

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Plan B Papers

Student Theses & Publications

1-1-1967

A Survey of Student Opinions of the Guidance Services at East Richland High School

Stephen H. Summers

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b

Recommended Citation

Summers, Stephen H., "A Survey of Student Opinions of the Guidance Services at East Richland High School" (1967). *Plan B Papers*. 547.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/547

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Plan B Papers by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

A SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINIONS OF THE GUIDANCE

SERVICES AT EAST RICHLAND HIGH SCHOOL

(TITLE)

BY

Stephen H. Summers

B. S. Eastern Illinois University, 1966

PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

AND PREPARED IN COURSE

Education 592

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1967

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS PLAN B PAPER BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE DEGREE, M.S. IN ED.

July 31, 1967
DATE


ADVISER

July 31, 1967
DATE


DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend special acknowledgment to Mr. Robert C. Green, Director of Guidance at East Richland High School, and the members of his staff, Mr. Mike David and Mr. Paul Moyes, for their cooperation in the administration of the questionnaires used in this study.

Acknowledgments also go to Mr. George Rumsey, Principal of East Richland High School, for permitting this survey to be conducted.

Sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Carl K. Green, my advisor, and Dr. William J. Crane for their cooperation and assistance in this study.

Stephen H. Summers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Paper	
Survey of Related Research	
History of the East Richland Guidance Program	
Procedure Used in the Survey	
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE RESULTS	12
The Results for Each Question and for Each Service	
Tests of Significant Difference Between the Groups	
Answering Each Question	
A Summarization of the Total Questionnaire	
III. CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS	40
Conclusions	
Summary	
Recommendations	
APPENDIX	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section I--General Information. .	15
2. Chi-Square Analysis of Section I--General Information. . .	15
3. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section II--Occupational and Educational Information.	19
4. Chi-Square Analysis of Section II--Occupational and Educational Information.	19
5. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section III--Individual Analysis.	25
6. Chi-Square Analysis of Section III--Individual Analysis. .	25
7. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section IV--Student Inventory. .	29
8. Chi-Square Analysis of Section IV--Student Inventory. . . .	29
9. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section V--Counseling.	32
10. Chi-Square Analysis of Section V--Counseling.	31
11. The Distribution of the Answers For Each Question Given By All the Groups for the Section VI--Placement and Follow-Up.	35
12. Chi-Square Analysis of Section VI--Placement and Follow-Up.	35
13. The Distribution of the Answers Given By Each Group to the Six Sections of the Questionnaire.	37
14. The Distribution of the Answers Given By The 442 Students to the Total Questionnaire.	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Paper

The guidance program as perceived by students can give some indication as to how well communications have been established between the counselors and the students. The purpose of this paper, therefore, was to survey the opinions of the students at East Richland High School to discover the extent to which they are familiar with the various guidance services available to them. The results of this survey will help the guidance staff at East Richland High School to determine, which, if any, services in the guidance program need improving and what can be done to strengthen these services. The writer also will make use of the results of this survey to make recommendations with regard to the place of public relations and communications within the guidance program.

In 1958 Froehlich wrote in his text, Guidance Services In Schools,

We believe that the best way of acquainting the public with the activities of the guidance program is to operate a guidance program which meets the needs of the publics: parents, students, teachers, administrators, and the community. If such a program is in operation, it will act as its own publicity agent to a certain extent and will incite more people to avail themselves of the service. The finest formal publicity program will not promote the services if the guidance program is substandard. The best publicity is a good program.¹

¹Clifford P. Froehlich, Guidance Services In Schools, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958), p. 307.

Public relations in guidance is the organized effort of guidance personnel to exchange information through mass media and group techniques with people of the community, administrators, faculty members, parents, and students. It is the "informational stage" of guidance--setting the scene for action. Through public relations, information is disseminated about the guidance program philosophy, existing guidance services, and future program needs.²

Some authorities believe that a good program is not enough. Berdie says " . . . without serious attention being given to relationship problems, no matter how good a counseling program is in terms of the professional level of the program such a program will tend to be rather static and an unprogressive affair."³

Barry and Wolf also write in support of this theory. They say

. . . through a careful consideration of his relationship to his field and to education, a guidance personnel worker may clarify and improve not only those relationships but also his personal relationships with other educators and students. When each individual in the various school or college groups knows where the other stands, what they believe in, and what their roles are, relationship should be simpler and mutual understanding should result.⁴

This means that an organized and effective guidance program must not only be built around a counselor or counselors competent in the

²Joseph W. Hollis and Lucile W. Hollis, Organizing For Effective Guidance, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965), p. 163.

³Ralph F. Berdie, "Some Relationship Problems in Counseling," Roles and Relationships in Counseling, ed. Ralph F. Berdie (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), p. 21.

⁴Ruth Barry, and Beverly Wolf, Modern Issues in Guidance - Personnel Work (New York: Bureau of Publications - Teachers College - Columbia University, 1957), p. 193.

use of guidance tools, but that basic interpersonal relationships and formal public relations are also a necessity in building a successful guidance program.

While the information dispersed in the public relations program often encourages students to take a more active role in the guidance department, communications actually begin with the interaction between a guidance staff member and an individual student. Communications thus provide for the individualized exchange of information that is essential for forming attitudes concerning guidance materials and services. Communications, then, are oftentimes personalized and are primarily the "attitude-formation stage" of guidance in contrast to public relations, the "informational stage."⁵

Communication can be described as the continuous exchange of ideas between two or more persons for a given time. The exchange is on an individual basis that gives people an opportunity to react immediately to shared information and comments. Public relations, on the other hand, is concerned chiefly with groups and is a more formal and impersonal operation for supplying and gathering information. Thus, in public relations, information is flowing in one direction at a time--from the guidance staff to a group or vice versa. Communications between two or more persons extends beyond the sharing of data through public relations and established a working relationship that involves an exchange of psychological and intellectual attitudes, desires, and suggestions.⁶

⁵Hollis and Hollis, p. 293.

⁶Ibid., p. 194.

Counselors receive training in the use of the guidance tools, but they do not receive training in how to build good public relations or how to establish effective communications with students. It is possible that any public relations and communications efforts would have good results and benefit a guidance program, but it is also quite possible that if efforts in these areas were left to chance, they may bring about undesirable results.⁷ Barry and Wolf say, "Real two-way communication is never easy, but it is particularly difficult when one of the two parties is not a single group. The 'public' comprising a community is in reality many 'publics' and yet guidance-personnel work will have to attempt to reach all members and groups within the community if particular needs of society are to be known."⁸

Good public relations, therefore, must serve to pave the way for an effective organization for communications. Communications, then are built on the foundation of the essential information gathered and dispersed in public relations. Only when people have been given information can a basis for the formation of positive attitudes be established. If public relations information is to be fully utilized then, communications between individuals must follow. Guidance information may be known by many people, but an individual may need the opportunity to interact with a member of the guidance staff to gain personal interpretations before being able to utilize the information to crystallize or modify

⁷Charles M. David, "A Survey of Student, Teacher, and Parent Opinions of the Guidance Services at Chillicothe High School" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Dept. of Guidance, Eastern Illinois University, 1963), p. 2.

⁸Barry and Wolf, p. 192.

his ideas, feeling, concepts, or attitudes about the guidance program.⁹

In this same line of thought Stoops says,

Guidance is new to the educational program. As with any new feature, it has to be understood before it can be appreciated. Unless teachers, counselors, administrators, and laymen in the community work together in developing and maintaining the program to the mutual satisfaction of each, the guidance program cannot function successfully.¹⁰

It appears to this writer, then, that the first step in attempting to initiate a program of public relations and effective communications is to attempt to discover the extent to which the students are familiar with the various services available in their guidance program.

While surveying related research and materials for this paper, the writer found numerous definitions of the terms "public relations" and "communications" as they are related to guidance and student personnel terminology. For purposes of simplicity and clarification, the writer will, as he makes mention of these terms throughout the remainder of the paper, be referring to the definitions presented by Hollis and Hollis in their book "Organizing For Effective Guidance." These definitions are:

public relations--the organized effort of guidance personnel to exchange information through mass media and group techniques with people of the community, administrators, faculty members, parents, and students.

communication--the continuous exchange of ideas between two or more persons for a given time.¹¹

⁹Hollis and Hollis, p. 165.

¹⁰Emery Stoops and Gunnar Wahlguist, Principles and Practices in Guidance (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958), p. 279.

¹¹Hollis and Hollis, pp. 163 and 194.

Survey of Related Studies

Two studies by Robert L. Gibson are particularly relevant. The first study, with regard to pupils opinions of the guidance program, showed the following results: that 27 per cent of the students indicated that counselors had not assisted them personally in any way; that 56 per cent reported they were not sure what constituted the activities of their school guidance program; that 33 per cent responded that the program had not been described, explained, or outlined to them during their school career; that 49 per cent of the students stated that there were occasions when they would have liked to discuss matters, personal and otherwise, with the counseling staff, but did not consider it possible for a variety of reasons; that 76 per cent of the senior students had serious doubts about their tentative occupational choices; and that 34 per cent of the students would have liked further interpretation of their test results.¹²

Gibson's second study, with regard to teachers' opinions of the guidance program showed the following (similar) results: that 21 per cent of those reporting indicated that the guidance program of their school had never been described, explained, or outlined to them specifically for informational purposes; that a high proportion (33 per cent) of these teachers felt that they were not usually informed of the guidance test results, and 54 per cent indicated that they were not sure test results were adequately interpreted to them; and that 76 per cent of the teachers contributing felt that counseling records should be available to all teachers.¹³

¹²Robert L. Gibson, "Pupil Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL, (1962), 453-457.

¹³Ibid., "Teacher Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, (1965), p. 416-421.

Marilyn Heilfron, in her study of the function of counseling as perceived by students reports,

while there is no doubt about the effectiveness of any counseling program depends upon counselors' perception of the role they should fulfill in the high school, it is equally important to a program's effectiveness that students perceive the functions of a counseling department in such a way that they will avail themselves of its services.¹⁴

Two studies by C.W. Grant concerning student perceptions showed the following results: students perceive the counselor as one whose main contributions to them lie in the areas of educational and vocational planning; that an extremely small percentage (4 per cent) of the students inventoried referred to the counselor as one to whom they would turn for assistance on personal-emotional difficulties; that 70 per cent of the teachers and administrators also think that someone other than the counselor should work with students with personal-emotional difficulties.^{15,16}

Grant teamed with Bergstein in a study about how parents perceive the counselor's role. It was found that parents at all four grade levels (9-12) perceived school counselors to be more helpful with educational and vocational problems than with personal-emotional-social problems.¹⁷

James Brough, in a study designed to identify the origins or sources of students ideas and attitudes toward the role and function of the school

¹⁴Marilyn Heilfron, "The Function of Counseling as Perceived by High School Students," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, (1960), p. 133.

¹⁵C. W. Grant, "How Students Perceive the Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXII, (1954), p. 386-388.

¹⁶C. W. Grant, "The Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIII, (1954), p. 74-77.

¹⁷Harry Pergstein and C. W. Grant, "How Parents Perceive the Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIX, (May, 1961), p. 698-703.

counselor found: (a) that the source that received the highest per cent of responses was the counselor discussing his role with the students in classroom visits (as indicated by 100 per cent of the boys and 96 per cent of the girls), (b) and that actually talking with the counselor and the description of the counseling function in the student handbook were the second and third most commonly selected sources.¹⁸

In a study by Roemmich and Schmidt concerning students perceptions of the assistance provided them in making college plans by counselors, it was found that: (a) one out of 20 received help from teachers, (b) one out of 10 received help from counselors, (c) one out of 10 received help from friends, (d) one out of three made their own selections, and (e) one out of two received help from their parents.¹⁹

The writer actually found very few related surveys concerning the extent to which students are familiar with the guidance services in their schools. The possible reason for this is that the knowledge the students do have of their guidance programs vary with each school and have no significance for general publication.

History of the East Richland Guidance Program

East Richland Community School District, located in and around Olney, Illinois, a city of 10,000 population in southern Illinois, serves approximately 3,500 students in grades K-12. The district is composed of three city grade schools (K-6), four rural grade schools (1-8), one parochial school (1-8), one junior high school (7-8), and one high school (9-12).

¹⁸James R. Brough, "Sources of Student Perceptions of the Role of the Counselor," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, (February, 1965), p. 597-599.

¹⁹Herman Roemmich and John L. Schmidt, "Student Perceptions of Assistance Provided by Counselors in College Planning," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, (October, 1962), p. 157-158.

The classes which have received the most personal attention from the guidance department in the past are the junior and senior classes and more specifically the college bound students of these classes. The counselors of this school specifically stated that the members of the junior class each year receive more attention from the guidance department than any other class. The freshman and sophomore class students receive little or no guidance services other than preliminary academic planning.

Procedure Used in the Survey

The East Richland High School was chosen for this survey because the principal had requested that some type of research be conducted within the guidance department. This school was also chosen because it is located in the writer's hometown and because the writer is well acquainted with the guidance staff members and the guidance program as a whole.

The sample for this survey was taken from the sophomore (253) and senior (189) students of the school. The instrument used for sampling the students was a questionnaire (appendix C) which was developed from the two previously cited studies by Robert L. Gibson (with several modifications of his questions and the addition of the writer's specific questions). The questionnaire contained thirty-two questions about the five guidance services: occupational and educational information, individual analysis, student inventory, counseling, and placement and follow-up (plus an introductory section on general information). The purpose of the questionnaire was to discover the extent to which the students were familiar with the various guidance services offered in their school.

The director of guidance, along with the other guidance staff members, administered the questionnaire to the sophomore students on November 12, 1966, as a prelude to the National Educational Development Test which

was given later the same morning. The questionnaire was administered to the senior students on November 16, 1966, at a specially requested senior class meeting. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix A) which was read aloud by the director of guidance and a "directions" page (Appendix B) in order to inform the students of the purpose of the study.

The questionnaires were answered by the students on the IBM 1230 answer sheets (Appendix D). These answer sheets were then used in the preparation of: (1) an Exam Analysis Program, and (2) a Chi-Square Program (to be explained in Chapter II).

Limitations of the Study

Because the study was limited to two classes (442 students) at East Richland High School, the results are significant for use only by the counselors and administrators of that particular school. Another limitation of this study was that there was no way of knowing if the answers given to the questionnaire were reliable. There was no control group which could be used for comparison purposes.

CHAPTER II

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESULTS

The results of the survey includes: (a) the results for each question as responded to by each of the groups sampled, (b) the results for each guidance service as it was answered by all groups, and (c) a summarization of the total questionnaire.

The Results for Each Question and Each Section

To assist in describing the results of the questionnaire for each question and for each section an Exam Analysis Program was computed on the data contained on the 1230 IBM answer sheets. The possible answers for each question were: (a) yes, (b) no, and (c) not sure. The Exam Analysis Program computed the number of each group who responded to the possible answers for each question. The percentage of response of each group to each question and the total number of responses for each section were figured with the use of a Monroe Calculator.

Test of Significant Difference

It was hypothesized in this study that there would be significant differences between the responses given by each group. The writer wanted to determine, then, whether the frequencies in the classes (sophomore and senior) of the sample distribution differed sufficiently from the theoretical normal frequencies (sophomore and senior) to discredit the assumption of normality in the sampled distribution.

The chi-square provided a convenient method for doing this.

The statistic used is known as x^2 (chi-square), which may be defined as $x^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_o}$

(The chi-square formula for testing agreement between observed and expected frequencies), where "fo" is the observed frequency in a class and the "fe" is the frequency expected if a theory or hypothesis is true, the summation being over all classes in which comparisons are made.

A chi-square was computed for each of the thirty-two questions of the questionnaire. In this calculation, the null hypothesis is assumed that there is no significant difference in the opinions expressed between the sophomore and senior groups. The confidence in the significance of x^2 (that is, the willingness to accept or reject the null hypothesis) depends upon whether or not x^2 exceeds or fails to reach the .05 or .01 points. If the x^2 fails to reach the .05 value, it is taken to be inconsequential (not-significant) and the null hypothesis is accepted. If x^2 reaches the .05 point but fails to reach the .01 point it is termed "significant" because the writer decided beforehand to take the .01 value as the standard criterion. If the x^2 reaches the .01 value it is termed "very significant."

Summarization of the Total Questionnaire

To aid the writer in determining the extent to which the sophomores and the seniors are either familiar or not familiar with the various guidance services, the distribution of answers and the percentages of answers given by each group to the total questionnaire will be analyzed. Also, the number of students in each group who omitted the questions will be studied (the "Directions Page" Appendix B specifically asked that all students answer all questions).

The questionnaire was administered to the sophomore students on November 12, 1966 and to the senior students on November 16, 1966. The percentage of each class answering the questionnaire were:

Sophomore---98.8

Senior-----78.3

The reasons for not having a perfect percentage of each class are that either some of the students (seniors) were absent from school for the day or they (sophomores) did not take the NEDT tests as scheduled.

The original questionnaire as answered by all students contained 42 questions. The last two questions in each section (exp. numbers 6 and 7 in Section I) have been eliminated in the description of the results. The reason for this procedure is that these questions were included in each section as "dummy questions," to be answered by all groups. These questions, however, were not scored, thus enabling the Exam Analysis Program to compute the results for each section more clearly. A total of ten "dummy questions" then, have been eliminated from the results of the survey, leaving a total of 32 questions in the final analysis.

The Results for Each Question and for Each Service

To describe the results for each question and for each guidance service, the distribution of the answers by each group are presented in table form. The total number of answers given by each group are also presented within the tables. The number of students who omitted each question was negligible, and therefore will be analyzed later in this chapter. As the reader looks at these tables it is important to remember the unequal number (253 sophomores and 189 seniors) in the groups that were sampled.

SECTION I

Pupil Opinions--General Information

Question No.

1. Could you tell a new student entering your school what most of the guidance activities are in your school?
2. Has the guidance program of this school ever been described, explained, or outlined to you for your information?
3. Do you know who the faculty members are in your school who are responsible for student guidance and counseling?
4. Has the school guidance program, as you understand it, assisted you personally in any way while attending this school?
5. In your opinion, does the school guidance program add anything of value to your school?

TABLE 1

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION I--GENERAL INFORMATION

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	150	59	102	54	77	30	68	36	25	10	17	9
2.	170	67	93	49	69	27	79	31	13	5	16	8
3.	220	87	169	89	25	10	14	7	8	3	5	3
4.	220	87	163	86	24	9	22	12	9	4	2	1
5.	239	94	166	88	7	3	14	7	7	3	7	4
Total	999	79	693	73	202	16	197	21	62	5	47	5

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

TABLE 2

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION I--GENERAL INFORMATION

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance	DF
1.	1.6370	.05	2
2.	14.5280	.01	2
3.	.9207	NS	2
4.	3.1964	*	2
5.	5.7200	*	2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

It was surprising to note that only 54 per cent of the seniors, as compared to 59 per cent of the sophomores reporting, indicated that they "could" describe the guidance program and it's activities to a new student entering their school for the first time. Furthermore, 36 per cent of the seniors and 30 per cent of the sophomores indicated they "could not" describe the program. Approximately ten per cent of each group indicated they were "not sure" concerning the program's activities. The Obtained Chi-Square of 1.6370 for Question Number 1 was Not Significant.

In responding to Question Number 2, only 49 per cent of the senior group indicated that the guidance program had been described, explained, or outlined to them for their information while 31 per cent of them said this had not been done with 8 per cent reporting that they were "not sure." In direct contrast to the senior results, 67 per cent of the sophomore group reporting indicated that the program had been explained or outlined for them, as compared to only 27 per cent who said it had "not been" and to only 10 per cent who were "not sure." The Obtained Chi-Square of 14.5280 was Very Significant.

The Very Significant Chi-Square can be attributed to the fact that the sophomore group had a much higher percentage of "yes" responses than the senior group. The reason for this high number of responses is that the sophomore group had the advantage of having a Junior High School Counselor who made an attempt to describe and outline the high school guidance program to them. The present senior group did not have a counselor in the Junior High School. Also, the present sophomore group was influenced by a much more thorough and more efficient guidance orientation program during their Eighth and

Ninth grades than were the present senior class members. Further, the present philosophy of the guidance program calls for individual conferences with all new freshman at which time the guidance program and guidance activities are thoroughly explained to them.

In general, both the senior and the sophomore groups overwhelmingly indicated that they did know who the faculty members are in their school who are responsible for student guidance and counseling. Only 7 per cent of the seniors and only 10 per cent of the sophomores indicated they did not know who those faculty members are. The Obtained Chi-Square of .9207 for Question Number 3 was Not Significant.

To Question Number 4, 89 per cent of the seniors and 87 per cent of the sophomores indicated that they felt the guidance program had assisted them personally in some way while in school. An additional 7 per cent of the seniors and 10 per cent of the sophomores reporting felt that the program had not assisted them. The Obtained Chi-Square of 3.1964 was Not Significant.

Approximately 95 per cent of the sophomore group and nearly 90 per cent of the seniors responding to Question Number 5 indicated that the school guidance program did add something of value to their school. Only 3 per cent of the sophomores, as compared to 7 per cent of the seniors, indicated that the program did not add anything of value to their school. The Obtained Chi-Square of 5.7200 for Question Number 5 was Not Significant.

The answers given by the groups to Question Numbers 4 and 5 directly contradicted the answers given by the same groups to Question Numbers 1 and 2. To Question Number 1, 30 per cent of the sophomores and 36 per cent of the seniors indicated they could not describe the guidance program to a new student entering the school. Further, to

Question Number 2, 27 per cent of the sophomores and approximately 30 per cent of the seniors indicated that the guidance program had not been explained or outlined for their information. In direct contrast however, in Question Numbers 4 and 5 the students in both groups overwhelmingly indicated that they felt the guidance program had personally assisted them while in school and had added something of value to their schooling.

The results of Section I--General Information tend to confirm a weakness in communication between the guidance staff and the responding groups. These results clearly indicate that even though many of the students reportedly cannot verbally describe the program to new students, and have not had the program explained or outlined to them for their information, they do, through their limited contact with the guidance department, feel that the program is worthwhile and that it has assisted them personally in some way.

SECTION II

Pupil Opinions--Occupational and Educational Information

Question No.

8. Have you ever discussed your occupational and educational plans with your school counselor?
9. Does your school have informational materials about occupations on file anywhere for you use?
10. Have you ever gone to the guidance department of your school for information about a particular field of work?
11. Do you feel that you have had enough opportunities to learn about the occupation of your choice while a student in your school?
12. Does your school have educational materials about colleges, universities, and vocational schools on file anywhere for your use?
13. Have you ever gone to the guidance department of your school for any type of educational information?

14. Have you been encouraged to investigate the personal and educational requirements for occupations you have considered?
15. Does your guidance department help you to consider information about yourself as it is related to your future educational and occupational plans?

TABLE 3

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION II--OCCUPATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8.	230	91	169	89	22	9	17	9	1	0	2	1
9.	188	74	157	83	15	6	10	5	50	20	19	10
10.	100	40	114	60	152	60	70	37	1	0	2	1
11.	117	46	99	52	112	44	80	42	23	9	9	5
12.	187	74	169	89	6	2	4	2	59	23	14	7
13.	125	49	136	72	122	48	47	25	6	2	3	2
14.	146	58	127	67	95	38	51	27	10	4	8	4
15.	202	80	128	68	30	12	34	18	21	8	23	12
Total	1295	64	1099	73	554	27	313	21	171	8	80	5

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

TABLE 4

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION II--OCCUPATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			
		.05	.01	NS	DF
8.	.7357			*	2
9.	7.6660	*			2
10.	21.8202		*		2
11.	3.7281			*	2
12.	19.8611		*		2
13.	25.1069		*		2
14.	5.2528			*	2
15.	6.5352	*			2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

To Question Number 8, nearly 90 per cent of both the senior group and the sophomore group indicated that they had discussed their occupational and educational plans with their school counselors. Also, almost 10 per cent of each group reported that they had not discussed their plans with their counselor. The obtained Chi-Square Value of .7357 was Not Significant.

Eighty-three per cent of the seniors reporting indicated the school did have informational materials about occupations on file for their use. Nearly 15 per cent of the senior students either were "not sure" this material existed or simply said "no", the material is not available anywhere. Almost 75 per cent of the sophomore group indicated this material was available to them while an additional 6 per cent said it was "not" and nearly 20 per cent were "not sure." The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 7.6660 was Significant.

The Significant Chi-Square for Question Number 9 can be attributed to the larger percentage of seniors answering "yes" and to the extremely large number of sophomores (nearly 25 per cent) responding either "no," or "not sure" to the question. The possible explanation for this would be that while the majority of the seniors normally would have given a good deal of time and thought to their occupational choice and would have investigated the materials the guidance department had available, the sophomores, on the whole, have not emphasized or given particular importance to their occupational planning as of the present, and therefore have not made use of the materials on occupations made available to them.

To Question Number 10, 60 per cent of the seniors reported that they "had" gone to the guidance department of their school for information about a particular field of work. Only a small number, about

40 per cent of the sophomore group, indicated they had done this. Also, nearly 60 per cent of the sophomores and approximately 37 per cent of the seniors reported they had never ^{gone} ~~went~~ to the guidance department to investigate the available occupational materials. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 21.8202 for this question was Very Significant.

The Very Significant Chi-Square can be attributed to the extremely large percentage (60) of sophomores, as compared to only 37 per cent of the seniors, who reported that they had never gone to the guidance department for information about a particular field of work. The responses given by both groups tend to confirm the explanation given for the Significant Chi-Square for Question Number 9. While it is apparent by the responses given to Question Number 9 that the majority of both groups do know that the guidance department has materials on occupations available for their use, only 60 per cent of the seniors and only 40 per cent of the sophomores have used these materials. The responses given to Question Numbers 9 and 10 confirm the writer's assumption that the sophomore class members have yet to give a high degree of importance to their occupational planning. Either this, or the guidance staff is not making a valid attempt to communicate to all the groups within the school that these materials are available for their use.

To Question Number 11, only 46 per cent of the sophomores and 52 per cent of the seniors felt that they have had enough opportunities to learn about occupations of their choice. In contrast to these responses, 44 per cent of the sophomores and 42 per cent of the seniors indicated they have not had enough opportunities to learn about

occupations. The responses to Question Number 11 tend to confirm the assumption made concerning the guidance staff in Question Number 11 in that even though the materials on occupations are available, either the counselors are not making this fact clearly known to all groups or they are not stressing to the students the importance of the information contained in these materials. The Obtained Chi-Square of 3.7281 for Question Number 11 was Not Significant.

In responding to Question Number 12, approximately 90 per cent of the seniors and only 74 per cent of the sophomores indicated that they knew that the guidance department did have educational materials on file for their use. Nearly 25 per cent of the sophomores and only 7 per cent of the seniors indicated they were "not sure" about this question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 19.8611 was Very Significant.

The Very Significant Chi-Square in Question Number 12 is due to the larger percentage (90) of senior "yes" responses and the extremely large percentage (23) of sophomores as compared to 7 per cent of the seniors who were "not sure" these materials were available for their use. The results for Question Number 12 are similar to the results for Question Number 9 concerning the student's knowledge of available occupational materials. In responding to both of these questions, a somewhat larger number and percentage of senior students did have knowledge of these materials. It is significant to note, however, that to both questions, an extremely large percentage of the sophomore group reported "not sure," thus indicating that communication between the guidance staff and the sophomore group concerning occupational and educational information may be inadequate.

To Question Number 13, 72 per cent of the senior group responded that they had gone to the guidance department for educational information while 25 per cent reported they had not. Approximately 50 per cent of the sophomores indicated they had attempted to obtain this information while a large percentage (48) reported they had not gone to the guidance department for educational materials. The Obtained Chi-Square of 25.1069 was Very Significant.

The responses given by both groups to Question Numbers 10 and 13 have similar results and comparisons between the questions are extremely important (as was done with Question Numbers 9 and 12). The results for Question Numbers 10 and 13 both show a low percentage of sophomores responding and an above normal percentage of seniors indicating that they had gone to the guidance department for occupational and educational information. A much higher percentage of sophomores (60 per cent for Question Number 10 and 48 per cent for Question Number 13) than seniors (37 per cent for Question Number 10 and 25 per cent for Question Number 13) indicated they had not visited the guidance department for this information. Since an unusually high percentage of sophomores had earlier responded that they were "not sure" that materials were on file for their use, the fact that they responded to Question Number 13 the way they did indicates that the sophomores have not taken their occupational and educational planning seriously as yet, and therefore, have not visited the guidance department to learn what types of information is available for their use concerning these purposes. These responses also indicate that information concerning guidance activities pertaining to occupational and educational information have not been adequately explained to these groups.

To Question Number 14, 58 per cent of the sophomore and 67 per cent of the seniors reporting indicated that the counselors had encouraged them to investigate the personal and educational requirements for occupations they had considered. The fact that 38 per cent of the sophomores and 27 per cent of the seniors reporting indicated that the counselors did not do this, clearly shows that the counselors need to stress this fact in future conferences on vocational and educational planning. The Chi-Square Value of 5.2528 was Not Significant.

Eighty per cent of the sophomores and only 68 per cent of the seniors responding to Question Number 15 reported that the guidance department did help them to consider information about themselves as it was related to their future educational and occupational plans. Also, a high percentage (18) of the senior groups as opposed to only 12 per cent of the sophomores reported that the counselors did not do this. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 6.5352 was Significant and can be attributed to the higher percentage of seniors reporting "no" and the lower percentage of seniors reporting "yes" to the question.

The results of Section II--Occupational and Educational Information generally indicate that the guidance staff does need to communicate information pertaining to occupational and educational information more effectively to these groups, and in particular to the sophomore group. The large percentage of "no" and "not sure" responses to the various questions concerning this guidance service clearly justifies this need. These students cannot be expected to avail themselves of this guidance service unless they clearly understand what it is and how it may satisfy their needs.

SECTION III

Pupil Opinions--Individual Analysis

Question No.

18. Have you taken any tests administered by your guidance department?
19. If so, were you usually informed of the results of these tests?
20. Were your parents informed of these results?
21. Do you understand what these results mean as far as you are concerned?
22. Would you have desired further interpretation of your test scores?
23. Do you feel reasonably sure that you could, at this time, identify any special abilities or aptitudes that you may have?

TABLE 5

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION III--INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
18.	204	81	166	88	33	13	17	9	16	6	3	2
19.	187	74	160	85	44	17	12	6	22	9	12	6
20.	106	42	88	47	102	40	75	40	45	18	22	12
21.	177	70	130	69	47	19	46	24	29	11	11	6
22.	127	50	83	44	92	36	92	49	34	13	11	6
23.	103	41	91	48	91	36	76	40	59	23	20	11
Total	904	60	718	63	409	27	318	28	205	137	9	7

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

TABLE 6

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION III--INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			
		.05	.01	NS	DF
18.	7.8753	*			2
19.	12.7509		*		2
20.	3.2044			*	2
21.	5.5306			*	2
22.	11.0054		*		2
23.	11.7061		*		2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

To Question Number 18, 88 per cent of the seniors and 81 per cent of the sophomores reporting indicated that they had taken tests administered by the guidance department. An additional 13 per cent of the sophomores and 9 per cent of the seniors reported they had not taken tests while 6 per cent of the sophomores and 2 per cent of the seniors reported "not sure". The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 7.8753 was Significant. This is due to the higher percentage of senior "yes" responses and the higher percentage of sophomore "no" responses. The sophomore percentage would clearly be higher if this question would have been asked immediately following the administration of the NEDT later the same morning as this questionnaire was given.

Approximately 85 per cent of the senior group indicated that they were informed of the results of their tests. Only 74 per cent of the sophomores responded "yes" to this question. An Additional 17 per cent of the sophomores answered "no" and approximately 10 per cent answered "not sure", while only 6 per cent of the seniors answered "no" and "not sure". The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 12.7509 for Question Number 19 was Very Significant due to the much larger percentage of senior "yes" responses and the extremely larger percentage of sophomore "no" responses.

To Question Number 20, the percentage of seniors who responded "yes" was somewhat higher (47 per cent to 42 per cent) than the sophomore responses. Forty per cent of both groups also reported that their parents were not informed of their test results. Eighteen per cent of the sophomores and 12 per cent of the seniors were not sure about the question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 3.2044 was Not Significant.

Nearly 70 per cent of both groups reporting to Question Number 21 indicated that as far as they were concerned they did understand what their test results meant. However, approximately 30 per cent of each of the groups also reported "no" and "not sure" thus indicating that they did not understand their test results. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 5.5306 was Not Significant.

The responses to Question Number 22 clearly indicate that the groups, and especially the sophomores, would have desired further interpretation of their test scores. Approximately 45 per cent of the seniors and nearly 50 per cent of the sophomores reporting indicated that they would have desired further interpretation. Thirty-six per cent of the sophomores and 49 per cent of the seniors indicated that they did not desire further interpretation and an additional 13 per cent of the sophomores and 6 per cent of the seniors were "not sure" as to the need for further interpretation. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 11.0054 was Very Significant.

The responses given to Question Number 23 are nearly evenly divided among the possible answers. Approximately 50 per cent of the seniors and only 41 per cent of the sophomores indicated that they thought they could identify the special abilities and aptitudes that they possessed at the present time while 40 per cent of the seniors and 36 per cent of the sophomores felt they could not. An additional 23 per cent of the sophomores and 11 per cent of the seniors were "not sure" whether they could identify their aptitudes and interests. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 11.7061 was Very Significant. It is interesting to note concerning Question Number 23 that the percentages of responses given by the senior group were higher in both "yes" and

"no" responses to the question thus indicating that only a slightly higher, 8 per cent, of the seniors felt they could identify their aptitudes and interests than indicated they could not.

The results of Section III--Individual Analysis clearly indicate that of the overwhelming majority of those students who have taken tests administered by the guidance department, more than 50 per cent of both groups felt that they either needed further interpretation of their test results or that they were "not sure" of their results as they had been interpreted to them. This clearly shows that even though more than 75 per cent of each group reported that they were informed of their test results, the communication between the counselors and the students in the interpretation of these results was not sufficient and precise enough that the students fully understood what these tests meant to them.

It is also important to note that in Section III, four of the possible six questions had Obtained Chi-Square Values of Significant or Very Significant, thus indicating significant differences between the responses of the two groups. This would further confirm that communication between the counselors and these groups is either inadequate for these purposes or is more concentrated with one of the groups (probably the senior group) than with the other.

SECTION IV

Pupil Opinions--Student Inventory

Question No.

26. Have you ever had the opportunity to have your cumulative records explained to you?
27. Would you like to have your cumulative records explained to you?
28. Do you know what information is included in your cumulative records?

TABLE 7

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION IV--STUDENT INVENTORY

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
26.	81	32	38	20	137	54	128	68	34	13	21	11
27.	195	77	143	76	32	13	22	12	26	10	22	12
28.	67	26	40	21	149	59	129	68	37	15	16	8
Total	343	45	221	39	318	42	279	49	97	13	59	10

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

TABLE 8

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION IV--STUDENT INVENTORY

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			
		.05	.01	NS	DF
26.	9.5003		*		2 ¹
27.	.2917			*	2
28.	6.1641	*			2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

To Question Number 26, a much higher percentage of sophomores indicated that they had had the opportunity to have their cumulative records explained to them. However, only 32 per cent of the sophomores, as compared to 20 per cent of the seniors, did respond "yes" to this question. A total of 54 per cent of the sophomores and 68 per cent of the seniors reported they had not had their records explained to them while approximately 12 per cent of each group indicated they were "not sure" about the question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 9.5003 was Very Significant.

The Very Significant Chi-Square Value can be attributed to the much larger percentage of sophomore "yes" responses and the larger

percentage of senior "no" responses. (As will be indicated in the explanation of Question Number 28, the writer feels that the number of "yes" responses to Question Number 26 are not valid responses, thereby invalidating the Obtained Chi-Square Value).

In responding to Question Number 27, 75 per cent of each of the groups reporting indicated that they would like to have their cumulative records explained to them. Only a small percentage, approximately 12 per cent of each group, indicated no need for an explanation of their records while nearly the same percentages of each group were "not sure" concerning this interpretation. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of .2917 was Not Significant.

To Question Number 28, 26 per cent of the sophomores and 21 per cent of the seniors reporting indicated that they did know what was included in their cumulative records. On the other hand, 59 per cent of the sophomores and 68 per cent of the seniors indicated they did not know what was included in these records. Fifteen per cent of the sophomores and 8 per cent of the seniors were "not sure" concerning the information included in their cumulative records. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 6.1641 was Significant.

The "yes" responses given by the sophomore group to Question Numbers 26 and 28 are in direct conflict. While in Question Number 28 only 26 per cent of the sophomores indicated that they know what is included in their cumulative records, a total of 32 per cent of the same group indicated in Question Number 26 that they have had their cumulative records explained to them. The writer feels that the sophomore students gave invalid responses to Question Number 26 because it is inconceivable that these students could have had their cumulative records explained to them when they really did not know what was included

in these records. Therefore, the writer feels that the Obtained Chi-Square Value of Question Number 26 is inaccurate.

The results of Section IV--Student Inventory indicate that the majority of both of the responding groups has not had the opportunity to have their cumulative records explained to them. Therefore, only a small percentage of both reporting groups know what was included in these records. On the other hand, a large majority of both groups indicated they would like to have their cumulative records explained to them.

SECTION V

Pupil Opinions--Counseling

Question No.

31. Have you ever had a serious problem that you would have liked to have discussed with your counselor immediately?
32. If your answer to the previous question was yes, was this problem discussed?
33. If your answer to the previous question was no, did your counselor attempt to discuss this problem with you at a later date?
34. Have you ever had a problem that you would have liked to talk over with your counselor but did not because you were afraid--or just could not figure out a way to approach this counselor with your problem?
35. Have you had an opportunity to discuss with your school counselor various approaches to solving problems with which you have been faced?
36. Do you usually prefer to talk over your personal problems with a student friend?
37. Should the counselor's records be available to the teacher?

TABLE 10

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION V--COUNSELING

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			
		.05	.01	NS	DF
31.	.0808			*	2
32.	5.3033			*	2
33.	6.1840	*			2
34.	1.0201			*	2
35.	.4307			*	2
36.	1.6993			*	2
37.	15.3624		*		2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

TABLE 9

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL
THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION V--COUNSELING

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
31.	94	37	69	37	154	61	114	60	5	2	3	2
32.	44	17	40	21	122	48	67	35	79	31	67	35*
33.	57	22	27	14	103	41	70	37	87	34	81	43*
34.	103	41	71	38	141	56	106	56	9	4	10	5
35.	120	47	84	44	116	46	88	47	17	7	15	8
36.	171	68	127	67	63	25	51	27	18	7	8	4
37.	140	55	109	58	71	28	70	37	41	16	9	5
Total	729	41	527	40	770	43	566	43	256	14	193	15

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

* Significant number of omissions--to be explained later in
this chapter

To Question Number 31, it is important to note that only 37 per cent of both of the groups reporting indicated that they have ever had a serious problem that they would have liked to have discussed with their school counselor immediately. Furthermore, approximately 60 per cent in each group indicated that they had not had any serious problems while in high school. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of .0808 was Not Significant. (These results are very similar to the results to the same question in Robert L. Gibson's first study).

Of the 37 per cent of both of the groups who reported they had had serious problems while in high school, it is interesting to note that less than one-half of the sophomores and only about 60 per cent of the seniors indicated that they had discussed their problems with their counselor. Also, 31 per cent of the sophomores and 35 per cent of the seniors were "not sure" whether they had discussed their problems with

the counselor. It is also significant to note that in answering Question Number 32, a larger percentage of students in both groups indicated they had not discussed their problems with the counselor than had originally indicated in Question Number 31 that they had had serious problems which they had wanted to discuss with their counselor. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 5.3033 was Not Significant.

To Question Number 33, only 57 of the 94 sophomore students indicating they had had problems they wished to discuss with their counselor reported that these problems had actually been discussed. Similarly, only 27 of the 69 senior students with problems indicated they had discussed their problems with the counselor. As in Question Number 32, a significant number of students were "not sure" concerning the question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 6.1840 was Significant for Question Number 33.

To Question Number 34, a slightly higher percentage (than Question Number 31) of both groups indicated they had had problems, but reported that they had not discussed this problem because they were not sure as to how they could approach the counselor. Again, more than one-half of both groups reported they had not had any serious problems while in high school. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 1.0201 was Not Significant.

The students were nearly evenly divided in responding to Question Number 35. Slightly less than 50 per cent of both groups indicated that they had not discussed various approaches to solving their problems with their counselor. Also, nearly 50 per cent of the same groups reported they had discussed these approaches. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of .4307 was Not Significant.

It appears from the responses given to Question Number 36 that students would prefer to talk over their problems with their fellow students rather than with the counselor. Nearly 67 per cent of both of the groups indicated they would prefer fellow students and friends over the counselors while approximately 25 per cent of both groups indicated they would rather discuss their problems with the counselor. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of 1.6993 was Not Significant.

To Question Number 37, 58 per cent of the seniors as opposed to 55 per cent of the sophomores indicated that the counselor's records should be made available to the teacher. Also, a much higher percentage of the senior students responded "no" to the question. The higher percentage of senior responses would account for the Very Significant Chi-Square Value of 15.3624.

The results of Section V--Counseling tend to confirm that the counseling function of the guidance department has not been effectively communicated to the student groups. It is readily apparent from the responses given to Question Numbers 31 and 34 that a large percentage of these students have had serious problems while in high school. It is revealing, however, to note that only around 50 per cent of these students indicate they have had the opportunities to see their counselors concerning their problems. Furthermore, for various reasons, it appears that the majority of these students would rather discuss their problems with their friends rather than with their counselor.

In Section V, Question Numbers 32 and 33, it is significant to note the high percentage of both of the groups who responded "not sure". It is further significant that more than 5 per cent of the seniors

entirely omitted responding to either of these questions. The seniors who failed to answer these questions represented the highest percentage of omissions for any single question in the entire questionnaire.

SECTION VI

Pupil Opinions--Placement and Follow-Up

Question No.

40. Do you feel that your school, and the guidance department in particular, has the responsibility to assist students and graduating seniors in securing part-time employment?
41. Should the school guidance department have the responsibility of assisting graduating seniors in locating and enrolling in appropriate post-high school educational institutions?
42. Should the guidance department conduct periodic follow-up studies of the school's former pupils (graduates and dropouts)?

TABLE 11

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS FOR EACH QUESTION GIVEN BY ALL THE GROUPS FOR THE SECTION VI--PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP

	YES				NO				NOT SURE			
	Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior		Soph.		Senior	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
40.	152	60	110	58	77	30	64	34	23	9	14	7
41.	195	77	165	87	35	14	17	9	21	8	5	3
42.	151	60	110	58	64	25	54	29	35	14	23	12
Total	498	66	385	68	176	23	135	24	79	10	42	7

(Due to rounding procedures all percentages do not equal 100%)

TABLE 12

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SECTION VI--PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP

Question Number	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			
		.05	.01	NS	DF
40.	.8290			*	2
41.	9.4265		*		2
42.	.7030			*	2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

To Question Number 40, a slightly higher percentage of sophomores than seniors indicated that the guidance department should have the responsibility to assist students and graduating seniors in securing part-time employment. Approximately 67 per cent of each group also indicated that the guidance department should not have this responsibility while nearly 10 per cent of both groups reported "not sure" to the question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of .8290 was Not Significant.

In contrast to the answers given to Question Number 40, a much higher percentage (77 per cent of the sophomores and 87 per cent of the seniors) of the students indicated that the guidance department should have the responsibility of assisting graduating seniors in locating and enrolling in post-high school educational institutions. Fourteen per cent of the sophomores and only 9 per cent of the seniors indicated that the department should not have this responsibility. Due to the much larger percentage of senior "no" responses, the Obtained Chi-Square Value of 9.4265 for Question Number 41 was Very Significant.

Only a small majority of the students in both groups indicated that the guidance department should conduct periodic follow-up studies of the school's former pupils. Approximately 40 per cent of both groups responded "no" and "not sure" to this question. The Obtained Chi-Square Value of .7030 for Question Number 42 was Not Significant.

The results of Section VI--Placement and Follow-Up indicate that a much higher percentage of both the sophomore and senior groups feel that the guidance department should have more responsibility in helping students locate and enroll in post-high school institutions than in assisting students in securing part-time employment. Since from 50

to 60 per cent of the students graduating annually from this school (East Richland) do pursue higher education, the higher percentage for this question was expected. Only a small majority of the students felt that the department should conduct periodic follow-up studies.

A Summarization of the Total Questionnaire

The following tables show the distribution of the answers given to the total questionnaire. Table 13 shows the distribution of the answers given by each group to the six sections of the questionnaire. Table 14 shows the distribution of the answers given by all the groups to the total questionnaire.

TABLE 13

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN BY EACH GROUP TO THE SIX SECTIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

	YES		NO		NOT SURE		OMITTED		TOTAL Number
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
I. Soph.	999	79	202	16	62	5	2	0	1265
I. Sen.	693	73	197	21	47	5	8	0	945
II. Soph.	1295	64	554	27	171	8	4	0	2024
II. Sen.	1099	73	313	21	80	5	20	2	1512
III. Soph.	904	60	409	27	205	13	0	0	1518
III. Sen.	718	63	318	28	79	7	19	2	1134
IV. Soph.	343	45	318	42	97	13	1	0	759
IV. Sen.	221	39	279	49	59	10	8	2	567
V. Soph.	729	41	770	43	256	14	16	0	1771
V. Sen.	527	40	566	43	193	15	37	3	1323
VI. Soph.	498	66	176	23	79	10	6	1	759
VI. Sen.	385	68	135	24	42	7	5	1	567

Table 13 shows the distribution of the answers given by each group to the six sections of the questionnaire. It can be seen from this table that more than 20 per cent of both the sophomore and senior groups answered either "no" or "not sure" to Section I--General Information, thus indicating that the present "orientation program" of the guidance department for both new and returning students is inadequate and therefore is not communicating the necessary and proper information concerning the guidance department and its related activities.

From Table 13, it can also be seen that more than 25 per cent of both of the groups sampled answered either "no" or "not sure" to the service of occupational and educational information. An additional 2 per cent of the senior group omitted this section entirely. The answers given to this section would seem to indicate that this service is not well understood by all the students. Another possible explanation for these answers would be that these students, and especially the sophomores, simply have not had the occasion to use this service as yet.

In responding to the questions in Section III--Individual Analysis, again a large percentage (nearly 40 per cent in each group) answered either "no" or "not sure", thus indicating their lack of understanding or unfamiliarity with this service. It would appear from these results that the guidance department may be testing beyond their means to appropriately interpret these guidance tests to the individual students who have a right to such interpretations.

The results for Section IV--Student Inventory show more than 55 per cent of both groups reporting either "no" or "not sure" to the questions asked. These results would seem to indicate that a majority of these students do not know what is included in their cumulative records and

would, however, like to have their records explained to them.

Table 13 further shows that nearly 60 per cent of both groups reporting answered either "no" or "not sure" to Section V--Counseling. These results would clearly indicate that the "counseling function" of the guidance department has not been adequately communicated to these students. The results would also seem to indicate that the counselors of this school may be functioning more in peripheral activities than in their primary roles as counselors.

The results for Section VI--Placement and Follow-up show nearly 34 per cent of both of the reporting groups answering either "no" or "not sure" thus indicating again that this service is not well understood by all the students.

TABLE 14

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN BY THE 442 STUDENTS
TO THE TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

	YES	NO	NOT SURE	OMITTED
Distribution of the 14,144 answers	8410	4237	1370	126
Distribution of the answers by percentage	59	30	10	1

Table 14 shows the distribution of the answers given by the 442 students to the total questionnaire. It can be seen from this table that 59 per cent of all the students answered the questionnaire "yes", thus indicating their familiarity with the guidance services available in their school. A total of 40 per cent of the students answered "no" and "not sure" to the questionnaire and an additional 1 per cent omitted various questions throughout the questionnaire, thus indicating their unfamiliarity or lack of understanding of some of the services offered by the guidance department.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

From this study several conclusions were drawn. First, as was indicated by more than 35 per cent of both groups who said they "could not" describe their school's guidance program to a new student, the counselors were not communicating effectively concerning the role and the services of the guidance program.

Second, as was evidenced by the larger percentage of sophomores than seniors who indicated that the guidance program had been explained, described, or outlined to them for their information, the newer orientation program, although not totally adequate, was more comprehensive in communication concerning the guidance department than previous orientation procedures were. Communication concerning the essential characteristics of the total guidance program were, however, still inadequate for the proper presentation of the guidance department and its related activities.

Third, as indicated by Table 1, an overwhelming majority of the students indicated that the guidance department had assisted them personally while they were in school and that the program did add something of value to the total school program.

Fourth, as was evidenced by the much larger percentage of seniors than sophomores who indicated that occupational and educational materials were on file for their use, communication concerning the availability of these materials, especially to the sophomore group, was inadequate for present occupational and educational planning.

Fifth, as was evidenced by only a small majority of both groups who indicated that they had gone to the guidance department for occupational and educational materials, the counselors were not effectively encouraging the students to use the occupational and educational files and therefore are not utilizing these materials to their fullest extent.

Sixth, as was evidenced by the 44 per cent of the seniors and 42 per cent of the sophomores responding "no" to Question Number 11 concerning opportunities to learn about occupations of their choice, the counselors were not devoting enough of their time to meeting the student's needs concerning occupational choices and occupational planning.

Seventh, as was indicated by the responses given by both groups to Question Numbers 14 and 15 concerning occupational and educational planning, the counselors are not presently encouraging students to investigate personal and educational requirements of occupations of their choice.

Eighth, as was evidenced by the higher percentage of senior responses to nearly all the questions in Section II, the counselors were not effectively communicating and stressing the availability and use of the service of occupational and educational information to the sophomore students.

Ninth, as was evidenced by the distribution of answers given by both groups in Table 6, the guidance department may be testing beyond their means to appropriately interpret test results to the individual students who have the right to such interpretations.

Tenth, as was evidenced by the percentages of both groups who responded that they would have desired further interpretation of their test results, the counselors need to devote more time to individual or group interpretation of test results.

Eleventh, as was evidenced by the distribution of answers given by both groups to Section IV--Student Inventory, although a majority of the students would prefer to have their cumulative records explained to them, the counselors, at this time, have not made these records available for individual interpretations.

Twelfth, as was indiczted by less than one-half of the students who reported they did have problems but yet were unable to discuss these problems with their counselor, the counselors of this school may be functioning less in their primary roles as counselors and more in peripheral activities within the guidance department.

Thirteenth, as was evidenced by the percentages of both groups who indicated they were either afraid--or could not figure out a way to approach their counselor with their problem, the counselors are not effectively communicating to the students their proper role and function within the school setting.

Fourteenth, as was evidenced by the responses to Question Number 36 in Table 10, the students would prefer to talk over their problems with their friends rather than their counselors, further indicating that communication concerning the proper role and function of the school counselors is inadequate.

Fifteenth, as was evidenced by the results in Table 12, a higher percentage of both the sophomore and senior groups feels that the guidance department should have more responsibility in helping students locate and enroll in post-high school institutions than in assisting students in securing part-time employment.

Summary

The results of this study are similar to Robert L. Gibson's study "Pupil Opinions of High School Guidance Programs" in the respect that communication concerning the role and services of the guidance program was found to be inadequate. The results of this study indicated, therefore, that the services of the guidance department are not being effectively utilized to the fullest extent by the students of this school. Although this study was not designed to give a comparable figure (Gibson's study was designed for and administered to an all-senior group), it is possible to conclude from this study that communications have not been well established between the counselors and the students.

The results of this study are also similar to the study by Grant (1954) in the respect that students perceive the counselor as one whose main contribution to them lies in the areas of educational and vocational planning.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this survey the writer recommends that the guidance staff at East Richland High School devote more time to achieving the specific guidance objective of meeting the needs of the students. The writer also recommends the use of this survey's findings to serve as a guideline for improving and strengthening the present guidance program.

To promote a better understanding of the guidance services and a more effective utilization of the present guidance program, the following public relations and communications activities are suggested:

1. Formal group guidance conferences be conducted with the administration and faculty of the entire school district in the fall of the

year to disseminate information about the guidance program philosophy, the existing guidance services available, and the future needs of the guidance program.

2. Appropriate personnel be designated within each elementary school and the Junior High School to receive, display, and file guidance materials for use by the students, their parents, and the faculty members of the respective schools.

3. Formal orientation programs be conducted in the spring of the year within the high school setting for all students (and their parents) entering high school the following year to acquaint them with the services they may expect to receive from the guidance program.

4. A formal letter of orientation about the guidance program could be constructed and mailed to all the parents of incoming freshman, and a simplified reminder letter of the same could be mailed to all other returning students.

5. An outline of the guidance program, and a general description of the available guidance services could be added to the student handbook.

6. A teacher's handbook containing information concerning the guidance department activities could also be constructed for faculty and administration use.

7. A monthly series of Guidance Bulletins could be constructed and mailed to all administrators and faculty members within the school district to keep them accurately informed of the past, present, and forthcoming activities of the guidance department.

8. Group guidance conferences could be conducted within all homerooms at the beginning of the school year to inform all students of activities and services provided by the guidance department. This would provide

the counselor the opportunity to openly discuss his role and function in the school system and perhaps reduce the present gap in counselor-student relationships.

9. The counselors should be approachable in their attitudes and mannerisms and make themselves available for individual student conferences at any time throughout the school day. The total counseling program should be made flexible enough so that each counselor would have this time available each day.

10. The guidance staff, in conjunction with the teaching staff, should provide for satisfactory coordination between subject matter classes and occupational and educational information and planning.

11. The guidance staff could place less emphasis on the scope of the district testing program and more emphasis on providing clear and concise interpretation of test results not only to the individual student but also to those parents who would desire this interpretation.

12. The guidance staff should recognize and make constructive use of peer group activities as a potential resource for communication of essential guidance activity information.

Because this study was limited to only two classes (442 students) at East Richland High School and because there was no way of knowing if the answers given to the questionnaire were reliable, the results are only significant for use by the counselors and administration of the above school.

APPENDIX

- A. Cover letter to students
- B. Directions to students
- C. The Questionnaire
- D. The IBM 1230 Answer Sheet
- E. Tally questionnaire for sophomore students
- F. Tally questionnaire for senior students
- G. Chi-square tally for sophomore and senior students

TO THE STUDENT

A study is being conducted to strengthen the guidance program at East Richland High School. As a part of this study, the students of your school are being asked to fill out this questionnaire.

The questionnaire is seeking to discover the extent to which you are familiar with the various guidance services offered in your school. Will you please respond to the questionnaire as frankly and honestly as you are able?

The questionnaire is being given for an important reason. It will enable the guidance staff of your school to decide which, if any, services in the guidance program need more attention and what can be done to strengthen these services for the students who will follow you at East Richland High School.

Read the directions carefully. (The administrator of the questionnaire will read over the directions aloud as the students read them.)

DIRECTIONS:

1. DO NOT place your name on either the questionnaire or the answer sheet.
2. In the "Identification Number" section of your IBM answer sheet, please blacken the space under number "2" on the top line if you are a sophomore or the space under number "4" if you are a senior.
3. Read each numbered question and refer to it's corresponding numbers on the IBM answer sheet. If you feel that your answer to each question is "yes", blacken the space corresponding under number "1" on the answer sheet. If you feel that your answer to each question is "no", then blacken the corresponding space under number "2". If you feel that the question "does not apply to you" or that you are "not sure" about your answer then blacken the corresponding space under number "3". Mark only one answer for each question.
4. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines and completely fill in the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind about an answer, erase your first mark COMPLETELY.

SECTION I

Pupil Opinions--General Information

1. Could you tell a new student entering your school what most of the guidance activities are in your school?
2. Has the guidance program of this school ever been described, explained, or outlined to you for your information?
3. Do you know who the faculty members are in your school who are responsible for student guidance and counseling?
4. Has the school guidance program, as you understand it, assisted you personally in any way while attending this school?
5. In your opinion, does the school guidance program add anything of value to your school?
6. When you entered high school, were you helped to learn about your new school and how to get along in it?
7. Do you feel you have a part in the development of the school program and activities?

SECTION II

Pupil Opinions--Occupational and Educational Information

8. Have you ever discussed your occupational and educational plans with your school counselor?
9. Does your school have informational materials about occupations on file anywhere for your use?
10. Have you ever gone to the guidance department of your school for information about a particular field of work?
11. Do you feel that you have had enough opportunities to learn about the occupation of your choice while a student in your school?
12. Does your school have educational materials about colleges, universities, and vocational schools on file anywhere for your use?
13. Have you ever gone to the guidance department of your school for any type of educational information?
14. Have you been encouraged to investigate the personal and educational requirements for occupations you have considered?
15. Does your guidance department help you to consider information about yourself as it is related to your future educational and vocational plans?
16. Do you have any doubts or indecisions about your probable choice of an occupation at this time?
17. Does your school, and the guidance department in particular, sponsor "Career Days" and "College Days" for your benefit?

SECTION III

Pupil Opinions--Individual Analysis

18. Have you taken any tests administered by your guidance department?
19. If so, were you usually informed of the results of these tests?
20. Were your parents informed of these results?
21. Do you understand what these results mean as far as you are concerned?
22. Would you have desired further interpretation of your test scores?
23. Do you feel reasonably sure that you could, at this time, identify any special abilities or aptitudes that you may have?
24. Do you feel reasonably sure that you can identify your special interests?
25. Do you feel that you know most of the strong and weak points of your personality?

SECTION IV

Pupil Opinions--Student Inventory

26. Have you had the opportunity to have your cumulative records explained to you?
27. Would you like to have your cumulative records explained to you?
28. Do you know what information is included in your cumulative records?
29. Do you feel that student's cumulative records should be made available to teachers?
30. Do you know what an anecdotal record is?

SECTION V

Pupil Opinions--Counseling

31. Have you ever had a serious problem that you would have liked to have discussed with your counselor immediately?
32. If your answer to the previous question was yes, was this problem discussed?
33. If your answer to the previous question was no, did your counselor attempt to discuss this problem with you at a later date?
34. Have you ever had a problem that you would have liked to talk over with your counselor but didn't because you were afraid--or just couldn't figure out a way to approach this counselor with your problem?
35. Have you had an opportunity to discuss with your school counselor various approaches to solving problems with which you have been faced?

36. Do you usually prefer to talk over your personal problems with a student friend?
37. Should the counselor's records be available to the teacher?
38. Do you feel that the teacher should use the counselor as a referral agent when the student's problem is beyond the teacher's understanding?
39. Is it desirable for the counselor to furnish a review of a student interview to the teacher who made the referral?

SECTION VI

Pupil Opinions--Placement and Follow-up

40. Do you feel that your school, and the guidance department in particular, has the responsibility to assist students and graduating seniors in securing part-time employment?
41. Should the school guidance department have the responsibility of assisting graduating seniors in locating and enrolling in appropriate post-high school educational institutions?
42. Should the guidance department conduct periodic follow-up studies of the school's former pupils(graduates and dropouts)?

NAME _____ LAST _____ FIRST _____ MIDDLE _____ DATE _____ AGE _____ SEX _____ DATE OF BIRTH _____
M OR F _____
CITY _____ GRADE OR CLASS _____ INSTRUCTOR _____

NAME OF TEST _____ PART _____ 1 _____ 2 _____

DIRECTIONS: Read each question and its numbered answers. When you have decided which answer is correct, mark the corresponding number on this sheet with a No. 2 pencil. Make your mark as long as the lead will permit, and completely fill the area between the pair of lines. Fill in the number of your mark COMPLETELY. Make no other marks. Any other marks will be penalized.

SAMPLE					SCORES				
1. Which AGO is									
a. a country					1-4 a city				
b. a mountain					1-5 a state				
c. an island									
1	2	3	4	5	4	5			

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

T					F					T					F					T					F				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120
121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150

Appendix E.

YES			NO		NOT SURE		OMITTED
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1.	150	59	77	30	25	10	1
2.	170	67	69	27	13	5	1
3.	220	87	25	10	8	3	0
4.	220	87	24	9	9	4	0
5.	239	94	7	3	7	3	0
8.	230	91	22	9	1	0	0
9.	188	74	15	6	50	20	0
10.	100	40	152	60	1	0	0
11.	117	46	112	44	23	9	1
12.	187	74	6	2	59	23	1
13.	125	49	122	48	6	2	0
14.	146	58	95	38	10	4	2
15.	202	80	30	12	21	8	0
18.	204	81	33	13	16	6	0
19.	187	74	44	17	22	9	0
20.	106	42	102	40	45	18	0
21.	177	70	47	19	29	11	0
22.	127	50	92	36	34	13	0
23.	103	41	91	36	59	23	0
26.	81	32	137	54	34	13	1
27.	195	77	32	13	26	10	0
28.	67	26	149	59	37	15	0
31.	94	37	154	61	5	2	0
32.	44	17	122	48	79	31	8
33.	57	22	103	41	87	34	6
34.	103	41	141	56	9	4	0
35.	120	47	116	46	17	7	0
36.	171	68	63	25	18	7	1
37.	140	55	71	28	41	16	1
40.	152	60	77	30	23	9	1
41.	195	77	35	14	21	8	2
42.	151	60	64	25	35	14	3

Appendix F.

	YES		NO		NOT SURE		OMITTED
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1.	102	54	68	36	17	9	2
2.	93	49	79	31	16	8	1
3.	169	89	14	7	5	3	1
4.	163	86	22	12	2	1	2
5.	166	88	14	7	7	4	2
8.	169	89	17	9	2	1	1
9.	157	83	10	5	19	10	3
10.	114	60	70	37	2	1	3
11.	99	52	80	42	9	5	1
12.	169	89	4	2	14	7	2
13.	136	72	47	25	3	2	3
14.	127	67	51	27	8	4	3
15.	128	68	34	18	23	4	4
18.	166	88	17	9	3	2	2
19.	160	85	12	6	12	6	5
20.	88	47	75	40	22	12	4
21.	130	69	46	24	11	6	2
22.	83	44	92	49	11	6	3
23.	91	48	76	40	20	11	2
26.	38	20	128	68	21	11	2
27.	143	76	22	12	22	12	2
28.	40	21	129	68	16	8	4
31.	69	37	114	60	3	2	3
32.	40	21	67	35	67	35	15
33.	27	14	70	37	81	43	11
34.	71	38	106	56	10	5	2
35.	84	44	88	47	15	8	2
36.	127	67	51	27	8	4	3
37.	109	58	70	37	9	5	1
40.	110	58	64	34	14	7	1
41.	165	87	17	9	5	3	2
42.	110	58	54	29	23	12	2

Appendix G

Question No.	Obt. Chi-Square Value	Level of Significance			DF
		.05	.01	NS	
1.	1.6370			*	2
2.	14.5280		*		2
3.	.9207			*	2
4.	3.1964			*	2
5.	5.7200			*	2
8.	.7356			*	2
9.	7.6660	*			2
10.	21.8202		*		2
11.	3.7281			*	2
12.	19.8611		*		2
13.	25.1069		*		2
14.	5.2528			*	2
15.	6.5352	*			2
18.	7.8753	*			2
19.	12.7509		*		2
20.	3.2044			*	2
21.	5.5306			*	2
22.	11.0054		*		2
23.	11.7061		*		2
26.	9.5003		*		2
27.	.2917			*	2
28.	6.1641	*			2
31.	.0808			*	2
32.	5.3033			*	2
33.	6.1840	*			2
34.	1.0201			*	2
35.	.4307			*	2
36.	1.6993			*	2
37.	15.3624		*		2
40.	.8290			*	2
41.	9.4265		*		2
42.	.7030			*	2

NS = Not Significant

DF = Degrees of Freedom

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Barry, Ruth, and Wolf, Beverly. Modern Issues in Guidance-Personnel Work. New York: Bureau of Publications--Teachers College--Columbia University, 1957.
- Berdie, Ralph F. "Some Relationship Problems in Counseling," Roles and Relationships in Counseling. Ed. Ralph F. Berdie. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1953.
- Froehlich, Clifford P. Guidance Services in Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.
- Hollis, Joseph W., and Hollis, Lucile W. Organizing For Effective Guidance. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965.
- Stoops, Emery, and Wahlquist, Gunnar. Principles and Practices in Guidance. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.

Articles

- Bergstein, Harry, and Grant, C.W. "How Parents Perceive the Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIX (May, 1961), 698-703.
- Brough, James R. "Sources of Student Perceptions of the Role of the Counselor," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII, No. 6 (February, 1965), 597-599.
- Grant, C. W. "How Students Perceive the Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXII (1954), 386-388.
- _____. "The Counselor's Role," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIII (October, 1954), 74-77.
- Gibson, Robert L. "Pupil Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (1962), 453-457.
- _____. "Teacher Opinions of High School Guidance Programs," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV No. 4 (December, 1965), 416-421.
- Heilfron, Marilyn. "The Function of Counseling as Perceived by High School Students," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIX (October, 1960), 133.

Roemmich, Herman, and Schmidt, John L. "Student Perceptions of Assistance Provided by Counselors in College Planning," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (October, 1962), 157-158.

Unpublished Materials

David, Charles M. "A Survey of Student, Teacher, and Parent Opinions of the Guidance Services at Chillicothe High School."
Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Guidance, Eastern Illinois University, 1963.