

1972

# Differentiated perceptions of counselor functions in Iowa area vocational-technical schools and community colleges

Wendell Anthony Osorno  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Osorno, Wendell Anthony, "Differentiated perceptions of counselor functions in Iowa area vocational-technical schools and community colleges " (1972). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 5271.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/5271>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### **University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-26,936

OSORNO, Wendell Anthony, 1941-  
DIFFERENTIATED PERCEPTIONS OF COUNSELOR  
FUNCTIONS IN IOWA AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS  
AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1972  
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Differentiated perceptions of counselor functions  
in Iowa area vocational-technical schools and community colleges

by

Wendell Anthony Osorno

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Guidance and Counseling)

**Approved:**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**In Charge of Major Work**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Major Area**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Graduate College**

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Purpose	1
Need for the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	6
Definition of Terms	7
Delimitations	9
Organization of the Study	10
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Current Conceptions of Guidance and Counseling Services	11
Emerging Concepts and Attitudes of Counselor Functions	16
Challenges and Demands for Professionally Trained Counselors	23
Summary	30
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	31
Introduction	31
Instrument Used in the Study	31
Description of the Population	41
Collection of the Data	43
Treatment of the Data	45
FINDINGS	48
Introduction	48
Tabulation of the Data	49
Descriptive Analysis of the Data	83
DISCUSSION	117
Descriptive Variables	117
Views on Current Counselor Functions	117
Views on Future Counselor Functions	123
Views on Whether Counselor Time Should Be Required on <b>Certain</b> Specific Tasks	128
Comparison of Functions that are Comprised of Tasks Requiring Counselor Time and Future Functions	135
Value of the Study	137

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	140
Summary	140
Conclusions	148
Recommendations to Area School Personnel	149
Recommendations for Further Research	150
LITERATURE CITED	151
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	155
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS	156
APPENDIX B: COMMENTS BY AREA SCHOOL PERSONNEL	172

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Full-time equivalent enrollments in Iowa Area schools-reimbursable only	24
Table 2. Nation-wide demand for counselors under continuation of current conditions and on current bases	26
Table 3. Stratification of administrators, counselors and instructors by Area schools	44
Table 4. Number of inventories mailed to each of the groups in the study, number and per cent of these returned and usable	48
Table 5. Sex, age, and professional education of the respondents	50
Table 6. Number of years the respondents had been employed in their present position	51
Table 7. Responsibilities of position held by respondents	51
Table 8. Enrollment in the Area schools in which the respondents were located	52
Table 9. Instructional offerings in the Area schools in which the respondents were located	52
Table 10. Tabulation of the counselors' current function(s) as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	54
Table 11. Tabulation of the counselors' future function(s) as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	60
Table 12. Tabulation as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	65
Table 13. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values for the counselors' current functions when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel	84



## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
Table 14. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values for the counselors' future functions when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel	89
Table 15. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel	93
Table 16. Summary of the correlations between descriptive variables and current functions	102
Table 17. Summary of the correlations between descriptive variables and future functions	107
Table 18. Correlations between functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time and the matching future functions when perceived by administrators, counselors, and instructors	113
Table 19. Percentages and ranks of the counselors' current functions as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	120
Table 20. Percentages and ranks of the counselors' future functions as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	125
Table 21. Percentages and ranks as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors	129

## INTRODUCTION

## Background and Purpose

The comprehensive community college, as one facet of the educational hierarchy, has been increasingly recognized as a multi-purpose educational institution with the development of the individual as its primary objective. This facet of higher education represents one of the few unique accomplishments of American education in the twentieth century.

Williamson (43, p. 57) in his conference report on Student Personnel Work in the Junior College: Obligations and Opportunities makes the following evaluation:

The community college has been credited with revolutionizing higher education, with furthering the development of American civilization, with providing an avenue of mobility through educational opportunity for otherwise marginal people, with assuming a major role in the preparation of citizenship decision making---in short, with expanding post-high school opportunities for all interested citizens.

Ralph Fields (13, p. 3) states, "lifelong education is the concern of the community college . . . whether the problem is civic or social, personal or group, vocational or cultural . . . if education is helpful, the community college is ready to serve."

Authorities who view the community college as the institution to implement such varied opportunities and mobility for any and all who are interested, also point out the need for a complete and effective guidance and counseling service in the community college. Medsker (26, p. 142) states, "no claim of the junior college is discussed more often than its student personnel program, particularly the guidance and counseling phase." He further writes, ". . . without good counseling the potentially important

role of the two-year college in higher education could well be in jeopardy" (26, p. 168). Walter Sindlinger (34, p. 31) states, "the heart of the comprehensive, community-oriented college, is its guidance and counseling program."

The fundamental purpose of the community college, more than any other institution of higher education, has been to project a student-centered image by emphasizing as its primary function the comprehensive attempt to meet the needs of a greater diversity of students. Community college educators have recognized the importance of this function, and have committed funds and efforts to make such a program possible.

In recent years, however, there has been evidence of considerable skepticism at all levels of education regarding the significance of guidance and counseling contributions to the educational endeavor. The community colleges are not without their share of critics. Cohen (7) has even predicted that counselors will have no legitimate functions to perform in the community colleges of the future. He also predicts that counseling will no longer be a distinct function of the college. Arbuckle (3) indicates that one must at least wonder if the counselor actually---functionally---does perform a unique service for which he is specially educated and trained, or whether he is actually a teacher performing teaching or administrative functions.

Many of the issues concerning the relevance of guidance and counseling would appear to be the result of efforts to resolve various questions related to what constitutes the proper function(s) of counselors in the community college. Collins (8, p. 546) writes, "the counseling movement

has still not zeroed in on its function and proved its worth." His critical views have indicated that guidance and counseling in the community colleges are often based on faulty perceptions of counselor functions and the correction lies in a determined effort to identify inseparably linked tasks and functions that should be performed by professionally trained counselors.

In this endeavor, differing perceptions of the counselor's task and function can be crucial in the counselor's communication and effectiveness with others. If the perceptions of counselor functions differ very much among an institution's personnel, they may be expected to have difficulty in establishing an effective line of communication and an effective working relationship. The present study was an attempt to identify and understand some of these differences so that counselors may more effectively deal with them in the future.

#### Need for the Study

The rapid growth and development of a statewide system of Area schools in Iowa has been impressive both in terms of total number of students enrolled and the varied program opportunities offered. Legalized less than six years ago by the 61st Iowa General Assembly, the Area schools are the fastest growing components of higher education in Iowa.

There are currently fifteen Area schools operating in Iowa. Eleven of the Area schools have been organized as Area community colleges and four have been organized as Area vocational-technical schools. Their full-time equivalent enrollment has increased from 10,164 during the 1966-67 school

---

year to a projected full-time equivalent enrollment of 26,123 students for the 1970-71 school year (18). This enrollment, however, represents only the reimbursable full-time equivalent enrollment and does not represent the actual number of all students enrolled. For example, during the 1969-70 school year approximately 118,000 students enrolled in Area schools. The majority of this large enrollment represented students who enrolled in adult and continuing education programs as part-time students (19).

During this rapid growth or perhaps as a result of it, there has been little expenditure on research into the nature of counselor functions in the Area schools. The majority of the functions performed by the counselors in Area schools have typically been the result of a gradual accumulation of responsibilities and rarely the product of any comprehensive statewide plan. No statewide study has been conducted to ascertain the current emphasis of guidance and counseling within the range of student personnel services. A survey of the literature revealed no empirical research that has focused on the current and future responsibilities of counselors in Area schools.

If Area school personnel are to establish an effective line of communication and an effective working relationship in Area schools, then they certainly should welcome any contributions that would assist in determining the status of counselor functions in Iowa Area schools. It would also seem apparent that if differing perceptions of counselor functions were held by Area school personnel, knowledge of them would be valuable in furthering the understanding of some of these differences so that they may more effectively deal with them in the future.

In 1970, Giles Smith (37), Chief of the Guidance Service Section, State Department of Public Instruction, indicated that an assessment of the current and future functions of counselors in Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges would be valuable in identifying and improving guidance services in these institutions. He further recommended that before Area schools can become actively engaged in setting any comprehensive plan for specific counselor functions in Area schools, they must assess and identify the counselor's function(s) within the array of student personnel services.

The present study was the first statewide effort to elicit responses from Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors in determining the status of counselor functions in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. This research was intended to serve as a means by which later studies could be compared, so eventually a methodology of a comprehensive statewide plan for guidance and counseling services would be available in studying the effectiveness of counselors' in meeting the needs of Area school students.

The results of this study should also be useful in the initial training of counselors who may be interested in Area schools and for the in-service programs of Area school personnel. Knowledge of the current and future emphasis of guidance and counseling services, as well as the function(s) of counselors in Area schools should be of value in improving attitudes, understandings, and skills that will enable Area school personnel to provide a better program of education for all students.

---

### Statement of the Problem

The general problems of this study were to delineate the status of counselor functions in Iowa Area schools as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors. Specifically, the study sought the perceptions of Area school personnel in order to ascertain:

1. The perceptions of these three groups in regard to the current function(s) of counselors in Iowa Area schools.
2. The perceptions of these three groups in regard to the future function(s) of counselors in Iowa Area schools.
3. The perceptions of these three groups as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks in Iowa Area schools.

In addition, the study was to determine whether any relationship existed between the following descriptive variables and the perceptions of the groups studied on counselor functions:

- a. Sex
- b. Age
- c. Professional education
- d. Years employed at present position
- e. Responsibilities of position
- f. Institution's enrollment
- g. Institution's instructional offerings

A basic assumption and rationale underlying this study was to determine a pattern of function(s) for counselors in Iowa Area schools.

The following set of six hypotheses was tested in regard to the statement of the problem and the above assumption:

1. There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' current function(s).

2. There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' future function(s).

3. There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks.

4. There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' current function(s).

5. There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' future function(s).

6. There is no significant correlation between function(s) that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time, and future function(s) of counselors when analyzed for the perceptions of administrators, counselors, and instructors.

#### Definition of Terms

There are a number of terms which have wide usage across the state and nation. Additional ones will be used consistently throughout this study. The nomenclature of education can be relatively exact, or it can be confusing and misleading if not properly used. For the purpose of this study, the following selected terms have been defined to assist the reader in interpreting the data:



Community colleges - Defined as a publicly supported institution which offers two years of liberal arts, pre-professional, or other instruction which fulfills a portion of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree program and which also offers the curriculum of a vocational-technical school. Community colleges, junior colleges, two-year colleges, and Area schools will be used interchangeable throughout this study.

Area schools - Defined as the official designation of the administration units as defined by the 61st Iowa General Assembly, Senate File 550. There are fifteen such Area schools covering virtually every county and school district in Iowa. In order to establish some consistency with national terminology, Area schools will be synonymous to community colleges, junior colleges, and two-year colleges.

Administrator - Refers to the legally designated executive officer of an Area school. Also includes the person or persons directly in charge of the following administrative areas: student personnel services, adult & continuing education programs, college-parallel (arts & science) programs, and career education (vocational-technical) programs.

Counselor - Refers to a person employed in the Area school who has received specific training in guidance and counseling and is certified and recognized by the administration, faculty, and students as a counselor regardless of title or other assignments.

Instructor - Refers to a full-time professional employee of an Area school who is employed in a college-parallel, vocational-technical, or adult & continuing education program.

College-parallel or Arts & Science program - Those courses and

programs that are traditional in the sense that they constitute a portion of the baccalaureate degree program, and that their format and content closely resemble similar courses in senior colleges.

Vocational education or training - Defined as educational training that provides a student with practical experiences in a particular occupational field. Generally speaking, the courses and programs for such training require a limited amount of related instruction in social sciences, humanities, mathematics, and sciences.

Technical training - Defined as courses and programs requiring more extensive formal classroom instruction in the area of specialization, social sciences, humanities, mathematics, and sciences than that required in vocational courses and programs.

#### Delimitations

The scope of this investigation was limited to Iowa Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors in full-time positions during the period of September, 1970 to June, 1971. The results of this study cannot be used to describe the perceptions of administrators, counselors, and instructors of vocational-technical schools and community colleges in other states.

Certain descriptive variables were chosen for this study in order to determine if they were related to the criterion variables, namely, twenty-one assigned functions. However, the results of this study are not intended to exclude other variables that were not considered and could possibly be related to the perception of these functions by Area school

personnel.

There is no way to predict, with certainty, how administrators, counselors, and instructors will react to a specific survey of existing conditions or to functions that may be assigned; yet their reactions may have important implications for the development and clarification of counselor functions in Area schools.

#### Organization of the Study

In this study, the material was organized and presented in six chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction, background and purpose, need for the study, statement of the problem, definition of terms, delimitations, and organization of the study. The second chapter contains a summarization and analysis of related literature and research.

The methods and procedures used for the study are discussed in the third chapter. This chapter includes sections on the instrument used in the study, description of the population, and the collection and treatment of the data.

The fourth chapter includes the findings relative to the data collected from the mailed inventory. The fifth chapter includes a discussion of the findings with a primary focus in presenting areas of strong agreement and disagreement. The sixth, and final chapter of the study, presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

---

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Introduction

The preceding chapter stated that issues concerning the relevance of guidance and counseling would appear to be the result of efforts to resolve various questions related to what constitutes the proper function(s) of counselors in the community college. This chapter cites the literature and research concerned with the function(s) of community college counselors in the various states and the writings of educators throughout the nation. While empirical research concerning the status and function of the counselor in community colleges has been confined to a limited number of states, there exists certain pertinent information in the literature that pertains to the rationale of this study.

## Current Conceptions of Guidance and Counseling Services

Authorities in education have often stressed that guidance and counseling services have long played a key role in public education. This important role has also been emphasized in the success or failure of the community college student. As early as 1950, Conant (10, p. xi) wrote:

It would not be too much to say that on the success or failure of our guidance program hangs, in all probability, the success or failure of our system of public education.

In evaluating the expanding role of the junior college, L. G. Derthick (12, p. 185) says:

The strong guidance and counseling emphasis found in the junior college assists in screening those whose ambitions and interests are not commensurate with their aptitudes and capabilities, and provides appropriate alternate programs.

Fields (13, p. 70) supports this viewpoint by saying, "available guidance often makes the difference between frustrated withdrawal and well-balanced replanning."

In 1967, Jensen (20, p. 1) concluded that guidance and counseling services were pivotal to the success of all other programs at the community college level. He believed that as community colleges became more concerned for the individual student, the guidance and counseling offered by the junior college would become of prime importance to all who enter the open door policy colleges.

Jones (22, p. 1) expressed the following view:

Guidance experts generally agree that the counseling service provides the basic elements necessary for any guidance program to be effective. The emergence of the comprehensive community college with its wide range of educational options and diverse student population has tended to further emphasize the importance of the counseling function.

Historically, however, community colleges have not always concerned themselves with the specific functions of guidance and counseling. Confusion has often existed in community colleges since no distinction is made between guidance and counseling services, and student personnel work.

In discussing this dilemma, Miller (28, p. 13) emphasized that often there are, after all, certain guidance and counseling services which may profitably be regarded as distinct from other student personnel services. The broad term personnel services usually includes housing service, health service, financial assistance, placement service, and alike. In this contrast, the key words of guidance and counseling services are planning, decision making, and development.

---

Miller (29, p. 15) further argued that the concepts which are symbolized by the words guidance and counseling are ones of assisting individuals to make plans, decisions, and in implementing their development in accordance with their own emerging life patterns. Guidance and counseling should be viewed as functions in their own right. Although a part of the educative process, they are not the same as instruction or curriculum, or control. We should think of guidance and counseling as a process in which many people will participate. This process must be implemented by some organizational plan in which the roles of various persons are defined and their functions coordinated. Guidance and counseling is a continuous process, not something limited to certain levels of education, or to certain grades, or spots on the schedule.

The weaknesses of existing guidance and counseling practices are well documented by Medsker (26, pp. 162-165):

1. Many institutions lack policy formulation, planning, and professional direction of the program.
2. The counseling program in many institutions is inadequate.
3. Little research is conducted which enables the two-year college to obtain facts about their students.
4. Two-year colleges make only limited effort to evaluate the student personnel program.

In a 1957 study, Medsker (26) found that of 73 two-year colleges surveyed, 49 reported the counseling services, if done at all, were done by instructors and sometimes deans of colleges or administrators.

Starr (35) in a survey of guidance practices in selected junior colleges of the Northwest, reported the following existing characteristics:

(a) personal-social guidance has not been extensively developed; (b) lack of available trained counselors is a major weakness; (c) academic-vocational guidance receives most attention; (d) extensive use of local community agencies is evident; (e) extensive use of faculty members often untrained in guidance seems to be customary; (f) testing programs are offered more consistently than are other services; and (g) little, if any, research or evaluation is evident. Starr (35, p. 443) further concluded:

The guidance and counseling services in the Northwest follow a consistent pattern. Included in these programs are testing, academic advising, personal counseling, housing, employment, loans, follow-up, vocational counseling and scholarship.

The findings of Johnson's (21) study in 1966 indicated that there was an acute lack of conformity in student personnel services within Illinois, and also that some services such as counseling and vocational placement have been neglected by more than a third of the two-year institutions in Illinois.

In 1966, Karns (23) conducted a study of junior college student personnel services in Oklahoma and concluded that counseling, orientation, and placement were established as essential services in junior colleges, however, these services were below the minimum acceptable level in the state system of junior colleges. He recommended from this study that these services be placed on the priority of program improvements in Oklahoma junior colleges.

Repeatedly research articles and studies have pointed out that guidance and counseling services are seen as central to the success of community colleges, and yet, counselors have been criticized as increasing their ranks, but not their effectiveness. Too often has the trained counselor

been called upon to perform a plethora of functions, i.e., placement counseling, health counseling, veterans counseling, residence counseling, remedial reading, speech and hearing therapy, marriage counseling, vocational counseling, educational counseling, provided psychological services, foreign student counseling, and psychiatric services.

Medsker (26) points out that the lack of definitive functions for counselors in junior colleges has been suggested as being an important factor in the inadequate guidance and counseling services that currently exist.

The array of functions that counselors are called upon to perform at the college and university levels have contributed to the dilemma of understanding what constitutes the proper function(s) of counselors in community colleges. Hardee (14, pp. 12-13) summarizes that in four-year colleges, counselors are sometimes used in admissions counseling, rehabilitation counseling, financial advisement, group therapy, remedial aid services, discipline, selective service counseling, and study skills counseling.

Clearly, if the counselor has been hired to do one thing, and is loaded down with a second and a third and a fourth set of tasks, he is unable to perform his presumed original assignment very competently. Guidance and counseling consist of specialized services, vitally important to the total educational effort. However, these vital services are frequently prohibited from accomplishing their respective purposes, because they are misconceived at the planning level and shuffled into the plethora of student personnel services. Corrective measures by all parties must be taken to eliminate vagueness and ambiguities so that these services can be

---



clearly and precisely delineated into counselor functions. Counselors must take the initiative in correcting these conceptual and programming errors that so often tend to weaken guidance and counseling services in community colleges. If community college counselors are to establish their own identity and not have it established for them, they must work hand in hand with other related professional groups such as the faculty and administration (36).

#### Emerging Concepts and Attitudes of Counselor Functions

The relative newness and the rapid growth of the Area schools in Iowa have given rise to many questions. Though much is known and much has been written about this type of educational programming, recent objective data were lacking. For example, not since 1965 has a comprehensive attempt been made to determine whether the attitudes of teachers in two-year colleges are in harmony with the expressed objectives and functions of counselors in these institutions. Vague ambiguous concepts or attitudes of counselor functions have often been viewed by administrators and teachers. Possibly the reason for this misconception or lack of understanding is due in part to the lack of agreement found among counselors on what should be the proper function(s) of counselors in community colleges.

Hoyt (16, p. 5) in reviewing research needs in junior colleges recommended as a first step in reducing ambiguities in the area of personnel involved with guidance and counseling responsibilities, a description of the characteristics---particularly the work-experience and educational background of present community college personnel. The importance of

providing such a description for staff involved in each of several major types of functions, i.e. counseling, group advising, admissions, placement, administration, etc. was stressed.

Informal observations by Hoyt (16) suggests that a greater emphasis is placed on the counseling function at some schools than at others. Those that emphasized counseling, seemed to have differences in the degree to which this was a service devoted primarily to helping students make plans, to helping students resolve conflicts and overcome handicaps, or to helping students improve basic educational skills. These observations led to the expressed need to provide a dependable description of functions which occupy a student personnel program and of the relative amount of time devoted to such functions especially assigned to counselors.

Hoyt (16) contends that the findings relevant to this problem, while descriptively only, could be expected to be instrumental in stimulating and evaluating local planning as well as providing useful normative information.

Another profitable means of reducing ambiguities is to look at the counselors' function through the eyes of his various publics. In this endeavor, community college counselors should also be aware of how counselors are perceived at other levels of the educational hierarchy so that they might better understand their proper function. Obviously, this may produce a distorted image or caricature. However, according to Shertzer and Stone (33, p. 687):

Caricatures are harsh but nonetheless revealing because they contain elements of truth which place in bold relief the most salient characteristics the individual conveys in his efforts to meet the demands of his role.

The caricature that may be drawn from professional educators concerning counselors has often been referred to by Darley (11, p. 228) in this five-fold description:

1. The faculty often views the counselor as an administrator and the nicest thing you can say about administrators is that they are a necessary evil which may be tolerated but better yet eradicated.
2. Counselors are usually ancillary workers and are therefore expendable.
3. Counselors often coddle and pamper students who might be better off if they would drop or flunk out of school.
4. Counselors often hide behind pseudo-Freudian, and pseudo-psychometric jargon to establish a pretense of being a separate profession.
5. The counselors pretense of confidentiality is merely a shield to hide behind when the welfare of the institution is involved or his activities challenged.

If faculty assessments of the community college counselors' function is viewed in like manner, then it follows that when the community college counselor functions as an administrator he will be viewed as an administrator; if he provides only ancillary services, rather than integrating his services to all students and faculty, he will be expendable. If the community college counselors' acceptance and understanding of students is coddling, over-protective, and pampering of academic incompetents, then the faculty may be justified in their misconceptions. To the degree that community college counselors rely on jargon rather than clear, understandable communications to the staff, they also risk being branded a charlatan in its clearest form. When confidentiality is used as a self-protective device rather than an indispensable part of ethical conduct, the community

college counselors' function becomes suspect by all of his various publics.

Richardson and Blocker (32) are quick to point out that the junior college counselors' function is often difficult to appraise because of his assigned responsibilities within the wide range of student personnel services. It is difficult to know whether various publics are responding to what the counselor believes his function should be, or to what they see his function to be throughout the plethora of student personnel services which exist in many community colleges.

In appraising the resources of junior college student personnel workers, Matson (24) found that in most cases the counselor and the student personnel worker were viewed as one and the same. It was her recommendation that in the training of junior college student personnel workers, proper roles and functions of counselors and student personnel workers should be identified and recognized by the staff, administration, and professional educators.

Vontress and Chesseborough (40) indicate that the counselor has no business working as an administrator. The rationale is simple. Any specialist renders his most efficient service in the area of his specialization. Therefore, counselors who also work at administrative tasks lose their effectiveness as counselors and hardly become efficient as administrators. The administratively functioning counselor is probably the most useless person on the professional staff. Notwithstanding his specialized training, he is rendered useless to the most important people in the school, the students.

Shertzer and Stone (33) emphasize that students do not bring their

problems to an administrator; so to the degree that a counselor functions as an administrator, he is rendered impotent as a counselor.

Thornton (39) supports this viewpoint and emphasizes that:

The administrator-counselor would indeed find it difficult to provide adequate time and service for his students. Even though his training may be in counseling, the pressure of other tasks and frequent absences would tend to interrupt the progress of counseling.

In 1969, Weihe (41) conducted a study at Kirkwood Community College designed to determine how students in the arts & sciences, vocational-technical, and adult education programs perceived student personnel services; how familiar they were with the services; and how counselors and counseling were perceived. The results of the study concluded that the role of the counselor was not clearly seen by students in terms of his relative position with other staff members. Student responses indicated that the counselor was perceived as part administrator, part instructor, but more often a mediator.

Major reasons for varying attitudes and perceptions of the counselors' function were evaluated by Wrenn. He makes the point that since there are different levels of counseling, institutions tend to classify all formal advisement services as part of the counseling program. Wrenn (44, p. 59) explains that there are four different levels of counseling that vary from the professionally trained counselor who handles many complex student problems, to those functions performed by faculty members in the general advisement of students. He viewed all types of nominal relationships between students and faculty members to be the "first level" of counseling. Admissions and registration would likely be examples of the first level.

The "second level" of counseling would involve faculty advising. The "third level" of counseling would be conducted by selected faculty members who could deal with almost any problem that came up, even if it was outside the area of academic adjustment. The "fourth level" of counseling is contrasted from the third level, by faculty members who are trained professionally in therapeutic counseling. Medsker (26) feels that all levels of counseling exist in practice, but some colleges have a higher proportion of Wrenn's fourth level. A great variation exists, however, in the counseling efforts put forth at all levels.

Stensaas (36, p. 15) in response to faculty members used as advisors and often as counselors in community colleges writes:

Often the use of advisors is encouraged as a helpful adjunct to the guidance program since it releases counselors from jobs that can be performed as well by faculty members. This is excellent in theory but too often in practice is abused, as faculty members are required to perform jobs beyond their professional preparation.

In 1967, the Michigan state department of public instruction (27) conducted a survey of guidance and counseling programs in Michigan community colleges. Their study involved 95 possible returns from twenty-one community colleges in Michigan. All the community colleges participating in the survey were sent a questionnaire to be answered by the president, dean of instruction, dean of student personnel, a faculty member, and a counselor. The investigation found that among the twenty-one basic student personnel functions used in the Carnegie study more than 95 per cent of the respondents saw the counselor as being directly responsible for the student counseling function. Among the other basic student personnel functions, five were seen by 90 per cent or more of the respondents as part of the

counselor's role, i.e., the counselor had either direct responsibility or performed an assisting role. They were: (a) applicant consulting, (b) educational testing, (c) group orienting, (d) career information, (e) student advisement.

In the survey of guidance and counseling in Michigan community colleges (27, p. 8) the community college counselor's major function was repeatedly perceived as his work with students who are adjusting to college level work, who are making vocational and educational plans, and who are coping with new knowledge of self and environment. The counselor's day-to-day activities were seen most frequently as: (a) counseling with students who are undecided about a vocation; (b) counseling with students who are having academic problems; (c) interpreting test results in a counseling interview; (d) counseling with students who are undecided about a major and/or senior college; (e) helping students with plans to meet transfer requirements; and (f) counseling with students who see their problem as "personal."

In 1969, Stensaas (36) analyzed the role of the community college counselor as perceived by California community college counselors, presidents, and academic senate presidents. A questionnaire was sent to each of the 87 community colleges in California. Stensaas reported that the community college counselor was not viewed as a specialist working with a limited number of tasks, but as a generalist working throughout the student personnel and educational program. The results of the study pointed out that the community college counseling function differs from counseling in other segments of higher education in the following ways: (a) the training

required or expected is different; (b) the community college counselor is closely aligned with the instructional staff; and (c) the community college counselor and his publics believe he should perform more tasks than are customarily performed by four-year college and university counselors.

#### Challenges and Demands for Professionally Trained Counselors

The overriding challenge for those who are employed in community colleges can be simply stated: to become competent innovators for new roles in new settings. The challenge is easy to state; understanding and implementation are more difficult.

Obviously, it is not enough to copy, in part or in total, guidance and counseling programs, roles, and functions from higher education, secondary education, or some combinations thereof. Because the community college setting and its problems are unlike those with which we are familiar, we must understand new concepts, develop new competencies, and modify old attitudes. In this endeavor, community college counselors and other staff members alike will need to understand the community college and its setting, the community college student, community resources and opportunities, as well as the theoretical foundations that undergrid guidance and counseling practices. We need to realize, according to Thornton (39, p. vii), that:

The community junior college is not just secondary education, deserving the epithet, "glorified high school." Nor is it only higher education, as described by the phrase "decapitated college." It is an indigenous American educational institution developed to perform needed functions, some of which shared by the high schools or by the colleges, and some of which are its own unshared responsibilities.



Due to the open door admissions policy and the multiple program opportunities designed to serve the needs of all, Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges, more than any other educational institution, have attracted and enrolled a diverse population with respect to socio-economic class, race, age, ability, and level of vocational development. Area community colleges have broadened their program offerings to encompass terminal education, transfer education, adult education, and general education. According to Medsker (26), community service projects, remedial and salvage programs, guidance, and counseling undergrid these programs.

The statewide system of Area schools in Iowa has demonstrated significant growth since its inception during the school year 1966-67. The enrollment of students in adult education, college-parallel, and vocational-technical programs is shown in Table 1 (18). This significant growth

Table 1. Full-time equivalent enrollments in Iowa Area schools-reimbursable only

Programs	Adult Education	College Parallel	Vocational-Technical	Totals
School year 1966-67	669	7,345	2,150	10,164
School year 1967-68	2,431	9,264	4,720	16,415
School year 1968-69	3,262	9,236	7,259	19,757
School year 1969-70	4,566	9,615	7,534	21,715
(Estimated) 1970-71	<u>5,330</u>	<u>11,081</u>	<u>9,712</u>	<u>26,123</u>
Totals	16,258	46,541	31,375	94,174

supports the axiomatic view that many Area community college students are searching for a way to improve and understand themselves and where they might fit into the world which includes the world of work. If Area community colleges are to successfully meet the needs of all their students, who are basically vocationally oriented, the colleges, in effect must concern themselves with helping students in their educational and vocational appraisal as well as development.

Raines (31, p. 6) recommended that professionally trained counselors were needed to provide effective guidance and counseling assistance to students who need to make decisions regarding educational and vocational objectives or who need assistance in resolving personal problems which are interfering with their educational progress. A college which meets only the intellectual and vocational needs of the individual or community is doing only part of the job. Anyone with an emotional problem will not function fully either academically or vocationally, and no academic or vocational problem is without emotional complications (31). The lack of professionally trained counselors in community colleges, however, has often resulted in students not having the assistance needed for adequate appraisal and development. Area community colleges must bolster their capabilities for dealing with this concern and demand for more professionally trained counselors.

The staffing of professionally trained counselors to assist students in vocational decision making, as well as educational and personal problem solving has been of concern to those in community colleges. According to Collins (8, p. 548):

The function of vocational counseling has too frequently been downgraded, minimized, or sidestepped by junior college counselors, yet vocational counseling, and its corollary, educational guidance, have a centrality which makes all other functions pale in significance.

Hitchcock (15, p. 87) former APGA Executive Director, estimated that the number of full-time counselors in the junior colleges was only 790 in 1965. The nation-wide demand for professionally trained counselors in a variety of settings from 1965 through 1975 is presented in Table 2 by Hitchcock (15, p. 109).

Table 2. Nation-wide demand for counselors under continuation of current conditions and on current bases

Setting	1965	1970	1975
Elementary	2,500(est.)	26,987	53,500
Secondary	31,000	44,938	71,887
Junior Colleges	791	4,000	5,000
Colleges and Universities	4,000	6,674	7,591
Employment service	3,000	7,494	8,158
Rehabilitation	3,500	5,187	5,695
OEO Programs	<u>450</u>	<u>3,600</u>	<u>7,200</u>
Totals	45,241	98,880	159,031

Starr (35, p. 145) recommended that more professionally trained counselors be added to the junior college staffs with a minimum of one for each 350 full-time student and that professional counselors be made available all hours of the day. In a survey of junior colleges,

Alderson (2, p. 102) found that 350 was the average number of students per full-time counselor found in most two-year colleges.

In his national survey of student personnel services, Raines (31, p. 20) found that a lack of adequate staffing of counselors meant that nearly half a million junior college students were being deprived of adequate counseling. If, as many authorities in higher education have suggested, the ultimate success of the comprehensive concept of higher education rests upon adequate guidance, dramatic improvements are required nationally (31.)

McDaniel (25, p. 32) suggested that a method found effective in promoting guidance and counseling assistance, is the promotion and use of faculty members. The use of faculty members who have special interest and ability to serve as advisors for students increases the effectiveness of the guidance program (14). Hardee supports this idea and advocates utilizing faculty members in student personnel programs and especially in counseling (14).

Currently some community colleges, especially small colleges, faculty members are called upon to become advisors and perform many functions in lieu of trained counselors. The assignments of counseling responsibilities to ineffective and untrained instructors, however, casts serious doubts in the adequacy of such programs (36).

In reviewing faculty involvement in college counseling, Hardee (14, p. 50) points out that not all faculty members are suited, by temperament or training, for employment in this capacity and suggests three criteria to be used in selecting faculty members for a counseling role:

1. The interest of the faculty member in counseling.

2. The ability of the faculty member to deal effectively with students in a one-to-one relationship.
3. The willingness of the faculty member to learn the fundamentals of his counseling responsibility.

Stensaas (36, p. 13) in writing about faculty involvement in counseling states:

The shortage of trained counselors is one of the key reasons for the past and current use of faculty members in much of the guidance that is conducted at the community college. Student personnel services grew so rapidly that faculty members were recruited to perform them. Today, any involvement of faculty in student personnel services is still labeled "counseling" much to the chagrin of professional counselors.

Matson (24, p. 3) in the Carnegie report of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, said:

The teacher who "liked students," or was willing to accept the assignment (which frequently was imposed on top of a full-time teaching program) volunteered or was invited to participate as a counselor in the student personnel functions.

One of the primary recommendations submitted in 1970 by Blocker (4, p. xii) in his report to the State of Iowa Office for Planning and Programming was that Iowa's publicly supported community colleges study the feasibility of using larger numbers of teacher faculty members as part-time counseling and guidance personnel. As presently organized, Blocker felt the professionals in these institutions are arbitrarily divided between instructional and counseling categories, which arrangement, although administratively convenient, does not necessarily make the best educational sense (4).

Several reasons to explain why this practice has enjoyed widespread

acceptance have been examined by Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (5, pp. 243-244). They have concluded that:

The assignment of counseling responsibilities to all members of the staff does not require an increase in remuneration or faculty released time. Thus, it provides administrators with an easy and inexpensive procedure for satisfying the requirements of accreditation committees and easing their own consciences. There is a prevailing belief in certain administrative circles that the counseling service should confine itself strictly to helping students adjust to the academic program and avoid concern with their personal problems. It is obvious that untrained counseling personnel will be only too happy to avoid becoming involved in the personal problems of students; professionally trained counselors have been taught that it is not possible to separate the two.

In a critical view of existing junior college counseling, Collins (8, p. 549) writes:

Most junior college counselors do see themselves as specialists in educational advisement and from catalog study and experience have made themselves into experts in this field. As a group they are much better informed than faculty advisors on graduation, major and transfer requirements and they have good reason to be outraged when it is suggested that this vital if unglamorous and sometimes routine function be performed by subject matter specialists. Faculty advisors often have narrow views based on their own college experiences 20 years previous and frequently have axes to grind. There is no reason to expect them to have developed the body of knowledge necessary for accurate educational programming and hence there is no reason to assign them this task.

In his study of vocational education programs and the Area schools of Iowa, Blocker (5) highly recommended that Iowa's publicly supported universities be encouraged to offer comprehensive educational programs for the training of instructional, counseling, and administrative personnel specifically for community colleges. Blocker (5) contends that this is necessary in order to overcome an acute shortage of individuals, who

understand the history and philosophy of two-year colleges, students and student personnel services, curriculum, instructional techniques, and the basic elements of administration and college governance.

#### Summary

In brief, the literature and research concerned with the functions of community college counselors indicated the following:

1. Guidance and counseling currently are a popular part of student personnel programs in community colleges. However, the function of the counselor appears to be less defined than that of many other established fields and roles.
2. Empirical research concerning the status and function of the counselor in community colleges has been confined to a limited number of states.
3. A lack of definitive functions for counselors in community colleges was viewed as an important factor in the inadequate guidance and counseling services that currently exist.
4. A profitable means of reducing ambiguities about the counselors' function is to look at the counselors' function through the eyes of his various publics.
5. A continuous demand in community college student personnel programs is the staffing of more certified counselors.
6. The literature emphasizes the need to assess and evaluate the counselors' function within the plethora of student personnel services in two-year colleges.

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

### Introduction

The general problems of this study were to delineate the status of counselor functions in Iowa Area schools as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors and to ascertain their perceptions in regard to the current and future function(s) of counselors in Area schools. An attempt was also made to delineate the responses of these three groups in order to ascertain their perceptions as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks. These results were used to determine a pattern of functions for counselors in Area schools. In addition, the study was to determine whether any relationship existed between seven descriptive variables and the perceptions of the groups studied of counselor functions.

This chapter describes the methods and precedures that were used to collect, analyze, and synthesize the required data for the study. The chapter has been divided into four sections: (a) instrument used in the study, (b) description of the population, (c) collection of the data, and (d) treatment of the data.

### Instrument Used in the Study

#### Description

The instrument used for this study was an inventory (see Appendix A). The inventory was attractively printed by the State Department of Public Instruction. It contained three parts and was stapled into booklet form.



A cover letter on the outside conveyed an appeal to Area school personnel for their cooperation in the study.

Part I of the inventory contained the respondent's identification number by category and institution. The first three digits identified the category and the last two digits the institution that a respondent represented.

Example:	026	-	05
	Counselor		Area V Community College

This part also included seven descriptive variables that the respondents were asked to identify for statistical purposes of the study.

In Part II, a list of twenty-one basic functions of a community college student personnel program was descriptively outlined as a basis for each respondent to indicate the assigned function(s) performed by the counselor at his institution. Below each assigned function were illustrated activities to assist in identifying the function performed at an institution. Based on the current position and affiliation of the respondent with an institution, two kinds of responses were asked for each assigned function: (a) his perception of the current responsibilities of the counselor at his institution, and (b) his conception of the future responsibilities of the counselor at his institution.

Part III contained a list of certain specific tasks that are related to the functions in Part II and commonly performed by counselors in a community college. The respondents were asked to indicate their perception as to whether counselor time should be required for each of the tasks listed.

The method of responses to Parts II and III of the inventory was a six

step numerical scale ranging from "completely disagree" to "completely agree."

### Construction

In the development of the inventory, a thorough examination of the literature was conducted. In order to delineate the status of counselor functions as perceived by Area school personnel, twenty-one basic functions were utilized from the report by Dr. Max Raines on the appraisal and development of junior college student personnel programs (31). These twenty-one basic functions were used as criterion variables and separately treated with respect to the perceptions of the groups studied on current and future categories. The same functions were used in each category and were organized into five administrative units. Each of the functions is herein categorized under a general rubric and described operationally (9, pp. 13-15):

#### Admission, Registration, and Records

Pre-College Information - Dissemination of information by brochures, counselor visitations, on-campus visits, conferences, direct correspondence, etc., to encourage college attendance, to note special features of the college, to further understanding of requirements for admission and for special curriculums, to develop proper attitudes, and to give all pertinent information contributing to student decision and planning.

Applicant Appraisal - Subsumes all devices, such as transcript and test interpretation, individual case studies, interviewing of students, conducting staff inquiries, etc., to obtain, organize and evaluate significant background information to determine admission and curriculum eligibility, to effect proper placement and to assist students toward the self-knowledge needed for decision making and planning.

Educational Testing - Measurement of aptitude, interests, values, achievement, and personality factors of students

as well as assessment of the pervasive characteristics and tone or climate of the institution. Evaluation of past record and testing in the skills of reading, listening, speaking, composition, and mathematics to assure proper placement of students in courses of varying levels of difficulty.

Personnel Records - Maintenance of accurate, functional records to be compiled into a cumulative file reflecting educational, psychological, physical, and personal development. These records should be comprehensive, pertinent, accurate, and should be widely but discreetly disseminated.

Student Registration - Designing registration forms and data processing procedures, effecting class changes and withdrawals, recording instructors' grades, providing transcripts and, where possible, machine-scheduling the students into classes.

Academic Regulation - Enforcing probation policies, evaluating graduation eligibility, handling cases of student infraction of the college rules, interviewing terminated students or probationers petitioning for re-admission.

### Guidance and Counseling

Applicant Consulting - Giving of information pertinent to interpretation of tests and other data, and proffering educational and occupational service to applicants prior to formal admission.

Student Advisory - Giving of information pertinent to selection of courses, occupational pre-requisites, transfer requirements, effective study methods, academic progress, availability of resource agencies, and other such areas of concern to students. The depth level of advisement will depend on whether it is done by the professional counselor or by the faculty advisor.

Group Orientation - All information-giving associated with induction into college, attitude development, effective study skills, test interpretation, vocational decision, educational planning, involvement in activities, rules and regulations, etc., which lends itself to the group process as well or better than through individual contact.

Student Counseling - Professional service to students in clarifying basic values, attitudes, interests and abilities; all phases of decision making; formulating vocational-educational plans; in identifying and resolving problems interfering with plans and progress; and in providing appropriate resources for more intensive and deep-seated personal problems.

Career Information - Provision of occupational information toward narrowing of vocational choice. Basic curriculum decisions and planning is contingent upon possession of maximum occupational information made available through comprehensive libraries, brochures and references, seminars, consultation services, faculty advisement, and particularly through local and regional occupational information centers.

### Placement and Financial Aid

Financial Assisting - Loans, scholarships, part-time jobs, budget management, solicitation of funds, securing of government grants. All of these are necessary if the economic equation is to be balanced so that no student is denied college because of lack of money. Specialists within student personnel are needed to perform these tasks.

Graduate Placement - The placement officer within the student personnel office has responsibility for locating appropriate employment for qualified graduates and other students terminating their college training, for providing prospective employers with placement information, and for follow-up studies designed to provide guides to curricular development.

### Student Activities

Student Self-Governing - Advising student government organizations, providing training in formal and informal group processes, conducting leadership training programs, and supervising intercollegiate student government conferences and all other significant aspects of citizenship training.

Co-Curricular Activity - Arranging for cultural activities, sponsoring of clubs and organizations, advising student publications, organizing vocational and other special interest groups---all co-curricular activities which contribute to educational growth and development.

Social Regulation - Social involvement, social amenities, social grace, moral and ethical conduct are all concerns of student personnel workers, particularly to those responsible for student activities and for the operation of on-campus living facilities.

Student Induction - Geographical, academic, social, attitudinal, and other psychological orientation of the student to the college. Preferably, this orientation should be intermittent throughout the spring and summer period prior to initial enrollment.

### Administration

Program Articulation - For smooth transition throughout the two-year college period, there must be adequate two-way flow with the faculties of the feeder high schools and with the colleges of transfer, effective intra-staff relationships, and good lines of communication with industrial and commercial enterprises and other cooperating agencies within the community.

In-Service Education - Systematic opportunities for professional discussion among student personnel staff members, consultants for special areas of interest and needs, a flood of professional literature, interpretation of local research data, provision for attendance at professional conferences, systematic articulation with instructional departments and periodic summer workshops or other review and up-dating seminars.

Program Evaluation - Follow-up of dropouts, graduates, and transfers; student evaluation of counseling; student affairs, etc.; development of local normative data and other research on special topics of interest.

Administrative Organization - To be effective, student personnel programs must be adequately staffed, housed, financed, evaluated, and effectively related to the total mission of the college.

The literature was also reviewed to construct statements aimed at determining the perception of the respondents as to whether counselor time should be required on specific tasks commonly performed by counselors in a community college. Fifty-two specific tasks were designed and subsequently

grouped into functions corresponding to the twenty-one basic functions previously described. These tasks were identified as criterion variables and are herein grouped under their corresponding functions.

### Admission, Registration, and Records

#### Pre-College Information

- a. Preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the institution.
- b. Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.

#### Applicant Appraisal

- a. Evaluating high school and college transcripts.
- b. Serving on admissions committee.

#### Educational Testing

- a. Administering tests to incoming students.
- b. Assemble and maintain appropriate testing instruments.

#### Personnel Records

- a. Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.
- b. Writing recommendations for students seeking employment and college transfer.

#### Student Registration

- a. Designing forms and procedures for student registration.
- b. Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.

#### Academic Regulation

- a. Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.
- b. Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.

## Guidance and Counseling

### Applicant Consulting

- a. Interpreting test results to students.
- b. Consulting with students about career plans and educational goals.

### Student Advisory

- a. Interpreting college transfer requirements.
- b. Helping students plan appropriate programs or curricula.
- c. Approving course selection for students.
- d. Interpret effective study skills to students.

### Group Orientation

- a. Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.
- b. Teach courses in psychology and/or educational vocational exploration.

### Student Counseling

- a. Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems.
- b. Counseling with students about personal and social problems.
- c. Conducting group counseling for underachievers.
- d. Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.
- e. Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.
- f. Assisting students in achieving self-understanding.

### Career Information

- a. Dispensing career information.
- b. Studying manpower needs within community and region.
- c. Interpreting occupational information.

## Placement and Financial Aid

### Financial Assisting

- a. Analyzing financial needs of students.
- b. Securing financial assistance for students.
- c. Supervising students on work-study programs.

### Graduate Placement

- a. Arranging placement interviews.
- b. Working with employment agencies in placement of students.
- c. Work with institutional departments in placement activities.
- d. Compile curricular guides for transferring students into senior colleges.

## Student Activities

### Student Self-Governing

- a. Sponsoring or advising student government.
- b. Supervising elections and student conferences.

### Co-Curricular Activity

- a. Supervising co-curricular student activities program.

### Social Regulation

- a. Reprimanding students for social misconduct.
- b. Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities.

### Student Induction

- a. Interpreting student services and regulations.
- b. Train returning students to help new students.
- c. Maintaining referral resources for students.



Administration

## Program Articulation

- a. Serving on faculty committees.
- b. Serving as consultant to a department or division of the institution.
- c. Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.

## In-Service Education

- a. Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.
- b. Attending professional workshops and conferences.

## Program Evaluation

- a. Conducting follow-up studies of former students.
- b. Confer with students withdrawing from the institution.

## Administrative Organization

- a. Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/or student personnel services.

Seven descriptive variables were also used in the study to determine whether any relationship existed between descriptive variables and the criterion variables. Sex, age, professional education, years employed at present position, responsibilities of position, institution's enrollment, and institution's instructional offerings were used as the descriptive variables.

Tryout

The printed inventory used in this study was developed from many drafts. Extensive planning was necessary in order to develop an instrument whose appearance, length, clarity, and ease in completion would assist in a

successful return and cooperation of the respondents. A pretest and tryout of the inventory was conducted in September, 1970. Copies of the dittoed inventory and cover letter were completed by fifteen educators whose backgrounds were similar to those who were included in the study. Statements that were ambiguous were revised or deleted. Recommendations were considered in the development of the final form.

#### Description of the Population

The population sampled in this study included all Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges in the state of Iowa. Every Area school within the state participated in the study, for a total of fifteen. Preliminary investigation revealed over 1,600 professional school personnel employed within the Area schools. This investigation included administrators, counselors, and instructors who were employed in a full-time position during the period of September, 1970 to June, 1971 by the following Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges:

Area I - Northeast Iowa Area Vocational-Technical School, Calmar

Area II - North Iowa Area Community College, Mason City

Area III - Iowa Lakes Community College, Estherville, Emmetsburg

Area IV - Northwest Iowa Vocational School, Sheldon

Area V - Iowa Central Community College, Eagle Grove, Fort Dodge,  
Webster City

Area VI - Merged Area VI Community College, Iowa Falls, Marshalltown

Area VII - Hawkeye Institute of Technology, Waterloo

Area IX - Eastern Iowa Community College, Clinton, Muscatine,  
Davenport

Area X - Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids

Area XI - Des Moines Area Community College, Boone, Ankeny

Area XII - Western Iowa Tech, Sioux City

Area XIII - Iowa Western Community College, Clarinda, Council Bluffs

Area XIV - Southwestern Community College, Creston

Area XV - Indian Hills Community College, Centerville, Ottumwa

Area XVI - Southeastern Iowa Area Community College, Burlington,  
Keokuk

After careful consideration, it was decided to include in this study all Area school administrators who were identified by the following positions:

- a. Superintendent
- b. Campus dean
- c. Director of college-parallel programs
- d. Director of vocational-technical programs
- e. Director of adult & continuing education
- f. Director of student personnel services

A list of designated administrators was made from each Area school.

A similar list was also compiled of all Area school personnel who were identified and certified as counselors from each Area school. A total of 87 administrators, and 80 counselors was identified for the purpose of the study.

#### Selection of Sample

Cochran (6, p. 2) lists the following principal advantages of sampling as compared with taking a complete enumeration or census of the aggregate:

(1) reduced cost, (2) greater speed, (3) greater scope, and (4) greater accuracy.

It was decided that approximately 25 per cent of the total population of full-time instructors, employed in each Area school, would be an adequate sample for the purpose of the study. A stratified random technique of sampling described by Wert, Neidt, and Ahmann (42, pp. 108-110) was used to select a representative sample of instructors employed in full-time positions at Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. This representative cross section included instructors in the college-parallel programs, vocational-technical programs, and the adult education programs from each Area school. A list of instructors from each Area school was alphabetized into three instructional categories. These instructional categories were college-parallel, vocational-technical, and adult education. A table of random numbers was used to determine the starting point from one to four for the selection of instructors to be used in the study. A sample of 313 college-parallel and vocational-technical instructors was selected by this procedure. Since there were only 50 full-time instructors identified as coordinators or instructors in adult education programs, all were included for the purpose of the study.

Table 3 indicates the number of administrators, counselors, and instructors by Area school represented in the study.

#### Collection of the Data

Prior to the collection of the data, a personal conference was held with the Director of Student Personnel Services from each of the Area

Table 3. Stratification of administrators, counselors, and instructors by Area schools

Group	Administrators	Counselors	Instructors	Total
Area I	4	4	12	20
Area II	5	6	20	31
Area III	5	5	18	28
Area IV	4	2	6	12
Area V	6	8	36	50
Area VI	8	4	28	40
Area VII	4	3	23	30
Area IX	10	5	33	48
Area X	5	10	58	73
Area XI	7	10	33	50
Area XII	4	3	20	27
Area XIII	8	6	28	42
Area XIV	5	2	7	14
Area XV	5	6	23	34
Area XVI	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	87	80	363	530

schools. The proposed study and a willingness to help the Area schools assess and improve their guidance and counseling services was presented to the directors in November, 1970. Their cooperation, as well as suggestions, were requested in order to facilitate the collection of the data.

In January, 1971, 530 administrators, counselors, and instructors representing each Area vocational-technical school and community college in the state of Iowa were sent an inventory. The names of the administrators, counselors, and instructors were compiled from an official list of professional Area school personnel submitted by each Area school and verified from the 1970-71 data on Iowa Area schools (17).

The inventory was mailed through campus delivery by the Director of Student Personnel Services at each Area school. In February, a follow-up reminder card and a second mailing was sent to those not returning the inventory. (See Appendix A for copies of the cover letter and follow-up reminder card.) The final returns of the inventory were received by March, 1971.

#### Treatment of the Data

The responses from the inventory were coded, then they were punched and verified on International Business Machines (IBM) cards at the Iowa State University Computation Center. IBM machines were used for the sorting, tabulating, and summarizing of the data. The responses from administrators, counselors, and instructors were statistically treated with respect to the criterion variables.

The criterion measures were the responses to current function(s) of counselors, future function(s) of counselors, and as to whether counselor time should be required on specific tasks. All data relevant to the criterion measures were descriptively treated and reported by the use of frequency counts, percentiles, means, standard deviations, and

correlations.

The basic statistical model including the effects of variability isolated in the experiment was:

$$Y = \mu + \alpha_i + e_{ij}$$

where

- Y = perception on the criterion variables
- $\mu$  = overall grand mean perception
- $\alpha_i$  = contribution due to the *i*th treatment or group
- $e_{ij}$  = random error or deviation corresponding to the *j*th observation of the *i*th treatment or group

This model was used for the raw data relevant to hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 of the study and can be defined as a single-classification analysis of variance. For a description of the procedures relevant to the model used, see Chapter 10, Snedecor and Cochran (38).

Popham (30, p. 61) says, "The central task of educational research is to discover the nature of relationships between educational variables." He further indicates that correlational techniques provide the researcher with a procedure for quantifying the nature of relationships between two or more variables.

Correlational techniques were used to test the raw data applicable to hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 of the study. The specific correlation technique used in this study was the Pearson product-moment correlation. For a description of the procedures relevant to this correlation technique and the test of significance, see Chapter 6, Popham (30).

In applying analysis of variance and product-moment correlations to

the raw data of the study, the five per cent level of significance was used in determining if the observed deviation between the groups studied was too large to be accounted for by chance and the hypotheses were tested at this level.

The investigation into the extent of agreement or disagreement on the perception of counselor functions by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors attempted to identify those functions and tasks which are endorsed by a majority of the three groups. There were no established standards which could be applied, but for the purpose of this study the researcher felt that the hypothesis of consensus would be supported on those items for which more than 75 per cent of the respondents were in agreement. Where more than 75 per cent of the respondents marked within the numerical scale of 0, 1, 2, 3 or within the numerical scale of 4, 5, 6 it would be hypothesized that a consensus of agreement would exist on the item.



## FINDINGS

## Introduction

The findings of this study are based upon the results obtained from the responses of an inventory by 465 administrators, counselors, and instructors in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Table 4 summarizes the number of inventories mailed, the number returned, and the number usable. It can be observed that 530 inventories were mailed, 482 were returned, and 465 were usable. There were 85 administrators, 76 counselors, and 304 instructors whose responses were usable in the study. The percentage of returns in this study was 90.9 per cent while the percentage of usable returns was 87.7 per cent.

Table 4. Number of inventories mailed to each of the groups in the study, number and per cent of these returned and usable

Groups	N Mailed	N Returned	% Returned	N Usable	% Usable
Administrators	87	85	97.7	85	97.7
Counselors	80	78	97.5	76	95.0
Instructors	<u>363</u>	<u>319</u>	<u>87.8</u>	<u>304</u>	<u>83.7</u>
Total	530	482	90.9	465	87.7

In the findings relevant to this study, the data were categorized and presented according to the following sections:

1. Tabulation of the data using frequency counts and percentages.

This section presents the characteristics of the respondents, and the

degree of agreement and disagreement associated between the groups studied on each function and task used in the study.

2. Descriptive analysis of the data using means, standard deviations, analysis of variance, and correlations. In this section, major differences are presented where the observed deviations between the groups studied were too large to be accounted for by chance. The various hypotheses examined in this study will be restated and evaluated when data appropriate for their evaluation are presented in this section.

#### Tabulation of the Data

Descriptive information concerning the respondents in terms of sex, age, and professional education is presented in Table 5. There were 84 male administrators and only one female administrator who responded to the survey. Of the counselors, 70 were male and six were female respondents. Of the instructors, 224 were male and 80 were female respondents. The administrators as a group were older; none was under 26, while two of the counselors and 11 instructors were under 25 years of age. Fifty-six and five tenths per cent of the administrators were 41 years of age or older, while 21.1 per cent of the counselors and 39.4 per cent of the instructors were in this age range. The table also indicates that the administrators as a group had reached a higher degree of professional education. Twenty-four and seven tenths per cent of the administrators had completed a doctorate, while one counselor and five instructors had doctorates. It was interesting to note, however, that most of the respondents had completed a masters degree or more of professional education. All of the administrators

Table 5. Sex, age, and professional education of the respondents

	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex:						
Male	84	98.8	70	92.1	224	73.7
Female	1	1.2	6	7.9	80	26.3
Age:						
Under 25	0	----	2	2.6	11	3.6
25 - 40	37	43.5	58	76.3	173	56.9
41 - 60	44	51.8	16	21.1	112	36.8
over 60	4	4.7	--	----	8	2.6
Professional education:						
B.A. Aca.	3	3.5	4	5.3	72	23.7
M.A. Couns.	7	8.2	42	55.3	8	2.6
M.A. Adm.	18	21.2	--	----	7	2.3
M.A. Aca.	2	2.4	--	----	52	17.1
M.A. +	34	40.0	29	38.2	86	28.3
Doctorate	21	24.7	1	1.3	5	1.6
Other	--	----	--	----	74	24.3

and counselors had completed a professional degree, while 24.3 per cent of the instructors had not completed any professional education that warranted a degree. Instructors who responded to the "other" category were primarily instructors in the vocational-technical programs who completed apprenticeship, vocational, or technical training.

In Table 6, the number of years the respondents were employed at their present position has been recorded. The median number of years for the administrators was 4.1, while for the counselors and instructors the median number of years was 3.1 and 3.8 respectively.

The data in Table 7 represent the number of respondents who held

Table 6. Number of years the respondents had been employed in their present position

Respondents	Years employed in present position			
	0-2	3-6	7-10	over 10
Administrators	23	52	5	5
Counselors	36	34	4	2
Instructors	<u>108</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	167	247	26	25

Table 7. Responsibilities of position held by respondents

Respondents	Responsibilities of position					
	Administrator	Counselor		Instructor		
		Full Time	Part Time	A-S	V-T	A-E
Administrators	85	--	--	---	---	--
Counselors	--	62	14	---	---	--
Instructors	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>40</u>
Total	85	62	14	121	143	40

responsibilities in selected positions for the purpose of this study. It was interesting to note that out of 76 counselors surveyed in this study, only 62 were full-time counselors, while 14 were part-time. There were 121 arts & science instructors, 143 vocational-technical instructors, and 40 full-time adult education instructors who completed the survey.

Table 8 represents the enrollment in the Area schools in which the

Table 8. Enrollment in the Area schools in which the respondents were located

Respondents	Enrollment groups						
	Below 500	500 to 999	1000 to 1999	2000 to 2999	3000 to 3999	4000 to 4999	over 5000
Administrators	16	17	35	15	2	--	--
Counselors	11	22	32	11	0	--	--
Instructors	<u>35</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
Total	62	127	183	88	5	--	--

Table 9. Instructional offerings in the Area schools in which the respondents were located

Respondents	Instructional offerings									
	College Parallel		Voc.-Tech.		Voc.-Tech. and Adult Ed.		Coll. Par. Voc.-Tech. Adult Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrators	-	---	1	1.2	17	20.0	67	78.8	85	100.0
Counselors	2	2.6	2	2.6	16	21.1	56	73.7	76	100.0
Instructors	<u>4</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>76.0</u>	<u>304</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	6	1.2	8	1.7	97	20.8	354	76.3	465	100.0

respondents were located. The most frequent enrollment size in which the respondents were located was in the 1000-1999 range.

The data in Table 9 reveal the type of institutional offerings for the Area schools in which the respondents were located. Examination of the data reveal that the majority, 76.3 per cent, of the respondents were

located in Area schools which offered college-parallel, vocational-technical, and adult education programs. Area schools which offered only vocational-technical and adult education programs ranked second with 20.8 per cent. There were only 1.2 per cent and 1.7 per cent of the respondents located in Area schools which offered only college-parallel or only vocational-technical programs respectively.

Frequency counts and percentages were tabulated to establish the degree of agreement or disagreement between Area school personnel on their perceptions of current and future functions of counselors, and also as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks. A six step numerical scale ranging from "completely disagree" to "completely agree" was employed as the method of responding to each criterion variable. A seventh step was added to accommodate a "no response" for any variable that the respondent did not mark. This step was identified by a numerical zero. The data were reported in this manner so that the importance placed on each function and task could be more easily evaluated. It should be remembered that the researcher felt that the hypothesis of consensus would be supported on those items for which more than 75 per cent of the respondents were in agreement. Where more than 75 per cent of the respondents marked within the categories 0, 1, 2, 3 or within the categories 4, 5, 6 it would be hypothesized that a consensus of agreement would exist on the item. The data in Tables 10 and 11 represent the frequency counts and percentages associated with the perceptions of Area school personnel on the counselor's current and future functions respectively. Frequency counts and percentages relative to whether counselor time should be required on specific tasks are

Table 10. Tabulation of the counselors' current function(s) as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Current Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Pre-College Information	6	41	48.2	28	36.8	124	40.8
	5	26	30.6	21	27.6	94	30.9
	4	8	9.4	16	21.1	41	13.5
	3	4	4.7	1	1.3	20	6.6
	2	2	2.4	8	10.5	15	4.9
	1	3	3.5	2	2.6	8	2.6
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7
Applicant Appraisal	6	43	50.6	25	32.9	102	33.6
	5	19	22.4	24	31.6	93	30.6
	4	11	12.9	9	11.8	49	16.1
	3	6	7.1	5	6.6	34	11.2
	2	3	3.5	12	15.8	12	3.9
	1	2	2.4	1	1.3	12	3.9
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7
Educational Testing	6	52	61.2	27	35.5	128	42.1
	5	25	29.4	24	31.6	97	31.9
	4	1	1.2	16	21.1	43	14.1
	3	1	1.2	2	2.6	9	3.0
	2	2	2.4	4	5.3	11	3.6
	1	3	3.5	3	3.9	13	4.3
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0
Personnel Records	6	42	49.4	22	28.9	109	35.9
	5	16	18.8	24	31.6	103	33.9
	4	12	14.1	14	18.4	45	14.8
	3	6	7.1	3	3.9	21	6.9
	2	2	2.4	11	14.5	11	3.6
	1	6	7.1	2	2.6	13	4.3
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7

<sup>a</sup>Rating Scale: 6 completely agree  
5 mostly agree  
4 slightly agree  
3 slightly disagree  
2 mostly disagree  
1 completely disagree  
0 no response

Table 10. (Continued)

Current Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Registration	6	29	34.1	13	17.1	82	27.0
	5	13	15.3	20	26.3	61	20.1
	4	17	20.0	16	21.1	51	16.8
	3	8	9.4	7	9.2	40	13.2
	2	8	9.4	13	17.1	27	8.9
	1	9	10.6	7	9.2	39	12.8
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	4	1.3
Academic Regulation	6	16	18.8	10	13.2	44	14.5
	5	25	29.4	23	30.3	71	23.4
	4	21	24.7	16	21.1	69	22.7
	3	9	10.6	11	14.5	50	16.4
	2	7	8.2	10	13.2	29	9.5
	1	6	7.1	6	7.9	35	11.5
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	6	2.0
Applicant Consulting	6	51	60.2	43	56.6	117	38.5
	5	25	29.4	22	28.9	99	32.6
	4	7	8.2	7	9.2	47	15.5
	3	1	1.2	2	2.6	20	6.6
	2	0	0.0	1	1.3	11	3.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	2.3
	0	1	1.2	1	1.3	3	1.0
Student Advisory	6	43	50.6	25	32.9	102	33.6
	5	19	22.4	24	31.6	93	30.6
	4	11	12.9	9	11.8	49	16.1
	3	6	7.1	5	6.6	34	11.2
	2	3	3.5	12	15.8	12	3.9
	1	2	2.4	1	1.3	12	3.9
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7
Group Orientation	6	22	25.9	18	23.7	60	19.7
	5	27	31.8	17	22.4	56	18.4
	4	22	25.9	15	19.7	73	24.0
	3	7	8.2	8	10.5	49	16.1
	2	6	7.1	14	18.4	30	9.9
	1	0	0.0	4	5.3	33	10.9
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0



Table 10. (Continued)

Current Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Counseling	6	61	71.8	55	72.4	137	45.1
	5	16	18.8	14	18.4	80	26.3
	4	5	5.9	3	3.9	51	16.8
	3	1	1.2	2	2.6	13	4.3
	2	1	1.2	2	2.6	19	6.3
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.3
Career Information	6	25	29.4	21	27.6	81	26.6
	5	29	34.1	23	30.3	72	23.7
	4	15	17.6	19	25.0	52	17.1
	3	5	5.9	5	6.6	47	15.5
	2	7	8.2	4	5.3	32	10.5
	1	3	3.5	4	5.3	16	5.3
0	1	1.2	0	0.0	4	1.3	
Financial Assisting	6	36	42.4	18	23.7	96	31.6
	5	19	22.4	10	13.2	74	24.3
	4	9	10.6	11	14.5	45	14.8
	3	5	5.9	7	9.2	28	9.2
	2	3	3.5	18	23.7	24	7.9
	1	12	14.1	12	15.8	33	10.9
0	1	1.2	0	0.0	4	1.3	
Graduate Placement	6	29	34.1	15	19.7	79	26.0
	5	21	27.7	17	22.4	58	19.1
	4	16	18.8	14	18.4	67	22.0
	3	5	5.9	6	7.9	41	13.5
	2	5	5.9	17	22.4	23	7.6
	1	8	9.4	7	9.2	33	10.9
0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0	
Student Self-Governing	6	28	32.9	12	15.8	51	16.8
	5	16	18.8	15	19.7	59	19.4
	4	14	16.5	10	13.2	63	20.7
	3	6	7.1	7	9.2	35	11.5
	2	9	10.6	13	17.1	42	13.8
	1	11	12.9	19	25.0	48	15.8
0	1	1.2	0	0.0	6	2.0	

Table 10. (Continued)

Current Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Co-Curricular Activity	6	28	32.9	10	13.2	63	20.7
	5	19	22.4	9	11.8	60	19.7
	4	12	14.1	14	18.4	58	19.1
	3	6	7.1	11	14.5	34	11.2
	2	9	10.6	12	15.8	39	12.8
	1	10	11.8	20	26.3	46	15.1
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	4	1.3
Social Regulation	6	16	18.8	8	10.5	39	12.8
	5	18	21.2	14	18.4	71	23.4
	4	19	22.4	8	10.5	68	22.4
	3	9	10.6	12	15.8	36	11.8
	2	5	5.9	13	17.1	36	11.8
	1	17	20.0	21	27.6	52	17.1
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7
Student Induction	6	29	34.1	13	17.1	73	24.0
	5	30	35.3	20	26.3	71	23.4
	4	18	21.2	22	28.9	64	21.1
	3	1	1.2	7	9.2	45	14.8
	2	3	3.5	8	10.5	26	8.6
	1	3	3.5	6	7.9	20	6.6
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	5	1.6
Program Articulation	6	21	24.7	4	5.3	35	11.5
	5	18	21.2	18	23.7	43	14.1
	4	17	20.0	20	26.3	70	23.0
	3	13	15.3	8	10.5	48	15.8
	2	10	11.8	15	19.7	48	15.8
	1	5	5.9	11	14.5	54	17.8
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	6	2.0
In-Service Education	6	16	18.8	6	7.9	32	10.5
	5	18	21.2	14	18.4	49	16.1
	4	23	27.1	21	27.6	57	18.8
	3	8	9.4	12	15.8	46	15.1
	2	13	15.3	10	13.2	54	17.8
	1	6	7.1	13	17.1	63	20.7
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0

Table 10. (Continued)

Current Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Program Evaluation	6	34	40.0	25	32.9	85	28.0
	5	27	31.8	19	25.0	74	24.3
	4	16	18.8	14	18.4	70	23.0
	3	3	3.5	9	11.8	29	9.5
	2	2	2.4	5	6.6	23	7.6
	1	2	2.4	4	5.3	20	6.6
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0
Administrative Organization	6	19	22.4	12	15.8	45	14.8
	5	23	27.1	15	19.7	61	20.1
	4	21	24.7	21	27.6	73	24.0
	3	8	9.4	10	13.2	27	8.9
	2	8	9.4	11	14.5	51	16.8
	1	5	5.9	7	9.2	39	12.8
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	8	2.6

presented in Table 12.

It can be seen in Table 10 that more than 75 per cent of the respondents agreed that certain functions were currently performed by the counselor at their institution. In this analysis, over 75 per cent of the administrators agreed that the following 13 functions are currently performed by counselors at their institution:

Pre-College Information	Student Counseling
Applicant Appraisal	Career Information
Educational Testing	Financial Assisting
Personnel Records	Graduate Placement
Applicant Consulting	Student Induction
Student Advisory	Program Evaluation
Group Orientation	

In contrast, over 75 per cent of the counselors perceive the following nine functions currently performed by them:

Pre-College Information  
 Applicant Appraisal  
 Educational Testing  
 Personnel Records  
 Applicant Consulting

Student Advisory  
 Student Counseling  
 Career Information  
 Program Evaluation

Over 75 per cent of the instructors perceived the following eight functions currently performed by counselors:

Pre-College Information  
 Applicant Appraisal  
 Educational Testing  
 Personnel Records

Applicant Consulting  
 Student Advisory  
 Student Counseling  
 Program Evaluation

In analyzing the data in Table 11 to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement between Area school personnel on the future functions of counselors, it was discovered that over 75 per cent of the administrators believe that 14 functions should be performed by the counselor in the future. It was found that over 75 per cent of the administrators perceived the identical 13 functions that were identified by them as functions currently performed by counselors. In addition, over 75 per cent of the administrators also believe that the counselor in the future should be responsible for the Administrative Organization function.

It can be seen in Table 11 that over 75 per cent of the instructors believe that 12 functions should be performed by the counselor in the future. In addition to the eight functions currently perceived by this group, the Student Induction, Group Orientation, Career Information, and Graduate Placement functions were viewed as functions that should be the responsibility of the counselor in the future.

In reviewing the results for the perception of counselors on future functions, it was found that over 75 per cent of the counselors believe

Table 11. Tabulation of the counselors' future function(s) as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Future Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Pre-College Information	6	50	58.8	22	28.9	167	54.9
	5	22	25.9	22	28.9	82	27.0
	4	3	3.5	16	21.1	24	7.9
	3	3	3.5	5	6.6	11	3.6
	2	2	2.4	10	13.2	9	3.0
	1	5	5.9	1	1.3	10	3.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Applicant Appraisal	6	49	57.6	29	38.2	126	41.4
	5	17	20.0	19	25.0	88	28.9
	4	8	9.4	7	9.2	42	13.8
	3	3	3.5	6	7.9	25	8.2
	2	4	4.7	9	11.8	10	3.3
	1	4	4.7	6	7.9	11	3.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Educational Testing	6	55	64.7	34	44.7	179	58.9
	5	23	27.1	22	28.9	83	27.3
	4	2	2.4	9	11.8	17	5.6
	3	0	0.0	3	3.9	9	3.0
	2	3	3.5	2	2.6	6	2.0
	1	2	2.4	6	7.9	9	3.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Personnel Records	6	46	54.1	25	32.9	130	42.8
	5	17	20.0	19	25.0	113	37.2
	4	5	5.9	10	13.2	20	6.6
	3	2	2.4	2	2.6	17	5.6
	2	6	7.1	16	21.1	6	2.0
	1	9	10.6	4	5.3	17	5.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

<sup>a</sup>Rating Scale:

- 6 completely agree
- 5 mostly agree
- 4 slightly agree
- 3 slightly disagree
- 2 mostly disagree
- 1 completely disagree
- 0 no response

Table 11. (Continued)

Future Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Registration	6	28	32.9	6	7.9	95	31.3
	5	15	17.6	14	18.4	62	20.4
	4	18	21.2	20	26.3	35	11.5
	3	4	4.7	4	5.3	33	10.9
	2	9	10.6	15	19.7	30	9.9
	1	11	12.9	17	22.4	47	15.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Academic Regulation	6	20	23.5	6	7.9	72	23.7
	5	25	29.4	15	19.7	69	22.7
	4	15	17.6	20	26.3	52	17.1
	3	9	10.6	11	14.5	35	11.5
	2	6	7.1	14	18.4	34	11.2
	1	10	11.8	10	13.2	40	13.2
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Applicant Consulting	6	67	78.8	43	56.6	185	60.9
	5	12	14.1	25	32.9	81	26.6
	4	3	3.5	5	6.6	18	5.9
	3	1	1.2	1	1.3	11	3.6
	2	2	2.4	1	1.3	4	1.3
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	2	0.7
Student Advisory	6	44	51.8	26	34.2	116	48.0
	5	21	24.7	27	35.5	96	31.6
	4	13	15.3	14	18.4	28	9.2
	3	2	2.4	4	5.3	16	5.3
	2	3	3.5	4	5.3	9	3.0
	1	2	2.4	1	1.3	7	2.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Group Orientation	6	33	38.8	23	30.3	101	33.2
	5	23	27.1	28	36.8	86	28.3
	4	16	18.8	15	19.7	52	17.1
	3	6	7.1	5	6.6	25	8.2
	2	5	5.9	3	3.9	19	6.3
	1	2	2.4	2	2.6	19	6.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7

Table 11. (Continued)

Future Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Counseling	6	76	89.4	68	89.5	189	61.2
	5	4	4.7	7	9.2	82	27.0
	4	4	4.7	0	0.0	17	5.6
	3	1	1.2	1	1.3	7	2.3
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	2.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Career Information	6	37	43.5	34	44.7	148	48.7
	5	24	28.2	22	28.9	86	28.3
	4	13	15.3	12	15.8	32	10.5
	3	3	3.5	3	3.9	12	3.9
	2	7	8.2	4	5.3	14	4.6
	1	1	1.2	1	1.3	9	3.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
Financial Assisting	6	42	49.4	9	11.8	123	40.5
	5	15	17.6	10	13.2	66	21.7
	4	8	9.4	10	13.2	36	11.8
	3	4	4.7	8	10.5	16	5.3
	2	3	3.5	20	26.3	25	8.2
	1	13	15.3	19	25.0	36	11.8
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Graduate Placement	6	38	44.7	15	19.7	126	41.4
	5	21	24.7	20	26.3	79	26.0
	4	11	12.9	13	17.1	35	11.5
	3	3	3.5	7	9.2	16	5.3
	2	3	3.5	13	17.1	14	4.6
	1	9	10.6	8	10.5	32	10.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Student Self-Governing	6	29	34.1	4	5.3	64	21.1
	5	11	12.9	21	27.6	78	25.7
	4	17	20.0	15	19.7	52	17.1
	3	4	4.7	10	13.2	32	10.5
	2	12	14.1	14	18.4	37	12.2
	1	12	14.1	12	15.8	38	12.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0

Table 11. (Continued)

Future Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Co-Curricular Activity	6	30	35.3	6	7.9	65	21.4
	5	10	11.8	8	10.5	70	23.0
	4	17	20.0	21	27.6	53	17.4
	3	5	5.9	6	7.9	29	9.5
	2	10	11.8	18	23.7	42	13.8
	1	12	14.1	17	22.4	42	13.8
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0
Social Regulation	6	20	23.5	2	2.6	48	15.8
	5	10	11.8	3	3.9	80	26.3
	4	17	20.0	8	10.5	53	17.4
	3	11	12.9	11	14.5	28	9.2
	2	11	12.9	24	31.6	38	12.5
	1	16	18.8	28	36.8	56	18.4
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Student Induction	6	41	48.2	11	14.5	102	33.6
	5	22	25.9	19	25.0	95	31.3
	4	12	14.1	23	30.3	45	14.8
	3	2	2.4	9	11.8	20	6.6
	2	5	5.9	10	13.2	20	6.6
	1	3	3.5	4	5.3	19	6.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
Program Articulation	6	28	32.9	7	9.2	66	21.7
	5	14	16.5	19	25.0	71	23.4
	4	19	22.4	17	22.4	61	20.1
	3	7	8.2	7	9.2	33	10.9
	2	11	12.9	14	18.4	27	8.9
	1	6	7.1	12	15.8	42	13.8
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.3
In-Service Education	6	29	34.1	15	19.7	56	18.4
	5	19	22.4	17	22.4	78	25.7
	4	15	17.6	20	26.3	54	17.8
	3	9	10.6	6	7.9	31	10.2
	2	6	7.1	11	14.5	38	12.5
	1	7	8.2	7	9.2	47	15.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0



Table 11. (Continued)

Future Functions	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Program Evaluation	6	49	57.6	29	38.2	145	47.7
	5	19	22.4	24	31.6	88	28.9
	4	12	14.1	11	14.5	33	10.9
	3	2	2.4	1	1.3	14	4.6
	2	1	1.2	5	6.6	10	3.3
	1	2	2.4	6	7.9	13	4.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Administrative Organization	6	22	25.9	20	26.3	64	21.1
	5	22	25.9	22	28.9	75	24.7
	4	24	28.2	12	15.8	57	18.8
	3	5	5.9	7	9.2	28	9.2
	2	8	9.4	8	10.5	37	12.2
	1	4	4.7	7	9.2	38	12.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.6

eight functions should be their responsibility in the future. Seven of the nine functions that were perceived by over 75 per cent of the counselors as their current responsibility were also viewed as functions that should be performed by them in the future. These functions were: Educational Testing, Student Counseling, Program Evaluation, Student Advisory, Applicant Consulting, Pre-College Information, and Career Information. In addition to these seven, the Group Orientation function was conceived to be a future function of counselors by more than 85 per cent of the counselors.

In examining the data in Table 12, as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks, it appears that administrators and instructors believe that the counselor should be required to perform more specific tasks than are currently perceived by counselors.

Table 12. Tabulation as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the institution.	6	20	23.5	5	6.6	76	25.0
	5	19	22.4	11	14.5	59	19.4
	4	19	22.4	23	30.3	61	20.1
	3	6	7.1	7	9.2	42	13.8
	2	9	10.6	17	22.4	28	9.2
	1	12	14.1	13	17.1	38	12.5
Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	6	43	50.6	22	28.9	108	35.5
	5	16	18.8	15	19.7	64	21.1
	4	6	7.1	13	17.1	56	18.4
	3	6	7.1	8	10.5	31	10.2
	2	7	8.2	9	11.8	17	5.6
	1	7	8.2	9	11.8	28	9.2
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

<sup>a</sup>Rating Scale:  
 6 completely agree  
 5 mostly agree  
 4 slightly agree  
 3 slightly disagree  
 2 mostly disagree  
 1 completely disagree  
 0 no response

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Evaluating high school and college transcripts.	6	37	43.5	15	19.7	123	40.5
	5	13	15.3	21	27.6	86	28.3
	4	15	17.6	13	17.1	50	16.4
	3	4	4.7	9	11.8	20	6.6
	2	10	11.8	9	11.8	15	4.9
	1	6	7.1	9	11.8	9	3.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Serving on admissions committee.	6	42	49.4	27	35.5	106	34.9
	5	28	32.9	18	23.7	87	28.6
	4	9	10.6	18	23.7	63	20.7
	3	2	2.4	3	3.9	20	6.6
	2	2	2.4	5	6.6	14	4.6
	1	2	2.4	5	6.6	12	3.9
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Administering tests to incoming students.	6	47	55.3	21	27.6	175	57.6
	5	21	24.7	20	26.3	70	23.0
	4	6	7.1	19	25.0	22	7.2
	3	1	1.2	9	11.8	10	3.3
	2	4	4.7	2	2.6	10	3.3
	1	6	7.1	5	6.6	17	5.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Assemble and maintain appropriate testing instruments.	6	57	67.1	38	50.0	163	53.6
	5	15	17.6	20	26.3	84	27.6
	4	11	12.9	7	9.2	31	10.2
	3	1	1.2	3	3.9	13	4.3
	2	1	1.2	3	3.9	3	1.0
	1	0	0.0	4	5.3	9	3.0
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	1	0.3
Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.	6	48	56.5	36	47.4	134	44.1
	5	20	23.5	20	26.3	95	31.3
	4	13	15.3	15	19.7	44	14.5
	3	2	2.4	1	1.3	11	3.6
	2	2	2.4	3	3.9	11	3.6
	1	0	0.0	1	1.3	7	2.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Writing recommendations for students seeking employment and college transfer.	6	27	31.8	15	19.7	59	19.4
	5	21	24.7	19	25.0	64	21.1
	4	12	14.1	16	21.1	70	23.0
	3	13	15.3	6	7.9	47	15.5
	2	8	9.4	13	17.1	32	10.5
	1	4	4.7	7	9.2	32	10.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Designing forms and procedures for student registration.	6	25	29.4	4	5.3	79	26.0
	5	12	14.1	13	17.1	53	17.4
	4	16	18.8	15	19.7	42	13.8
	3	6	7.1	9	11.8	36	11.8
	2	14	16.5	11	14.5	30	9.9
	1	12	14.1	24	31.6	63	20.7
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.	6	33	38.8	11	14.5	86	28.3
	5	11	12.9	12	15.8	64	21.1
	4	10	11.8	18	23.7	41	13.5
	3	10	11.8	15	19.7	32	10.5
	2	6	7.1	8	10.5	28	9.2
	1	15	17.6	12	15.8	53	17.4
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.	6	30	35.3	22	28.9	86	28.3
	5	27	31.8	19	25.0	85	28.0
	4	16	18.8	18	23.7	57	18.8
	3	3	3.5	6	7.9	32	10.5
	2	6	7.1	6	7.9	11	3.6
	1	3	3.5	5	6.6	31	10.2
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.	6	12	14.1	14	18.4	37	12.2
	5	24	28.2	13	17.1	55	18.1
	4	22	25.9	20	26.3	84	27.6
	3	10	11.8	10	13.2	37	12.2
	2	11	12.9	10	13.2	37	12.2
	1	6	7.1	9	11.8	53	17.4
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Interpreting test results to students.	6	65	76.5	53	69.7	171	56.3
	5	13	15.3	18	23.7	93	30.6
	4	6	7.1	4	5.3	26	8.6
	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.6
	2	1	1.2	0	0.0	5	1.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.3
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0
Consulting with students about career plans and educational goals.	6	66	77.6	60	78.9	187	61.5
	5	17	20.0	15	19.7	72	23.7
	4	2	2.4	1	1.3	25	8.2
	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.0
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	2.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Interpreting college transfer requirements.	6	57	67.1	42	55.3	174	57.2
	5	17	20.0	18	23.7	80	26.3
	4	7	8.2	10	13.2	24	7.9
	3	2	2.4	3	3.9	9	3.0
	2	1	1.2	3	3.9	6	2.0
	1	1	1.2	0	0.0	10	3.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Helping students plan appropriate programs or curricula.	6	48	56.5	45	59.2	158	52.0
	5	27	31.8	21	27.6	83	27.3
	4	7	8.2	8	10.5	38	12.5
	3	3	3.5	2	2.6	14	4.6
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.0
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Approving course selection for students.	6	21	24.7	25	32.9	77	25.3
	5	28	32.9	21	27.6	87	28.6
	4	20	23.5	17	22.1	68	22.1
	3	7	8.2	5	6.6	31	10.2
	2	3	3.5	5	6.6	14	4.6
	1	6	7.1	3	3.9	25	8.2
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Interpret effective study skills to students.	6	27	31.8	24	31.6	94	30.9
	5	27	31.8	22	28.9	78	25.7
	4	19	22.4	21	27.6	83	27.3
	3	7	8.2	5	6.6	21	6.9
	2	1	1.2	3	3.9	12	3.9
	1	4	4.7	1	1.3	13	4.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.	6	49	57.6	33	43.4	144	47.4
	5	17	20.0	20	26.3	80	26.3
	4	13	15.3	14	18.4	45	14.8
	3	2	2.4	5	6.6	13	4.3
	2	1	1.2	3	3.9	13	4.3
	1	2	2.4	0	0.0	9	3.0
	0	1	1.2	1	1.3	0	0.0
Teach courses in psychology and/ or educational-vocational exploration.	6	5	5.9	2	2.6	20	6.6
	5	4	4.7	14	18.4	41	13.5
	4	24	28.2	17	22.4	68	22.4
	3	15	17.6	12	15.8	39	12.8
	2	17	20.0	16	21.1	46	15.1
	1	20	23.5	15	19.7	87	28.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0



Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems.	6	11	12.9	10	13.2	60	19.7
	5	10	11.8	3	3.9	50	16.4
	4	11	12.9	14	18.4	52	17.1
	3	5	5.9	7	9.2	25	8.2
	2	20	23.5	12	15.8	26	8.6
	1	28	32.9	30	39.5	89	29.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Counsel with students about personal and social problems.	6	67	78.8	67	88.2	177	58.2
	5	17	20.0	8	10.5	84	27.6
	4	1	1.2	0	0.0	24	7.9
	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	3.3
	2	0	0.0	1	1.3	6	2.0
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Conducting group counseling for underachievers.	6	47	55.3	27	35.5	119	39.1
	5	20	23.5	33	43.4	102	33.6
	4	10	11.8	8	10.5	53	17.4
	3	2	2.4	6	7.9	12	3.9
	2	2	2.4	2	2.6	8	2.6
	1	4	4.7	0	0.0	10	3.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.	6	48	56.5	39	51.3	175	57.6
	5	18	21.2	20	26.3	77	25.3
	4	12	14.1	8	10.5	30	9.9
	3	3	3.5	3	3.9	6	2.0
	2	3	3.5	3	3.9	8	2.6
	1	1	1.2	3	3.9	6	2.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.	6	68	80.0	63	82.9	188	61.8
	5	11	12.9	11	14.5	73	24.0
	4	4	4.7	2	2.6	28	9.2
	3	2	2.4	0	0.0	6	2.0
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Assisting students in achieving self-understanding.	6	56	65.9	59	77.6	124	40.8
	5	17	20.0	14	18.4	91	29.9
	4	10	11.8	2	2.6	60	19.7
	3	2	2.4	1	1.3	15	4.9
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	3.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Dispensing career information.	6	60	70.6	43	56.6	184	60.5
	5	15	17.6	28	36.8	76	25.0
	4	7	8.2	4	5.3	27	8.9
	3	2	2.4	1	1.3	4	1.3
	2	1	1.2	0	0.0	7	2.3
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.0
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Studying manpower needs within community and region.	6	18	21.2	11	14.5	91	29.9
	5	23	27.1	20	26.3	87	28.6
	4	23	27.1	13	17.1	63	20.7
	3	5	5.9	7	9.2	17	5.6
	2	6	7.1	15	19.7	22	7.2
	1	10	11.8	10	13.2	24	7.9
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Interpreting occupational information.	6	48	56.5	35	46.1	117	38.5
	5	27	31.8	31	40.8	91	29.9
	4	8	9.4	7	9.2	51	16.8
	3	0	0.0	2	2.6	27	8.9
	2	2	2.4	1	1.3	5	1.6
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	3.9
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Analyzing financial needs of students.	6	32	37.6	15	19.7	100	32.9
	5	21	24.7	10	13.2	86	28.3
	4	14	16.5	18	23.7	62	20.4
	3	4	4.7	6	7.9	20	6.6
	2	7	8.2	11	14.5	21	6.9
	1	7	8.2	15	19.7	15	4.9
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0
Securing financial assistance for students.	6	32	37.6	13	17.1	104	34.2
	5	18	21.2	11	14.5	66	21.7
	4	17	20.0	17	22.4	56	18.4
	3	4	4.7	9	11.8	25	8.2
	2	6	7.1	12	15.8	24	7.9
	1	8	9.4	13	17.1	28	9.2
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	1	0.3
Supervising students on work- study programs.	6	10	11.8	2	2.6	50	16.4
	5	9	10.6	7	9.2	52	17.1
	4	13	15.3	11	14.5	55	18.1
	3	17	20.0	18	23.7	50	16.4
	2	9	10.6	12	15.8	43	14.1
	1	27	31.8	26	34.2	53	17.4
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Arranging placement interviews.	6	32	37.6	11	14.5	103	33.9
	5	26	30.6	22	28.9	65	21.4
	4	11	12.9	12	15.8	58	19.1
	3	3	3.5	5	6.6	18	5.9
	2	4	4.7	11	14.5	26	8.6
	1	9	10.6	15	19.7	33	10.9
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Working with employment agencies in placement of students.	6	37	43.5	24	31.6	113	37.2
	5	23	27.1	15	19.7	76	25.0
	4	9	10.6	12	15.8	54	17.8
	3	9	10.6	8	10.5	18	5.9
	2	2	2.4	11	14.5	18	5.9
	1	4	4.7	6	7.9	25	8.2
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Work with institutional depart- ments in placement activities.	6	41	48.2	23	30.3	123	40.5
	5	23	27.1	16	21.1	87	28.6
	4	11	12.9	22	28.9	42	13.8
	3	2	2.4	2	2.6	14	4.6
	2	1	1.2	11	14.5	20	6.6
	1	7	8.2	1	1.3	15	4.9
	0	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	1.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Compile curricular guides for transferring students into senior colleges.	6	32	37.6	28	36.8	131	43.1
	5	30	35.3	12	15.8	84	27.6
	4	12	14.1	18	23.7	40	13.2
	3	4	4.7	5	6.6	24	7.9
	2	4	4.7	5	6.6	9	3.0
	1	2	2.4	8	10.5	13	4.3
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.0
Sponsoring or advising student government.	6	20	23.5	5	6.6	64	21.1
	5	23	27.1	9	11.8	52	17.1
	4	11	12.9	13	17.1	58	19.1
	3	5	5.9	17	22.4	39	12.8
	2	13	15.3	12	15.8	30	9.9
	1	13	15.3	20	26.3	61	20.1
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Supervising elections and student conferences.	6	21	24.7	4	5.3	47	15.5
	5	11	12.9	6	7.9	67	22.0
	4	21	24.7	10	13.2	52	17.1
	3	10	11.8	10	13.2	35	11.5
	2	14	16.5	24	31.6	40	13.2
	1	8	9.4	22	28.9	62	20.4
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Supervising co-curricular student activities program.	6	19	22.4	3	3.9	47	15.5
	5	15	17.6	6	7.9	52	17.1
	4	21	24.7	14	18.4	74	24.3
	3	14	16.5	13	17.1	53	17.4
	2	5	5.9	13	17.1	33	10.9
	1	11	12.9	27	35.5	44	14.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Reprimanding students for social misconduct.	6	2	2.4	0	0.0	35	11.5
	5	7	8.2	1	1.3	44	14.5
	4	19	22.4	4	5.3	41	13.5
	3	5	5.9	3	3.9	38	12.5
	2	15	17.6	13	17.1	41	13.5
	1	37	43.5	55	72.4	105	34.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities.	6	27	31.8	11	14.5	64	21.1
	5	29	34.1	18	23.7	78	25.7
	4	13	15.3	15	19.7	68	22.4
	3	5	5.9	12	15.8	36	11.8
	2	6	7.1	14	18.4	23	7.6
	1	5	5.9	6	7.9	33	10.9
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Interpreting student services and regulations.	6	34	40.0	20	26.3	78	25.7
	5	29	34.1	18	23.7	82	27.0
	4	10	11.8	23	30.3	72	23.7
	3	7	8.2	6	7.9	32	10.5
	2	1	1.2	6	7.9	20	6.6
	1	4	4.7	3	3.9	19	6.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Train returning students to help new students.	6	12	14.1	15	19.7	40	13.2
	5	16	18.8	17	22.4	60	19.7
	4	35	41.2	17	22.4	92	30.3
	3	10	11.8	9	11.8	40	13.2
	2	6	7.1	12	15.8	28	9.2
	1	6	7.1	6	7.9	41	13.5
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0
Maintaining referral resources for students.	6	43	50.6	41	53.9	137	45.1
	5	26	30.6	24	31.6	86	28.3
	4	15	17.6	8	10.5	41	13.5
	3	0	0.0	2	2.6	18	5.9
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	3.9
	1	0	0.0	1	1.3	8	2.6
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7



Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Serving on faculty committees.	6	48	56.5	32	42.1	106	34.9
	5	30	35.3	20	26.3	91	29.9
	4	6	7.1	18	23.7	62	20.4
	3	0	0.0	1	1.3	18	5.9
	2	1	1.2	4	5.3	14	4.6
	1	0	0.0	1	1.3	13	4.3
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Serving as consultant to a department or division of the institution.	6	32	37.6	27	35.5	78	25.7
	5	26	30.6	19	25.0	72	23.7
	4	13	15.3	18	23.7	72	23.7
	3	4	4.7	6	7.9	37	12.2
	2	5	5.9	5	6.6	21	6.9
	1	5	5.9	1	1.3	22	7.2
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.	6	67	78.8	46	60.5	187	61.5
	5	11	12.9	21	27.6	76	25.0
	4	4	4.7	8	10.5	26	8.6
	3	2	2.4	0	0.0	4	1.3
	2	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.7
	1	0	0.0	1	1.3	8	2.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.	6	33	38.8	24	31.6	84	27.6
	5	25	29.4	25	32.9	96	31.6
	4	18	21.2	20	26.3	73	24.0
	3	5	5.9	1	1.3	14	4.6
	2	1	1.2	3	3.9	12	3.9
	1	2	2.4	2	2.6	24	7.9
	0	1	1.2	1	1.3	1	0.3
Attending professional work- shops and conferences.	6	64	75.3	49	64.5	149	49.0
	5	15	17.6	22	28.9	94	30.9
	4	4	4.7	5	6.6	44	14.5
	3	1	1.2	0	0.0	14	4.6
	2	1	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.3
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Conducting follow-up studies of former students.	6	55	64.7	22	28.9	141	46.4
	5	21	24.7	24	31.6	77	25.3
	4	2	2.4	17	22.4	42	13.8
	3	1	1.2	2	2.6	18	5.9
	2	5	5.9	4	5.3	12	3.9
	1	1	1.2	7	9.2	14	4.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 12. (Continued)

Tasks	Rating Scale <sup>a</sup>	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Confer with students withdrawing from the institution.	6	69	81.2	58	76.3	194	63.8
	5	13	15.3	13	17.1	68	22.4
	4	1	1.2	4	5.3	25	8.2
	3	1	1.2	1	1.3	4	1.3
	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.3
	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	0.0
	0	1	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Conducting studies on the guid- ance and counselor program and/ or student personnel services.	6	47	55.3	32	42.1	135	44.4
	5	21	24.7	21	27.6	93	30.6
	4	10	11.8	16	21.1	48	15.8
	3	3	3.5	3	3.9	12	3.9
	2	3	3.5	3	3.9	7	2.3
	1	1	1.2	1	1.3	8	2.6
	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

Over 75 per cent of the counselors believe that the counselor should be required to perform 31 of the specific tasks listed. In contrast, over 75 per cent of the administrators feel that 39 specific tasks should be required of the counselor, and over 75 per cent of the instructors feel that 35 specific tasks should be required of the counselor.

#### Descriptive Analysis of the Data

Several null hypotheses were set forth to be tested in attempting to assess whether any significant differences and/or relationships existed between Area school personnel in their perception of the variables used in this study. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values were computed to determine whether any major differences existed. In addition, correlations were run to determine whether any significant relationships existed between certain variables. Other findings that provided meaning to the study were also presented in this section.

Presented in Tables 13, 14, and 15 are the means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values for the criterion variables as perceived by Area school personnel. Significant differences between the groups were determined by the use of "F" values and reported by their level of significance.

In Table 13 it can be seen that Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors differed in their perception of the counselors' current function(s) on 14 specific areas. Inspection of Table 13 indicate that the current functions found to be significantly different were primarily influenced by the perceptions of administrators and instructors. Of the 14

Table 13. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values for the counselors' current functions when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel

Current Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Pre-College Information	5.02	1.35	4.71	1.38	4.84	1.34	1.08
Applicant Appraisal	4.97	1.38	4.55	1.46	4.63	1.40	2.31
Educational Testing	5.30	1.28	4.77	1.31	4.89	1.38	3.74*
Personnel Records	4.79	1.58	4.48	1.44	4.76	1.37	1.28
Student Registration	4.18	1.75	3.89	1.59	3.99	1.76	0.61
Academic Regulation	4.14	1.51	3.92	1.48	3.75	1.62	2.08
Applicant Consulting	5.43	0.91	5.31	1.05	4.85	1.29	10.11**

\*\*  $F_{2,460}$  .01 level = 4.66

\*  $F_{2,460}$  .05 level = 3.02

Table 13. (Continued)

Current Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Student Advisory	5.03	1.20	4.94	1.08	4.51	1.46	6.40**
Group Orientation	4.56	1.25	4.06	1.57	3.84	1.62	7.03**
Student Counseling	5.54	0.96	5.55	0.89	4.96	1.25	13.53**
Career Information	4.55	1.45	4.52	1.37	4.18	1.59	2.80
Financial Assisting	4.47	1.83	3.56	1.83	4.26	1.73	5.99**
Graduate Placement	4.42	1.66	3.81	1.66	4.05	1.67	2.73
Student Self-Governing	4.12	1.82	3.32	1.84	3.58	1.75	4.43*

Table 13. (Continued)

Current Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Co-Curricular Activity	4.20	1.80	3.13	1.74	3.73	1.77	7.28**
Social Regulation	3.71	1.79	3.06	1.74	3.59	1.67	3.52*
Student Induction	4.79	1.31	4.06	1.47	4.12	1.59	7.02**
Program Articulation	4.09	1.59	3.10	1.51	3.29	1.67	8.00**
In-Service Education	3.92	1.57	3.40	1.54	3.20	1.68	6.44**
Program Evaluation	4.91	1.26	4.50	1.47	4.32	1.54	5.22**
Administrative Organization	4.21	1.51	3.81	1.52	3.58	1.71	4.89**

current functions that were found statistically significant, the mean scores of administrators were found to be the highest on 13. Of the counselors, a mean score was found to be the highest on only one.

Of the 14 current functions, the counselors mean scores were lowest on six and the instructors mean scores were lowest on eight. The counselors low scores included current functions that could be classified as student personnel functions and included Co-Curricular Activity, Social Regulation, Student Induction, Financial Assisting, Student Self-Governing, and Educational Testing. The instructors low scores included such current functions as Applicant Consulting, Student Advisory, Group Orientation, Student Counseling, Program Articulation, In-Service Education, Program Evaluation, and Administrative Organization. The findings were relevant to null hypothesis number 1: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' current function(s).

The null hypothesis was rejected between the groups studied in their perception of fourteen current functions. The following were significant at the .05 level: Educational Testing, Student Self-Governing, and Social Regulation. The following current functions were highly significant at and beyond the .01 level: Student Counseling, Program Evaluation, Student Advisory, Administrative Organization, Applicant Consulting, Co-Curricular Activity, Student Induction, Group Orientation, Program Articulation, In-Service Education, and Financial Assisting.

There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for the Personnel Records, Applicant Appraisal, Pre-College Information, Career



Information, Student Registration, Academic Regulation, and Graduate Placement functions. There appeared to be no statistical difference between the groups in their perception of these seven current functions.

It can be observed in Table 14 that Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors differed in their perception of the counselors' future function(s) on 17 areas. Inspection of Table 14 indicate that the future functions found to be significantly different were primarily influenced by administrators. Of the 17 future functions that were found statistically significant, the mean scores of administrators were found to be the highest on 14. Of the counselors, only two mean scores were found to be the highest. Two mean scores of instructors were also found to be the highest.

Of the 17 future functions, the counselors mean scores were lowest on 14 and the instructors mean scores were lowest on three. The counselors low scores included future functions that could be appropriately classified as student personnel functions. These functions included Pre-College Information, Applicant Appraisal, Educational Testing, Personnel Records, Student Registration, Academic Regulation, Financial Assisting, Graduate Placement, Student Self-Governing, Co-Curricular Activity, Social Regulation, Student Induction, Program Articulation, and Program Evaluation. The instructors low scores included such future functions as Student Counseling, In-Service Education, and Administrative Organization. The reported data were relevant to null hypothesis number 2: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' future function(s).

Table 14. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values for the counselors' future functions when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel

Future Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Pre-College Information	5.17	1.37	4.50	1.38	5.15	1.27	7.99**
Applicant Appraisal	5.08	1.40	4.46	1.68	4.83	1.37	3.77*
Educational Testing	5.42	1.08	4.85	1.48	5.30	1.16	5.15**
Personnel Records	4.79	1.72	4.30	1.67	4.96	1.35	5.99**
Student Registration	4.18	1.75	3.22	1.65	4.03	1.85	7.16**
Academic Regulation	4.16	1.62	3.44	1.50	3.95	1.73	3.91*
Applicant Consulting	5.65	0.80	5.36	0.99	5.37	1.03	2.83

\*\*  $F_{2,460}$  .01 level = 4.66

\*  $F_{2,460}$  .05 level = 3.02

Table 14. (Continued)

Future Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		F <sup>2</sup> Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Student Advisory	5.11	1.20	4.84	1.18	5.07	1.23	1.31
Group Orientation	4.78	1.31	4.75	1.21	4.52	1.52	1.46
Student Counseling	5.82	0.55	5.86	0.43	5.38	1.04	14.01**
Career Information	4.91	1.28	5.00	1.20	4.99	1.37	0.10
Financial Assisting	4.58	1.83	2.98	1.72	4.43	1.78	21.83**
Graduate Placement	4.71	1.62	3.90	1.66	4.61	1.68	6.11**
Student Self-Governing	4.05	1.83	3.40	1.55	3.92	1.71	3.37*

Table 14. (Continued)

Future Functions	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Co-Curricular Activity	4.05	1.87	3.03	1.59	3.83	1.75	7.85**
Social Regulation	3.63	1.80	2.21	1.29	3.68	1.74	23.67**
Student Induction	4.97	1.34	4.00	1.39	4.55	1.55	8.59**
Program Articulation	4.27	1.62	3.50	1.61	3.91	1.72	4.13*
In-Service Education	4.41	1.59	3.97	1.58	3.81	1.71	4.21*
Program Evaluation	5.25	1.10	4.69	1.53	5.00	1.33	3.53*
Administrative Organization	4.38	1.41	4.23	1.62	3.89	1.73	3.53*

In viewing the analysis that was conducted in Table 14, it was found that the null hypothesis was rejected on 17 future functions. The following were significant at the .05 level: Applicant Appraisal, Program Evaluation, Administrative Organization, Student Self-Governing, Program Articulation, In-Service Education, and Academic Regulation functions. The following functions were highly significant at the .01 level: Personnel Records, Educational Testing, Student Counseling, Co-Curricular Activity, Pre-College Information, Student Induction, Student Registration, Social Regulation, Financial Assisting, and Graduate Placement.

There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on the remaining four future functions since the "F" values were less than the tabular values at both the .05 and .01 levels of significance. The groups appeared to be in strong agreement that the Student Advisory, Applicant Consulting, Group Orientation, and Career Information functions should be performed by the counselor at their institution in the future.

It can be seen in Table 15 that there were differences between Area school personnel in their perception as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks. The data reported were relevant to null hypothesis number 3: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks.

The findings indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected on 33 specific tasks. Six tasks were significant at the .05 level, while 27 tasks were highly significant at the .01 level.

There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on 19

Table 15. Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance "F" values as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when delineated from the perceptions of Area school personnel

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the institution.	3.98	1.71	3.22	1.52	3.99	1.68	6.69**
Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.	4.71	1.68	4.07	1.73	4.43	1.61	3.01
Evaluating high school and college transcripts.	4.52	1.66	3.96	1.64	4.82	1.34	10.87**
Serving on admissions committee.	5.17	1.11	4.57	1.48	4.68	1.39	5.09**
Administering tests to incoming students.	5.03	1.49	4.44	1.40	5.12	1.39	6.88**
Assemble and maintain appropriate testing instruments.	5.48	0.84	4.93	1.50	5.18	1.19	4.23*
Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.	5.29	0.96	5.07	1.13	5.01	1.21	1.87

\*\*  $F_{2,460}$  .01 level = 4.66

\*  $F_{2,460}$  .05 level = 3.02

Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		F <sub>11</sub> Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Writing recommendations for students seeking employment and college transfer.	4.40	1.52	3.94	1.62	3.91	1.58	3.23*
Designing forms and procedures for student registration.	3.90	1.81	2.92	1.66	3.76	1.88	7.31**
Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.	4.11	1.91	3.56	1.60	3.96	1.84	2.00
Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.	4.74	1.34	4.39	1.49	4.34	1.59	2.21
Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.	3.97	1.45	3.78	1.60	3.52	1.63	2.93
Interpreting test results to students.	5.65	0.71	5.57	0.86	5.36	0.94	4.59*
Consulting with students about career plans and educational goals.	5.75	0.48	5.77	0.44	5.33	1.12	10.49**
Interpreting college transfer requirements.	5.45	0.96	5.22	1.07	5.24	1.20	1.29

Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Helping students plan appropriate programs or curricula.	5.41	0.78	5.43	0.78	5.17	1.12	3.13*
Approving course selection for students.	4.45	1.40	4.61	1.37	4.31	1.52	1.34
Interpret effective study skills to students.	4.70	1.28	4.73	1.16	4.57	1.38	0.65
Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.	5.18	1.25	4.93	1.24	5.00	1.27	0.95
Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.	2.88	1.45	3.06	1.48	2.94	1.65	0.28
Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems.	2.85	1.81	2.71	1.78	3.41	1.93	5.89**
Counseling with students about personal and social problems.	5.77	0.44	5.84	0.53	5.35	0.97	15.48**
Conducting group counseling for underachievers.	5.12	1.30	5.01	1.00	4.92	1.22	0.96



Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.	5.20	1.14	5.05	1.32	5.27	1.15	1.05
Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.	5.70	0.66	5.80	0.45	5.38	1.02	9.02**
Assisting students in achieving self-understanding.	5.49	0.79	5.72	0.57	4.94	1.18	21.48**
Dispensing career information.	5.54	0.83	5.48	0.65	5.53	1.04	1.48
Studying manpower needs within community and region.	4.14	1.58	3.67	1.67	4.45	1.52	8.02**
Interpreting occupational information.	5.40	0.84	5.27	0.83	4.81	1.32	10.68**
Analyzing financial needs for students.	4.54	1.60	3.51	1.82	4.59	1.42	15.43**
Securing financial assistance for students.	4.49	1.62	3.48	1.75	4.37	1.64	9.70**
Supervising students on work-study programs.	2.97	1.73	2.56	1.44	3.50	1.71	10.90**

Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Arranging placement interviews.	4.61	1.61	3.63	1.77	4.33	1.69	7.28**
Working with employment agencies in placement of students.	4.79	1.47	4.19	1.67	4.57	1.56	3.00
Work with institutional departments in placement activities.	4.94	1.45	4.40	1.47	4.75	1.48	2.69
Compile curricular guides for transferring students into senior colleges.	4.84	1.33	4.38	1.66	4.84	1.43	3.16*
Sponsoring or advising student government.	3.91	1.80	2.92	1.56	3.66	1.79	7.21**
Supervising elections and student conferences.	3.89	1.65	2.55	1.48	3.53	1.77	13.68**
Supervising co-curricular student activities program.	3.95	1.62	2.57	1.50	3.63	1.62	16.81**
Reprimanding students for social misconduct.	2.41	1.52	1.46	0.89	2.95	1.80	25.90**
Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities.	4.59	1.45	3.76	1.53	4.06	1.60	6.09**

Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Interpreting student services and regulations.	4.89	1.30	4.40	1.36	4.34	1.47	4.89**
Train returning students to help new students.	4.00	1.33	3.94	1.57	3.70	1.57	1.63
Maintaining referral resources for students.	5.27	0.95	5.32	0.92	4.95	1.31	4.38*
Serving on faculty committees.	5.45	0.72	4.94	1.17	4.71	1.34	12.17**
Serving as consultant to a department or division of the institution.	4.71	1.45	4.71	1.27	4.24	1.53	5.22**
Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.	5.65	0.77	5.44	0.84	5.37	1.06	2.70
Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.	4.87	1.26	4.73	1.29	4.51	1.44	2.48
Attending professional workshops and conferences.	5.64	0.73	5.57	0.61	5.22	0.95	10.84**

Table 15. (Continued)

Tasks	Administrators		Counselors		Instructors		"F" Values
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Conducting follow-up studies of former students.	5.37	1.13	4.48	1.51	4.49	1.38	8.53**
Confer with students withdrawing from the institution.	5.71	0.80	5.68	0.63	5.38	1.08	5.46**
Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/or student personnel services.	5.21	1.12	4.96	1.16	5.01	1.21	1.12

specific tasks since their "F" values were less than the tabular values at both the .05 and .01 levels of significance. It appeared that Area school personnel did agree that the following tasks should require counselor time:

Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.

Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.

Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.

Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.

Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.

Interpreting college transfer requirements.

Approving course selection for students.

Interpret effective study skills to students.

Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.

Conducting group counseling for underachievers.

Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.

Dispensing career information.

Working with employment agencies in placement of students.

Work with institutional departments in placement activities.

Train returning students to help new students.

Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.

Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.

Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/or student personnel services.

The groups expressed some indecision regarding the following task, however, the direction of the responses indicated that this task should not require counselor time:

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.

The investigator's interest in the relationship between seven descriptive variables and the perception of Area school personnel on the current and future functions of counselors led to the following null hypotheses and analyses. Correlations were computed to determine significant deviations from zero.

Null hypothesis number 4: There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' current function(s).

It can be seen in Table 16 that age, responsibilities of position, institution's enrollment, and institution's instructional offerings were the descriptive variables with the highest overall correlation with current functions when perceived by Area school personnel.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the second descriptive variables, age, and the following current functions: Applicant Appraisal, Program Articulation, Financial Assisting, and Graduate Placement. This variable was significantly correlated at the .05 level with the Applicant Appraisal, Program Articulation, and Financial Assisting functions. The variable, age, was highly significant at the .01 level with the Graduate Placement function. The correlation values for the remaining current functions were not significant, so consequently the hypothesis failed to be rejected between 17 current functions and the variable, age.

Table 16. Summary of the correlations between descriptive variables and current functions

Current Functions	Descriptive Variables						
	Sex	Age	Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position	Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
Pre-College Information	.02	.04	.03	.03	.00	-.11*	.04
Applicant Appraisal	-.00	.12*	.02	.01	-.00	-.03	.03
Educational Testing	-.07	.08	-.01	.12*	-.05	-.06	-.05
Personnel Records	-.00	.08	.02	.08	.05	-.08	.07
Student Registration	.00	.00	-.04	.00	-.00	-.09	.03
Academic Regulation	-.02	.01	.01	.02	-.06	-.05	-.00
Applicant Consulting	-.03	.03	-.06	.08	-.16**	-.07	.00

\*\* Significant at or beyond the .01 level;  $r = .13$ ,  $N = 400$ .

\* Significant at or beyond the .05 level;  $r = .10$ ,  $N = 400$ .

Table 16. (Continued)

Current Functions	Descriptive Variables						
	Sex	Age	Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position	Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
Student Advisory	.00	.03	.01	.03	-.10*	.01	-.01
Group Orientation	-.09	.07	.04	.02	-.12**	-.01	-.00
Student Counseling	-.06	.03	-.05	.06	-.17**	.00	.04
Career Information	-.01	.06	.06	-.02	-.07	-.02	.04
Financial Assisting	-.02	.10*	.00	.03	.03	-.19**	.15**
Graduate Placement	-.01	.13**	.02	.05	-.04	-.00	.13**
Student Self-Governing	.00	.02	-.00	-.07	-.01	-.26**	.13**



Table 16. (Continued)

Current Functions	<u>Descriptive Variables</u>						
	Sex	Age	Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position	Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
Co-Curricular Activity	-.03	.06	.00	.05	.04	-.21**	.08
Social Regulation	.07	.04	-.01	-.05	.08	-.20**	.10*
Student Induction	-.04	.00	.05	.00	-.07	-.08	.09
Program Articulation	-.00	.11*	-.06	.01	-.10*	.04	-.04
In-Service Education	.04	.07	-.04	-.02	-.09	.05	-.06
Program Evaluation	-.07	.09	.01	.05	-.11*	-.10*	.03
Administrative Organization	-.05	.04	-.00	.04	-.09	-.02	-.01

101

The data indicated that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlation between the fifth variable, responsibilities of position, and the following current functions: Program Evaluation, Student Advisory, Student Counseling, Program Articulation, Applicant Consulting, and Group Orientation.

The variable, responsibilities of position, is significantly related at the .05 level with Program Evaluation, Student Advisory, and Program Articulation functions. It was also highly significant at or beyond the .01 level with the Student Counseling, Applicant Consulting, and Group Orientation functions. The correlation values were not significant for the remaining functions. Consequently, the evidence was insufficient to reject the hypothesis between 16 current functions and the variable, responsibilities of position.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the sixth variable, institution's enrollment, and the following current functions: Program Evaluation, Pre-College Information, Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting.

An institution's enrollment was significantly correlated at the .05 level with the Program Evaluation, and Pre-College Information functions. This variable was also highly significant at the .01 level with the Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting functions. The correlation values for the remaining functions were insufficient to reject the null hypothesis between 15 current functions and the variable, institution's enrollment.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the seventh

variable, institution's instructional offerings, and the following current functions: Social Regulation, Graduate Placement, Student Self-Governing, and Financial Assisting.

The Social Regulation and Graduate Placement functions were significantly correlated with an institution's instructional offerings at the .05 level, while the Student Self-Governing and Financial Assisting functions were highly significant at the .01 level with this same variable. The correlation values for the remaining functions were insufficient to reject the hypothesis between 17 current functions and the variable, institution's instructional offerings.

Correlation values were found not to be significant between the remaining descriptive variables and current functions. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis between the counselors' current functions and the descriptive variables of sex, professional education, and years employed at present position. These descriptive variables did not seem to influence the way Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors perceive the counselors' current functions.

Null hypothesis number 5: There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' future function(s).

The data in Table 17 indicate that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the first descriptive variable, sex, and the following future functions: In-Service Education, and Social Regulation. Sex was significantly related at the .05 level with the In-Service Education and Social Regulation functions. Correlation values were found not to be significant among the remaining future functions. Thus, there was

Table 17. Summary of the correlations between descriptive variables and future functions

Future Functions	Descriptive Variable						
	Sex	Age	Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position	Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
Pre-College Information	.02	.04	.10*	.02	.06	-.12*	.08
Applicant Appraisal	.05	.12*	.03	.06	.01	-.01	.04
Educational Testing	-.03	.10*	-.01	.10*	-.00	-.05	.05
Personnel Records	.01	.09	.03	.04	.08	-.08	.07
Student Registration	.03	.02	.02	.04	.03	-.11**	.09
Academic Regulation	.02	.01	.02	.01	.01	-.01	.04
Applicant Consulting	-.01	.03	-.00	.04	-.09	-.05	.00

\*\* Significant at or beyond the .01 level;  $r = .13$ ,  $N = 400$ .

\* Significant at or beyond the .05 level;  $r = .10$ ,  $N = 400$ .

Table 17. (Continued)

Future Functions	Sex	Age	Descriptive Variables			Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
			Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position		
Student Advisory	.05	.02	.03	.02	.02	.01	.03
Group Orientation	.07	.04	-.00	.00	-.08	.07	.02
Student Counseling	-.02	.05	-.11*	.00	-.20**	-.02	.13**
Career Information	.03	.01	.06	-.04	-.00	-.02	.05
Financial Assisting	.00	.12*	.07	.06	.08	-.18**	.10*
Graduate Placement	-.02	.06	.03	.03	-.00	-.08	.14**
Student Self-Governing	.06	.04	.06	-.10*	.06	-.29**	.11*

Table 17. (Continued)

Future Functions	Descriptive Variables						
	Sex	Age	Prof. Education	Years Employed	Res. Position	Inst. Enrollment	Inst. Offerings
Co-Curricular Activity	.03	.06	.01	-.01	.07	-.23**	.07
Social Regulation	.12*	.08	.06	-.01	.15**	-.22**	.14**
Student Induction	.01	.00	.12*	.00	-.01	-.15**	.08
Program Articulation	.03	.06	-.04	.00	.00	-.03	.02
In-Service Education	.10*	.02	-.05	-.00	-.10*	.04	-.02
Program Evaluation	-.07	.01	-.00	.00	-.03	-.12*	.02
Administrative Organization	.02	.06	-.02	.02	-.10*	.00	-.01

insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis between the remaining 19 future functions and the variable, sex.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlation values between the second variable, age, and the following future functions: Educational Testing, Applicant Appraisal, and Financial Assisting. Age was significantly correlated at the .05 level with these three functions. The correlation values for the remaining 18 future functions were insufficient to reject the null hypothesis on these functions and the variable, age.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the third variable, professional education, and the following future functions: Student Counseling, Pre-College Information, and Student Induction functions. Professional education was significantly related at the .05 level with the Student Counseling, Pre-College Information, and Student Induction functions. There were no significant correlations between the remaining future functions and professional education. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis between 18 future functions and the variable, professional education.

It may be observed that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the fourth variable, years employed in present position, and the following future functions: Educational Testing and Student Self-Governing. These functions were significantly correlated with this variable at the .05 level. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on the remaining future functions.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the fifth variable, responsibilities of position, and the following future functions:

Student Counseling, Administrative Organization, In-Service Education, and Social Regulation. This variable was significantly related at the .05 level with the Administrative Organization, and In-Service Education functions. The correlations were highly significant at the .01 level with the Student Counseling and Social Regulation functions. There were no correlation values of significance between the remaining functions and this variable. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis between the remaining 17 future functions and the variable, responsibilities of position.

The data indicated that there were no correlations between the sixth variable, institution's enrollment, and the following future functions: Program Evaluation, Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Pre-College Information, Student Induction, Student Registration, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting.

Institution's enrollment was significantly related at the .05 level with the Program Evaluation and Pre-College Information functions. It was highly significant at the .01 level with the Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Student Induction, Student Registration, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting functions. No correlation values were found to be significant among the remaining future functions. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for the correlation between the remaining 13 future functions and the variable, institution's enrollment.

The hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the seventh variable, institution's instructional offerings, and the following future



functions: Student Counseling, Student Self-Governing, Social Regulation, Financial Assisting, and Graduate Placement.

The variable, institution's instructional offerings, was significant at the .05 level with the Student Self-Governing and Financial Assisting functions. It was highly significant at the .01 level with the Student Counseling, Social Regulation, and Graduate Placement functions. The correlation values for the remaining future functions were not significant, so consequently the null hypothesis failed to be rejected between the remaining future functions and the variable, institution's instructional offerings.

The investigator's interest in the relationship or correlation between the respondents' perception of function(s) that are comprised of certain specific tasks requiring counselor time, and their perception of the future function(s) of counselors led to the following null hypothesis and analysis.

Null hypothesis number 6: There is no significant correlation between function(s) that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time, and future function(s) of counselors when analyzed for the perceptions of administrators, counselors, and instructors.

The data in Table 18 present the correlation values between functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time and the matching future functions when perceived by administrators, counselors, and instructors. The degrees of freedom associated with each group must be treated separately in analyzing the correlation values.

In reviewing the correlation values for the perception of administrators, it was found that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlations

Table 18. Correlations between functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time and the matching future functions when perceived by administrators, counselors, and instructors

Future Functions	Functions Comprised of Tasks		
	Administrators N = 85	Counselors N = 80	Instructors N = 304
Pre-College Information	.69**	.49**	.39**
Applicant Appraisal	.55**	.60**	.50**
Educational Testing	.51**	.56**	.55**
Personnel Records	.28**	.33**	.28**
Student Registration	.66**	.66**	.61**
Academic Regulation	.48**	.33**	.40**
Applicant Consulting	.25*	.13	.33**
Student Advisory	.36**	.40**	.41**
Group Orientation	.38**	.27*	.38**
Student Counseling	.20	.05	.30**
Career Information	.61**	.46**	.48**

\*\* Significant at or beyond the .01 level;  $r = .28$ ,  $N = 85$ ;  
 $r = .28$ ,  $N = 80$ ;  $r = .14$ ,  $N = 304$ .

\* Significant at or beyond the .05 level;  $r = .22$ ,  $N = 85$ ;  
 $r = .21$ ,  $N = 80$ ;  $r = .11$ ,  $N = 304$ .

Table 18. (Continued)

Future Functions	Functions Comprised of Tasks		
	Administrators N = 85	Counselors N = 80	Instructors N = 304
Financial Assisting	.79**	.65**	.71**
Graduate Placement	.72**	.60**	.71**
Student Self-Governing	.82**	.70**	.61**
Co-Curricular Activity	.73**	.60**	.52**
Social Regulation	.71**	.48**	.64**
Student Induction	.42**	.45**	.27*
Program Articulation	.43**	.06	.19**
In-Service Education	.16	.27*	.35**
Program Evaluation	.49**	.50**	.42**
Administrative Organization	.24*	.33**	.10

between the variables on the following 19 functions:

Pre-College Information  
 Applicant Appraisal  
 Educational Testing  
 Personnel Records  
 Student Registration  
 Academic Regulation  
 Applicant Consulting

Financial Assisting  
 Graduate Placement  
 Student Self-Governing  
 Co-Curricular Activity  
 Social Regulation  
 Student Induction  
 Program Articulation

Student Advisory  
Group Orientation  
Career Information

Program Evaluation  
Administrative Organization

The administrators perception of the Administrative Organization and Applicant Consulting functions were significantly related at the .05 level with their perception of the matching functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time. The remaining future functions, that are listed, were highly correlated at the .01 level with their matching function when perceived by this same group. The only correlation values that were found non-significant were the Student Counseling and In-Service Education functions. Consequently, the hypothesis was not rejected between the functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time, and the Student Counseling and In-Service Education functions when perceived by administrators.

Analysis of the correlation values for the perception of counselors revealed that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlations between the variables on the following 18 functions:

Pre-College Information  
Applicant Appraisal  
Educational Testing  
Personnel Records  
Student Registration  
Academic Regulation  
Student Advisory  
Group Orientation  
Career Information

Financial Assisting  
Graduate Placement  
Student Self-Governing  
Co-Curricular Activity  
Social Regulation  
Student Induction  
In-Service Education  
Program Evaluation  
Administrative Organization

The counselors perception of the Group Orientation, In-Service Education, and Student Induction functions were highly related at the .05 level with their perception of the matching functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time. The remaining functions listed were highly

significant at the .01 level when perceived by this same group.

There were no significant correlation values for the Student Counseling, Applicant Consulting, and Program Articulation functions. This indicated that the hypothesis failed to be rejected for the correlations between functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time, and the Student Counseling, Applicant Consulting, and Program Articulation functions when perceived by counselors.

It can be observed that the only correlation value that was non-significant for the perception of instructors was the Administrative Organization function. This indicated that the hypothesis was not rejected for the correlation between the Administrative Organization function, and the matching function that is comprised of tasks requiring counselor time when perceived by instructors.

The findings indicated, however, that the hypothesis was rejected for the correlation between the remaining future functions, and their matching functions when perceived by instructors. The Student Induction function was significantly related at the .05 level with its matching functions, while the remaining 19 future functions were highly correlated at the .01 level with their matching functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time.

---

## DISCUSSION

## Descriptive Variables

The intent of the present study was to show that the perceptions of counselor functions are significantly correlated to certain descriptive variables when perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors. The data in Tables 16 and 17 of the preceding chapter support this hypothesis. Of the seven descriptive variables used in the study, responsibilities of position, institution's enrollment, and institution's instructional offerings contributed to the highest overall correlations with the perception of current and future counselor functions. It is hypothesized that these variables may be contributing factors in the way that certain counselor functions are perceived by Area school personnel in Iowa.

The results of this study also reveal that in general the descriptive variables sex, age, professional education, and years employed in present position do not seem to influence the way that most counselor functions are perceived by Area school personnel.

## Views on Current Counselor Functions

The findings of this study, presented in the preceding chapter, indicate that there is significant differences between Area school personnel in their perception of the counselors' current functions. The data in Table 13 revealed that significant differences in perception were found between Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors on

14 of 21 functions. Of the 14 current functions that were found statistically significant, the mean scores of the administrators were found to be the highest on 13. Most of these functions could be classified as student personnel services. It appears that administrators view the counselor as being the key student personnel staff member to conduct these services. The need for counselors to provide these services may be evident when one considers the rapid growth and development of the Area schools in Iowa. It may well be that the diversity of students entering the Area schools results in casting the unique role of the counselor by necessitating an emphasis upon these services.

The counselors, however, seem to view their primary responsibility in the area of counseling. This was evidenced by the counselors having the highest mean score on the Student Counseling function. The counselors mean scores were found to be lowest on six functions that could be classified as student personnel services and included Co-Curricular Activity, Social Regulation, Student Induction, Financial Assisting, Student Self-Governing, and Educational Testing. These results represent fundamental differences between administrators and counselors in their perception of counselor functions.

Of the instructors, mean scores were found to be the lowest on six functions and included such functions as Applicant Consulting, Student Advisory, Group Orientation, Student Counseling, Program Articulation, In-Service Education, Program Evaluation, and Administrative Organization.

No significant differences were found between Area school personnel in their perception of the Personnel Records, Applicant Appraisal, Pre-College

Information, and Career Information functions. Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors appear to be in close agreement that these functions are currently performed by the counselor. The results further show that no significant differences exist between Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the Student Registration, Academic Regulation, and Graduate Placement functions. It is noteworthy, however, that counselors and instructors appear to be in closer agreement that these functions are not the current responsibility of counselors; whereas administrators tend to "agree" that these functions are currently performed by counselors.

In examining the response differences of Area school personnel on each function, an interesting observation was made. Although the values of the "F" test reveal that statistically significant differences exist between Area school personnel, this did not mean that there was either complete conflict or disagreement between the groups in their perception of the counselors' current functions. Inspection of the data in Table 19 shows the comparison of responses in percentage and rank order for each current function by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors.

It may be observed that Area school administrators appear to be in strong agreement that most of the 21 functions surveyed in the study are currently performed by the counselors at their institution. The findings show that 75 per cent to 97 per cent of the administrators surveyed are in close agreement that the following 13 functions are currently performed by counselors:



Table 19. Percentages and ranks of the counselors' current functions as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Current Functions	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
<u>Admission, Registration, Records</u>						
Pre-College Information	88.2	85.5	85.2	7	5	5
Applicant Appraisal	85.9	76.3	88.2	8	8.5	1.5
Educational Testing	91.8	88.2	88.1	3	4	3
Personnel Records	82.3	78.9	84.6	10	7	6
Student Registration	69.4	64.5	63.9	16.5	13	13
Academic Regulation	72.9	64.6	60.6	15	12	15
<u>Guidance and Counseling</u>						
Applicant Consulting	97.8	94.7	86.6	1	1.5	4
Student Advisory	90.5	90.8	78.7	6	3	7
Group Orientation	83.6	65.8	62.1	9	11	14
Student Counseling	96.5	94.7	88.2	2	1.5	1.5
Career Information	81.1	82.9	67.4	11	6	11
<u>Placement and Financial Aids</u>						
Financial Assisting	75.4	51.4	70.7	13	20	9
Graduate Placement	77.6	60.6	67.1	12	15	12
<u>Student Activities</u>						
Student Self-Governing	68.2	51.3	56.9	18	21	19
Co-Curricular Activity	69.4	56.6	59.5	16.5	17	16
Social Regulation	62.4	60.5	58.6	21	16	18
Student Induction	90.6	72.3	68.5	4.5	10	10
<u>Administration</u>						
Program Articulation	65.9	55.3	51.3	20	18	21
In-Service Education	67.1	53.9	54.6	19	19	20
Program Evaluation	90.6	76.3	75.3	4.5	8.5	8
Administrative Organization	74.2	63.1	58.9	14	14	17

<sup>a</sup> A = administrators; C = counselors; I = instructors.

Applicant Consulting (97.8)  
 Student Counseling (96.5)  
 Educational Testing (91.8)  
 Student Induction (90.6)  
 Program Evaluation (90.6)  
 Student Advisory (90.5)  
 Pre-College Information (88.2)

Applicant Appraisal (85.9)  
 Group Orientation (83.6)  
 Personnel Records (82.3)  
 Career Information (81.1)  
 Graduate Placement (77.6)  
 Financial Assisting (75.4)

In addition, over 60 per cent of the administrators feel that the remaining eight functions are also currently performed by the counselor. It would appear from the results of this study that Area school administrators view the counselors' current function as a comprehensive service. Not only must the traditional services be provided by counselors in guidance and counseling, but many additional ones are viewed by Area school administrators to be the current responsibility of counselors.

Counselors in this study, however, have different perceptions of their current function in Area schools. As shown in Table 19, only nine functions are viewed by 75 per cent to 94 per cent of the counselors surveyed as functions that they are currently responsible for at their institution. These views are indicated in their agreement on the following:

Applicant Consulting (94.7)  
 Student Counseling (94.7)  
 Student Advisory (90.8)  
 Educational Testing (88.2)  
 Pre-College Information (85.5)

Career Information (82.9)  
 Personnel Records (78.9)  
 Applicant Appraisal (76.3)  
 Program Evaluation (76.3)

Perhaps due in part to their direct involvement with student personnel services, the data further show that 51 per cent to 72 per cent of the counselors also indicated that they are currently responsible for the remaining functions surveyed.

Instructors did give some definite responses as to their perception of the counselor's current function in Area schools. It can be seen in Table

19 that only eight of 21 functions are viewed by 75 per cent or more instructors surveyed as functions currently performed by counselors.

These functions are:

Applicant Appraisal (88.2)	Pre-College Information (85.2)
Student Counseling (88.2)	Personnel Records (84.6)
Educational Testing (88.1)	Student Advisory (78.7)
Applicant Consulting (86.6)	Program Evaluation (75.3)

Over 51 per cent of the instructors surveyed also expressed some agreement that the remaining functions are currently performed by counselors at their institution. These perceptions were not the overwhelming viewpoint of all instructors in the survey, however, they do indicate the current trend of counselor functions as perceived by Area school instructors.

It would appear from the results of this study that Area school administrators perceive the counselor currently performing more functions than are currently perceived by counselors and instructors in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. The results also reveal that Area school counselors are currently involved in functions related to Admission, Registration, Records, Placement, Financial Aids, Student Activities, and Administration, as well as their primary activities in guidance and counseling. The Area school counselor appears to be currently a part of the student personnel administration. This broad range of responsibilities will undoubtedly influence the development and clarification of the counselors' professional role in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges.

## Views on Future Counselor Functions

It can be observed in Table 14 that no significant differences in the perception of the counselors' future function exists between Area school personnel on four of 21 assigned functions. The four functions are Student Advisory, Applicant Consulting, Group Orientation, and Career Information. Area school personnel appear to be in definite agreement that these functions should be the responsibility of the counselor in the future. Inspection of Table 14 also reveals that the future functions found to be significantly different were primarily influenced by administrators. Of the 17 future functions that were found statistically significant, the mean scores of administrators were found to be the highest on 14. Of the counselors only two mean scores were found to be the highest. Two mean scores of instructors were also found to be the highest.

Of the 17 future functions, the counselors mean scores were lowest on 14 and the instructors mean scores were lowest on three. The counselors low scores included future functions that could be appropriately classified as student personnel services. It appears that counselors do not view such services to be their primary responsibility in the future. The results indicate, however, that administrators view the counselor as being the key student personnel staff member to conduct these services in the future. Again, these results represent fundamental differences between administrators and counselors and a reordering of counselor functions to establish well defined roles for counselors would be a significant improvement over the differentiated perceptions that currently exist.

In examining the response differences between administrators,

counselors, and instructors for each assigned function, it was discovered that although the values of the "F" test reveal statistically significant differences exist between these groups on 17 functions, this did not mean that there was either complete conflict or disagreement between the groups in their conception of the counselors' future function.

Table 20 shows the results of comparing the percentage and rank order of responses for each future function by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors. It may be observed that Area school administrators appear to be in definite agreement that 14 of the assigned functions should be the responsibility of the counselor in the future. The findings show that 79 per cent to 98 per cent of the administrators are in strong agreement that the following functions should be performed by the counselor in the future:

Student Counseling (98.8)	Applicant Appraisal (87.0)
Applicant Consulting (96.4)	Career Information (87.0)
Educational Testing (95.2)	Group Orientation (84.7)
Program Evaluation (94.1)	Graduate Placement (82.3)
Student Advisory (91.8)	Administrative Organization (80.0)
Pre-College Information (88.2)	Personnel Records (79.0)
Student Induction (88.2)	Financial Assisting (76.4)

Over 55 per cent of the administrators also believe that the remaining eight functions should be the responsibility of the counselor in the future. These results appear consistent with their perception of the counselors' current function.

Instructors varied widely in their perception of the counselors future responsibility in Area schools. However, the direction of responses indicate that the instructors view more assigned functions for the counselor in the future. The findings show that 78 per cent to 93 per cent of the

Table 20. Percentages and ranks of the counselors' future functions as perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Future Functions	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
<u>Admission, Registration, Records</u>						
Pre-College Information	88.2	78.9	89.8	6.5	8	4
Applicant Appraisal	87.0	72.4	84.1	8.5	9	9
Educational Testing	95.2	85.4	91.8	3	6	3
Personnel Records	79.0	71.1	86.6	13	10	8
Student Registration	71.8	52.6	63.2	16.5	17.5	18
Academic Regulation	70.5	53.9	63.5	18	16	17
<u>Guidance and Counseling</u>						
Applicant Consulting	96.4	96.1	93.4	2	2	2
Student Advisory	91.8	88.1	88.8	5	4	5
Group Orientation	84.7	86.8	78.6	10	5	12
Student Counseling	98.8	98.7	93.8	1	1	1
Career Information	87.0	89.4	87.5	8.5	3	6.5
<u>Placement and Financial Aids</u>						
Financial Assisting	76.4	38.2	74.0	14	20	13
Graduate Placement	82.3	63.0	78.9	11	14	11
<u>Student Activities</u>						
Student Self-Governing	67.0	52.6	63.9	20	17.5	16
Co-Curricular Activity	67.1	46.0	62.8	19	19	19
Social Regulation	55.3	17.0	59.5	21	21	21
Student Induction	88.2	69.8	79.7	6.5	12	10
<u>Administration</u>						
Program Articulation	71.8	56.6	65.2	16.5	15	14
In-Service Education	74.1	68.4	61.9	15	13	20
Program Evaluation	94.1	84.3	87.5	4	7	6.5
Administrative Organization	80.0	71.0	64.6	12	11	15

<sup>a</sup> A = administrators; C = counselors; I = instructors.

instructors surveyed are in close agreement that the following functions should be the future responsibility of counselors:

Student Counseling (93.8)	Program Evaluation (87.5)
Applicant Consulting (93.4)	Personnel Records (86.6)
Educational Testing (91.8)	Applicant Appraisal (84.1)
Pre-College Information (89.8)	Student Induction (79.7)
Student Advisory (88.8)	Graduate Placement (78.9)
Career Information (87.5)	Group Orientation (78.6)

Other assigned functions which over 59 per cent of the instructors did perceive to be future responsibilities of the counselor reflected a growing need to clearly formulate the counselors' future function in Area schools. They, like administrators, may simply feel that counselors can better provide such services. This viewpoint represents a much broader concept in job orientation and description for the counselor in the future.

Counselors, on the other hand, expressed strong disagreement that three specific functions should not be their responsibility in the future. These functions are:

Social Regulation (83.0)
Financial Assisting (61.8)
Co-Curricular Activity (54.0)

Counselors generally believe that their primary function in the future should be appropriately focused on guidance and counseling functions. This is evidenced by over 75 per cent of the counselors strongly supporting the following functions:

Student Counseling (98.7)	Group Orientation (86.8)
Applicant Consulting (96.1)	Educational Testing (85.4)
Career Information (89.4)	Program Evaluation (84.3)
Student Advisory (88.1)	Pre-College Information (78.9)

Many counselors also expressed indecision regarding the remaining functions. The direction of counselor responses, however, indicates a

shift from sole reliance on guidance and counseling with individuals to more diversified services. The results of this study indicate a definite shift in job description for the counselor in the future. Approximately 52 per cent to 72 per cent of the counselors surveyed expressed some agreement that the following functions would be their responsibility in the future. These functions are:

Personnel Records (71.1)	Program Articulation (56.6)
Applicant Appraisal (72.4)	In-Service Education (68.4)
Administrative Organization (71.0)	Student Registration (52.6)
Student Self-Governing (52.6)	Academic Regulation (53.9)
Student Induction (69.8)	Graduate Placement (63.0)

The results of this study clearly indicate that there is a difference between Area school personnel in their perceptions of counselor functions. It appears that Area school counselors in Iowa are primarily viewed as generalists who are responsible for many functions currently related to student personnel work. The need for professional counselors to provide their skills in all areas of student personnel may seem evident when one considers the characteristics of the population served by Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. However, the professional counselor seems to find himself in a dilemma by ignoring the expectations of his supporting institution or through the loss of his professional identity by disregarding the methodology of his professional training. It appears that the traditional functions of the counselor may be insufficient to meet the needs and expectations of the population served in Area schools. It is evident from the results of this study that a reordering of counselor functions to establish well defined roles for counselors would be a significant improvement over the differentiated



perceptions of counselor functions that currently exist.

Views on Whether Counselor Time Should Be  
Required on Certain Specific Tasks

Although the results of the "F" test statistically revealed in Table 15 that only 19 specific tasks appear to be highly agreed upon by Area school personnel as tasks that should or should not require counselor time, it was noteworthy that complete agreement or conflict did not exist within the groups on all tasks. As can be seen in Table 21, a comparison of responses in percentages and rank order for each task reveals that over 75 per cent of the Area school administrators surveyed highly agree that 39 specific tasks should require counselor time. Among the counselors surveyed, over 75 per cent of them believe 31 specific tasks should require their time. Of the instructors, over 75 per cent of them agree that 35 specific tasks should require counselor time. It appears that Area school administrators and instructors do expect the counselor to perform more tasks than the counselor himself expects to perform.

Few of the tasks were perceived by less than 50 per cent of the respondents as tasks that should require counselor time. Area school personnel obviously believe that certain tasks do not belong in the domain of counselor responsibility. In this analysis, it can be observed in Table 21 that the administrators viewed the following:

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration. (38.8)

Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems. (37.6)

Supervising students on workstudy programs. (37.7)

Table 21. Percentages and ranks as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks when perceived by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors

Tasks	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
<u>Pre-College Information</u>						
Preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the institution.	68.3	51.5	64.5	42	44	40
Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.	76.5	65.7	75.0	37	34	35
<u>Applicant Appraisal</u>						
Evaluating high school and college transcripts.	76.4	64.4	85.2	38	36	21.3
Serving on admissions committee.	92.9	82.9	84.2	16.5	24.3	24
<u>Educational Testing</u>						
Administering tests to incoming students.	87.1	78.9	87.8	25	29	18
Assemble and maintain appropriate testing instruments.	97.6	85.5	91.4	9.3	22	11.5
<u>Personnel Records</u>						
Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.	89.3	93.4	89.9	23	13	16
Writing recommendations for students seeking employment and college transfer.	70.6	65.8	63.5	41	33	41
<u>Student Registration</u>						
Designing forms and procedures for student registration.	62.3	42.1	57.2	47.5	46	46
Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.	63.5	54.0	62.9	45.5	42.5	42

<sup>a</sup> A = administrators; C = counselors; I = instructors.

Table 21. (Continued)

Tasks	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
<u>Academic Regulation</u>						
Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.	85.9	77.6	75.1	28.5	30	34
Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.	68.2	61.8	57.9	43	37	44
<u>Applicant Consulting</u>						
Interpreting test results to students.	98.9	98.7	95.5	3.5	4.2	2
Consulting with students about career plans and educational goals.	100.0	100.0	93.4	1.5	1.3	8
<u>Student Advisory</u>						
Interpreting college transfer requirements.	95.3	92.2	91.4	15	14	11.4
Helping students plan appropriate programs or curricula.	96.5	97.3	91.8	12	10	10
Approving course selection for students.	81.1	82.9	76.3	33.5	24.3	33
Interpret effective study skills to students.	86.0	88.1	83.9	26.5	19.3	25.5
<u>Group Orientation</u>						
Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.	92.9	88.1	88.5	16.5	19.3	17
Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.	38.8	43.4	42.5	49	45	51
<u>Student Counseling</u>						
Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems.	37.6	35.5	53.2	51	47.5	49

Table 21. (Continued)

Tasks	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
Counseling with students about personal and social problems.	100.0	98.7	93.7	1.5	4.2	7
Conducting group counseling for underachievers.	90.6	89.4	90.1	21	18	13
Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.	91.8	88.1	92.8	18.3	19.3	9
Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.	97.6	100.0	95.0	9.3	1.3	3
Assisting students in achieving self-understanding.	97.7	98.6	90.4	6.3	8.5	15
<u>Career Information</u>						
Dispensing career information.	96.4	98.7	94.4	13.5	4.2	4.3
Studying manpower needs within community and region.	75.4	57.9	79.2	39	39.5	31
Interpreting occupational information.	97.7	96.1	85.2	6.3	11	21.3
<u>Financial Assisting</u>						
Analyzing financial needs of students.	78.8	56.6	81.6	35.5	41	29
Securing financial assistance for students.	78.8	54.0	74.3	35.5	42.5	37
Supervising students on work-study programs.	37.7	26.3	51.6	50	51	50
<u>Graduate Placement</u>						
Arranging placement interviews.	81.1	59.2	74.4	33.5	38	36
Working with employment agencies in placement of students.	82.2	67.1	80.0	31	32	30
Work with institutional departments in placement activities.	88.2	80.3	82.9	24	27.5	28

Table 21. (Continued)

Tasks	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank <sup>a</sup>		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
Compile curricular guides for transferring students into senior colleges.	86.0	76.3	83.9	26.5	31	25.5
<u>Student Self-Governing</u>						
Sponsoring or advising student government.	63.5	35.5	57.3	45.5	47.5	45
Supervising elections and student conferences.	62.3	26.4	54.6	47.5	50	48
<u>Co-Curricular Activity</u>						
Supervising co-curricular student activities program.	64.7	30.2	56.9	44	49	47
<u>Social Regulation</u>						
Reprimanding students for social misconduct.	33.0	6.6	39.5	52	52	52
Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities.	81.2	57.9	69.2	32	39.5	39
<u>Student Induction</u>						
Interpreting student services and regulations.	85.9	80.3	76.4	28.5	27.5	32
Train returning students to help new students.	73.1	64.5	62.2	40	35	43
Maintaining referral resources for students.	98.8	96.0	86.9	5	12	19
<u>Program Articulation</u>						
Serving on faculty committees.	98.9	92.1	85.2	3.5	15	21.3
Serving as consultant to a department or division of the institution.	83.5	84.2	73.1	30	23	38

Table 21. (Continued)

Tasks	Percentage <sup>a</sup>			Rank		
	A	C	I	A	C	I
Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.	96.4	98.6	96.1	13.5	8.5	1
<u>In-Service Education</u>						
Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.	89.4	89.8	83.2	22	17	27
Attending professional workshops and conferences.	97.6	100.0	94.4	9.3	1.3	4.3
<u>Program Evaluation</u>						
Conducting follow-up studies of former students.	91.8	82.9	85.5	18.3	24.3	20
Confer with students withdrawing from the institution.	97.7	98.7	94.4	6.3	4.2	4.3
<u>Administrative Organization</u>						
Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/or student personnel services.	91.8	90.8	90.8	18.3	16	14

Reprimanding students for social misconduct. (33.0)

The counselors, on the other hand, were more indecisive on a number of specific tasks. The following were perceived by less than 50 per cent of the counselors as tasks that should require counselor time:

Designing forms and procedures for student registration. (42.1)

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration. (43.4)

Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems. (35.5)

Supervising students on workstudy programs. (26.3)

Sponsoring or advising student government. (35.5)

Supervising elections and student conferences. (26.4)

Supervising co-curricular student activities programs. (30.2)

Reprimanding students for social misconduct. (6.6)

In contrast, only two tasks were viewed by less than 50 per cent of the instructors as tasks requiring counselor time. These tasks were:

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration. (42.5)

Reprimanding students for social misconduct. (39.5)

It appears that the majority of administrators, counselors, and instructors participating in this study feel that the following tasks should not require counselor time:

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.

Reprimanding students for social misconduct.

The results of this study clearly indicate that although significant differences in the perceptions of Area school personnel were identified by the "F" test on 33 of 52 specific tasks, it appears that the majority of Area school personnel do view most of the tasks in this survey as requiring counselor time. Utilizing the counselor's time on many of these tasks would indeed limit his professional responsibilities to guidance and counseling of students. If the counselor's function can be expressed in terms of what he does within an institution, he certainly would be depriving students of adequate opportunities for counseling when he is expected to perform certain tasks that seem unrelated to guidance and counseling.

These implications may appear distressing to traditionalists. They compel the counselor to be sensitive to various activities in the institutional environment which may contribute to student distress. But, beyond observation, it also compels the counselor to evaluate the effect of these activities on students and to take appropriate action.

Although guidance and counseling tends to remain a primary focus of counselors, it appears that other tasks---about which few counselors in training are informed and fewer still receive preparation---are being given increasing emphasis in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Some of these tasks can hardly be considered innovations; however, they do indicate a changing attitude toward the service of professional counselors from customary procedures restricted to guidance and counseling to more diversified services; from a passive role to a more aggressive search for various methods of serving the campus community in meaningful ways.

#### Comparison of Functions that are Comprised of Tasks Requiring Counselor Time and Future Functions

An important part of this study was to determine whether any relationships exist between the respondents' perceptions of functions that are comprised of certain tasks requiring counselor time, and their perceptions of the future functions of counselors. In this endeavor, the investigator was interested in the degree of consistency in the respondents' perceptions of these two sets of variables. It was discovered that the respondents' perceptions of these two sets of variables were significantly correlated on most comparisons.



Among the administrators, only the correlation values for their perceptions of the Student Counseling and In-Service Education functions failed to yield a significant correlation with their perceptions of specific tasks that comprise these two functions. Among the counselors, it was found that the correlation values for their perceptions of the Student Counseling, Applicant Consulting, and Program Articulation functions failed to show that a significant relationship exists with their perceptions of specific tasks that comprise these functions. The only area that the instructor's responses were not highly correlated was between the Administrative Organization function and their perceptions of the specific tasks that comprise this function.

The general lack of significant correlation values over these few areas can be explained by examining the data relative to the comparison of these two sets of variables. For example, the failure to yield significant correlation values between the perceptions of administrators on the Student Counseling function, and the specific tasks that comprise this function is explained by the comparison of the mean values and standard deviations from these two sets of variables.

It can be seen in Table 14 that the administrators recorded a mean value of 5.82 and a standard deviation of .55 for their perceptions of the Student Counseling function. This indicated that a strong agreement exists between administrators that this function should be a future responsibility of counselors. However, when the administrators' responses on the specific tasks that comprise the Student Counseling function is examined in Table 15, it can be seen that only five of the six tasks descriptive of this

function were highly agreed upon as tasks that should require counselor time. It can be seen that the task, "Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems," with a mean value of 2.85 and a standard deviation of 1.81, contributed to the inconsistency and lack of significant correlation values. It seems that, "Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems," is a task that the administrators feel should not belong in the domain of counselor responsibility.

This specific task also contributed to the lack of significant correlation values when perceived by counselors. It appears that counselors, like administrators feel that conducting psychotherapy is perhaps one of the most difficult tasks to justify, and may be viewed as a task that should not be conducted by counselors in Area schools as a part of the Student Counseling function.

The comparison of functions that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time and future functions did reveal that in general Area school personnel are highly cohesive in their perceptions of these two sets of variables. The specific tasks used in this study seem to be highly correlated with the future functions of counselors when perceived by Area school personnel. The conclusion was that Area school personnel seem to have an understanding of most specific tasks that are descriptive of the functions used in this study.

#### Value of the Study

The development of this study evolved from a realization on the part of Area school personnel, counselor educators, and the Iowa State Depart-

ment of Public Instruction that up-to-date information was not available on the status of counselor function(s) in Iowa Area schools. It was realized that the majority of the functions performed by counselors in Area schools were typically the result of a gradual accumulation of responsibilities and rarely the product of any comprehensive statewide plan. No assessment had been made to identify the counselor's function within the plethora of student personnel services that are commonly assigned to him. In determining the status of counselor functions in two-year colleges, the review of literature revealed that very little research had been conducted. Researchers have sorely neglected the investigation of counselor functions in vocational-technical schools and community colleges. In fact, these institutions have been typically excluded from such studies (1), (45). This fact is surprising in light of the importance attached to the counseling function in the two-year college (22).

In order to determine the perceptions of counselor functions in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges, it was felt that an assessment of counselor functions as perceived by Area school personnel would be of considerable importance in describing existing conditions. It was realized that if the perceptions of counselor functions differed very much among an institutions' personnel, the counselor may be expected to have difficulty in establishing an effective line of communication and an effective working relationship. It seemed likely that the perceptions of administrators and instructors would be of specific importance to counselors since these groups can generate their good will and would help to determine the climate in which the counselor functions. In this

endeavor, administrators and instructors can interpret the services of counselors and are potentially prime sources of referrals. Their perception of the counselor's function(s) determines not only whom they refer but whether they refer anyone at all. These groups are indeed instrumental in determining the plethora of student personnel services in which the counselor may engage.

An awareness of "what is" is indeed one of the major purposes of descriptive studies in education. This study, however, also provides a basis for change and improvement for the professional counselors' function in Area schools. The results of this study may be used to bring more understanding of the differences in perception of counselor functions so that administrators, counselors, and instructors may more effectively improve their attitudes, understandings, and skills. As counselor functions become more clearly identified and assessed, counselors can become more actively engaged in setting certification standards, developing curriculums at counselor education institutions, and articulate the proper image of the counselor to those they seek to help. It seems that the present study can serve as a basis in furthering this development.

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Summary

The general problems of this study were to elicit responses from Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors in determining perceptions of counselor functions in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Specifically, the study sought the perceptions of Area school personnel in order to ascertain:

1. The perceptions of these three groups in regard to the current function(s) of counselors in Iowa Area schools.
2. The perceptions of these three groups in regard to the future function(s) of counselors in Iowa Area schools.
3. The perceptions of these three groups as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks in Iowa Area schools.

The study was also designed to determine whether any relationship exists between seven descriptive variables and the perceptions of the groups studied on counselor functions. The descriptive variables used in this study were sex, age, professional education, years employed at present position, responsibilities of position, institution's enrollment, and institution's instructional offerings.

In the analysis of the problems in this study, a survey instrument was constructed to elicit the responses made by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors on 21 functions and 52 specific tasks commonly performed by counselors in two-year colleges. Data were obtained from 85 administrators, 76 counselors, and 304 instructors in Iowa Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Specific areas of disagreement

were indicated when the differences between the three groups were tested using single-classification analysis of variance "F" tests. The Pearson product-moment correlation was employed to indicate whether any significant relationships existed between the three groups on certain variables. In applying analysis of variance and product-moment correlations to the raw data of the study, the five per cent level of significance was used in determining if the observed deviation between the groups was too large to be accounted for by chance. In other cases, descriptive analysis of the data using means, standard deviations, frequency counts, percentages, and ranks was used for analytical purposes.

The following null hypotheses were tested: Null hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' current function(s). Data reported in Table 13 revealed that significant differences in perception of the counselors' current functions were found between Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors on 14 of 21 functions. The analysis of variance "F" tests revealed that no significant differences were found between the three groups in their perception of the Personnel Records, Applicant Appraisal, Pre-College Information, Career Information, Student Registration, Academic Regulation, and Graduate Placement functions. The null hypothesis was not rejected on these seven functions; however, the null hypothesis was rejected on the remaining 14 functions.

Null hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception of the counselors' future function(s). Data presented in Table 14 reported that

significant differences in the perception of the counselors' future functions were found between Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors on 17 of 21 functions. No significant differences in the perception of the three groups were found in their perception of the Student Advisory, Applicant Consulting, Group Orientation, and Career Information functions. The null hypothesis was not rejected on these four functions; however, the null hypothesis was rejected on the remaining 17 functions.

Null hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between administrators, counselors, and instructors in their perception as to whether counselor time should be required on certain specific tasks. The data in Table 15 reported results indicating that the null hypothesis was rejected on 33 of 52 specific tasks. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis on the following 19 tasks.

Handling inquiries about admissions to institutions.

Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.

Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.

Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.

Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.

Interpreting college transfer requirements.

Approving course selection for students.

Interpret effective study skills to students.

Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.

Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.

Conducting group counseling for underachievers.

Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.

Dispensing career information.

Working with employment agencies in placement of students.

Work with institutional departments in placement activities.

Train returning students to help new students.

Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.

Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.

Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/ or student personnel services.

Null hypotheses 4 and 5 were tested in this study to determine whether any significant correlation existed between seven descriptive variables and the perception of Area school personnel on the current and future functions of counselors. The hypotheses and their results are listed below. The results are listed by variables as follows:

variable 1	sex
variable 2	age
variable 3	professional education
variable 4	years employed at present position
variable 5	responsibilities of position
variable 6	institution's enrollment
variable 7	institution's instructional offerings



Null hypothesis 4: There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' current function(s). The data reported in Table 16 presented the following results:

- variable 1: Not rejected
- variable 2: Rejected on Applicant Appraisal, Program Articulation, Financial Assisting, and Graduate Placement
- variable 3: Not rejected
- variable 4: Not rejected
- variable 5: Rejected on Program Evaluation, Student Advisory, Applicant Consulting, Group Orientation, Program Articulation, Student Counseling
- variable 6: Rejected on Program Evaluation, Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Pre-College Information, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting
- variable 7: Rejected on Student Self-Governing, Social Regulation, Financial Assisting and Graduate Placement

Null hypothesis 5: There is no significant correlation between seven descriptive variables and the counselors' future function(s). Data presented in Table 17 revealed the following results:

- variable 1: Rejected on In-Service Education, and Social Regulation
- variable 2: Rejected on Educational Testing, Applicant Appraisal, Financial Assisting
- variable 3: Rejected on Student Counseling, Pre-College Information, and Student Induction
- variable 4: Rejected on Educational Testing, and Student Self-Governing

- variable 5: Rejected on Student Counseling, Administrative Organization, In-Service Education, and Social Regulation
- variable 6: Rejected on Program Evaluation, Co-Curricular Activity, Student Self-Governing, Pre-College Information, Student Induction, Student Registration, Social Regulation, and Financial Assisting
- variable 7: Rejected on Student Counseling, Student Self-Governing, Social Regulation, Financial Assisting, and Graduate Placement

The following null hypothesis was tested to determine the degree of relationship and consistency in the respondents' perceptions of functions that are comprised of certain specific tasks requiring counselor time, and their perceptions of the future functions of counselors.

Null hypothesis 6: There is no significant correlation between function(s) that are comprised of tasks requiring counselor time, and future function(s) of counselors when analyzed for the perceptions of administrators, counselors, and instructors. The data reported in Table 17 revealed that among the administrators, only the correlation values for their perceptions of the Student Counseling and In-Service Education functions failed to yield a significant correlation with their perceptions of certain specific tasks that comprise these two functions. The null hypothesis was not rejected for the administrators perception of these two functions; however, it was rejected for the remaining 19 functions. Among the counselors, it was discovered that the correlation values for their perception of the Student Counseling, Applicant Consulting, and Program

Articulation functions failed to yield a significant correlation with their perceptions of certain specific tasks that comprise these functions. The null hypothesis was not rejected for these functions; however, it was rejected for the remaining 18 functions.

The only area that the instructor's response did not yield a significant correlation was between the Administrative Organization function and their perceptions of the specific tasks that comprise this function. The null hypothesis was not rejected for this function, but it was rejected on the remaining 20 functions.

Descriptive analyses of the data using frequency counts, percentages, and ranks were also computed to identify those functions and tasks which are endorsed by a majority of the administrators, counselors, and instructors. Since there were no established standards which could be applied, the researcher felt that the hypothesis of consensus would be supported on those items for which more than 75 per cent of the respondents were in agreement. The following summary includes findings relative to the extent of agreement or disagreement on the status of counselor functions by Area school administrators, counselors, and instructors that were reported in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

#### Current functions

1. The data revealed that a consensus of agreement by administrators ranged from 75 per cent to 97 per cent on each of 13 functions currently performed by counselors at their institutions. These functions are:

Pre-College Information  
Applicant Appraisal  
Educational Testing

Student Counseling  
Career Information  
Financial Assisting

Personnel Records  
 Applicant Consulting  
 Student Advisory  
 Group Orientation

Graduate Placement  
 Student Induction  
 Program Evaluation

2. A consensus of agreement by the counselors ranged from approximately 75 per cent to 94 per cent on each of nine functions. Their strong agreement was expressed on the following functions:

Pre-College Information  
 Applicant Appraisal  
 Educational Testing  
 Personnel Records  
 Applicant Consulting

Student Advisory  
 Student Counseling  
 Career Information  
 Program Evaluation

3. Over 75 per cent of the instructors surveyed are in agreement that only eight functions are currently performed by counselors at their institutions. These functions are:

Pre-College Information  
 Applicant Appraisal  
 Educational Testing  
 Personnel Records

Applicant Consulting  
 Student Advisory  
 Student Counseling  
 Program Evaluation

#### Future functions

1. The results of the study showed that a consensus of agreement by administrators ranged from 79 per cent to 98 per cent on each of 14 functions that should be performed by the counselor in the future. The data revealed that the administrators believe that the identical 13 functions that were identified by them as functions currently performed by counselors should also be performed in the future. In addition, however, a high majority of the administrators agree that the counselor should also be responsible for the Administrative Organization function in the future.

2. The data revealed that a consensus of agreement by instructors ranged from 78 per cent to 93 per cent that the counselor should be

responsible for each of 12 functions in the future. In addition to the eight functions currently perceived by a majority of this group as current functions of the counselor, the Student Induction, Group Orientation, Career Information, and Graduate Placement functions were viewed as functions that should be performed by the counselor in the future.

3. Over 75 per cent of the counselors surveyed strongly agree that eight functions should be their responsibility in the future. These functions are:

Pre-College Information  
Educational Testing  
Applicant Consulting  
Student Advisory

Group Orientation  
Student Counseling  
Career Information  
Program Evaluation

#### Counselor time on certain specific tasks

1. Over 75 per cent of the administrators view 39 specific tasks requiring counselor time.
2. Among the counselors surveyed, over 75 per cent believe that the counselor should be required to perform 31 specific tasks.
3. The data showed that over 75 per cent of the instructors surveyed perceive 35 specific tasks requiring counselor time.

#### Conclusions

The following conclusions, which are derived from the findings of this study, may be applied to Area vocational-technical schools and community colleges in Iowa as stated in the delimitations.

1. Area school administrators as a group perceived the counselor currently performing more functions than are currently perceived by counselors and instructors.

2. There is agreement among administrators and instructors that the counselor should be responsible for more functions in the future.

3. Area school counselors are currently involved with functions related to admission, registration, records, placement, financial aids, student activities, as well as guidance and counseling. The Area school counselor was primarily viewed as a generalist who was responsible for many functions currently related to student personnel work.

4. The fact that administrators, counselors, and instructors did not agree on whether the counselor should be responsible for many of the current and future functions indicated that more precise role definitions regarding the counselors' function was needed.

5. The descriptive variables, responsibilities of position, institution's enrollment, and institution's instructional offerings seem to have the highest overall effect on the perception of the counselors' function.

6. Although guidance and counseling tend to remain a primary focus of Area school counselors, it appears that other functions and tasks are being given increasing emphasis.

#### Recommendations to Area School Personnel

1. Area school personnel in each institution should assist in the reordering of counselor responsibilities to establish well defined roles for counselors in the areas of: (a) Admission, Registration, Records, (b) Guidance and Counseling, (c) Placement and Financial Aids, (d) Student Activities, and (e) Administration.

2. Professors of higher education and counselor training, as well as the State Department of Public Instruction should attempt to reach a consensus on whose responsibilities the above functions are so that Area school personnel might have some guidelines to follow in setting responsibility in their respective institutions.

3. Area school administrators, in cooperation with other school personnel, should prepare job specifications for all members of the professional staff. Special emphasis should be placed on role definitions for the counselors.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of this study have uncovered areas that merit further investigation.

1. A study should be made to investigate in more detail the amount of time spent by counselors on the different assigned functions and tasks.

2. A study, based on the same format as the present, should be made concerning the differences in perception of counselor functions in the more populous states.

3. Studies should be designed to develop more adequate instruments for measuring the functions of counselors at the vocational-technical school and community college levels.

4. Another area of interest would be a study to investigate how Area school students and their parents perceive the counselors' function(s).

## LITERATURE CITED

1. Albert, Gerald. A survey of college counseling facilities. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 46: 540. February, 1968.
2. Alderson, Lester A. Junior college counseling. *Junior College Journal* 32: 100-103. October, 1961.
3. Arbuckle, Dugold S. Does the school really need counselors? *The School Counselor* 17, No. 5: 325-330. May, 1970.
4. Blocker, Clyde E. Vocational education and the Area schools. A report to the State of Iowa Office for Planning and Programming. New York, N.Y., Institute for Educational Development. August, 1970.
5. Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, R. H., and Richardson, R. C. The two-year college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliff, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1965.
6. Cochran, W. F. Sampling techniques. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1963.
7. Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical concepts for the community college. Beverly Hills, California, Glencoe Press, Inc. 1969.
8. Collins, Charles C. Junior college counseling: A critical view. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43: 546-550. February, 1965.
9. Collins, Charles C. Junior college student personnel programs, what they are and what they should be. Washington, D.C., American Association of Junior Colleges. 1967.
10. Conant, James B. Introductions. In Rothney, J. W. M., and Roens, B. A. *Guidance of American youth*. Cambridge, Mass., Howard University Press. 1950.
11. Darley, John G. The faculty is human, too. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 35: 225-230. December, 1956.
12. Derthick, L. G. The expanding role of the junior college. *Junior College Journal* 28: 185. December, 1957.
13. Fields, Ralph. *The community college movement*. New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1962.
14. Hardee, Melvane D. *The faculty in college counseling*. New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1959.



15. Hitchcock, Arthur A. Counselors: supply, demand and needs. In McGowan, John F. Counselor development in American society. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Office of Education. June, 1965.
16. Hoyt, Donald P. Research needs in junior college student personnel work. In report from National Committee, Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development. New York, N.Y., Carnegie Corporation. November, 1965.
17. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Data on Iowa Area schools. Des Moines, Iowa, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. 1970.
18. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Opportunities in Iowa's Area schools. Des Moines, Iowa, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. 1970.
19. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Enrollment Growth of Area schools. In Blocker, C. E. Vocational education and the Area school. New York, N.Y., Institute for Educational Development. 1970.
20. Jensen, Arthur. What is community college counseling? Educational pamphlet. Sacramento, California, California State Department of Public Instruction. February, 1967.
21. Johnson, James J. The perceived function of personnel services in the junior colleges of Illinois. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Evanston, Illinois, Library, Northwestern University. 1966.
22. Jones, Twyman. The counselor and his role. Junior College Journal 40: 10-14. April, 1970.
23. Karns, Lee T. The status of the student personnel services in the seven state and five municipal junior colleges of Oklahoma. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Norman, Oklahoma, Library, University of Oklahoma. 1966.
24. Matson, Jane E. Appraisal of existing and potential resources for the preparation of junior college student personnel specialists. In report from National Committee, Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development. New York, N.Y., Carnegie Corporation. November, 1965.
25. McDaniel, J. W. Essential student personnel practices for junior colleges. Washington, D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges. 1962.

26. Medsker, Leland L. The junior college: progress and prospect. New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1960.
27. Michigan State Department of Public Instruction. A survey of guidance and counseling programs in Michigan community colleges. Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State Department of Public Instruction. 1967.
28. Miller, C. H. Foundations of guidance. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row Publications. 1961.
29. Miller, C. H. Vocational guidance in the perspective of cultural change. In Borow, H. Man in a world of work. Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton Mifflin Book Co. 1964.
30. Popham, W. James. Educational statistics, use and interpretation. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row Publications. 1967.
31. Raines, Max R. Report on appraisal and development of junior college student personnel programs. New York, N.Y., Carnegie Corporation. November, 1965.
32. Richardson, R. C. and Blocker, Clyde E. A trilevel concept of personnel services in two-year colleges. The Journal of College Student Personnel 9: 126-127. March, 1968.
33. Shertzer, Bruce and Stone, Shelly C. The school counselor and his publics: a problem of role definition. Personnel and Guidance Journal 41: 687-690. April, 1963.
34. Sindlinger, Walter E. Variety among junior and community colleges. College Entrance Examination Board, from high school to college. Princeton, New Jersey, CEEB. 1965.
35. Starr, J. M. Guidance practices in selected junior colleges in the northwest. Junior College Journal 31: 442-446. 1961.
36. Stensaas, Don M. The role of the community college counselor as perceived by California community college counselors, presidents and academic senate presidents. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Pullman, Washington, Library, Washington State University. 1969.
37. Smith, Giles J., Chief, Guidance Services, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa. Interview. September, 1970.
38. Snedecor, George W. and Cochran, William G. Statistical methods. 6th ed. Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press. 1967.

39. Thornton, James W., Jr. The community junior college. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1966.
40. Vontress, Clement E. and Chesseborough, Welton C. Saboteurs of guidance. Moravia, N.Y., Chronicle Guidance Publications, Inc. 1968.
41. Weihe, Lois S. Student perceptions of student personnel services in a community college. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Kirkwood Community College. June, 1969.
42. Wert, James E., Neidt, Charles O., and Ahmann, J. Stanley. Statistical methods in educational and psychological research. New York, N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1954.
43. Williamson, E. G. Student personnel work in the junior college: obligations and opportunities. In Raines, Max R. Conference report, Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs. Flint, Michigan, Flint Community Junior College. 1964.
44. Wrenn, Gilbert C. Student personnel work in college. New York, N.Y., The Ronald Press Co. 1951.
45. Yoder, Marlen and Beals, Lester. Student personnel services in the west. Junior College Journal 37: 38-41. October, 1966.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep gratitude that the writer wishes to acknowledge h's appreciation to Dr. Ray Bryan for his most valuable assistance, guidance, and encouragement throughout the course of this project. Special and sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Anton Netusil, whose competent assistance facilitated the analyses of data and conclusions of this project.

Recognition and appreciation is given to the many individuals who have contributed to the successful completion of this study, with special acknowledgements to the other members of the writer's graduate committee, Dr. Gordon Hopper, Dr. George Kizer, Dr. Edwin Lewis, and Dr. Trevor Howe.

A special note of recognition is extended to Mr. Giles Smith, and the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, who gave financial support and assistance in the printing of the instrument and preparing of materials for the study.

Finally, the writer is grateful to his wife, Carolyn, for her encouragement, understanding, and moral support throughout the entire graduate program at Iowa State University. Her patience and much appreciated proof reading and typing is deeply appreciated.

**APPENDIX A:**

**SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS**

1270P-459G

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
Ames, Iowa 50010

College of Education

January 11, 1970

Area School Personnel,

We need your help in determining what constitutes the proper function of counselors in Iowa Area schools. PLEASE GIVE US FIFTEEN MINUTES OF YOUR TIME.

Area school personnel who have the position or title of counselor often assume or are called upon to fulfill a wide range of tasks and functions. The attached inventory is aimed at seeking more knowledge about the functions of the counselor in Area schools.

A state-wide study of responses from Area school personnel will help to establish a pattern of functions for counselors. The SUCCESS of this study depends on YOUR COOPERATION. If you would like a resume of the completed study, we will be glad to send one upon your request.

Please complete the inventory and RETURN BY MAIL in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Thank you for giving your IMMEDIATE attention and time to completing this inventory.

Sincerely yours,

*Ray Bryan*

Dr. Ray Bryan  
Professor  
College of Education

Sincerely yours,

*Wendell A. Osorno*

Mr. Wendell A. Osorno  
Director of Guidance  
Humboldt, Iowa 50548

-1-

Inventory of Counselor Functions in Iowa  
Area Vocational-Technical Schools and Community Colleges

Personnel who have the position or title of "counselor" often are called upon to fulfill a wide range of functions. In this inventory, the term "counselor" will refer to a person who has had specific training in guidance and counseling and is recognized by the administration, faculty, and students at your institution as a counselor regardless of title or other assignments.

---

PART I. General Information. Your responses will be confidential. They will be used for statistical purposes only. \_\_\_\_\_

Place the number of your appropriate response in the space preceding each item.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| _____ 1. Sex   | 1. Male<br>2. Female  |
| _____ 2. Age   | 1. Under 25 years<br>2. 26 - 40 years<br>3. 41 - 60 years<br>4. Over 60 years   |
| _____ 3. Professional Education  | 1. B.A. or B.S. Academic Area<br>2. M.A. or M.S. Counseling<br>3. M.A. or M.S. Administration<br>4. M.A. or M.S. Academic Area<br>5. M.A.+ or M.S.+ hrs. _____<br>6. Ed.D. or Ph.D. _____<br>7. Other _____ |
| _____ 4. Years employed at present position  | 1. 0 - 2 years.<br>2. 3 - 6 years<br>3. 7 - 10 years<br>4. Over 10 years  |
| _____ 5. Responsibilities of position 1970-71  | 1. Administrator<br>2. Full - time Counselor<br>3. Part - time Counselor<br>4. Instructor in Arts & Science<br>5. Instructor in Vocational-Tech<br>6. Instructor in Adult Education<br>7. Other _____       |
| _____ 6. Institution's enrollment (approx. head count of full-time students) 1970-71 | 1. Less than 499<br>2. 500 - 999<br>3. 1000 - 1999<br>4. 2000 - 2999<br>5. 3000 - 3999<br>6. 4000 - 4999<br>7. Over 5000  |
| _____ 7. Institution's instructional offerings 1970-71                               | 1. College parallel (Arts & Science)<br>2. Career program (Vocational-Tech)<br>3. Adult Education<br>4. All of the above<br>5. Only #2 and #3   |

PART II. Counselor functions as YOU see them performed at your institution.

Directions: This inventory contains a list of 21 basic functions of a student personnel program as a basis for you to indicate the assigned functions performed by the counselor at your institution. Below each assigned function are illustrated activities to assist in your identification of the function at your institution.

Based on your current position and affiliation with your institution, two kinds of circled responses are needed for each ASSIGNED FUNCTION: (1) YOUR perception of the counselor's current responsibility at your institution, and (2) YOUR conception of what the counselor's future responsibility should be at your institution. Your circled response should correspond to the following outlined criteria:

- 6 completely agree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.
- 5 mostly agree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.
- 4 slightly agree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.
- 3 slightly disagree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.
- 2 mostly disagree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.
- 1 completely disagree assigned function is a counselor's responsibility.

Current Responsibility						INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility					
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p><b>PERSONNEL RECORDS FUNCTION</b></p> <p>Developing system for accumulating information on students; maintaining policies for confidential handling of records; preparing recommendations for job placement and transfer institutions...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p><b>EDUCATIONAL TESTING FUNCTION</b></p> <p>Selecting and developing appropriate testing instruments; administering tests to incoming students; developing normative and predictive data...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1



Current Responsibility							INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility						
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	Completely Agree		Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		
6	5	4	3	2	1	STUDENT COUNSELING FUNCTION Conducting counseling interviews; acting as catalyst in student evaluation of values; making use of diagnostic tests...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	APPLICANT APPRAISAL FUNCTION Evaluating transcripts of previous course work, synthesizing available personnel data; serving on admissions committee... etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	PROGRAM EVALUATION FUNCTION Developing experimental projects; arranging for follow-up studies of former students; conducting studies of student characteristics...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	STUDENT ADVISORY FUNCTION Scheduling advisees into classes; reviewing senior college requirements; advising students on special study skills needed...etc	6	5	4	3	2	1		

Current Responsibility						INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility					
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION FUNCTION</b> Preparing job description and organizational patterns; identifying and interpreting counselor staff needs; preparing program budgeting requests...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>APPLICANT CONSULTING FUNCTION</b> Interpreting test results to applicants; explaining curricular requirements; introducing career planning... etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITY FUNCTION</b> Analyzing needs for student activities and facilities; supervising student activities budget; arranging for cultural activities...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>STUDENT SELF-GOVERNING FUNCTION</b> Advising student government; conducting leadership programs; increasing the involvement of students in the institution's decision-making process...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1

Current Responsibility							INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility						
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	Completely Agree		Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>PRE-COLLEGE INFORMATION FUNCTION</p> <p>Conferring with high school groups; preparing and distributing descriptive material; handling inquiries about college attendance...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>STUDENT INDUCTION FUNCTION</p> <p>Training student guides; interpreting student services and regulations; introducing students to activities... etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>GROUP ORIENTATION FUNCTION</p> <p>Conducting orientation classes or seminars; interpreting occupational information; teaching effective study skills...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>CAREER INFORMATION FUNCTION</p> <p>Identifying sources of occupational information; studying manpower needs within the community and region; developing effective methods for disseminating career information...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1		

Current Responsibility							INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility						
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	Completely Agree		Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		
6	5	4	3	2	1	PROGRAM ARTICULATION FUNCTION Arranging for staff to serve on faculty committees; arranging joint meetings of staff with high school counselors; arranging visits of staff to senior colleges...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FUNCTION Providing for counselor supervision and development; arranging for faculty advisor training; arranging for staff participation in professional meetings...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	STUDENT REGISTRATION FUNCTION Projecting future enrollments; designing forms and procedures, processing class changes, withdrawals...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		
6	5	4	3	2	1	ACADEMIC REGULATION FUNCTION Implementing academic policies; evaluating graduation eligibility; interpreting requirements to students...etc.	6	5	4	3	2	1		

Current Responsibility						INVENTORY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS	Future Responsibility					
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>SOCIAL REGULATION FUNCTION</p> <p>Implementing social policies; maintaining social calendar; handling cases of social misconduct...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>FINANCIAL ASSISTING FUNCTION</p> <p>Administering student loans; seeking funds for grant-in-aid; analyzing financial needs of students...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1
6	5	4	3	2	1	<p>GRADUATE PLACEMENT FUNCTION</p> <p>Maintaining liaison with employment agencies; consulting with prospective employers; arranging placement interviews...etc.</p>	6	5	4	3	2	1

PART III. Counselor time on tasks as YOU see them performed at your institution.

Directions: This inventory contains a list of specific tasks commonly performed by counselors in a community college student personnel program.

Based on your current position and affiliation with your institution, you are asked to indicate your perception of whether counselor time SHOULD BE REQUIRED for each of the tasks listed. Your circled response should correspond to the following outlined criteria:

- 6 completely agree that counselor time should be required.
- 5 mostly agree that counselor time should be required.
- 4 slightly agree that counselor time should be required.
- 3 slightly disagree that counselor time should be required.
- 2 mostly disagree that counselor time should be required.
- 1 completely disagree that counselor time should be required.

Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	INVENTORY
						OF
						COUNSELOR TASKS
6	5	4	3	2	1	Evaluating high school and college transcripts
6	5	4	3	2	1	Administering tests to incoming students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting group counseling for underachievers.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Helping students plan appropriate programs or curricula.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Analyzing financial needs of students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting orientation classes or seminars for incoming students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Assemble and maintain appropriate testing instruments.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Securing financial assistance for students.

						INVENTORY OF COUNSELOR TASKS
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Counseling with students about personal and social problems.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Work with institutional departments in placement activities.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting in-service training for faculty advisors on uses of test results.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Sponsoring or advising student government.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Designing forms and procedures for student registration.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting psychotherapy with students having emotional problems.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting institution's graduation requirements.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Maintaining a personal and confidential file on counselees.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting test results to students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Dispensing career information.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting college transfer requirements.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting information on student characteristics and needs to faculty.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Reprimanding students for social misconduct.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Writing recommendations for students seeking employment and college transfer.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Processing class changes, withdrawals, etc.

						INVENTORY OF COUNSELOR TASKS
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Serving on faculty committees.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting studies on the guidance and counselor program and/or student personal services.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Supervising students on work-study programs.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting student services and regulations.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Preparing and distributing descriptive material publicizing the institution.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Conducting follow-up studies of former students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Attending professional workshops and conferences.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Handling inquiries about admissions to institution.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpreting occupational information.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Supervising co-curricular student activities program.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Working with employment agencies in placement of students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Approving course selection for students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Train returning students to help new students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Working with administration and students in developing policies covering all social activities.



						INVENTORY OF COUNSELOR TASKS
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Arranging placement interviews.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Studying manpower needs within community and region.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Counsel with students who are undecided about a vocation.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Serving as consultant to a department or division of the institution.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Serving on admissions committee.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Supervising elections and student conferences.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Maintaining liaison with high school counselors and with college of transfer students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Interpret effective study skills to students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Maintaining referral resources for students.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Consulting with students about career plans and educational goals.
6	5	4	3	2	1	Confer with students withdrawing from the institution.

							INVENTORY OF COUNSELOR TASKS
Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree		
6	5	4	3	2	1	Assisting students in achieving self-understanding.	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Advising faculty and administration on academic policies.	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Compile curricular guides for transferring students into senior colleges.	
6	5	4	3	2	1	Teach courses in psychology and/or educational-vocational exploration.	

Thank you for your cooperation in completing this inventory. Your responses will help in establishing a pattern of functions for counselors in Area schools.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Area School Personnel,

The purpose of this card is to remind you of the inventory on counselor functions we sent you on January 11th. Although the number of responses received so far has been very gratifying, we do want to minimize the unknown as much as possible. To do this, your response is needed.

We realize that we have approached area school personnel who already are very busy. Laying aside an inventory for that "free" period which so seldom comes is certainly understandable! But we will greatly appreciate the fifteen minutes it will take you to complete this inventory---and will welcome any comments you may care to make.

This statewide study of responses from Area school personnel will help establish a pattern of functions for counselors. The SUCCESS of this study depends on your cooperation.

Thank you for your consideration and help in completing this study.

Sincerely yours,

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Ray Bryan  
Professor  
College of Education

Mr. Wendell A. Osorno  
Director of Guidance  
Humboldt, Iowa 50548

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Ames, Iowa

February 15, 1971

Dear Area School Personnel

You may recall receiving your copy of our inventory on counselor functions several weeks ago. The inventory is part of an attempt to discover how various members of the Area school staff feel about the function(s) of counselors.

YOUR contribution to the study is exceedingly IMPORTANT, so we have enclosed a second copy in case you have misplaced the first one sent to you.

We believe that this study will be helpful in establishing a pattern of functions for counselors in our Area schools. PLEASE send your response now.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Dr. Ray Bryan  
Professor  
College of Education

Mr. Wendell A. Osorno  
Director of Guidance  
Humboldt, Iowa

## APPENDIX B: RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS

Page twelve of the survey questionnaire provided space for comments by the respondents. Approximately one-third of the Area school personnel who responded used this space to express their opinions. Obviously, space will not permit the inclusion of all the comments, however, some typical and representative opinions have been selected by the investigator. The samples have been quoted in the exact words of the respondent, but anonymity was respected in all cases.

Administrators Comments

I am reminded that counselors are involved in many areas. However, I feel that they should work with faculty in job placement and not replace the necessity for faculty contribution.

- - - - -

I feel that in post-secondary institutions the guidance counselors must be able to function in other capacities than just counseling. I also feel from what I can gather that most Area school personnel services divisions are understaffed.

- - - - -

A "counselor," per se, is a rare bird where his salary is a question of necessity, i.e., he has to wear more than one hat to be justified in most Area school systems in Iowa.

- - - - -

The problem as I see it is that "counselors" may or may not be synonymous with "Student Personnel Worker." In small schools, "counselors" do many of the functions listed in the inventory; while in larger schools, specialists in student services do many of the functions. Most of our instructors view the counselor performing student services as prescribed in this survey.

Records, Registrars duties, Student Activities, are a part of Student Personnel Services but not specific counselor functions.

- - - - -

The present day counselor is not well equipped to function in a "comprehensive community college" setting. Many were carry-overs from the "old" junior college or have been recruited from the secondary school setting. Their main function in the past has been the interpretation of a college catalog to an already bright person. Counselors have also had the tendency to develop an administrative air which in my judgement is wrong. They need to greatly over extend themselves in the student services area.

- - - - -

It seems to me that these are the functions of a counselor and would be interested to know if there are any situations where a departure exists.

- - - - -

This was a good listing, though there are several functions that I "see" that were not listed. Maybe these are peculiar to a vocational school.

1. Discuss all considered changes with the director of instructional area before meeting with Superintendent or President.
2. Set-up folder and roster of advisees for advisors and conduct training seminar annually for advisors.
3. Keep other departments informed by student functions and trends.
4. Publish results of enrollments, counseling appointments and placement trends in short periodic reports to inform other administrators and instruction heads of situation.
5. Publish confidential list of student disabilities for teachers use.

- - - - -

#### Counselors Comments

I feel we need para-professionals and/or student aides to handle much of the busy work. I believe we need people to work in Student Personnel Work who have a B.A. or M.A. but we should call them student personnel workers and not counselors. Counselors should counsel while personnel workers should handle student services such as financial aids, housing, student activities, government, etc.

- - - - -

Even though I'm a certified counselor, approximately two-thirds of my time is spent as admissions officer for this institution.

- - - - -

The role of a counselor in the Area schools is so diffused because of limited staffing, it is difficult to give an unqualified answer to a number of the items in the survey.

- - - - -

In most cases a counselor in the community college which is relatively small, serves many functions. It is difficult to say which things he or she should or should not do. It simply comes to this---either it is done by the counselor or it does not get done.

- - - - -

Hopefully, the pattern of responses indicates that, in my opinion, the counselor's role in a community college is to work with students. In order to do this, counselor's need to be on the periphery of nearly all college functions. This should not, however, detract from their central task of counseling: personal, educational, and vocational.

- - - - -

I definitely feel some guidelines are needed and such agencies as the department of public instruction and the North Central Association made aware of these guidelines and also that these agencies insist that counselors be free to function as counselors and not as administrators as I'm sure is the case in many Area schools.

- - - - -

The functions and tasks which you have designated are often shared by administration, counselors, and faculty members so that it is difficult to decide how much counselor time should be spent on each activity. I do believe that counselors should not be involved in actual disciplinary procedures and should not attempt psychotherapy. Many tasks are overlapping, however.

- - - - -

Although assigned functions and/or counselor tasks aren't what I would call most desirable in strict sense of "counseling," I do however feel that a person with counseling training and/or a strong student oriented philosophy will function best and make positive contributions to all items listed in the survey. The counselors function is in such a state of transition in the Area schools it is hard to pin down. Also many persons who begin in

Area schools as counselors are gradually involved into other positions in student personnel departments of the Area schools.

- - - - -

I doubt that most Iowa Area Community Colleges are well enough organized in their Student Personnel Services division to be able to define a "counselor," let alone write and stay with a job description.

- - - - -

A well designed instrument, would like to see the results. The counselor in the Area school must be free to work with and for students and staff on a direct personal contact level. I see the counselor as the only probable liaison between the impersonality of the institution, and the human needs of the people served by the institution.

- - - - -

#### Instructors Comments

The range of counselor duties is too broad. An admissions officer, placement officer and similar personnel could better serve the job description as currently exist in our Area schools. The counselor should be free to function in guidance and counseling activities.

- - - - -

Until the typical counselor with whom I have had contact develops greater competency, I would be hesitant in increasing his role.

- - - - -

I feel that the counseling staff is being spread too thin in tasks. Public relations should be handled by specially trained person in advertising, etc. Student Activities should be handled by someone not being asked to do all the other duties of a counseling staff member. Our counselors are asked to be public relations officers, plan student activities, test, counsel, plus plan commencement. They are extremely professional, but put in many more outside hours than should be required of a counselor.

- - - - -

There are so many counselor related tasks and too few counselors to perform them. I don't think counselors should be involved with academic standards, curriculum planning, or teaching. I do think the counselor should be involved with student needs---interpreting them to faculty & administration---and interpreting school policies to the students. A



counselor might refer students who need psychotherapy, but few counselors are qualified to do more than this. I do not think counselors should be involved in what is probably the work of the registrar, publicity director, public relations office, etc..

- - - - -

One of the most serious deficiencies of our educational institutions is the lack of training for "vocational-technical" counselors. We educate & train good counselors, but almost no vocational-technical counselors. There is a difference. A good vocational-technical counselor must understand the business-industrial world.

- - - - -

Good counseling is very much needed in all Area schools. Not to lead and push the student but to help them find their own direction.

- - - - -

I feel that the counselors are required to perform too many administrative functions that deletes their time from their primary duties as counselors.

- - - - -

Most counselors are very deficient in their knowledge of vocational-technical education at all levels in our educational system. More stress should be applied at the State level to correct this condition.

- - - - -

It would be so very helpful if all faculty had a copy of the counselors job description in detail so that they could work with the counselor more effectively.

- - - - -

In my opinion, the community college success can very well depend on the counseling and guidance that the adult student receives.

- - - - -

The prime roles of counseling as I see it in the place where I work is to guide students in courses they should take, professional paths they should follow and help in the transfer to 4 year schools. Career planning also seems of major importance. I hope this survey may establish guidelines for the counselors which will more clearly define their roles.

- - - - -

I suggest that placement, financial aids, social activities, would not be direct functions of counselors. Duties have included the full range for a complete student personnel services program. Counselor-student ratio would generally make this impossible.

- - - - -

I unfortunately have not met an effective counselor. Since many are on administrator salary schedules, they feel they are administrators and try to function as such---not as guidance counselors.

- - - - -

I feel the establishment of a pattern of functions for counselors would be great so they wouldn't have to spend half their time drinking coffee and indulging in lounge chatter. I realize this is unfair to good counselors, but where are they?

- - - - -

Counselors should not have other duties, like coaching or recruiting, that interferes with their availability to students.

- - - - -

Counselors in vocational-technical areas should have more job placement responsibility than counselors in Arts & Science areas.

- - - - -

Counselors I feel play a very important role in the college of today but lets not over load them.

- - - - -

I feel a counselor is just as useful as he wants to be---I'm grateful that our counselors are useful, very willing to help and let us know this. They are doing a great job.

- - - - -

Comprehensive community colleges should increase counseling staff to the number deemed necessary to really do an effective job.

- - - - -

The positions of counselor, head of student personnel, and registrar are currently not well defined at our institution. The faculty doesn't really know who is in charge of something at any given time. It seems to change from day to day.

- - - - -

My basic concept is that the counselor is available to help students on a one-to-one basis, regarding academic, vocational, social, financial, and/or personal problems. He should have information available---but should not be responsible for gathering it. General testing, registration, specific financial aids, etc. should be handled by other administrators.

- - - - -