



1980

## Differential Characteristics of Users and Non-Users of a Community College Counseling Center

Michael Eugene Schnur  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Schnur, Michael Eugene, "Differential Characteristics of Users and Non-Users of a Community College Counseling Center" (1980). *Dissertations*. 1879.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/1879](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1879)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1980 Michael Eugene Schnur

Differential Characteristics of Users and  
Non-Users of a Community College  
Counseling Center

by

Michael Eugene Schnur

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty at the Graduate  
School of Loyola University of Chicago  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

May  
1980

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation goes to the members of my Dissertation Committee, Dr. John Wellington, director, Dr. Manuel Silverman and Dr. Judy Mayo, all of whom have had an influence on me not only during this study, but throughout the course of my graduate work.

Administrators, faculty, and students at Thornton Community College were generous with their time and help during this research. A special note of gratitude goes to Mr. Nick Falica and Ms. Nadine Sterk for their support and patience during this project, and without whom the study would have been much more difficult.

Dr. Robert Kabral, Director of the Survey Research Center, University of Illinois, contributed his time and effort to help develop the research questionnaire.

Drs. Audrey Melamed, who gave me much needed guidance and resources, and Thomas Chval, who provided advice and statistical help, were both of incalculable value.

Finally, I thank my family, whose love and patience supported me throughout the study.

## VITA

Michael Eugene Schnur, son of Eugene Carl and Dorothy Gilles, was born on September 28, 1943 in Black River Falls, Wisconsin. His early years were spent in Beloit, Wisconsin, where he received his primary and secondary education. He was graduated from Beloit Catholic High School in 1961.

In the fall of 1961 he entered the University of Wisconsin, Madison, to study Economics. The 1964-65 academic year was spent at the Institut de Touraine, in Tours, France. The degree of Bachelor of Arts was conferred in June, 1967, from the University of Wisconsin. After working for Time, Inc., for two years, he commenced his graduate education at Loyola University of Chicago in 1970. The Master of Education degree was awarded from Loyola in 1972. The Doctor of Philosophy degree in Guidance and Counseling was awarded in May, 1980.

Dr. Schnur has been active in education since 1970 in various capacities; writer, teacher, department chairman, and counselor. He is presently a counselor and coordinator of the Career Resource Center at Thornton Community College, South Holland, Illinois, and is active in professional associations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi

### Chapter

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Historical Perspective . . . . .	1
Problem to be Investigated . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms . . . . .	12
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	16

### Chapter

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	17
Perception of Counseling Services . . . . .	17
Function of Counseling . . . . .	22
Relevant Differential Studies . . . . .	32
Two-Year College Student Characteristics . . . . .	50
Summary . . . . .	56
III. METHOD . . . . .	61
Population . . . . .	61
Sample . . . . .	62
Procedures . . . . .	64
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	76
Characteristics of the Sample . . . . .	76
Research Questions . . . . .	113
Discussion . . . . .	135

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	143
Recapitulation . . . . .	143
Conclusions . . . . .	155
Recommendations . . . . .	158
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	162
APPENDIX A . . . . .	170

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Mean Percentage of Time Spent in Direct Services	26
2 Services Offered by Counseling Centers in Sample	27
3 Function and Orientation of Counseling Centers	31
4 Distribution of Responses on Scales 1 through 6	77
5 Representativeness of Sample . . . . .	84
6 Characteristics of Sample . . . . .	85
a. Personal data . . . . .	85
b. High school experience . . . . .	89
c. Counseling Center Information . . . . .	90
d. Why Counseling services are not used . . . . .	93
e. Career/Education characteristics . . . . .	94
f. Level of Student Involvement . . . . .	96
g. College choice factors . . . . .	98
h. Socio-economic Information . . . . .	99
i. Previous counseling . . . . .	103
j. Developmental experiences . . . . .	105
k. Adjustment Information . . . . .	107
l. Leisure activities/total sample	108
m. Leisure activities/user/non-user groups . . . . .	109
n. Current Problem Areas . . . . .	110
o. Perceived Counselor Role . . . . .	112
p. Preferred Helper/Problem Area . . . . .	114
7 T-Tests of Significance, Scale 1 & Scale 2 . . . . .	115
8 T-Tests of Significance, Scale 3 & Scale 4 . . . . .	117
9 T-Tests of Significance, Scale 5 & Scale 6 . . . . .	118
10 Results of Chi <sup>2</sup> Analyses . . . . .	121
11 Chi <sup>2</sup> : Peer Use . . . . .	126
12 Chi <sup>2</sup> : Source of Information . . . . .	127
13 Chi <sup>2</sup> : Post Graduation Plans . . . . .	129

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
14 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Post Graduation Plans . . . . .	130
15 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Educational Aspirations . . . . .	131
16 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Parental Income . . . . .	132
17 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Childhood . . . . .	134
18 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Course Selection . . . . .	136
19 Chi <sup>2</sup> :	Philosophy/Religion . . . . .	137



## CHAPTER I

### BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

Counseling services are a crucial element in the mission of the community colleges. Theoretically, the very existence of the community college is predicated upon the ability of the institution to deliver specific services to an increasingly complex and diverse population. Where the institutional bureaucracy cannot meet these needs, counseling is expected to compensate. This chapter develops historically the unique role of the community college in American education, the role of counseling within the community college, and defines the problem to be investigated within this context.

#### Historical Perspective

One conclusion which can be drawn from Wagshal's Learning Tomorrow: Commentaries on the Future of Education (1979) is that the United States, as it begins the nineteen-eighties, will need educational models more appropriate for the diverse population being served. Over a decade ago, Professor Havighurst of the University of Chicago, identified and articulated five social processes occurring in America which are responsible today for the creation of this diversity and subsequent need. These processes include

greater knowledge about the universe and the logical expansion of human action in both time and space; an increased capacity to produce with a concomitant decrease in opportunities to work for all when necessary and at any time; a growing trend towards metropolitan organization of services including education; the end of white men's hegemony in world affairs and the beginning of international interdependence and cooperation; and social integration (Havighurst, 1966). It is further asserted that these processes are producing ever increasing societal complexities with such great speed that it falls upon public educational institutions to deal with this new data in ways that both facilitate assimilation into American life and compliment the achievement of American social goals.

The public community college, a uniquely American institution, has been created in response to the foregoing needs. The community college extends formal education two years beyond high school, providing additional education a more technical society needs. From a slow start in 1902, the community colleges have grown to a point where, in 1960, they could claim 23% of all the first-time students in higher education. By 1970, this figure had risen to 34%. It is projected that by 1980, more than 40% of first-time students will be found in a local community college (Simon, 1971).

The community college accepts adults who are in need of additional training, re-training, or education in order to deal with an increasingly complex society. As a result, first-time students will be increasingly more heterogeneous. This diversity is expected to stimulate the growth of community colleges through the turn of the century even as enrollments in other educational institutions, such as high schools, decline.

In the state of Illinois, the community college was originally conceived in 1901. It was also in Illinois, Joliet specifically, that the very first public community college in the nation began to function in 1902. Though the system continued to grow, the initial legislation establishing a comprehensive state-wide system was not enacted until 1965. This legislation, ammended as the Illinois Public Community College Act of 1973, forms the legal framework of the current sytem. The system consists of 39 districts. The districts include over 95% of the state's population, 50 campuses, and more than 90% of the state's territory (ICCB, 1979).

The community college system is well woven into the fabric of Illinois higher education. It operates in accordance with the two main objectives established by the National Society for the Study of Education, namely, to provide low-cost, post-high school education near the homes

of the students and, to provide guidance and counseling (NSSE, 1955). The nature of that education was largely pre-baccalaureate preparation prior to the nineteen-fifties at which time vocational education and community service began to assume more importance (Fields, 1962). Today, the mission of the community college system reflects a great diversity of need. As stated by the Illinois Community College Board in 1979, this mission is to provide 1) the first two years of a baccalaureate education, 2) career or vocational education, 3) general studies or adult education, 4) community education or special interest classes, 5) public service activities, and 6) student services in the form of guidance and counseling (ICCB, p. 1).

To facilitate the achievement of community college objectives, several services are offered which are not found elsewhere in higher education and which respond more creatively to current educational needs and expectations. These services include open-door admissions, low cost, extensive guidance and counseling services, an emphasis on teaching as opposed to research, and more flexibility in the curriculum (Kerr, 1974; Gleazer, 1968). These services form the advantages that accrue to the students of a community college.

The accessibility and availability of the institution forces the community college to deal with a tremendous disparity in educational, emotional, and intellectual develop-

ment among its students. Its population is as diverse as the community in which it is located. Education of parents, income, age and other demographic factors will vary widely. Many students may be unmotivated or undecided about their career choices. Legislation is making higher education available to the handicapped (P.L. 94-482, P.L. 94-142, P.L. 93-112). Adults are coming back to school. Programs involving high school dropouts are being developed. Impoverished youths from minority ghettos with severe learning disabilities are coming to community colleges. The factory workers are returning to the classroom to increase their chances for a better life, or to be re-trained for a new career.

The community college must be prepared to be many things to many people, to meet these people where they are and help them to the next step of their growth. To meet these ends, there is a demand for effective guidance services. The services appear to have been understressed in comparison to the needs (Fields, p. 316). It cannot be stated too emphatically that if community college students are to be helped in the formation and pursuit of meaningful goals, guidance and counseling services must be equal to the task, a task which carries with it an implicit demand for counseling to be a necessary and integral part of the learning experience. Counseling is a school's

response to the increasing complexity of modern society and its attempts to meet its educational needs. As an institution, the community college is mandated to display a degree of flexibility to help its diverse and non-traditional student population adjust and adapt. This flexibility is written into the mission of community colleges. Even course offerings are to be adapted to the needs of the particular community in which the college is located. Traditional ways of granting credit are supplemented with life experience credit. The disparity of needs that the institution is expected to meet is so great that flexibility is an apparent prerequisite for its survival. In all cases where the institutional procedures are not appropriate, it falls upon counseling to provide the services which will enable the student to acquire the learning which is the promise inherent in the community college system.

Current social changes in the United States are placing great demands on the community colleges and perhaps even greater burdens upon their counseling services. A survey of community colleges conducted in the last half of the nineteen-sixties reported a lack of those very services most needed by their diverse student populations. Seventy-five percent of the schools surveyed had inadequate student personnel programs. Over 50% had inadequate guidance and counseling services. Few community colleges had enough

resources to serve as area guidance centers. The existence of local community colleges may be jeopardized because of the failure to provide those very services for which they were created (Raines, 1968).

Koos (1970) sampled over 600 community college students in five states and administered the Mooney Problem Checklist to them. In his results, he stresses that substantial members of students have serious problems in all areas of concern. The largest percentage (20) was found in Adjustment to College Work. The next largest area of concern was Finance, Living Conditions, and Employment. Next of order of importance were the areas of Personal-Psychological Relations followed by Courtship, Sex and Marriage. The least important areas were Health and Physical Development along with Curriculum and Teaching Procedures. The most obvious conclusion, even in comparison to students in other types of institutions, is that students identify as serious, problems in all eleven categories of the checklist. Their needs evidently cover an extremely wide range of concerns.

Students needs are counterbalanced by institutional realities. The institution is operating under certain exigencies. Monroe (1972) states that the halcyon days of generous support and public faith in education has given way to limited financial support and disenchantment with

higher education. The 1970's were marked by economic recession and national pessimism. Administrators were forced into an economic bind as finances dried up. The economic factors, along with the reversal of attitudes towards higher education, is causing community colleges to look for better ways to fulfill the goals defined and accepted during the 1960's. Unquestioned acceptance of the value of higher education by the public appears to be giving way to a demand for accountability. Given the above considerations (students needs and institutional exigencies), it is essential that all counseling services be as creative, effective, and efficient as possible.

Counseling services and their delivery systems need to be scrutinized. Counseling appears to be in between students' needs and institutional exigencies. One result is confusion about the role of the counselor. Since the institution wields budgetary power, most counseling services offered are of the traditional nature. However, the mandate of counseling within the community college context is to provide developmental experiences. Where do the loyalties of the counselor lie? Do counselors adopt the role of student advocate or maintain institutionally defined roles? Do counselors foster developmental change? Could the college afford to cut services of a developmental nature? Do current services need to be modified? These



are indeed very real concerns for community college counseling.

In order to better address these issues, baseline data need to be established. With counseling, students are the focii of the data, being, as they are, the primary consumers of counseling services. Therefore, the current impact of counseling can be measured by studying 1) the students' perceptions of counselors and counseling; 2) the students' attitude toward, and willingness to use, counseling services; 3) the characteristics of the students who use those services; and 4) the characteristics of the students who do not use counseling services.

The present study was concerned with the counseling center at a major metropolitan suburban community college. The counseling center purports to implement the objectives of counseling as stated by Helfgot (1975), for the community colleges in Illinois, that is:

to offer a cluster of professional services and related experiences which will maximize a student's chances for making responsible decisions relating to his/her educational, personal, social, and vocational development. Further, these decisions should be appropriate to, and in consonance with, the student's interests, aptitudes, needs, values, and potential. (p. 12)

#### The Problem To Be Investigated

The present study was designed to be descriptive due to the exploratory nature of the research as well as the

unknown characteristics of the population. The research problem to be investigated can be stated simply: Are selected attitudes and characteristics of Thornton Community College students associated with their use or non-use of Counseling Center services? The following questions were posed:

- 1) Is there an association between attitude towards counseling and use or non-use of counseling?
- 2) Is there an association between self-esteem and the use or non-use of counseling?
- 3) Is there an association between locus of control and the use or non-use of counseling?
- 4) Is there an association between counseling stigma and the use or non-use of counseling?
- 5) Is there an association between counseling readiness and counseling use or non-use?
- 6) Is there an association between perceived counseling usefulness and counseling use or non-use?
- 7) Is there an association between perception of counselor role within the institution and counseling use or non-use?
- 8) Are there associations between the following demographic variables and the use or non-use of counseling?
  - a) Health
  - b) Ethnic group

- c) Marital status
- d) Living arrangement
- e) Primary language
- f) High school
  - 1) achievement
  - 2) preparation
- g) Mode of transportation to college
- h) Awareness and primary use of counseling services
- i) Age
- j) Sex
- k) Military experience
- l) Year in school/curriculum
- m) Educational aspirations
- n) Career plans
- o) Curricular and extra-curricular activity
- p) Order of preference for Thornton Community College
- q) Parental data
  - 1) socio-economic status
  - 2) personal relationship
  - 3) education
- r) Birth order
- s) Personal financial resources
- t) Hours of work/week
- u) Religion

- 1) reared in
- 2) practice today
- v) Previous counseling experience
- w) Childhood
  - 1) experiences
  - 2) relationship with parents
- x) Adjustment to adult responsibilities
- y) Most important problem area
- z) Preferred helper per problem area

#### Definition of Terms

For purposes of clarity, frequently used terms, as well as the principle instruments utilized, are herein defined as they pertain to the particular research involved with the present study.

#### User

For the purposes of the present study, user relates to a full-time student, enrolled in at least twelve semester hours and having matriculated status, that is, having been formally accepted for admission by the college. Further, the user must have made an appointment to see a counselor by following the established procedure of the Counseling Center. Having made the appointment, the user must have kept the appointment and seen the designated counselor at least once during the spring, 1979 semester.

### Non-user

For purposes of the present study, a non-user is a full-time student (that is, enrolled in twelve semester hours or greater and having matriculated status). The non-user is characterized by not having seen a counselor, or used the Counseling Center, according to the established procedure at any time during the spring, 1979 semester.

### Counseling Center

The term Counseling Center refers to the organizational unit of counseling as well as those services affiliated with counseling, and the Counseling Center. The college catalogue defines available counseling services under the rubric of Counseling and Academic Guidance (TCC Catalogue, 1979). It states:

A professional counseling staff serves the academic, vocational and personal needs of students. The counseling staff assists students in determining career choices and in planning programs designed to reach their educational goals. Individual and group counseling is available to assist students to develop greater self-awareness and insight into problem-solving procedures. (TCC, p. 13)

The TCC Student Handbook, 79-80, states further that:

counselors can give you information on entrance exams, orientation, registration, and how to plan an academic program. It is suggested that students avail themselves of counseling services prior to enrollment and throughout their college experience. Some of the services available are

academic and career planning, testing, personal counseling, study habits, tutoring, academic advising and course selection, and group counseling. (p. 16)

On the door to the Counseling Center are the words, "COUNSELING" and below that, in smaller upper-case letters, are the words, "ACADEMIC ADVISING."

### Counseling Attitude Scale

The scale utilized to measure the students' attitude towards the Counseling Center services was the Counseling Attitude Scale which was devised by A. L. Form (1953) at Michigan State University. The attitude scale assesses opinion. The measure indicates a student's willingness to use the counseling center services, the premise being that a counseling center cannot be effective unless the students have a positive opinion of the center.

### Locus of Control

Locus of control refers to one's perceived ability to direct one's own life. The concept was developed from social learning theory and relates to an internal versus an external control of reinforcement.

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as . . . the result of luck, chance, fate, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him . . . we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own

behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control. (Rotter, 1975, p. 57)

### Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is defined as an attitude, either positive or negative, that one has towards the object of self. It is also considered as the intuitive affect one has for oneself. This construct was measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965).

### Counseling

Counseling is a professional intervention, an activity which facilitates growth in other human beings. In this study, counseling is concerned with the development of a student population and is, thus, student oriented. Counseling is intended to involve the whole student, thus acknowledging the complexity of life which makes categorizing concerns difficult and integrates academic advisement, educational counseling, out-reach activity, career counseling, and personal/social counseling in equal proportions. Counseling is meant to be integrated, also, with the institution's educational program and instructional faculty, to work in partnership with other curricular programs to facilitate maximally the growth and development of the total human being (O'Banion, 1971).

### Limitations of the Study

This study pertains only to full-time students at Thornton Community College in the spring, 1979 semester. The conclusions and results may be generalized only to those students. Generalizations to other populations of similar student body composition would be difficult due to time factors, counseling organization factors, and measurement variances.

All reviewed literature related to counseling utilization relies upon a measurement device. There were no measuring instruments utilized in other studies which cover the variables of measured interest in the present study, nor appropriate to the design or population being investigated. Therefore, the Counseling Center Survey was developed. Since the survey instrument was basically demographic in nature, face validity was the primary criterion utilized in the pilot test, as well as readings by six independent judges. The results are limited insofar as the Survey, as an instrument of measurement, is limited.

Additionally, this study lacks the strength of comparability to other studies of a similar nature. This is due to the lack of such studies on the community college population. Therefore, the design is, in part, based upon extrapolations from studies of similar intent but on senior institution populations.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An exhaustive search of the literature revealed no studies on the topic of this dissertation, that is, differential characteristics of users and non-users of a community college counseling center. Therefore, a review of literature was completed on those topics relevant to counseling use, but which utilized different sample populations. The chapter is divided into four sections. Each section presents a selected factor which has an influence on the use of counseling services. The final section presents general characteristics of the sample population (community college students) using those services. In order of discussion, these sections are: 1) Perception of Counseling Services, 2) Function of Counseling, 3) Relevant Differential Studies, and 4) Two-Year College Student Characteristics.

#### Perception of Counseling Services

Whether a counseling center is utilized or not depends to a degree upon how those for whom it is intended perceive its function and services. Minge and Cass (1966) surveyed the student body at Washington State University in order to determine student knowledge of the Student Counseling Center and its function. Their instrument was a one-page question-

naire containing personal information along with 13 questions regarding the amount of knowledge the students had about the Student Counseling Center.

The results revealed how students perceived counselors and counseling. The main sources of information about the center for all students were friends and reading material. Eighty-six percent had heard of the counseling center, fewer knew specifically what went on in the center. A small percentage knew counselors held graduate degrees and most underestimated the number of counselors working in the center. Students thought personal and educational/vocational problems were approximately equal in types of problems presented at the center, which is an accurate perception. The students least aware of the center were males, married students, fraternity members, off-campus residents, freshmen and graduate students. The authors appropriately conclude their results are ambiguous as to the relationship between awareness of the counseling center and confidence in it.

King and Matteson (1959) studied perception of counseling services through the role a counseling center fulfills in relation to dealing with various types of problems. In other words, how appropriate was the counseling center as an agent to deal with the concerns of the students? The results indicated that students felt most free to take educational problems to the center. That was followed, in descending

order, by vocational problems, social problems, and personal problems. Further, it was found that the number of visits increased a students' willingness to use the center for educational problems, especially for freshmen, but this changed unaccountably after five visits. Females were more willing to seek help with educational problems than were males. The authors identified a circular relationship between institutional services and student needs. As more professionally prepared counselors and psychologists dealt with the emotional problems of students, the more the demand for these services grew and, conversely, could be expected to increase as the institution offered more of them.

As early as 1954, Claude Grant observed that the counselor is perceived in schools as giving "acceptable assistance in the categories of vocational and educational planning, but not as being able to give acceptable assistance in the personal-emotional area" (p. 387). As such, it is not surprising to read results such as those of the King and Matteson study. In Grant's (1954) survey of high school seniors, 62% of the sample chose the counselor as the first they would approach to work out educational programs and study plans. Students failed to see the counselor as helpful in the personal-emotional area. Non-school personnel were sought out for help in these areas, friends being first, followed by parents and doctors.

Mason, Arnold, and Hyman (1975) compared students' and parents' perceptions and expectations of the counselor, using, as did Grant, a sample of students at the secondary level. The results are similar even though twenty-one years separate the two studies. Aside from the finding of the latter study indicating that both students and parents ranked a counselor's most important characteristic that of being a parent, both ranked the function of discipline and attendance as second. Expectations were generally higher than perceptions which indicate a feeling of dissatisfaction with past counselor performance. Because there appeared to be a congruence between perceptions and expectations (insofar as both are rank ordered approximately the same), one assumes appropriate areas of functioning were identified, but the functioning was not at the desired level. The general perception of the counselor's role was that of an administrator who does counseling. The authors conclude that counselors must educate the community as to the full range of services which the counselor can provide. The implication is that a counselor's self-perceived role is broader than what is defined, or expected, by the student body and the total community, that is, more than college advising, vocational advising, programming, and testing. The counselors felt their roles were expanding, but they were still perceived as fulfilling a limited function.

Finally, in a Colorado study of high school students' perception of the counselor's role, Leaverton (1976) found nine areas in which students' perceptions differed from those of the counselors. These areas are: 1) a school career resource center, 2) discipline problems, 3) counseling parents about children's concerns, 4) contributing to faculty staffings, 5) information dissemination regarding the schools' guidance and counseling services, 6) making up-to-date educational/vocational information available to students, 7) facilitating relationships between teachers and parents, 8) being a referral agent, and 9) test interpretation to parents.

The results also showed that students viewed counselors as disciplinarians. One-third of the surveyed students had no information regarding the role or function of the counselor. They felt that they were not getting much vocational education while counselors thought that they were, and, whereas counselors viewed services labeled, "career planning," of value, students looked at them as having to make a choice of colleges. The students also felt counselors could be less dictatorial whereas counselors did not see themselves as being such. Students suggested that counselors should take a more personal interest in the students.

In summary, it may be fair to say that students appear to have a rather limited perception of counseling and coun-

selors that focuses on services of a parental/educational nature. At four-year institutions problems of a personal nature appear at a higher incidence. A certain lack of information is apparent at all levels of education regarding the role and function of counseling which results in vague impressions of what counseling services are and what counselors do. The students' attitudes toward counseling range from generally positive to somewhat negative.

#### Function of Counseling

The Illinois Community College Board defines counseling as the key element among student personnel functions in facilitating the total human development of the students. Because community colleges are community based, students appear to be opportunity and goal oriented. Therefore, living and learning not only has the opportunity of occurring but must be integrated. Counseling's function is to maximize the student's opportunity of reaching one's potential by focusing on vocational, educational, personal and social development. To accomplish this, counseling functions should include goal-setting, personal assessment, development of change strategies, strategy implementation, and evaluation for each student.

The emphasis of counseling is upon how the educational experience fits into the total living experience of the student. The counselor facilitates that appreciation. Because

students are becoming more and more non-traditional in nature, and are at widely varying developmental stages, it is essential that counselors initiate out-reach programs. To maximize their effectiveness, it is essential that this be perceived as supportive acts by supportive representatives of a supportive institution.

However, Warnath (1972) has observed that the modalities of counseling in schools that are goal-oriented, or concerned with preparing students for careers, are short-term academic, or vocational, counseling. This function fit the needs of the educational institution when the student population was homogeneous and stable. In response to changing student populations, many counselors altered their approach to students and thus expanded their services. Such modifications are in accord with the objectives of the Illinois Community College Board in order to better service the "whole" student.

The crucial variable in counseling tends to be the role of the supportive institution. Frequently, as a counselor moves to become a more active agent and aids in initiating needed changes in an institution based on student requirements, the counselor can be perceived as a threat to the institution if the required change appears to be a disruption of the status quo, or not in the best interests of the institution. To solve this dilemma, that is, the

conflict between the role of the counselor and the needs of the institution, counselors must look at their function within the institution realistically. Bisno (1960) found the counselor practitioner engaging in status seeking activities which were counter-productive to the welfare of the clients in order to gain professional respectability. In other words, when conflicts were presented, the counselors resolved the situation in favor of the institution, often to the student's detriment. The conclusion was that inconsistencies many times appear to exist between the counselors stated professional goals and the actual services delivered to the students. One of the causes of the non-use of counseling may therefore, be, that counselors do not see their function in a way that is congruent with students' needs, but rather those policies of the institution. Consequently, if the institution does not use its power and influence to support innovative outreach activities or other expanded student oriented counseling functions, it implicitly limits the function of counseling, and that is what students will see.

Little research has been done on the issue of counseling function at the community college level. Wolf and Dameron (1975) compared the respective functions of counseling centers in two-year and four-year colleges. In the two-year schools, 70% reported the counseling center was



separate from other students services. Two-year college counselors spent more time in academic advisement than in personal-social-emotional counseling. The opposite was true for four-year schools. The emphasis on personal counseling at the four-year schools was more than that placed on academic counseling at the community college. The time counselors spent on these functions correlated well with the respondents assessment of the importance of the counseling services rendered. (See Table 1)

The two-year college offered more services in course choice and course load, while more short- and long-term counseling was available at four-year schools. This is coincidental with other data which suggest a concern with the "whole" student, not just the "academic" student, at the four-year college. The findings seem to support War-nath's contention. (See Table 2, p. 27)

The authors discuss several variables which, though not measured in the study, could serve to explain the apparent differences between two-year and four-year college counseling center functions. Emotional problems may be resolved in the home milieu of the community college student, a resource not available to the residential four-year college student. Community college students tend to be older, therefore more mature. Counseling, because of open-door admissions, must take on an advisement tone to

\* TABLE 1

Mean Percentage of Time Spent in Direct Services

Type of Service	Type of College	
	Junior and Community (N = 20)	Senior and Universities (N = 16)
Academic advisement	38.9	11.5
Personal-social-emotional counseling	26.3	54.0
Other services	34.8	34.5

(Wolf & Dameron, 1975, p. 483)

## Services Offered by Counseling Centers in Sample

Service	Junior College N=20	Senior College N=16
Counseling for study problems	100%	94%
Counseling for choice of major	95	94
Counseling for personal problems	100	100
Counseling for academic course choice and load	85	50
Short-term counseling: severe emotional disorders (1-4 sessions)	65	100
Long-term counseling: severe emotional disorders (5 or more sessions)	25	62
Group counseling	70	62
Disciplinary counseling	10	25
Pre-college counseling	85	38
Summer orientation	40	56
Diagnosis for other schools	35	19
Supervision of residence hall counselors	10	31
Tutoring in academic areas	40	6
Freshman testing	95	75
Advising campus student organizations	30	19
Supervision of practicum students	50	56
Research	45	62
Student loans and scholarships	35	0
Counseling with faculty	100	81
Counseling all students on academic probation	55	25

(Wolf &amp; Dameron, 1975, p. 484)

help the disadvantaged. Finally, the staffs of the two types of institutions differ. The four-year schools have several doctoral-level counselors, those of the two-year colleges are usually at the master's level with perhaps one PhD. The type of student and the nature of the curricula may be variables which help determine what kinds of counselors are hired and the duties to which they are assigned. The authors conclude a movement towards a human development model of counseling may finally integrate these two most important functions.

Miller (1979) conducted a study of the counseling services offered at two-year colleges. Her sample population was from the east coast, consisting of schools in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. Twelve colleges responded to a two-page, 16 item questionnaire. They all offered formal counseling services. Size was not related to the comprehensiveness of the service as some of the smallest schools provided the most varied and thorough services. There was little difference in the range of duties performed by the participating centers' counselors. Each center was served by paraprofessionals or consultants. Counselors taught at all schools, and all schools with one exception had evening hours for counselors. The major problems presented by students were academic and vocational difficulties, followed in descending frequency by in-

terpersonal relations, emotional, and financial problems. There appeared to be a positive relationship between the needs of students and the services offered at the centers. The centers seemed to concentrate on pragmatic, coping skills rather than the more involved clinical modalities. The author concludes that counselors appear to be expanding their roles through research and liasons with the instructional faculty. Although she initially contends that the rapid growth of community colleges was due to a "commitment toward fostering the personal as well as the academic growth of the student" (p. 10), resulting in a greater emphasis placed on the delivery of direct service through the college counseling center, Miller sees counselors as playing important roles as consultants and researchers integrating many functions in a truly human development model of counseling which would include other college personnel that are in contact with the students.

Clark (1966) surveyed several large university counseling centers and found that all reported as their principal service offered, vocational, educational and personal counseling. He made several suggestions for areas that needed special emphasis. He felt that his data indicated a need for more personal adjustment counseling as it appeared to be a growing category in direct services, and emphasis on practical research which helps determine

"students' needs and characteristics; to evaluate counseling; and to investigate institutional characteristics and problem areas" (p. 822).

In senior institutions, personal counseling appears to get more attention than academic or occupational/vocational counseling. In real terms, reference to item 22 of Table 3 from the Nugent and Pareis (1968) survey of college counseling centers indicates that 84% of the respondents answered "no" to the handling of academic advisement. The opposite was true for two-year schools.

Sixty-six percent of the four-year colleges in the United States offered organized, formal counseling services (Albert, 1968). These services most often were directed to students with personal, educational or vocational problems. At four-year colleges, counselors must deal with problems not dealt with elsewhere, i.e., at home. This could explain why senior institutions defined counseling in more psychological terms and was so in function. The scarcity of data on two-year colleges makes conclusions tentative at best. In this setting, it appeared that institutional need and perceived student need interacted to produce a traditional academic advisement orientation to counseling. The functions then tended to be more educational/academic/vocational in nature and thus may have interfered with the need of a community college population

TABLE 3

## Function and Orientation of Counseling Centers

Questionnaire item	Response		No response
	Yes	No	
1. Are non-students counseled? Relatives only, 16%; General public, 26%; Other, 14%	56%	43%	1%
2. Is a fee charged for counseling students?	4%	95%	1%
3. Is a fee charged for testing students?	19%	74%	7%
4. Is a fee charged public for counseling?	23%	16%	61%
5. Is a fee charged public for testing?	29%	9%	62%
6. Does the counseling service evaluate counselees for administration or academic departments?	68%	27%	5%
7. Are involuntary referrals for evaluation responsibility of counseling center?	61%	26%	13%
8. Are tests administered to students for the administration or academic departments where counseling is not involved?	67%	30%	3%
9. Are involuntary referrals (for disciplinary reasons, etc.) accepted?	65%	30%	5%
10. Are voluntary referrals preferred?	80%	16%	4%
11. Is group counseling offered?	50%	48%	2%
12. Is help with reading and study habits offered?	67%	32%	1%
13. Is training for graduate students in counseling offered?	33%	64%	3%
14. Is counseling center research currently being done?	54%	34%	12%
15. Does faculty consult with the counseling staff about their own prob- lems?	88%	10%	2%
16. Is there an identifiable theoretical orientation? Rogerian, 19%; Learning, 8%; Freudian, 3%; Other, 14%.	44%	52%	4%
17. Are the number of consecutive interviews limited? Mean limit: 10.6 contacts.	9%	90%	1%
18. Does the center have its own psychometrist?	50%	47%	3%
19. Is a standard test battery used?	39%	60%	1%
20. Are projectives sometimes used?	64%	32%	4%
21. Is there an occupational library?	71%	27%	2%
22. Is academic advisement handled?	14%	84%	2%
23. How many interviews does a typical counselee have? 1-3, 40%; 4-6, 34%; 7-9, 8%; 10-12, 5%; over 12, 5%.			8%

for the more developmental experiences that counseling has been mandated to facilitate.

### Relevant Differential Studies

No data were available on the differential characteristics of users and non-users of community college counseling center services. All studies concerned with this subject have been performed at senior institutions. The studies usually serve to document the beneficial nature of counseling through the measurement of improvement in client performance or achievement, or some readily observable characteristic usually of an academic nature (Campbell, 1965; Ivey, 1962; Richardson, 1962; Frank and Kirk, 1975). In addition, the literature reflects a paucity of studies that include non-users as well as users, of counseling services. Users constitute a fraction of the total population of interest to counseling.

One possible explanation for the neglect of non-users is the assumption that users and non-users are essentially alike. In 1942, Schneidler and Berdie gathered data at the University of Minnesota of user/non-user characteristics. Their purpose was to assess the differences between students who did and did not come for counseling. The sampled students were compared on the basis of aptitude for college work, high school scholarship, and achievement in English.



On these variables, users and non-users did not differ significantly. A sub-group of Science, Literature and the Arts freshmen further did not differ significantly in achievement in Natural Sciences, Social Studies and Mathematics, or in certain personality traits such as morale, general adjustment, economic conservatism, measured interests, and occupational level. The conclusion was that users of counseling did not differ significantly from non-users.

Rossman and Kirk (1970) concentrated on comparing the scores for users and non-users of counseling services at the University of California, Berkeley, on the School and College Ability Test, Form UA, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, Form F, and a student questionnaire. The results revealed similarities between users and non-users in many areas, namely, ability level, personality characteristics, and biographical data. The differences were found on the quantitative portion of the SCAT where counseled women scored higher than men, the OPI where counseled men were higher on social isolation or alienation, described themselves as more tense and high-strung, had a poorer opinion of themselves, and had "stronger aesthetic and social inclinations while admitting to greater sensitivity and emotionality" (p. 185). Counseled women appeared to be more willing to act out their problems.

The student questionnaire provided several significant items. Counseled males were more likely to have had separated parents. They were also more frequently socially maladjusted and reported having been strictly disciplined as children. They still encountered difficulty in communicating with their parents. Counseled women came from families with less than \$15,000 annually, and were planning to work immediately after graduation. The authors concluded, however, that similarities were greater than the differences, and that the results, therefore, tended to support the findings of Schneidler and Berdie.

If users are representative of the students, the question of why more students do not use the counseling center still remains unanswered and indeed more curious. In a study conducted at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Meadows and Oelke (1968) compared selected variables for freshmen and sophomore male users and non-users. These variables were scholastic aptitude as measured by the College Entrance Examination Board, SAT-V, and SAT-M, high school grade point average, predicted freshman grade point average, actual grade point average of college work, interest patterns as measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men, declared major, temperament as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey,

socio-economic status as measured by Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position, and extra-curricular activities during high school and college. T-tests were used for standard score data, chi-square for nominal data.

The results clearly indicated that there were no differences between the two groups on the variable of scholastic ability. Those who sought counseling had lower college grade point averages. They also indicated significantly less interest in their curriculum major which appears significantly related to vocational indecision. These students participated in fewer college activities than non-users and tended to be more socially isolated. The two groups did not appear to differ in temperament or socio-economic status. High school achievement and extra-curricular activities were not significant variables. The study appeared to have established differences between users and non-users on the vocational and college academic variables, as well as social isolation.

Academic performance was the specific criterion used by Ivey (1962) in a study of counseling effectiveness. His hypothesis was that counseled students would fare better than non-counseled students. Freshmen, sophomores, and juniors were included in the sample.

The two groups (N=161 for each group) did not differ significantly on College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) scores and high school rank. The counseled group improved their grade point average .262 (4.0=A) while the non-counseled group improved .051, the difference being significant at the .01 level. Additional data provided by Ivey's study suggests that different academic performance patterns of counseled students distinguish them from non-counseled students, and the type of referral, the nature of the problem discussed, and the length of counseling also relate to improved academic performance. Indeed, the more serious the problem and the longer the counseling, the greater the improvement in academic performance appeared. Ivey asserted that counseling of a personal-psychological nature aids in a student's improved academic performance.

A study conducted in New York by Richardson (1964) two years after Ivey's tended to support this assertion. Although Richardson's sample consisted of only business majors at the Bernard Baruch School of Business and Public Administration, his design was more longitudinal, N was smaller (N=38 counseled; N=31 non-counseled) therefore, causing the differences to be less pronounced. Performance differences between the two groups were insignificant.

However, when the counseled students were compared on the basis of grade movement during their college careers, certain clusters of personality characteristics appeared. The group whose grades decreased after counseling experienced severe emotional difficulties which interfered with their ability to perform in college. Their behavior was argumentative, alienating, hedonistic and could be characterized as acting-out in general. The group whose grades rose tended to be emotionally stable but immature and lacking ego-strength. They appeared "blank, dependent and constricted" (p. 162). The group whose grades showed no change was so small the author could not draw any conclusion. Thus, this study appeared to establish the relationship between motivation to seek counseling and personality factors to academic performance, supporting Ivey's conclusions. No comparison of behavior clusters could be made with non-counseled students as no professional observed their behaviors. The same clustering may have occurred in groups with similar grade movement.

Frank and Kirk (1975) undertook a longitudinal study of a quite specific nature at the University of California, Berkeley. All incoming freshmen were given the School and College Ability Test Form UA and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and a student background questionnaire.

After four years, the names were checked for (a) users of Counseling Center only, (b) users of the Psychiatric Service only, (c) users of both services, and (d) users of neither service. Two years later, or six years from entering, data was gathered on persistence in school, grade point average, and major. Six categories were created, (a) 4-year graduates, (b) 5-year graduates, (c) students who left in good standing (+2.0), (e) students who left in bad standing (-2.0), and (f) no-data students.

The results showed both men and women users graduated on time at a rate higher than all other categories. The proportion of students who used the Counseling Center and then subsequently withdrew in bad standing was lower for users than for the non-users of either service. Users and non-users were similar in initial scholastic abilities, interests, backgrounds, and grade point averages. Staying in school and graduating seemed to be a differentiating variable.

Hudesmen, et. al. (1976) attempted a study comparing counseling awareness and usage patterns by examining users and non-users of counseling at an urban community college, one of the few studies to use this population. The two main measured variables were dependency and social isolation as factors influencing perception, and subsequent use,

of counseling. The results indicated that dependency was not a factor in the awareness of, or use of, counseling services. However, social isolation was significant. Responses of users on perceived discussion area of other counselees were compared to total user and non-user responses on the same dimension. The users had different self-perceptions. This supports the idea that users view themselves as having "unique" problems, and were, in some way, different from others. Users, as socially isolated, may have more awareness of the counseling center and tend to recognize and rely upon this resource. This supports Meadows and Oelke's conclusion.

No doubt personality factors also play a crucial part in whether a student decides to use a counseling center. Mendelsohn and Kirk (1962) at the University of California, Berkeley, used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to assess the differences in cognitive and intellectual functions between clients and non-clients. The four dimensions scored are Judgment-Perception, Thinking-Feeling, Sensation-Intuition, and Extraversion-Introversion. The sample consisted of 1/6 of the 1959 freshman class. The students were administered the MBTI. One year later, those who had used the counseling center were identified. Thus, two groups (clients and non-clients) were formed and compared.

The independent variable was appearance or non-appearance at the counseling center.

Users were found to be different from non-users on two dimensions, Judgment-Perception and Sensation-Intuition. On perception, users tended to be less judgmental in their approach to counseling. Further, intuitive scores indicated users could live with the high levels of ambiguity indigenous to counseling. That users and non-users have different preferences in perceptual and cognitive approaches seemed to be supported by this study.

Minge and Bowman (1967) went one step further. They suggested that not only do users and non-users have differing personality characteristics, but personality differences are present among users as well. Using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, 41 vocational-educational users, 30 personal counseling users, and 54 non-users were compared on fifteen sub-scales. The results were mixed. Vocational-educational users scored significantly higher on the sub-scale order than did the other two groups indicating a greater need on this scale. The two user groups both scored significantly lower than the non-user group on the sub-scale Dominance, while showing no significant difference between each other. Users, thus, may be less dominant than their peers. Finally, both user groups



scored significantly higher on the Abasement sub-scale than did their non-user counterparts indicating poorer self-esteem.

While the results indicate that personality differences do exist between users and non-users, there is one question left unanswered. Are the personality differences chronic or acute? This information would be helpful in better designing counseling programs and out-reach efforts. Since counseling's effectiveness is to a large degree determined by potential users perception of its services, as well as knowledge of its existence, the more that can be learned about students' needs, the better able counseling can be to provide for those needs and, at the same time, increase the number of students seeking their services.

Stringham (1969) found that users and non-users were different and could be identified. Evidence was found supporting the concept of durable personality and behavior traits that differentiated the two groups, and thus answered, to a degree, Minge and Bowman (1967). Further, she found that men and women varied in their use of counseling. Stringham's main instrument was the Omnibus Personality Inventory which was administered along with student self-descriptive adjectives, degrees of concern indices, acceptance of parental opinion indices, a social

openness index and selected demographic characteristics. The counseling service was primarily psychological in orientation.

The results revealed that socio-economic status, and two self-concept indices, expressiveness and traditionalism, were significant. Females of higher SES used personal counseling, and users in general tended to be more expressive and non-traditional. Significantly more men users saw themselves as unhappy, and women users saw themselves as more self-critical, more impulsive, and more concerned with personal identity questions.

A finding of secondary order was related to counseling termination. Early terminators more closely resembled non-users than did late terminators. This may be of considerable concern when it is remembered that of the number of users, a sizeable percentage do so fewer than five times (Form, 1953; King and Matteson, 1959).

In an attempt to isolate predictors of counseling center users, Cooke and Kiesler (1967) used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The results indicated that male and female users, as predicted, had significantly higher total MMPI mean and a higher neurotic score. Generally, they found that users had more elevated MMPI scales than non-users, which again supports the contention

that personality differences do exist between users and non-users.

Sharf and Bishop (1973) used the Opinion, Attitude, and Interest Survey to measure the difference in social and emotional adjustment of users and non-users at the University of Delaware. Users and non-users were further scrutinized by sex and type of problem, i.e., personal, vocational, or academic. The results indicated no significant differences between the two groups. Also, no significant difference could be demonstrated on the basis of sex. Significant differences were found on both adjustment scales between non-users and users with personal problems, but not educational or vocational problems. The students counseled for personal problems scored significantly lower on both scales indicating poorer emotional and social adjustment. The authors conclude that the two scales did differentiate the two groups successfully and that perhaps, personal problem students may define a sub-group of students presenting educational/vocational problems thereby supporting Minge and Bowman's hypothesis.

Gaudet and Kulick (1954) observed two groups of users of counseling services, educational/vocational services, and personal/social services. Their instrument

was the Minnesota Personality Scale which was used to measure differences between groups. Their results appear to be conclusive. The group of users of vocational and educational guidance did not differ significantly in adjustment from the normative sample. The other group, however, that seeking personal and social guidance, manifested poorer adjustment, including familial relationships, than did the educational/vocational group, a difference which was significant at the .001 level.

A study that is referred to repeatedly in research on users and non-users is that of Berdie and Stein (1966) which explored persistence in school as one independent variable. They concentrated on observable behavior, not personality characteristics, per se, and their findings support earlier work.

By looking at the quarter completed, they found that more users completed school work (three-quarters) and fewer dropped (after one or two quarters) than did non-users. Additionally, more users returned the sophomore year, a result supporting Frank and Kirk (1975). Users transferred with greater frequency from one college to another. The results of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory indicated that students who sought help in the Reading and Study Skills Center tended to have less academic

potential than other students, and that women users had fewer social skills, less social confidence, and were somewhat less stable. Again, differences rather than similarities were found.

Adjustment differences are found elsewhere in the literature. Wattenberg (1953) supported the hypothesis that early family experiences and disrupted relations discriminated users from non-users. This was confirmed by the male users of the Rossman-Kirk (1970) sample. Further, McCloud (1968), using the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the California Psychological Inventory, and several other scales derived from a variety of sources and experimental in nature, found male users to be significantly higher on all measures of maladjustment than control subjects, and lower on self-assurance, socialization, maturity, and other measures of responsibility. Female personal problem clients were more maladjusted and scored lower on the economic scale. This same group was lower on measurements of self-assurance, maturity, and responsibility, as well as measurements of achievement and intellectual efficiency.

These results support Rossman and Kirk in their finding more differences between users and non-users than similarities. This is now generally accepted, i.e., differ-

ences do exist. Even on the variable of scholastic ability, different results are found. For example, a review of the literature indicated a majority of studies finding no significant differences between users and non-users in scholastic ability of achievement. Baller (1945), however, at the University of Nebraska, found users to be significantly higher in ability and achievement than non-users. These results appear to hold for users of the academic service as well as for the personal-social service. In Baller's study, inferences from earlier research were more closely scrutinized. His results provide evidence again that differences between users and non-users of counseling services appear to exist, regardless of the direction of that difference.

The Mooney Problem Check List appears to successfully distinguish users from non-users of counseling services. In a study conducted by Doleys (1964) at Carbon-dale, a group of non-user, freshmen students were administered the Check List and then advised that counseling was available by inserting an information sheet in the place of the discussion section appearing at the end of the instrument. Of the students tested, 21% became users, 19% expressed an interest but changed their minds or failed to keep their appointments. A full 60% did not express an

interest in counseling. The user group scored significantly more problems than non-user groups. Users expressed more problems ". . . in the areas of: Health and Physical Development; Finances; Living Conditions, and Employment; Social-Psychological Relations; and Adjustment to College Work" (p. 24). The conclusions indicated that those who were ready for counseling (by actually becoming users) were more aware of their problems and were able to express them more readily than non-users. No significant differences were found between clients and non-clients on the Future, Vocational and Educational Scales. Personal-social concerns appeared to bring students to counseling more than educational-vocational concerns.

Doleys touches upon counseling readiness as one of the determinants of counseling use. Minge (1966) carried this further in research designed to ascertain whether a person with problems was inherently more amenable to change and therefore, more willing to change. He administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule before and after a self-descriptive rating task in an attempt to measure any changes in the subjects' self-perception as a result of this task. The researcher's hypothesis was that the reflection demanded by the self-rating task would be sufficient to induce changes in the self-perception

of the potential user because of a pre-existing readiness to change. The change scores for both groups increased with the administration of the EPPS. Users did not modify self-perceptions more than non-users, and both appeared to change. Among users, personal mean change scores were significantly different from vocational and educational users. The author concludes that a student ready for counseling might be dealing with problems which involve changes in self-perception which were felt to require professional assistance, especially when the changes were of a personal character.

The converse is that students had problems which they did not bring to counselors. They preferred to solve problems on their own, or to get help from someone else. Form (1953) investigated factors which influenced a student to seek help at a counseling center. He found that 60% of the students used the center at least one time. Most believed the center was beneficial. Male users had problems of an educational or vocational nature, while females were more prone to present personal-emotional problems. Users tended to be younger, while married men used the services least often. Users also tended to have lower grade point averages. Non-users appeared to be better adjusted academically, socially, and emotionally. Extremely active students tended to use counseling less. Students of



lower socio-economic groups appeared to be over-represented in the sample population. Most students said they would not seek counseling, or school agencies, when they needed assistance. Friends and family were the most important sources of help.

Snyder, Hill, and Derksen (1973) confirmed this conclusion twenty years later. Students in their study still preferred family or friends to counseling personnel when confronted with personal problems. For educational or vocational problems, college personnel were preferred. Most showed a generally positive attitude towards the counseling center. There seemed to be an ambivalence on the part of many students as to whether or not they should solve their problems alone, or if they should seek assistance. This same uncertainty was apparent when they were queried about the importance of a problem in relation to their use of the counseling service. Many did not feel their problems were sufficiently important to merit counseling which may be an indication of readiness and was interpreted as being such by the researchers.

In summary, the studies reviewed were of similar methodology. For the most part the sample populations were high school seniors or college students. All utilized measuring instruments, either a psychometric device, a survey questionnaire, or both. Behavior and/or person-

ality characteristics were compared. The results were mixed, and the conclusions tenuous, at best. It did appear that users were significantly different from non-users at four-year colleges. Evidence existed on the variables of college grade point averages, vocational indecision, social isolation, nature of problem (personal as opposed to academic or vocational), completion of education (persistence), perceptual and cognitive approaches to problem solving, dominance, self-abasement, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory elevated scales, social and personal adjustment indices, self-esteem, family relationships, troubled communications, and socio-economic status. These would appear to be among the most important variables to investigate in relation to the user/non-user differentials of a community college counselor center.

### Two-Year College Student Characteristics

The object of this section is to survey the characteristics of community college students as found in the literature. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a wealth of information upon which to draw. An attempt will be made to establish a general base line which can be compared to the present sample.

Smith and Lyon (1968) found students who matriculated

at community colleges to be significantly different from those who chose four-year colleges. They compared students on the basis of socio-economic status, ability level, and sex. Those students who chose a community college were from lower socio-economic groups and of lower ability. Most wanted to live at home while they attended classes. Higher ability and socio-economic groups almost without fail went on to four-year colleges.

A survey of community college students in Kansas City, Missouri (Student Characteristics Report, 1977) displayed the following features. Most of the students were female, an increasingly important part of the student population. The number of part-time students increased dramatically. There was a concomitant decrease in the number of day enrollments. The number of evening enrollment increased with the part-time enrollment figure. There were twice as many freshmen as sophomores. The number of veterans was decreasing. The number of minorities was increasing.

Carmody and Shevel (1972) found that junior college students were similar to students of other institutions of higher education in relation to their motivation for going to college, and their goals during college. In most other measured areas, however, differences predominated. Rehberg (1976) found two-year college students to be of

lower socio-economic status, and ability, than the four-year college student, thus supporting Smith and Lyon's finding. The two-year college student also reported less influence from all sources to continue their education, suggesting less environmental support for their decision to attend college. High school preparation was more likely to be career-oriented and the students were less likely to have engaged in extra-curricular activities. Self-regard was reported lower than their four-year counterparts, and they reported themselves as being more critical of social and political systems while less inclined to get involved to change them.

Patton (1974) surveyed the freshman class at Atlantic Community College in New Jersey and found that the majority chose a community college because it was close to home. The average student was usually the only person in the family going to college, was most often single, and chose to live at home but not always for economic reasons. Most students appeared to be self-supporting (either on grant/aid programs or working), and chose business, social science, or education with greatest frequency. Most were in need of vocational counseling. It was not determined if and how these needs were related to personal concerns. The majority intended to transfer to a four-year college. Study skills and reading levels were usually in need of

remediation.

Another east coast study examined twelve variables in relation to a community college population in Maryland. Tschechtelin (1974) found part-time students increasing. The average age of the student body was rising. Women were increasing at a greater rate than men, especially in the part-time category. More students were married than single. Students were racially mixed with no one group increasing noticeably. One-half of the students worked forty hours a week, or more. More veterans were attending, more students were taking general studies (remediation), students grade point averages were rising, but, there was a reduction in average course load. Non-credit enrollment was increasing much more rapidly than credit enrollment.

Koos (1970), in summarizing the characteristics of community college students, indicated that the proportion of lower aptitude students at junior colleges was higher than at four-year colleges. The aptitude level was even lower for students in career curriculums. In socio-economic terms, smaller proportions of students from higher socio-economic levels, fathers in upper-level occupations were found at the community colleges. Influencing factors were quoted as being proximity to home and low tuition policy.

Project TALENT looked at aptitude as it interfaces with environmental factors in determining where, and if, a student continued in an educational path. It was found that the community college student was more similar to the non-college student in terms of ability and more like the four-year college students in terms of socio-economic factors. A Medsker and Trent (1965) study reported a finding that local community colleges attract the largest proportion of all local graduates, particularly the high ability, low socio-economic group.

Areas of interest to community college students have not been investigated. Health, marriage, parent preparation, and vocational concerns were reported consistently, and were common to both sexes. The large response to sex instruction and marriage preparation reflected the sample populations concerns. Occupationally, fully one-third of the community college students were undecided, a figure three times larger than the undecided group at four-year colleges. Among those who chose a career, educational, clerical, engineering, and a cluster of medico-health professions were the most frequent choices. Transfer students tended to read more than career students.

Shea (1966) did an extensive study involving community colleges in four states. Multiple instruments were used. The two main instruments were the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey

Study of Values and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. As reflected on the scales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, two-year college freshman women appeared to be more theoretical, economic, political, and religious, while less aesthetic and social than their four-year counterparts. Males in the same class category differed from their four-year freshman counterparts on four scales, economic, aesthetic, social and religious. The two-year college freshmen, regardless of sex, appeared to be practical, conforming, and ". . . who values what is useful, and does not as highly value the beautiful or the harmonious or human relationships but does value religious experience" (p. 156).

The values of two-year college students did seem to be at variance with those of the four-year students. The variance may be a partial explanation for the student choosing to begin post-secondary education at the two-year college. In a sense, then, the two-year college may indeed be the medium of transitional values it was intended to be.

The results of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were mixed. The instrument measures the need for: achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggres-

sion. Differences between the two-year college group and the normative group were found on eleven scales: five were higher (deference, order, abasement, endurance, and aggression), and six were lower (achievement, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, dominance, and heterosexuality). Two-year college students appeared to have stronger needs to defer, to be orderly, to be subservient, to be persistent, and yet to be aggressive. There would seem to be a need to try out the real world of the college. Lower intellectual needs and less sophistication of the student seem to be indicated. The author concludes, ". . . that the stereotype of the two-year college student has some basis in fact and that the guidance role of the two-year college is indeed of great importance" (p. 158).

### Summary

The review of literature revealed mixed results on the complex issue of counseling utilization. It was apparent that knowledge about counselors and counseling was limited. Few students knew that counselors held graduate degrees, or how many counselors worked in the counseling centers of their respective campuses. Counseling was perceived as being appropriate for educational problems, and more appropriate for females than for males. There appeared to be a vague and ambiguous relationship between



awareness of counseling and its use.

The perceived counselor role was reported to be that of an administrator who does counseling, not a faculty member who helps students. Friends and parents were primary sources of help for most problems. However, as more professional counselors were added to counseling staffs in order to deal with personal/emotional problems, the more the demand for these services increased.

The counselor's self-perceived role was broader than what the students expect from the counselor. Counselors felt that their roles were expanding but they were still perceived as fulfilling a limited function. There appeared to be only vague impressions of what counselors did beyond academic counseling. This lack of information was apparent at all levels of education.

Counseling was central in the student services program to facilitate the total development of students. Appropriate counseling functions discussed in the literature included goal-setting, personal assessment, development of change strategies, implementation of these strategies, and evaluation for each student. To be effective, these functions must be perceived by the student as supportive acts within a supportive institution. Counselors, too often, functioned as administrative arbiters instead of student advocates. Conflicts appeared between stated

goals and services delivered. Institutions need to support student oriented counseling functions, be they traditional or non-traditional in design.

Counseling appeared to be separated from other student activities. Most of the time was spent in academic counseling. Four-year colleges appeared to be more concerned about the "whole" student. They recognized that the students had a wide range of needs, not only the educational/vocational, and allocated resources to meet the students' needs. Most centers were served by para-professionals and consultants. Personal adjustment counseling was a growing function of the direct services delivered.

More practical research was recommended to evaluate counseling services and institutional policies. At the community college level, the academic advisement function may interfere with the need for developmental experiences the community college counseling center should facilitate.

In the area of differential studies, there were two schools of thought. A few studies offered evidence that users of the counseling service were not atypical of the student population in general. Most researchers, however, presented evidence for differences on some measurable variable. The two groups did appear to be similar on high school scholarship, aptitude for college work, ability

levels, temperament, extra-curricular activities, interests, occupational levels, and economic conservatism.

Areas of mixed results were various personality characteristics, dependency, adjustment, and socio-economic status. Measures indicated evidence both for and against these variables discriminating the two groups of interest to this study.

Evidence established differences on several variables, among them the need for achievement, career decision, curricular activities, social isolation, persistence in college, cognitive and intuitive styles, self-concept, communication difficulties, familial relationships, childhood discipline, and more neurotic scores. Men appeared to use counseling less, but were as conflicted as women in several of the studies reviewed.

The only generalization was that differences appeared to exist between the two groups. These differences appeared to be unique to each population and are dependent upon the mode of assessment.

The survey of the two-year college student characteristics appeared to confirm the stereotype of the community college student, especially when compared to their four-year college counterpart. The two-year college students appeared to come from lower socio-economic levels and had less ability and sophistication than their four-

year counterparts. There was less environmental support for the community college students to attend college. Most still lived at home. There were more females than males on campus, and freshmen outnumbered sophomores two to one. They were more often single than married, and tended to get less involved with extracurricular activities. The community college students had lower self-regard than the senior college student, and displayed a need for vocational counseling, study skills and reading remediation. Work was a part of their lives. They were practical, conforming, and not too aesthetic. The two-year student appeared not to have had experiences conducive to making decisions with certainty. They appeared to have a strong need to defer, to be orderly, subservient, persistent, and yet aggressive. Lower intellectual needs were indicated by lower needs to achieve, and less sophistication was apparent from the parochial nature of the students' exposure. The counseling component of the community college learning experience appeared to be especially relevant to students with the above profile.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

This study explores the associations between selected student characteristics and the use or non-use of Thornton Community College's counseling center. Further, the investigation seeks to identify those characteristics which discriminate between users and non-users of the counseling center services. Chapter III describes how the study was conducted including the description of the population from which the sample was selected, along with the selection process itself. The development of the Counseling Center Survey is detailed. Finally, the analysis procedures of the students' responses on the questionnaire are described.

#### Population

The sample population for this study consisted of 1,754 full-time students enrolled in college credit courses (day and evening) at Thornton Community College. The college is located in South Holland, Illinois, a suburb of Chicago. The district (510) covers a population of well over 250,000 and is diverse in its characteristics and values. Income ranges from upper middle class to welfare recipients. Racially, the district includes major minority groups which are represented on campus. The area serves as a bedroom community for commuters and houses a few major

industries locally, along with many light industrial concerns.

Thornton Community College offers the first two years of baccalaureate preparation, one-year certificates, and two-year career curriculums. It receives its current authorization to operate under the Community College Act of 1973. Thornton Community College was selected for this study since the essential diversity of the student body and the organization of counseling services allowed ready identification of users and non-users of those services. A determination to utilize one college alone was made due to the exploratory nature of the research. The research design was approved by both Loyola University of Chicago's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects and Thornton Community College, the host institution.

#### Sample

The participants of this study consisted of 150 randomly selected full-time students enrolled in college credit courses during the spring, 1979 semester at Thornton Community College. The sample included transfer and career curriculum students who attended both day and evening classes.

The sample was stratified according to user or non-user categories. Users were defined as those full-time

matriculated students who voluntarily presented themselves at the counseling center and followed the established procedure in attempting to secure counseling. The procedure involves signing up on the counselor's appointment sheet for a standard one-half hour allotted time space prior to the designated appointment time. These sign-up sheets were utilized to identify student users. Any user seeing a counselor through the established procedure was included in the sample up to the cut-off date of May 3, 1979. Non-users were defined as those full-time matriculated students not utilizing counseling services through the established procedure up to the cut-off date of May 3, 1979.

Equalization groups of 300 were generated for both categories utilizing an IBM 370 programmed table of random numbers. From each of the two equalization groups, 75 subjects were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. The stratification introduced more homogeneity by reducing variation in the population. It was not assumed that the sample population would divide on the dependent variable according to orthodox statistical reasoning. Therefore, the sample size was determined by descriptive survey methodology for studies of an exploratory nature (Leedy, 1974; Backstrom and Hursh, 1963) and a previous counseling study of similar intent (Form, 1953, p. 209).

All selected participants were contacted initially by

phone and informed of the study by the researcher. Using the same format with every telephone call, the potential participant was assured of several things which included, 1) that participation was not a prerequisite to use the center services; 2) that they were in no way obligated to participate in the study; and 3) that the results of the study would remain confidential and be used only in the aggregate, not by individual respondent. Appointments were then established for the participants. At the appointed time, there was a short interview explaining the nature of the study, a reassurance of the confidential nature of the responses including how they were going to be used, and a brief discussion of the importance of honest answers to the questionnaire items. The students were then instructed to go to the library and complete the questionnaire (Counseling Center Survey). The completed form was returned to the researcher in the counseling center.

A procedure to randomly oversample 10% was built in to the research design in order to assure a clean sample with the requisite number of cases in each group, anticipating non-responses or non-usable questionnaires which had been completed incorrectly.

### Procedures

The procedures necessary to achieve the objectives of this research included the development of the Counseling



Center Survey (see Appendix A, p. 1170). The Survey incorporated attitudinal, self-esteem, and locus of control scales, as well as counseling stigma, counseling readiness, and perceived personal usefulness of counseling scales. In addition, twenty-seven demographic groups were measured directly. These data were taken from the completed questionnaire and used to describe the sample and to determine if differences exist between users and non-users of the counseling services.

#### Instrumentation

No instrument was available covering the variables of this research. Therefore, the Counseling Center Survey was developed. The Survey was designed to cover a broad spectrum of information for the specific purpose of determining what might be associated with the use or non-use of counseling services. The items on the Survey were derived from the review of related literature and were considered appropriate for this type of research. The locus of control measure was not typical for studies of this nature. Its inclusion was purely experimental on the part of the researcher.

The questionnaire items are one of three varieties:  
1) scaled measures of variables having some relation to counseling use or non-use (attitude towards counseling,

self-esteem, locus of control, counseling stigma, readiness, and usefulness); 2) direct measures of variables thought to be of significance in studies of this nature and important in developing a description of population characteristics; and 3) demographic data.

Counseling attitude scale. The Counseling Attitude Scale (see Appendix A, Items 1-21) was constructed by A. L. Form (1955) specifically to measure students' attitudes or opinions toward counseling. For counseling service utilization, potential users must have a positive opinion of those services. Therefore, the effectiveness of counseling will, to a degree, depend upon how positive the attitude of the students is towards counseling services and the center.

The scale was constructed by creating 120 items related to attitudes toward counseling, which were then sorted by 80 judges on a continuum of positive to negative. The resultant seventy-seven items which were determined to have high discrimination values were scaled in Likert fashion. The final items on the scale were the result of of item analysis yielding the highest phi coefficients. The author reports the same items being identified through scale analysis yielding a unidimensional scale. The reliability, using a split-half technique, was reported to be 0.94, while the

reproductibility coefficient was reported to be 0.87 (Form, 1955, p. 98) both of which are acceptable. This was based upon a sample of 320 high school students; W. J. Musgrove and G. J. Musgrove (1970) reported a reliability coefficient Alpha, of 0.82 which lends further credibility to the instrument as a research tool.

Self-esteem scale. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965) consists of ten Guttman-type scaled statements (see Appendix A, Items 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, 39, and 41) to which the client responds on a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The approach is direct and attempts to be unidimensional in determining a global index of self-esteem. The instrument was normed on a population of high school students. It has subsequently been used with older populations with satisfactory results.

The scale has achieved satisfactory reproducibility and face validity. Internal factor analysis of the scale items yield two main factors in the response set, self-derogation and defense of individual worth. Wylie (1974) contends that this technical lack of unidimensionality does not effect the instruments reliability. A Silbert and Tippett (1965) study supports the Self-Esteem Scale's convergent and discriminant validity. Correlations of 0.50 were found with other self-esteem measures in all cases.

Locus of control. The construct of locus of control was developed by Julian B. Rotter (1966). It relates to where one's perception of control focuses, whether internally or externally to the person, hence, locus of control. Further, it is asserted that the more one is able to attain valued outcomes that are fulfilling and satisfying, the more likely one is to hold internal locus of control expectancies (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 25). The original instrument consisted of twenty-three forced-choice items, with six filler items, which attempted to measure internality and externality, or the degree of perceived control one has over one's reinforcement.

The present research included a nine-item adaptation of the locus of control measure. The items included are the result of a factor analysis of the original items done by Mirels (1970) at Ohio State. His results indicated that, contrary to the belief that locus of control is a unidimensional construct, it actually involves two factors: a belief that one feels mastery over one's own life and, a belief that one is capable of having an impact on the political institutions. For both internal and external statements, Factor I had the person as the target of control. For Factor II, the social system was the target of control. Therefore, it was determined that those items of either factor indicating the greatest loadings for both sexes

would be included in the survey in order to determine if locus of control could be picked up by the short form and, further, to determine if users and non-users differed on this dimension.

The nine items incorporated in the Survey were those with factor loadings of  $\pm .30$  for both males and females in Mirels factor analysis (p. 227). These items appear in Appendix A, numbers 46 through 54.

The precedent for using an abbreviated scale was established by Andrisani and Nestel (1975). They found that the data acquired using an eleven item locus of control measure during a pretest on technical school students revealed almost the exact equivalent results of the complete scale. Correlation between the two versions was reported to be 0.69, and an item analysis conducted between the two versions produced correlation coefficients comparable to the corresponding values reported in the original research (p. 225). It can therefore be concluded that an abbreviated scale may yield a nearly equivalent measure as that yielded by the complete Rotter scale (p. 226). The inclusion of this scale was purely experimental.

Remaining scale items. The remaining items utilizing a scaled measure were derived mainly from the Snyder, Hill, and Derksen (1972) survey of the counseling services at

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. The scales fall into three categories: 1) stigma; 2) counseling readiness; and 3) perceived personal usefulness of counseling. Stigma refers to whether or not counseling represents a viable alternative for help seekers in this population's culture. It includes self, peer, and parental approval of seeking help from a counselor. Readiness surveys a student's feelings about the importance of a problem. Usefulness attempts to assess the student's perception of what counseling actually does in a personal sense. Stigma is quantified by Survey questionnaire item numbers 22, 24, 26, and 28. Readiness is measured by item numbers 31, 32, and 45. Counseling usefulness is measured by item numbers 34, 36, 40, and 43. The three scales are reported by Snyder, et. al. (1972) to have had homogeneity ratios of approximately 0.33, and Cronbach alpha above 0.58 which is generally accepted to be satisfactory reliability (p. 265).

The perceived role of the counselor within the institution are quantified by items 42 and 44. They are derived from Warnath's contention that institutionally defined roles may inhibit students' use of counseling. Counselor role statements were composed by the researcher and rely on content and face validity. Their inclusion was experimental and form one variable group, that is, perceived counselor role.

Remaining survey items. Questionnaire items 55 through 113 represent primarily demographic information. This information is divided into twenty-seven groups. This information is all self-reported and is based upon self-perceptions. They are 1) health status, 2) ethnic group, 3) marital status, 4) domestic living arrangement, 5) primary language, 6) high school experience, 7) transportation to college, 8) awareness and use of counseling, 9) age, 10) sex, 11) military experience, 12) number of hours completed and curriculum, 13) educational and career aspirations, 14) activity involvement, 15) college preference, 16) parental socio-economic data, 17) birth order, 18) personal finances, 19) work experience, 20) religion, 21) previous counseling experiences, 22) childhood experiences, 23) adjustment difficulties, 24) leisure, 25) problem areas, 26) preferred helper, and 27) counselor role.

Independent readers. Six independent readers were asked to read the Counseling Center Survey and to check for face and content validity. A 70% consensus was reached on all items included in the Survey. All items not reaching this criterion were either reworded or discarded. The readers were chosen for their depth of knowledge relating to either community college populations or survey research methodology. Recognized expertise was the criterion of

their selection as readers.

Instrument pilot. The Counseling Center Survey was administered to one class of Psychology 121 students at Thornton Community College. This class was chosen because it was representative of Thornton's student population, including the spectrum of transfer and career curriculum programs. The students were all attending full-time. There was one veteran. After completion of the questionnaire, the class discussed the items, and suggested some alternative phrasing. As a result, many items were changed and some item response categories were expanded.

These modifications were subsequently integrated with the changes required by the six independent readers. The final form of the Counseling Center Survey was reviewed for content, form, and accuracy at the Survey Research Center, University of Illinois. The items were pre-coded for IBM keypunch in-put. Each subject required a three card data set. Length of the questionnaire had been limited to forty-five minutes in order to avoid systematic bias due to time.

### Design and Statistical Analysis

The main purpose of this research was exploratory. Relationships, via associations, were being mapped (Hays, 1973). The study was intended to serve as a guide for



further studies which could be more refined. The present study intends to identify statistical associations which are relatively large and thereby indicate a relationship between an independent variable and the use or non-use of counseling exists.

The data needed to answer the research questions posed in this study were the responses of the student users and non-users of the Thornton Community College counseling center services as recorded on the Counseling Center Survey. These data include: 1) an attitude towards counseling scale, which is used interchangeably with Scale 1; 2) a self-esteem scale, which is used interchangeably with Scale 2; 3) a locus of control measure, which is used interchangeably with Scale 3; 4) a measure of counseling stigma, which is used interchangeably with Scale 4; 5) a measure of counseling readiness, which is used interchangeably with Scale 5; 6) a measure of perceived counseling usefulness, which is used interchangeably with Scale 6. All ordinal data are subject to T-tests in order to determine significance.

There are a total of twenty-seven demographic variable groups which are direct measures. Each item is individually analyzed. Cross-tabulations and  $\text{Chi}^2$  values are calculated to determine associations with use or non-use of counseling. The dependent variable is usage or non-

usage of counseling center services.

All data were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) at the facilities at Thornton Community College and Loyola University of Chicago. The student responses were key-punched into 3-card data sets from the pre-coded Counseling Center Survey. Pre-coding was designed to keep mechanical error to a minimum. All completed 150 data card sets were verified before analysis.

The results are presented 1) by frequency distribution grouped by the demographic variables, which provide the profile of the community college student, and 2) the results of the T-tests for scaled measures and  $\text{Chi}^2$  values for the demographic data. These data are used to 1) describe the community college student sample, and 2) to determine the variables which are associated with the use or non-use of Thornton Community College's counseling services.

### Research Questions

Due to the exploratory nature of this research, a broad spectrum of characteristics are surveyed. Associations are then tested in order to determine if a relationship exists between the dependent variable and an independent variable. Appropriate statistical procedures in

studies of this design are cross-tabulations and  $\text{Chi}^2$  tests used on nominal data. T-tests are used on scaled data. These analyses are to determine the existence of associations, not the strength of the associations nor the cause of any apparent differences between the two groups. These analyses are expected to reveal those characteristics and attitudes which 1) are associated with use or non-use of counseling, and 2) identify those characteristics which differentiate the two groups. The data and analysis are presented in Chapter IV in three sections: 1) Characteristics of the Sample; 2) Research Questions; and 3) Discussion.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the analysis of data derived from the Counseling Center Survey. The instrument measured attitudes toward counseling, self-esteem, locus of control, counseling stigma, counseling readiness, and the perceived usefulness of counseling as well as demographic data. The chapter is divided into three sections: 1) Characteristics of the Sample; 2) Research Questions; and 3) Discussion.

#### Characteristics of the Sample

A summary of the responses to the ordinal measures of the Counseling Center Survey are presented in Table 4. The results are reported by Survey item number, analysis code, and both the absolute and the relative response frequencies.

Scale 1. The Counseling Attitude Scale consisted of twenty-one items. Positive responses were recorded for all items with the exception of item 2 which refers to the Center's adequacy in dealing with personal problems, item 11 which refers to adjustment problems, item 13 which refers to interpretation of test results, and item 18 which refers to tests used by the Center.

Table 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES  
ON SCALES 1 THROUGH 6

N = 150

---

SCALE 1 - Counseling Attitude Scale  
Code 0 = Positive Response  
Code 1 = Negative Response

---

ITEM	CODE	N	%
1	0	138	92.0
	1	12	8.0
2	0	52	34.7
	1	98	65.3
3	0	124	82.7
	1	26	17.3
4	0	113	75.3
	1	37	24.7
5	0	109	72.7
	1	40	26.7
6	0	79	52.6
	1	71	47.4
7	0	134	89.3
	1	16	10.7
8	0	141	94.0
	1	9	6.0
9	0	142	94.7
	1	8	5.3
10	0	126	84.0
	1	24	16.0

Table 4 (Continued)

ITEM	CODE	N	%
11	0	70	46.7
	1	80	53.3
12	0	80	53.3
	1	70	46.7
13	0	53	35.3
	1	97	64.7
14	0	114	76.0
	1	36	24.0
15	0	130	86.7
	1	20	13.3
16	0	136	90.7
	1	14	9.3
17	0	127	84.7
	1	23	15.3
18	0	58	38.7
	1	92	61.3
19	0	130	86.7
	1	20	13.3
20	0	131	87.3
	1	19	12.7
21	0	108	72.0
	1	42	28.0
<hr/> SCALE 2 - Self-Esteem Scale Code 0 = Positive response Code 1 = Negative response			
23	0	144	96.0
	1	6	4.0

Table 4 (Continued)

ITEM	CODE	N	%
25	0	144	96.0
	1	6	4.0
27	0	148	98.7
	1	2	1.3
29	0	136	90.7
	1	14	9.3
30	0	145	96.7
	1	5	3.3
33	0	93	62.0
	1	57	38.0
35	0	138	92.0
	1	12	8.0
37	0	93	62.0
	1	57	38.0
39	0	131	87.3
	1	19	12.7
41	0	122	81.3
	1	27	18.0

SCALE 3 - Locus of Control  
 Code 0 = Internal stimuli  
 Code 1 = External stimuli

46	0	126	84.0
	1	24	16.0
47	0	100	66.7
	1	49	32.7

Table 4 (Continued)

ITEM	CODE	N	%
48	0	140	93.3
	1	10	6.7
49	0	111	74.0
	1	39	26.0
50	0	136	90.7
	1	14	9.3
51	0	127	84.7
	1	23	15.3
52	0	69	46.0
	1	80	53.3
53	0	109	72.7
	1	41	27.3
54	0	104	69.3
	1	46	30.7
<hr/> SCALE 4 - Stigma of Counseling Code 0 = Affirmative Code 1 = Negative			
22	0	144	96.0
	1	6	4.0
24	0	144	96.0
	1	6	4.0
26	0	138	92.0
	1	12	8.0
28	0	143	95.3
	1	7	4.7



Table 4 (Continued)

ITEM	CODE	N	%
SCALE 5 - Readiness for Counseling Code 0 = Affirmative Code 1 = Negative			
31	0	122	81.4
	1	28	28.6
32	0	98	65.3
	1	52	34.7
45	0	136	90.7
	1	14	9.3
SCALE 6 - Personal Usefulness of Counseling Code 0 = Useful Code 1 = Not useful			
34	0	44	29.4
	1	106	70.6
36	0	74	49.4
	1	76	50.6
40	0	89	59.3
	1	61	40.7
43	0	94	62.7
	1	56	37.3

Scale 2. The second scale measured the sample's self-esteem on a ten-point, unidimensional scale. On all items the respondents indicated generally positive self-regard. There was small variation.

Scale 3. This scale represented an attempt to isolate and record the respondent's locus of control according to an abbreviated 9 point scale. The sample showed a preference for those items representing internal locus of control. Item 52 was an exception. Eighty percent of the sample indicated that most people do not realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings which is an external indicator.

Scale 4. Scale 4 measured the stigma of using counseling and included the willingness to ask for help, parental approval of that behavior, perception of others to the behavior, and social acceptance. The distribution of results indicated that there was no stigma attached to using counseling services.

Scale 5. This scale measured a readiness to use counseling. The students were asked if they viewed their their problems as important enough to bring to counseling, appropriate for counseling and a viable alternative. In total frequencies, the students indicated a readiness to use counseling.

Scale 6. This scale was a measure of perceived personal usefulness of counseling which indicated that 1) there is a reservation about using the center for personal problems and, 2) that there was doubt about the counselor's role as a helper who assists students achieve independence. Counselors appear to be perceived as resources who can be used to help solve problems, but that those problems are limited to ones of an educational/vocational nature.

Community college student profile. The sample characteristics present an extensive profile of the community college student. The 150 students were representative of the total full-time student population at Thornton Community College during the 1979 spring semester (see Table 5). There were more females than males. Whites were the largest racial group with Blacks and Latinos following in second and third order, respectively. The majority of students were under twenty years of age.

Table 6 reports the characteristics of the sample. The results describe the students by absolute and relative response frequencies. Table 6 is subdivided into major variable groups for greater clarity.

Personal data. Table 6a (see p. 85) revealed that health was not perceived as being a problem for the stu-

Table 5  
Representativeness of Sample

	POPULATION N = 1754	SAMPLE N = 150
<u>SEX</u>		
Male	45%	42%
Female	55%	58%
<u>RACE</u>		
Black	19%	11%
White	77%	85%
Spanish	2%	3%
<u>AGE</u>		
15 - 20	52%	61%
21 - 25	28%	19%
26 - 30	8%	7%
31 - 39	8%	7%
40 - 80	4%	6%

dents as the overwhelming majority reported a good to excellent status. The students are usually single, living at home with their parents, and they spoke English. One student spoke Spanish. Driving a vehicle owned by the student was the preferred mode of transportation to the college. Driving a parent's vehicle, riding with a

Table 6

## Characteristics of Sample Population

## (a) Personal Data

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PERSONAL DATA</u>			
55	How would you rate your health?		
	Excellent	71	47.3
	Good	75	50.0
	Fair	4	2.7
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
56	What is your race/ethnic group?		
	Black	16	10.7
	Latin	5	3.3
	White	128	85.3
	Other	1	.7
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
57	What is your marital status?		
	Single	121	80.6
	Married	28	18.7
	Living as married	1	.7
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
58	With whom do you reside?		
	With parents	110	73.3
	With Friend/Spouse	36	24.0
	Alone	4	2.7
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
59	Language spoken at home?		
	English	149	99.3
	Spanish	1	.7
	Other	0	0
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 6a (Continued)

## Personal Data

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PERSONAL DATA (CONTINUED)</u>			
62	How do you usually get to Thornton Community College?		
	Drive own car	91	60.7
	Drive parent(s) car	31	20.6
	Ride with parent/friend	16	10.7
	Public transportation	11	7.3
	Walk	1	.7
	Total	150	100.0
75	Age:		
	15 - 20	92	61.3
	21 - 25	29	19.3
	26 - 30	10	6.7
	31 - 39	10	6.7
	40 - 80	9	6.0
	Total	150	100.0
76	Sex:		
	Male	62	41.3
	Female	88	58.7
	Total	150	100.0
77	Are you a veteran?		
	Yes	12	8.0
	No	138	92.0
	Total	150	100.0
100	Indicate the religious group in which you were raised:		
	Catholic	84	56.0
	Protestant	38	25.3

Table 6a (Continued)

## Personal Data

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
PERSONAL DATA (CONTINUED)			
100	Indicate the religious groups in which you were raised:		
	Jewish	0	
	Moslem	0	
	Non-religious family	7	4.7
	Other	21	14.0
	Total	150	100.0
101	Do you still regularly practice a religion?		
	Yes	99	66.0
	No	51	34.0
	Total	150	100.0

friend or parent, and public transportation were less favored alternatives. One student walked. The students appeared to be independent on this variable.

In the full-time population, veterans appeared to be under-represented with 8% claiming veteran status. Religion was an influence in the sample population. Catholicism was the most popular religion with 56% being raised in that faith, followed by Protestantism which was the faith of 25.3%. Significantly fewer students current-

ly practice the religion in which they were raised.

High school experience. Table 6b (see p. 89) reports the results of students' rating of their high school experience. This rating was, in general, positive. Achievement levels were relatively high with the majority of students placing themselves at an average grade of B or better. Fifty-two students, 34.7%, said they were average, and only 5.3% claimed to be poor in academics. No one reported being a failure. High school preparation was not rated as highly as achievement. While some students felt well-prepared, the majority perceived their preparation as having been average or poorer than average. A perceived average high school preparation from above average students would indicate possible disappointment with high school preparation.

Counseling center information. Table 6c (see p.90 ) presents the results of the Survey items which pertain to the awareness and use of the counseling center. The results showed knowledge about the center to be very high. Only one person was not aware of the center being on campus. However, knowledge of the kinds of services offered at the center was not as universal. Of the students sampled, 41.3% did not know what counseling services were available. The most significant source of information about counseling was the orientation program conducted by



Table 6b

## High School Experience

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE</u>			
60	What was your high school grade average?		
	A	10	6.7
	B	80	53.3
	C	52	34.7
	D	8	5.3
	E	0	.0
	Total	150	100.0
61	What is your opinion of your high school preparation?		
	Excellent	15	10.0
	Good	40	26.7
	Average	62	41.3
	Below Average	26	17.3
	Poor	7	4.7
	Total	150	100.0

counseling for beginning students. College printed material was the second most important source of information followed by friends and faculty which appeared to be of equal influence. Parents were the least significant source of information. The majority of the students believed their friends would use the center.

The center appeared to be conveniently located. Of

Table 6c

## Counseling Center Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>AWARENESS OF COUNSELING CENTER</u>			
63	Did you know there was a Counseling Center at Thornton Community College?		
	Yes	149	99.3
	No	1	.7
	Total	150	100.0
64	Do you know what counseling services are available at Thornton Community College?		
	Yes	88	58.7
	No	62	41.3
	Total	150	100.0
65	Where did you hear about the Counseling Center?		
	Orientation	64	42.7
	Friend	16	10.7
	Parents	2	1.3
	Printed Material	44	29.3
	Faculty	13	8.7
	Other (Self)	11	7.3
	Total	150	100.0
66	Is the Counseling Center conveniently located for you?		
	Yes	147	98.0
	No	3	2.0
	Total	150	100.0

Table 6c (Continued)

## Counseling Center Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>AWARENESS OF COUNSELING CENTER (CONTINUED)</u>			
71	How many times have you been to counseling this semester?		
	Never	75	50.0
	1 - 5	68	45.3
	Over 5	7	4.7
	Total	150	100.0
72	What specific counseling services do you use?		
	Career	37	49.3
	Social	0	.0
	Academic	32	42.7
	Transfer	3	4.0
	Personal	1	1.3
	Transcript	2	2.7
	School Policy	0	.0
	Total	150	100.0
73	If you have seen a counselor this semester, skip this number. If not, what are the main reasons that you do not use the Counseling Center? See Table 6d.		

the users, 90.6% had utilized the counseling center between one and five times for career and/or academic counseling. Only one person reported use of personal counseling. Not one reported social problems. A summary of the reasons for the non-use of counseling appears in

Table 6d.

Career/education characteristics. Table 6e (see p. 94) reports the results of the students' educational characteristics. Sophomores and transfer students appeared to be over-represented. Freshmen are more numerous than sophomores, and career students are more numerous than transfer students. This may be due to the importance of second year students transferring to their senior institutions, or that most full-time students are transfer students. The majority planned to continue their education at another institution on either a part-time or full-time basis.

These results coincided proportionately with educational aspirations as 82% planned to obtain a minimum of a Bachelor's degree. Only 12.7% said they are stopping their education with the Associate's degree. Three-fourths will stay in the Chicago area upon being graduated, one-half will live with a friend or spouse. While it appeared most have high educational aspirations, a significantly lower percentage will strike out on their own.

Level of student involvement. In response to the idea that more involved students might use counseling less, two items were introduced in the Survey which attempted to measure this construct. Table 6f (see p. 96)

Table 6d  
Why Counseling Services Are Not Used

	# of Responses	Percent
1. No reason to see counselor	42	56.0
2. Student sees faculty member	10	13.3
3. Lack of confidence in counseling	6	8.0
4. Student too busy	5	6.7
5. No response to item	5	6.7
6. Appointment too difficult to get	2	2.7
7. Appointment too long of wait	1	1.3
8. Lack of information	1	1.3
9. Counseling superficial	1	1.3
10. Problems referred to friends	1	1.3
11. Problem not important enough	<u>1</u>	<u>1.3</u>
	75	100%

(Summary of non-user responses to Item 73)

Table 6e

## Career/Education Characteristics

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>CAREER/EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS</u>			
74	In what curriculum are you enrolled?		
	Transfer	70	46.7
	Career	63	42.0
	Certificate	6	4.0
	Undecided	11	7.3
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
78	How many semester hours will you have completed by June, 1979?		
	0- 30	60	40.0
	31- 60	65	43.3
	Over 60	25	16.7
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
79	Do you plan to graduate from Thornton Community College?		
	Yes	123	82.0
	No	27	18.0
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
80 a	What will you do when you finish/leave Thornton?		
	Work full-time and no more education or part-time student	12	8.0
		45	30.0
	Work part-time and full-time student or part-time student	63	42.0
		4	2.7

Table 6e (Continued)

## Career/Education Characteristics

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>CAREER/EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS (CONTINUED)</u>			
80 a	What will you do when you finish/leave Thornton?		
	No work		
	full-time student	26	17.3
	Total	150	100.0
80 b	What will you do when you leave Thornton?		
	Stay in Chicago area	113	75.3
	Move to other city	37	24.7
	Total	150	100.0
80 c	What will you do when you leave Thornton?		
	Live with parents/ relatives	57	38.0
	Live alone	19	12.7
	Live with friend/ spouse	74	49.3
	Total	150	100.0
82	What is the highest degree you plan to obtain?		
	Associate's	19	12.7
	Bachelor's	66	44.0
	Master's	46	30.7
	Doctorate's	11	7.3
	Other (Technical)	8	5.3
	Total	150	100.0

Table 6f

## Level of Student Involvement

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>ACTIVITIES</u>			
83	Indicate the campus activities in which you participate during the semester.		
	Sports/Athletics	18	12.0
	Student Government	1	.7
	Special Interest	7	4.7
	Informal Social Group	22	14.7
	None	102	68.0
	Total	150	100.0
84	Indicate off-campus activities in which you participate during the semester.		
	Sports/Teams/Leagues	43	28.7
	Church Groups	21	14.0
	Work	57	38.0
	Interest Groups	19	12.7
	None	10	6.7
	Total	150	100.0

presents the results. On campus, the students do not participate in activities other than informal social groups and athletics. This could be due to the fact that Thornton is a commuter campus and students are on campus just for class and then leave, or, it could be the absence of activities on campus. Off-campus, the students appeared



to be quite involved with sports and church groups, as well as special interests. Many, 68%, said they participated in no on-campus activities while only 6.7% reported no off-campus activities.

College choice factors. Table 6g (see p. 98) presents the results of the college choice items on the Survey. The summer before a semester begins appeared to be the most crucial time for making the decision to attend College. By that time, 75% of the students had decided to come to Thornton. For 25%, attendance was a last minute decision. Thornton was the first choice for a majority of the students. Being close to home was the main reason for choosing Thornton.

Socio-economic data. Table 6h (see p. 99) presents the results of the socio-economic measures. These results indicated that the majority of fathers have had a high school education, or less, which corresponded to employment levels where over one-half worked at skilled or semi-skilled occupations. The remainder had some college/technical training and worked in management or the professions. Unemployed accounted for 5.3% of fathers. Students' mothers were better educated than their fathers. More mothers had a high school diploma while the same proportion had college or technical training. Mothers employment pattern was considerably different than the fathers.

Table 6g

## College Choice Factors

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>COLLEGE CHOICE FACTORS</u>			
85	When did you decide to attend Thornton Community College?		
	Early (before 1 year)	11	7.3
	Year before semester	53	35.3
	Summer before semester	45	30.0
	Just before semester	41	27.3
	Total	150	100.0
86	When you were choosing colleges, in what order of preference was Thornton Community College?		
	First	91	60.7
	Second	41	27.3
	Third	8	5.3
	Fourth	10	6.7
	Total	150	100.0
87	Why did you decide to attend Thornton Community College?		
	Close to home	132	88.0
	Friends	0	.0
	Financial	8	5.3
	Other siblings	1	.7
	Reputation of Thornton Community College	1	.7
	Specific training	3	2.0
	Other (Undecided)	5	3.3
	Total	150	100.0

Table 6h

## Socio-Economic Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA</u>			
89	Father's education (highest attained)		
	Less than high school	35	23.3
	High school or GED	56	37.3
	Some college/technical school	38	25.3
	College graduate	16	10.7
	Professional or post-graduate	5	3.3
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
90	Father's occupation		
	Managerial/Administrative	35	23.3
	Professional	21	14.0
	Clerical/Semi-skilled	5	3.3
	Skilled/Trade	71	47.3
	Unskilled	10	6.7
	Unemployed	8	5.3
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
91	Mother's education (highest attained)		
	Less than high school	24	16.0
	High school or GED	79	52.7
	Some college/technical school	29	19.3
	College graduate	15	10.0
	Professional or post-graduate	3	2.0
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 6h (Continued)

## Socio-Economic Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA (CONTINUED)</u>			
92	Mother's primary occupation		
	Managerial/Administrative	3	2.0
	Professional	12	8.0
	Clerical/Semi-skilled	34	22.7
	Skilled/Trade	12	8.0
	Housewife	81	54.0
	Unskilled	8	5.3
	Total	150	100.0
93	Parents present marital status (Check the most appropriate <u>one</u> ).		
	Married	117	78.0
	Divorced	15	10.0
	Widowed	12	8.0
	Re-married	2	1.3
	Other (not married)	4	2.7
	Total	150	100.0
94	Estimate your parents' combined income to the best of your knowledge.		
	Under \$5,000	6	4.0
	5,001 - 10,000	17	11.3
	10,001 - 15,000	20	13.3
	15,001 - 20,000	30	20.0
	20,001 - 25,000	30	20.0
	25,001 - 30,000	22	14.7
	Over 30,000	25	16.7
	Total	150	100.0

Table 6h (Continued)

## Socio-Economic Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PERSONAL FINANCES</u>			
97	For this academic year, estimate your total personal financial resources including all sources of income (parents, work, financial aid, loans, etc).		
	Under \$3,000	66	44.0
	3,001 - 5,000	35	23.3
	5,001 - 7,000	16	10.7
	7,001 - 9,000	4	2.7
	9,001 - 12,000	8	5.3
	12,001 - 15,000	7	4.7
	Over 15,000	14	9.3
	Total	150	100.0
99	How many hours per week do you usually work for pay during the semester?		
	1 - 10 hours	13	8.7
	11 - 20 hours	36	24.0
	21 - 30 hours	32	21.3
	31 - 40 hours	19	12.7
	Over 40 hours	7	4.7
	Not employed	43	28.7
	Total	150	100.0

They were regarded first as housewives by the majority of the students. The remainder 3.3% held clerical or semi-skilled jobs, with 10% who held responsible management positions.

Home life appeared to be stable for the majority of students as 78% reported their parents as being still married. Combined parental income was normally distributed with 40% of the students reporting between \$15,000 and \$25,000 annually. This result appears to conflict with the assumption that all community college students come from lower socio-economic groups.

Personal income of the students was considerably less. The majority reported having less than \$5,000 available. For the students, it appeared that ability to work, or wanting to work was part of the reason for staying at home to go to college because they did not appear to be dependent upon their parents for economic support.

Previous counseling. The results of the sample's previous counseling experience appears in Table 6i (see p.103). The majority of students have had satisfactory results with their high school counseling which would indicate a willingness to use the services again. The most discussed problems were those of an educational nature. At the college level most students indicated that they saw counselors between one and five times. At the high school level, students most frequently saw counselors over six times. Usage in high school appeared to be greater than in college.

Table 6i

## Previous Counseling

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PREVIOUS COUNSELING EXPERIENCE</u>			
102 a	Rate your high school counseling experience.		
	Number of times:		
	1 - 5	58	38.7
	6 - 10	40	26.7
	11 - 15	19	12.7
	More than 15	21	14.0
	None	12	8.0
	Total	150	100.0
102 b	Quality:		
	Satisfactory	87	58.0
	Poor	43	28.7
	Harmful	9	6.0
	Non-applicable	11	7.3
	Total	150	100.0
102 c	Problem Discussed:		
	Anything	19	12.7
	Mostly educational	113	75.3
	Mostly personal	3	2.0
	Non-applicable	15	10.0
	Total	150	100.0
103	Have you had counseling other than at Thornton Community College or at your high school?		
	Yes	33	22.0
	No	117	78.0
	Total	150	100.0

Developmental experiences. Table 6j (see p.105) reports the results of the students' recollections and perceptions of their formative years. The majority indicated having had positive childhoods with parents who had reasonably good relationships. Families of two siblings seem to predominate. Most parents were perceived as reasonable where discipline was concerned.

Adjustment. Table 6k (see p.107) shows the measures of adjustment attempted in the study. The results indicated that most of the students do share their parents' values to a degree. A smaller percentage, 24%, have less than satisfactory communication with their parents, while 26% reported having a difficult time adjusting to adult responsibilities. The percentage of communication problems and difficulty adjustments were almost identical indicating, perhaps, some association.

Leisure activities. This study surveyed for the first time the leisure pursuits of the community college student. These are reported by 1) total sample on Table 6l, and by 2) separate group categories (Table 6m, pp. 108-109). The most preferred activity was an organized athletic activity such as a ball or a court game. Individual sports contributed 13%. Creative activities accounted for 13.2% of total activity. Reading was more



Table 6j

## Developmental Experiences

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCES</u>			
95	Rate your parents' relationship to each other.		
	Close and relaxed	85	56.7
	Formal and reserved	26	17.3
	Congenial but argumentative	26	17.3
	Tense with disagreements	13	8.7
	Total	150	100.0
96	Indicate the order of your birth in your family.		
	Only child	3	2.0
	First	40	26.7
	Second	46	30.7
	Third	33	22.0
	Fourth	14	9.3
	Other (Include adopted)	14	9.3
	Total	150	100.0
105	Indicate your general feelings about your childhood memories.		
	Clear and happy	74	49.3
	Vague and mixed	18	12.0
	Average	46	30.7
	Sad	8	5.3
	Unhappy and difficult	4	2.7
	Total	150	100.0

Table 6j (Continued)

## Developmental Experiences

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCES (CONTINUED)</u>			
105	How would you describe the way that your parents disciplined you as you were growing up?		
	Very strict	19	12.7
	Somewhat strict	94	62.6
	Usually permissive	36	24.0
	Very permissive	1	.7
	Total	150	100.0

popular than television. A great diversity of interests was apparent among the students. These interests were almost equally divided between individual and group activities.

Problem areas. Table 6n (see p. 110) reports the results of two items which asked the students to indicate the most important problem area and then, the most and least urgent problems they have. The results were mixed. As in the adjustment area, 26% reported personal problems as being most important. Educational concerns formed the largest group of problems. The most urgent problem was money which accounted for 30.7% of the responses to

Table 6k

## Adjustment Information

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>TODAY</u>			
107	Estimate the degree to which you now share your parent's values.		
	Exactly	22	14.7
	Somewhat	111	74.0
	Little	14	9.3
	Not at all	3	2.0
	Total	150	100.0
108	Rate your communication with your parents today.		
	Excellent	39	26.0
	Good	75	50.0
	Fair	26	17.3
	Poor	3	2.0
	No applicable	7	4.7
	Total	150	100.0
109	How would you rate your growth from high school teenager to responsible adult?		
	Very difficult	11	7.3
	Difficult	28	18.7
	Average	70	46.7
	Very little difficulty	29	19.3
	No problems	12	8.0
	Total	150	100.0

Table 61

Leisure Activities  
(Total Sample)

ACTIVITY	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES N = 424	TOTAL PERCENTAGES 100%
Sports	100	24.0%
Creative	56	13.2%
Reading	47	11.1%
Social	45	10.6%
Exercise	26	6.1%
Friends	25	5.9%
Swimming	16	3.8%
Hobbies	14	3.3%
Bike riding	13	3.1%
Bowling	13	3.1%
Family	12	2.8%
Camping	10	2.4%
T.V.	10	1.9%
Travel	8	1.9%
Other	28	6.6%

(Summary of student responses to Item 111)

Table 6m

Leisure Activities  
(User/Non-User Group)

ACTIVITY	USER		NON-USER	
	N=208	%	N=216	%
Sports	45	(21.6)	55	(25.5)
Creative	32	(15.4)	24	(11.1)
Reading	22	(10.6)	25	(11.6)
Social	20	(9.6)	25	(11.6)
Exercise	10	(4.8)	16	(7.4)
Friends	13	(6.3)	12	(5.6)
Swimming	6	(2.9)	10	(4.6)
Hobbies	5	(2.4)	9	(4.2)
Bike riding	8	(3.9)	5	(2.3)
Bowling	8	(3.9)	5	(2.3)
Family	7	(3.4)	5	(2.3)
Camping	5	(2.4)	5	(2.3)
T.V.	3	(1.4)	7	(3.2)
Travel	5	(2.4)	3	(1.4)
Other	19	(9.1)	9	(4.1)

(Summary of student responses to Item 111)

Table 6n

## Current Problem Areas

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PROBLEM AREA</u>			
110	Which of the following is the <u>most important</u> problem-related area for you at this time?		
	Personal	39	26.0
	Social	8	5.3
	Marital	7	4.7
	Family/Parents	15	10.0
	Educational/Courses	64	42.7
	Vocational	14	9.3
	No response	3	2.0
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>
112	If you could get help with any one problem, from anyone and at no cost to you, <u>what one</u> problem area do you consider the <u>MOST URGENT</u> ? Indicate this with an M. Which <u>one</u> is the least important? Indicate this with an <u>L</u> .		
	Most Urgent to Get Help For:		
	Sex	4	2.7
	Parents	6	4.0
	Alcohol	0	.0
	School	3	2.0
	Social	5	3.3
	Marriage	7	4.7
	Courses	10	6.7
	Religion	2	1.3
	Adjustment	10	6.7
	Education	24	16.0
	Friends	2	1.3
	Other	9	6.0
	Finances	46	30.7
	Drugs	2	1.3
	Career choice	20	13.3
	Total	<u>150</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 6n (Continued)

## Current Problem Areas

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PROBLEM AREA (CONTINUED)</u>			
112	Least Urgent to Get Help For:		
	Sex	11	7.3
	Parents	6	4.0
	Alcohol	9	6.0
	School	3	2.0
	Social	6	4.0
	Marriage	9	6.0
	Courses	2	1.3
	Religion	20	13.3
	Adjustment	6	4.0
	Education	1	.7
	Friends	5	3.3
	Other	9	6.0
	Finances	2	1.3
	Drugs	52	34.7
	Career choice	9	6.0
	Total	150	100.0

item 112m. Educational concerns accounted for 16%, career for 13.3%, and courses for 6.7%. Least urgent problems were clearly identified as drugs, 34.7%, and religion, 13.3%. The sample appeared to be very practical in their view of life in their priorities and their concerns covered a wide range of needs.

Table 6o

## Counselor Role

ITEM	CHARACTERISTIC	N	%
<u>PERCEIVED COUNSELOR ROLE</u>			
42	Support the establishment		
	Strongly Agree	6	4.0
	Agree	64	42.7
	Undecided	67	44.7
	Disagree	11	7.3
	Strongly Disagree	2	1.3
	Total	150	100.0
44	More Administrators than Faculty		
	Strongly Agree	2	1.3
	Agree	39	26.0
	Undecided	66	44.0
	Disagree	38	25.3
	Strongly Disagree	5	3.3
	Total	150	100.0

Perceived counselor role. Table 6o reports the results of items 42 and 44 which measure the students' perception of counselors. The results indicated that 91.4% agreed with the statement, or were undecided, that counselors support the establishment. The counselor role of student advocate/change agent appeared to be obscure. Further, it was apparent that the majority of students, 71.3%, viewed counselors more as administrators than



faculty, or were undecided. Both results have serious implications for perceived counselor role within an institution.

Preferred helper. Table 6p (see p. 114) presents the results of the preferred helper by problem area. It showed that students rely predominantly on parents, friends, and themselves for help with solutions to their problems. The only exceptions appeared to be the counselor (college) when problems were of a course selection nature, or a clergy member when problems were of a philosophical or religious nature. A counselor is never sought out for a student's marriage problems, and almost never for any other problem. Friends were never consulted for financial problems. Faculty members were consulted least for all problems surveyed.

#### Research Questions

All of the data were subjected to analysis according to one of two methods. Ordinal data were tested for significance using the T-test. All demographic, nominal data were subjected to cross-tabulations and the Chi<sup>2</sup> test. The data were stratified into user and non-user groups. The user group was called Group 1. The non-user group was called Group 2.

Table 7 (see p. 115) presents the results of the

Table 6p

## PREFERRED HELPER

PROBLEM AREA	PARENT(S)	FRIEND(S)	COUNSELOR (COLLEGE)	FACULTY MEMBER	CLERGY	SELF	SPOUSE	COUNSELOR (PSYCHOLOGICAL)	OTHER
PERSONAL	$\frac{33}{22.0}$	$\frac{54}{36.0}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	0	$\frac{3}{2.0}$	$\frac{33}{22.0}$	$\frac{16}{10.7}$	$\frac{3}{2.0}$	$\frac{6}{4.0}$
EDUCATIONAL	$\frac{11}{7.3}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	$\frac{109}{72.7}$	$\frac{21}{14.0}$	0	$\frac{3}{2.0}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$
SOCIAL	$\frac{23}{15.3}$	$\frac{79}{52.7}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{26}{17.3}$	$\frac{11}{7.3}$	$\frac{5}{3.3}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$
VOCATIONAL	$\frac{19}{12.7}$	$\frac{6}{4.0}$	$\frac{86}{57.3}$	$\frac{11}{7.3}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	$\frac{14}{9.3}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{4}{2.7}$	$\frac{7}{4.7}$
SEXUAL	$\frac{14}{9.3}$	$\frac{37}{24.7}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	0	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	$\frac{45}{30.0}$	$\frac{18}{12.0}$	$\frac{23}{15.3}$	$\frac{9}{6.0}$
COURSE SELECTION	$\frac{5}{3.3}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{106}{70.7}$	$\frac{22}{14.7}$	0	$\frac{11}{7.3}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{3}{2.0}$
MARRIAGE	$\frac{45}{30.0}$	$\frac{15}{10.0}$	0	0	$\frac{12}{8.0}$	$\frac{26}{17.3}$	$\frac{33}{22.0}$	$\frac{14}{9.3}$	$\frac{5}{3.3}$
FINANCIAL	$\frac{89}{59.3}$	0	$\frac{6}{4.0}$	0	0	$\frac{27}{18.0}$	$\frac{10}{6.7}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{17}{11.3}$
FAMILY	$\frac{52}{34.7}$	$\frac{40}{26.7}$	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	0	$\frac{4}{2.7}$	$\frac{25}{16.7}$	$\frac{14}{9.3}$	$\frac{8}{5.3}$	$\frac{5}{3.3}$
WORRY/TENSE	$\frac{31}{20.7}$	$\frac{47}{31.3}$	$\frac{3}{2.0}$	0	$\frac{2}{1.3}$	$\frac{38}{25.3}$	$\frac{15}{10.0}$	$\frac{9}{6.0}$	$\frac{5}{3.3}$
PHILOSOPHY/ RELIGION	$\frac{24}{16.0}$	$\frac{12}{8.0}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	$\frac{3}{2.0}$	$\frac{62}{41.3}$	$\frac{36}{24.0}$	$\frac{5}{2.0}$	0	$\frac{9}{6.0}$
DEPRESSION	$\frac{19}{12.7}$	$\frac{49}{32.7}$	$\frac{1}{.7}$	0	$\frac{5}{3.3}$	$\frac{34}{22.7}$	$\frac{13}{8.7}$	$\frac{18}{12.0}$	$\frac{11}{7.3}$

Table 7  
Scale 1  
Counselor Attitude Scale

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	T VALUE	2-TAIL PROBABILITY
Group 1 (User)	7.88	3.6	.41		
				-2.43	0.016**
Group 2 (Non-User)	9.41	4.1	.47		

Scale 2  
Self-Esteem

Group 1 (User)	1.59	1.63	0.19		
				1.73	0.086
Group 2 (Non-User)	1.14	1.56	0.18		

\*.01  
\*\*.05

analysis of Scale 1, the Counseling Attitude scale, and Scale 2, the Self-Esteem scale. Table 8 (see p. 117) presents the results of the analysis of the Locus of Control scale, Scale 3 and the stigma of counseling scale, Scale 4. Table 9 (see p. 118) presents the results of the analysis of Scale 5, counseling readiness scale. Significant differences were found on the Counseling Attitude Scale and the counseling readiness scale. The Self-Esteem scale, Scale 2, approaches a significance while Scale 4, the stigma of counseling indicates a directional relationship.

Scale 1. The Counseling Attitude Scale was significant at the 0.01 level. The mean of the user group was 7.88, that for the non-user group was 9.41. With the scoring method used, the range of possible scores was 0 to 21, 0 being the most positive score, 21 being the least positive. Therefore, it may be said that both groups appeared to have a positive attitude towards counseling which is consistent with Form's (1953) findings. The attitude toward counseling of the user group appeared to be more positive than the non-user group.

Scale 2. The Self-Esteem Scale, based on the work of Rosenberg (1965), was not significant at the 0.05 level. However, a result of 0.086 is considered to be approaching the level of significance in that the prob-

Table 8

## Scale 3

## Locus of Control

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	T VALUE	2-TAIL PROBABILITY
Group 1 (User)	2.32	1.95	.22	0.83	0.409
Group 2 (Non-User)	2.06	1.90	.21		

## Scale 4

## Counseling Stigma

Group 1 (User)	0.27	0.53	.06	1.49	0.139
Group 2 (Non-User)	0.15	0.46	.05		

Table 9  
Scale 5  
Counseling Readiness

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	T VALUE	2-TAIL PROBABILITY
Group 1 (User)	0.48	0.84	0.09		
				-1.91	0.058*
Group 2 (Non-User)	0.76	0.92	0.11		

Scale 6  
Counseling Usefulness

Group 1 (User)	1.98	0.89	0.10		
				-0.18	0.857
Group 2 (Non-User)	2.01	0.92	0.10		

\* .05

ability of a result of this size occurring by chance is only eight in one-hundred times. In research where associations are being sought rather than casual relationships, a result of this size must be considered. Group 1, the user group, scored a mean of 1.5867. The non-user group scored 1.1351. The lower score indicates higher self-esteem. The mean of the non-user group, being the lower of the two means, indicates more positive self-esteem among the non-users. This result supports the findings of Minge and Bowman (1967), and Stringham (1969).

Scale 3. The abbreviated Locus of Control measure recorded a T value of 0.83 which was too large to be significant or approaching significance. The probability factor (T value) was 0.409.

Scale 4. The Stigma of Counseling measure, derived from the Snyder, et.al. study (1973), was insignificant. The T value of 1.49 had a corresponding probability level of 0.139. This could be considered directionally significant, or indicative of an association of some importance. However, statistically, it is insignificant.

Scale 5. The Counseling Readiness scale (Snyder, 1973) was significant at the 0.058 level. Readiness measured such items as the importance of the problems, the willingness to discuss the problems with a counselor,

as well as that discussion being an appropriate recourse for the solution of the problem. A mean of 0.48 was recorded for Group 1 (users), and 0.7568 for Group 2 (non-users). The lower mean indicated a greater readiness for counseling use.

Scale 6. The Personal Usefulness of Counseling measure, again derived from the Snyder study (1973), was also insignificant at the 0.857 level which is too large to indicate either a directional measure or an approach to significance.

Remaining measures. Table 10 (see p. 121) presents the results of the cross-tabulated  $\text{Chi}^2$  values for all direct measures and demographic variables. Each item was analyzed for significance individually. The results are reported by variable groups.

Health. Item 55 asked that the students rate their present health status. Group 1 and Group 2 did not differ significantly, thus, not supporting Doleys' (1964) findings wherein users reported a high number of health problems.

Ethnic group. Item 56 asked the students to identify themselves as a member in one of six major racial groups. Group 1 did not differ significantly from Group 2.

Marital status. Item 57 described the marital status of the sample. The status was defined by one of four



Table 10  
Results of Chi<sup>2</sup> Analyses

ITEM	VARIABLE	CHI <sup>2</sup> VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
38	39	17.60748	4	0.0015**
42	43	3.92073	4	0.4168
44	45	3.70712	4	0.4471
55	56	2.22084	2	0.3294
56	57	1.20000	3	0.7530
57	58	1.21724	2	0.5441
58	59	1.03636	2	0.5956
59	60	1.00671	1	0.3157
60	61	0.50769	3	0.9172
61	62	1.19017	4	0.8797
62	63	4.15835	4	0.3850
63	64	1.00671	1	0.3157
64	65	1.34714	1	0.2458
65	66	13.90559	5	0.0162**
66	67	1.36054	1	0.2434
67	68-75	0.0	0	0.0
75	76	3.78531	4	0.4358
76	77	0.68732	1	0.4071
77	78	0.09058	1	0.7634
78	79	0.64205	2	0.7254

Table 10 (Continued)

ITEM	VARIABLE	CHI <sup>2</sup> VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
79	80	0.72267	1	0.3953
80a	81	17.47032	4	0.0016**
b	82	6.06314	1	0.0138**
c	83	2.83606	2	0.2422
81	84	0.0	0	0.0
82	85	13.16483	4	0.0105**
83	86	1.21467	4	0.8572
84	87	5.09016	4	0.2782
85	88	2.78452	3	0.4261
86	89	5.62594	3	0.1313
87	90	4.63333	5	0.4622
88	91	0.0	0	0.0
89	92	0.56241	4	0.9671
90	93	2.17116	5	0.8250
91	94	6.61840	4	0.1575
92	95	3.09295	5	0.6857
93	96	6.01880	4	0.1977
94	97	13.24270	6	0.0393*
95	98	5.62745	4	0.2288
96	99	5.83197	5	0.3229
97	100	8.42489	6	0.2086

Table 10 (Continued)

ITEM	VARIABLE	CHI <sup>2</sup> VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFIFANCE
98	101-108	0.0	0	0.0
99	109	7.54154	5	0.1834
100	110	5.35087	3	0.1478
101	111	0.47534	1	0.4905
102a	112	7.29041	4	0.1213
b	112A	3.72266	3	0.2930
c	112B	3.76159	3	0.2884
103	113	0.15540	1	0.6934
104a	114	0.0	0	0.0
b	115	0.0	0	0.0
105	116	8.28352	4	0.0817***
106	117	2.43561	3	0.4870
107	118	5.34620	3	0.1481
108	119	5.60234	4	0.2309
109	120	2.72593	4	0.6047
110	121	4.51431	6	0.6074
111	122	0.0	0	0.0
112M	123	10.33512	13	0.6663
112L	124	11.25672	14	0.6658
113a	125	10.82912	7	0.1462
b	126	4.55443	6	0.6021

Table 10 (Continued)

ITEM	VARIABLE	CHI <sup>2</sup> VALUE	DEGREE OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
113c	127	10.07313	7	0.1845
d	128	8.31774	7	0.3054
e	129	5.68660	6	0.4592
f	130	12.40646	6	0.0535*
g	131	3.57393	5	0.6122
h	132	6.82191	4	0.1456
i	133	4.88388	6	0.5588
j	134	8.23821	6	0.2212
k	135	11.28357	6	0.0800***
l	136	8.48104	6	0.2049

\*\*\* Approaching significance

\*\* .01 Level of significance

\* .05 Level of significance

categories, 1) Single, 2) Married, 3) Living as married, and 4) Other. There were no significant associations between the user or the non-user group and counseling utilization.

Living arrangement. Item 58 attempted to ascertain users and non-users domestic environment. The results

did not indicate an association with counseling utilization.

Primary language. Item 59 probed the prevalence of English as the primary language. The results did not show an association between either group and counseling utilization.

High school experience. Items 60 and 61 represent direct measures of Group 1 and Group 2 in terms of high school achievement (Item 60) and preparation for life (Item 61). Both were insignificant in relation to counseling utilization.

Transportation. Item 62 is an indirect measure of independence. The level of significance was 0.385.

Awareness of Counseling. Items 38, and 63 through 73 surveyed the students' knowledge and use of the counseling center services. The two items which showed significant associations were Items 38 and 65. Item 38 measured the students' perception of their peers' use of the center. The results were significant at the 0.0015 level (see Table 11). Users believed that their friends used the center to a greater degree than did the non-users. Item 65 related to the students' source of information about the center. This item was significant at the 0.0162 level ( see Table 12, p.127 ).

Student classification. Curriculum (Item 74) and

Table 11

## Peer Use

ITEM 38	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Strongly disagree	2	2	4 2.7
Disagree	1	12	13 8.7
Uncertain	20	31	51 34.0
Agree	49	28	77 51.3
Strongly agree	3	2	5 3.3
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 17.61  
 4 Degrees of freedom  
 Significance - 0.0015

year in school (Item 78) yielded no significant associations.

Age. Item 75 was insignificant.

Sex. Item 76 was insignificant.

Career and educational aspirations. This group of

Table 12

## Source of Information

ITEM 65	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Orientation	34	30	64 42.7
Friends	9	7	16 10.7
Parents	1	1	2 1.3
Printed material	13	31	44 29.3
Faculty	10	3	13 8.7
Other	8	3	11 7.3
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 13.90

5 Degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0162

variables yielded mixed results. Persistence in school as measured by intent to graduate was insignificant. The results obtained were contrary to the findings of Berdie and Stein (1966), and Frank and Kirk (1975) who found persistence in school discriminated the two groups. Educational plans subsequent to graduation (Item 80a) was significant at the 0.0016 level (see Table 13, p. 129). Users indicated a greater desire for full-time education after leaving Thornton Community College. Item 80b was significant at the 0.0138 level (see Table 14, p. 130). Fewer users will stay in the Chicago area after graduating from Thornton. Item 82, educational aspirations, was significant at the 0.0105 level (see Table 15, p. 131). Users indicated less desire for both Associate's and Bachelor's degrees while wanting to obtain more graduate degrees.

Activity level. Curricular and extra-curricular activities, on or off-campus, were insignificant. The results support the conclusions of Meadows and Oelke (1968) and differ from Form's (1953) finding that use tends to vary with level of activity. Users and non-users appeared to be equally involved.

College preference. The items pertaining to the factors surrounding the students' decision to attend Thornton Community College (order of preference, time of



Table 13

## Post Graduation Plans

ITEM 80 (a)	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Full-time work; no more education	4	8	12 8.0
Full-time work; part-time education	13	32	45 30.0
Part-time work; full-time education	41	22	63 42.0
Part-time work; part-time education	1	3	4 2.7
No work; full-time education	16	10	26 17.3
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 17.47  
 4 Degrees of freedom  
 Significance = 0.0016

of decision, and reason for choice) were all insignificant (Items 86, 85, and 87 respectively).

Socio-economic status. The items pertaining to the socio-economic status of the sample (Item 89 through Item 94) yielded insignificant results with the exception

Table 14

## Post Graduation Locale

ITEM 80 (b)	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Stay in Chicago area	50	63	113 75.3
Move to another city	25	12	37 24.7
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 6.06  
 1 Degree of freedom  
 Significance = 0.0138

of Item 94, estimated combined parental income. Users tend to come from homes with higher income (see Table 16, p. 132) which refutes many conclusion of lower socio-economic groups being over-represented in counseling. This was significant at the 0.0393 level.

Financial resources. Item 97, personal financial resources, did not indicate a difference between the two groups.

Employment. Item 99, hours per week employed, did

Table 15

## Educational Aspiration

ITEM 82	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Associate's Degree	3	16	19 12.7
Bachelor's Degree	32	34	66 44.0
Master's Degree	27	19	46 30.7
Doctorate's Degree (Ph.D., etc.)	7	4	11 7.3
Other	6	2	8 5.3
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 13.16

4 Degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0105

not yield an association between users or non-users of the counseling center.

Religion. Neither the religion reared in (Item 100), nor the practice of a religion regularly (Item 101) were significant.

Table 16

## Parental Income

ITEM 94	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Under \$5,000	5	1	6 4.0
\$5,001 - 10,000	6	11	17 11.3
\$10,001 - 15,000	9	11	20 13.3
\$15,001 - 20,000	12	18	30 20.0
\$20,001 - 25,000	18	12	30 20.0
\$25,001 - 30,000	16	6	22 14.7
Over \$30,000	9	16	25 16.7
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 13.24  
6 Degrees of freedom  
Significance = 0.0393

Previous counseling experience. The items relating to the students' high school counseling experience (Items 102a, b, and c, Item 103, and Item 104a and b) were all found to be insignificant.

Order of birth. Item 96 was insignificant.

Childhood experiences. There were not significant differences between users and non-users in terms of how they viewed their parents' relationship (Item 95) and their parents' rearing practices (Item 106). Childhood memories (Item 105), obtained results which approached significance (see Table 17, p. 134). The user group tended to have more positive memories of their childhood, and fewer average childhoods. This result, at the 0.0817 level, indicates that the area would need to be investigated further. Users, however, appeared to report better adjustment than non-users.

Current relationships. Item 107 measures the sample's degree of commonality with parental values today. Item 108 measures the quality of communications with parents today. Both were insignificant.

Adjustment. Items 109 and 110 surveyed the relative difficulty the two groups had in their adjustment from adolescence to adulthood. The results were insignificant.

Problem area. Item 112 requested the sample to indicate their most, and least urgent problem area.

Table 17

## Childhood

ITEM 105	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Clear and happy	50	38	74 49.3
Vague	14	4	18 12.0
Average	18	28	46 30.7
Sad	5	3	8 5.3
Difficult	2	2	4 2.7
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> - 8.28  
 4 Degrees of freedom  
 Significance = 0.0817

While the results are informative, they were statistically insignificant.

Perceived counselor role. Items 42 and 44 represented an attempt to quantify the contention that institutionally defined roles limit the usefulness of counselors

as student advocates. While the frequency distributions of the sample indicated some support of the association, the two groups did not differ statistically.

Preferred helper. Item 113, a table of problem areas matched with sources of available help, yielded two significant results. Item 113f, course selection, was matched with college counselor at a significance level of 0.0535 (see Table 18, p. 136). Item 113k, philosophy/religion, was matched with clergy at a significance level of 0.0800 (see Table 19, p. 137).

### Discussion

Part one of this chapter, Characteristics of the Sample, described the community college student at Thornton Community College in the spring, 1979 semester. Based upon the distribution of responses to the Counseling Center Survey, the "average" student appeared to be a combination of the stereotyped image of the community college student in some ways, but truly unique in other ways.

The student would be caucasian, have a positive attitude towards counseling, and have generally high self-esteem. Locus of control would be primarily towards internality indicating a tendency towards independence. Health would not be a problem; the student would be

Table 18  
Course Selection

ITEM 113 (f)	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Parents	3	2	5 3.4
Friends	1	0	1 0.7
Counselor (College)	60	46	106 72.1
Faculty	5	17	22 15.0
Self	4	7	11 7.5
Spouse	0	1	1 0.7
Counselor (Psychological)	0	1	1 0.7
Column total	73 49.7	74 50.3	147 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 12.40  
6 Degrees of freedom  
Significance = 0.0535



Table 19

## Philosophy/Religion

ITEM 113 (k)	USER GROUP 1	NON-USER GROUP 2	ROW TOTAL
Parents	15	9	24 17.0
Friends	2	10	12 8.5
College Counselor	1	0	1 0.7
Faculty	3	0	3 2.1
Clergy	30	32	62 44.0
Self	17	19	36 25.5
Other	1	2	3 2.1
Column total	75 50.0	75 50.0	150 100.0

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 11.28

6 Degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0800

single, living at home, and speaking English. High school preparation was perceived as average while achievement level was rated above average. The student would have high educational aspirations.

Knowledge of the Counseling Center was due to an orientation program or printed material, and the student would use career or academic counseling services. In high school, the student would have seen a counselor, with satisfactory results, at least ten times. In college, this student would use counseling between one and five times, and perceive peers as using these services.

Thornton appeared to be the college of preference with the decision to attend college having been made at least by the summer before the semester began. The student has varied interests which are fulfilled off-campus. On-campus, activity involvement is almost non-existent.

The mother of the student would be better educated than the father. Fathers worked at a skilled or semi-skilled occupation. Both mother and student worked at least part-time. The relationship with parents appeared to be good with relatively open communication between the parents and the student. The student would have had little trouble adjusting to adulthood. Education was the main concern of the student, religion and drugs the least concern. The student would rely on friends, parents, and

self for help with problems except those of an educational or financial nature. Faculty members appeared to be the least utilized resource available to students. The student perceived the counselor as supporting the establishment and more of an administrator than a faculty member. The role of student advocate for counselors appeared to be obscure.

The Illinois Community College Board endorses the role of student advocate for counselors that emphasizes the development of the "whole" student. The educational experience is to provide these developmental experiences. The community college, "the people's college," is supposed to humanize as well as educate (O'Banion, 1971). Counseling is the key component in the college's student services program. As such, counseling should be perceived as providing the developmental experiences by the student body. The results of this study revealed that the perceived role of the counselor, beyond that of an academic advisor, is vague. Whether or not this was due to institutionally defined parameters, or counselors' self-perception, was not determined.

Associations were determined to exist between use or non-use of counseling and nine Counseling Center Survey measures, two scales and seven demographic variables. The Counseling Attitude Scale, Scale 1, was significant at the

.01 level. Users appeared to have a higher opinion of counseling than did non-users. The counseling readiness measure, Scale 5, yielded a result which was significant at the .05 level. Users were more inclined to discuss their problems with counselors. Item 38, significant at the .001 level, indicated that counseling use was perceived as more widespread among users than non-users. Item 65, which was significant at the .01 level, revealed that users rely more on orientation and less on printed material for their knowledge about counseling. Non-users acquired their information more from college printed material than from orientation.

Educational aspirations yielded strong associations with counseling use. Item 80a, which was significant at the .01 level, indicated that users had a greater desire to continue full-time education after graduation. Item 80b, which was significant at the .01 level, indicated that users will leave the Chicago area upon graduation. Item 82, significant at the .01 level, indicated that users had higher educational aspirations. Fewer users would terminate at the Associate's level, and more desired graduate level degrees than did non-users.

The only socio-economic data which was significant was Item 94, estimated parental income, and that was significant at the .03 level. Users appeared to come from

homes with higher reported income.

The problem area/preferred helper grid revealed one association of significance. Item 113f, course selection and college counselor was associated at the .05 level. This reflects a system of advising which incorporates faculty members in the advising process. What appears to be of interest is that a sizable number of students who are non-users and had faculty advisors assigned, still chose a counselor for course selection over a faculty member.

One scale, the Self-Esteem measure, approached significance, as did two demographic variables. Self-esteem, Scale 2, was significant at the .08 level. Users appeared to have lower self-regard than the non-users. Item 105 yielded an association significant at the .08 level. Users appeared to have had happier childhood memories than did non-users, and thus, appeared to be possibly better adjusted. Item 113k, the philosophy/religion problem area, was significant at the .08 level, also. Users and non-users appeared to choose a clergy member with whom to discuss problems of this nature. Users chose parents more and friends less than did the non-users who chose both equally.

Users appeared to be slightly more dependent upon parents than non-users. Non-users appeared to have had

less happy childhoods than did the users, and are having more problems adjusting to adult responsibilities. It would appear that both users and non-users could benefit from the developmental experiences which are supposed to be a part of the community college learning experience, albeit for different reasons. Clearly, differences were established between selected characteristics and use or non-use of counseling. Conclusions and recommendations follow in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Recapitulation

In the last two decades, the community college has grown tremendously in response to societal needs. This growth has been attributed in part to services not offered elsewhere in higher education such as low tuition, open-door admissions, flexible curricula, and extensive guidance and counseling services. The community college, as a result, has effectively been rendered available to all who desired post-secondary education.

The task of the community college is to meet the students where they are and help them to their next step of growth. In the process, the students are to be helped in the formation and pursuit of meaningful goals. Where institutional procedures are not appropriate to meet these ends, it falls upon counseling to provide the services which will help the students benefit from the learning which is the promise of the community college. Because of the great demands being placed upon community colleges, and perhaps the even more strenuous burdens upon their counseling services, it is essential those services be

maximized. It is necessary to know the students and their needs.

### Purpose

This study explores the association between selected characteristics and attitudes of students with their use or non-use of counseling services. The knowledge gained from the students' responses to the administered questionnaire was instrumental in determining the distribution of the population characteristics as well as providing more information to the community college student which is presently lacking. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, research questions were posed in order to establish if characteristics existed which yielded associations of sufficient strength so as to distinguish users from non-users. There was no hypothesis testing of differences between groups per se.

The lack of information on community college population is a further stimulus to this study. Non-users of the services were included to determine if users were truly representative of the student body in general, and if not, what variables would differentiate the two groups. These differences may be used to more effectively service users and reach those not presently serviced by the center.



## Research Questions

The problem statement of this research may be simply put: Are there characteristics and attitudes which differentiate users from non-users of counseling, and if so, what are they?

The questions were categorized by mode of measurement and analysis. There were six scales and twenty-seven variable groups. The six scales addressed the following questions:

- 1) Is there an association between attitude towards counseling and use or non-use of counseling services?
- 2) Is there an association between self-esteem and use or non-use of counseling services?
- 3) Is there an association between a locus of control measure and use or non-use of counseling?
- 4) Is there an association between counseling stigma and use or non-use of counseling?
- 5) Is there an association between counseling readiness and counseling use or non-use?
- 6) Is there an association between perceived usefulness of counseling and its use or non-use?

The twenty-seven variable groups are basically self-reports. They are defined as direct measures of the variables in question. Those variable groups are: 1) perceived health, 2) race, 3) marital status, 4) domestic

environment, 5) language spoken, 6) high school experience, 7) transport independence, 8) awareness and use of counseling, 9) age, 10) sex, 11) military status, 12) student classification (hours completed and curriculum), 13) educational and career aspirations, 14) activity involvement, 15) college choice factors, 16) socioeconomic data, 17) personal resources, 18) employment, 19) religion, 20) previous counseling experience, 21) birth order, 22) childhood, 23) adjustment, 24) leisure activities, 25) problem areas, 26) preferred helper, and finally, 27) perceived counselor role.

### Review of the Literature

This study was the first on the topic of differential characteristics of users and non-users of a community college counseling center. Due to the paucity of information on counseling utilization with community college populations, similar studies conducted at senior institutions were reviewed.

Counseling was analyzed and defined by the factors influencing counseling use. Sixty-six percent of the senior institutions surveyed offered organized counseling services. The major services provided were educational, vocational, and personal counseling. These schools emphasized psychological services and were more

oriented to personal counseling. Two year college counseling appeared to be organized towards an advisement function. This may be at odds with the mandate of counseling within community colleges to provide for more developmental experiences.

A review of studies concerning differential variables among users and non-users of counseling revealed significant differences between the two groups. Differences appeared between students presenting personal as opposed to educational/vocational problems. Persistence in school, grade point average, and vocational decision were supported by the research as having discriminant value. Measures of dominance, self-abasement, personal and social adjustment indices (including family relationships and communication patterns), as well as self-esteem measures, provided further evidence of differences between the two populations. Socio-economic status did not always differentiate the two groups.

A survey of community college student characteristics which would affect counseling use disclosed tremendous variation from school to school and year to year. In general, two year students appear to come from lower income groups and be of lower ability. Most wanted to live at home. Females were in the majority. Freshmen

doubled sophomores; veterans were decreasing; minorities were increasing. Students have less environmental support for attending college, are more career oriented and less involved in extra-curricular activities and less inclined to get involved because of lower self-regard than their four-year counterparts. Marital status varied with the institution.

Most community college students appeared to need study and reading skills remediation and vocational counseling. Business, social science, education, engineering and a cluster of health professions are the preferred majors. A large portion, however, are undecided. Both sexes were religious and concerned with economics. Both appear to be practical and conforming. Values appeared to be a factor in choosing a two-year college. In this sense, the counseling component of the student's learning is crucial to the role of the community college as a medium of values transition. Two-year students appeared to have strong needs to defer, to be more structured and subservient. Lower intellectual needs and less sophistication further indicated the need for strong counseling programs.

#### Procedures and Methodology

The research design was intended to increase the power of the study to discriminate between users and non-

users of counseling. Procedures and methodology are outlined below:

1) From the review of literature and counseling experience, items of interest were identified which were related to user/non-user differentials. These items were incorporated in the Counseling Center Survey. The instrument was validated by six independent readers and a pilot test. The items used all received a 70% consensus. Since the instrument utilized scales derived from other studies which already had reliabilities established, the majority of the questionnaire items were deemed to need only face and content validation.

2) Users and non-users of counseling were identified from the 1979 spring semester of Thornton Community College students. Equalization groups were created. Seventy-five students were randomly selected from each group. A 10% oversample procedure was utilized to anticipate non-responses and incomplete data sets. The data used for the analysis were taken from the Counseling Center Survey. Each scale was coded and analyzed separately. The remaining items were analyzed individually. Ordinal data were subjected to T-tests. Nominal, demographic data were analyzed by using cross-tabulations and  $\text{Chi}^2$  values.

### Results of the Study

A profile of the spring, 1979 semester full-time student of Thornton Community College was constructed from the sample characteristics. The students appeared to be of above average ability as measured by their self-rated high school achievement levels. They also reported being from average to above average income homes. This is contrary to the stereotype of the community college student and does not support the findings of previous researchers on these two dimensions (Smith and Lyons, 1968; Rehberg, 1976). It must be stated that the community college student may be of lesser ability and from lower socio-economic homes than their four-year counterparts, however, the evidence indicated that both ability level and income level were higher than expected.

The community college student appeared to be self-supporting, either out of necessity or desire. Therefore, contrary to Koos' (1970) findings, low tuition may not be as important as being close to home (Patton, 1974) as the most important reason for choosing a community college. The majority of the students, did chose Thornton for the latter reason. The students displayed a consistent desire to remain at home.

Students of both sexes appeared to be practical (fi-

nances were their most immediate concern) and religious (well over half still practice a religion regularly), findings which supported the work of Shea (1966). Women outnumbered men almost three to two, which was consistent with other surveys, Tschechtelin's (1974) in particular. The profile revealed a sample with diverse characteristics. The response patterns indicated few strong intellectual needs.

Whites constituted the majority of the sample. The students were young and single, in many ways very similar to four-year college students. All but one student knew there was a counseling center on campus. Fewer knew what services were offered which is consistent with Form's (1953) and Snyder, Hill, and Derksen's (1973) results. Career and academic counseling accounted for most of the counseling services used. Most users visited between one and five times, a finding which supports King and Matteson (1959) and Form (1953). The college orientation program proved to be the most important single source of information about counseling, followed by printed material and friends, in descending order of frequency. A lack of need was the reason most frequently given by non-users for not coming to the center, reinforcing a perception of counseling as a passive, non-integrated agency in the campus life of the student.

Sophomores were over-represented in the sample, as were transfer students. This could be a result of the emphasis placed upon transferring to senior institutions by the second year students. Also, freshmen appear to use counseling less. The majority of students planned to graduate from Thornton. An even greater number aspired to more education beyond their Associate's degree. The most sought after degree was the Bachelor's degree. The desire to leave the Chicago area was not as universal. The students appeared to prefer their home turf. On-campus, almost three-fourths of the students were not involved in any activity. Off-campus, only a small fraction were not involved in some kind of activity. The leisure activities preferred were sports, creative activities such as acting, singing, and sewing, and reading. These results support 1) the commuter student stereotype, or 2) that these types of activities simply were not a part of student campus life.

Fathers appeared to be less educated than mothers. Home life appeared to be stable for three-fourths of the students. Half of the homes had mothers and students who worked at least part-time. The majority of the students had normal childhoods with parents who were characterized as being close, and who currently share the values of their parents to at least some degree. The



students appeared to have good communication with their parents. Again, a majority of students had had counseling in high school with satisfactory results.

One-fourth of the students stated that personal and social problems were their most important problem area. Only one student out of 150 would bring personal problems to a counselor even though all of the students felt that their problems were important enough to seek out help. Friends and parents were the main sources of help for the student in need, a finding which supports those of Snyder, Hill, and Derksen (1973). The counselor and counseling appeared to be perceived as fulfilling a limited function, while the results of this study indicated that the students' needs cover a much wider range than those of an educational or vocational nature.

Statistical associations were found on two scales and seven demographic variables. Results approaching significance were found on one scale and two demographic variables.

Scale 1. The Counseling Attitude Scale yielded a T-value significant at the .016 level. Users had a higher opinion of counseling than did the non-users.

Scale 2. The self-esteem measure yielded a result which was approaching significance at the .08 level. This

would seem to indicate that users had less self-regard than non-users.

Scale 5. The counseling readiness scale was significant at the .058 level. Users were more willing to discuss their concerns with a counselor than were non-users.

Item 38. Peer use of the center was significant at the .01 level. Users more than non-users felt that their friends used counseling.

Item 65. Source of information regarding the counseling center was significant at the .01 level. Users relied more on orientation than did the non-users, while the non-users relied more on printed material than did the users.

Item 80a. Post-graduation plans were significant at the .001 level. Users consistently indicated a greater desire to continue their education full-time after being graduated from Thornton Community College.

Item 80b. Post-graduation location was significant at the .01 level. Users will leave the Chicago area in greater numbers than non-users upon completion of the work at Thornton.

Item 82. Educational aspirations were significant at the .01 level. Users indicated less intent to terminate their education at the Associate's level, while

they indicated a greater desire for more graduate degrees.

Item 94. Estimated parental income was significant at the .03 level. Users came from homes with higher reported incomes.

Item 105. Childhood memories approached significance at the .08 level. Users appeared to be better adjusted in that they reported happier childhoods.

Item 113f. Course selection was significant at the .05 level. Non-users selected counselors for course selection over faculty members.

Item 113k. Philosophy/religion was approaching significance at the .08 level. Users relied more on parents than friends while non-users relied on both equally. Both groups indicated clergy equally for their first choice.

### Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from this study. It is important to remember, however, that this study sought to determine if associations, or relationships, existed between selected student attitudes and characteristics, and their use or non-use of counseling services. The conclusions pertain only to those associations found to exist in the spring, 1979 semester sample.

1. Users were more willing, or ready, to discuss their problems with a counselor. Those problems were

limited to educational and/or career matters. Although there appeared to be no stigma attached to the use of counseling, users, to a greater degree than non-users, believed that their friends used counseling, a conclusion which indicated that seeking counseling was generally more acceptable for users.

2. Users appeared to have much higher educational aspirations than non-users and will leave their home area in greater numbers upon completion of their two-year degree than will non-users. In these respects, the user group resembled their four-year counterparts more than the non-user group.

3. Different counseling approaches were indicated for the users and the non-users. The users, though they came from higher income homes, tended to have less self-regard and were more dependent. Non-users indicated lower educational aspirations and less desire to leave the home area. For the users, decision-making skills and self-enhancing experiences would seem to be indicated. For the non-users, enrichment experiences would seem to be especially crucial if these are to be the only years in higher education.

4. Counselors are perceived as fulfilling a limited function. Their role is not clear beyond that of academic

advising. The counselor was not perceived as a change agent, or student advocate. Either counselors do only academic advising or the students need to know more about counseling.

5. The Counseling Center appeared to be serving successfully the role of an academic advisement agency for a young, middle-class, transfer student population that would be comfortable in such a setting. The study results indicated that students' and their needs were of a much wider range. Therefore, the orientation of counseling services need to be expanded to a cluster of services more appropriate to the total student population.

6. Users relied on orientation for information about counseling more than on college printed material. Non-users relied more on printed material for their information. Neither group relied upon the faculty, which is the most important single source of information for the students about college affairs.

7. Users of counseling were more positive towards counseling than were non-users. Use of counseling appeared to foster a more positive attitude towards counseling.

8. The Counseling Center appeared to be that, a center, conveniently located, yet separated from other school

activities. As the community college students were commuters, they were on campus for class and then left, usually for home or work. Neither Counseling's activities, nor their approaches to the student, indicated a sensitivity to this fact. Counseling appeared not to be integrated with the educational effort in a developmental sense, in order to facilitate the total human development of the student, to maximize the student's chances of reaching their fullest potential, but was of a more passive nature, limited to career/academic advising.

#### Recommendations

1. Counselors were perceived as fulfilling a limited academic advisory function. Counselors may, 1) assume that students want them to continue to fulfill this circumscribed function, or 2) use this feedback to examine their image and role to determine if they are fulfilling responsibilities which are congruent with their professional expectations and training. Further research on the interaction of students' perception of counseling, counselors' self-perceptions, and the influence of institutional expectations on the counseling function is needed to establish a baseline for the creation and implementation of a truly humanistic model of counseling for the community college system, a model which integrates advis-

ory functions with developmental experiences.

2. Both users and non-users relied more on parents and friends for help than they did on counselors. Therefore, alternative counseling models which involve peers and/or parents would extend counseling effectiveness through the media of preferred helpers. These models may take the form of group counseling, peer counseling, guidance councils, class activities, student work-shops, informal rap sessions. Such methods would accomplish several objectives: 1) increase efficiency of counseling; 2) reach more students with innovative approaches; 3) offer alternatives to students not comfortable in a traditional counseling setting; and 4) offer a dynamic image of counseling to the students.

3. Counselors need to initiate out-reach activities relevant to the students' developmental needs. These activities might take the form of interest activity groups based on the stated leisure activities surveyed in this study, or, skills activities which could include the teaching of goal setting, personal assessment, the development of change strategies, and the implementation and evaluation of these strategies. These functions are appropriate to developmental counseling and the needs of the students.

4. Information about counseling needs to be disseminated at all levels of the college and the community.

Specific counseling services were not known by the students. Thus, as faculty members were the least utilized resource according to the preferred helper matrix, but the most accessible to the students, the counselors, by becoming more actively involved with the faculty, would enhance the resource value of both as well as increasing the amount of information available to the students.

5. Further research is needed to establish definite associations in the two areas where only directional relationships were found in this study. The two areas are 1) self-esteem, and 2) early developmental experiences, both of which were significant at the .08 level. Significant associations would provide further support for a developmental model of counseling.

6. Associations were established on nine measures of the present study which utilized full-time students as the sample population. These variables should be subjected to more refined analysis controlling for sex, age, race, student's curriculum and year in college. In addition, as part-time students form the majority of students currently enrolled in community college, a duplication of this study with the part-time student population would increase the counselor's insight into the needs of the total student population.



7. Two variables explored in the present study, but which yielded insignificant associations, need to be investigated further. These are 1) locus of control and 2) the identification of students with personal problems. Due to the tendency of users toward dependent behavior, a criterion referenced locus of control measure would add to counseling knowledge by establishing this variable as a discriminator of users from non-users. The identification of students with personal problems is necessary for three reasons. 1) Personal problems were indicated as the most important problem area by 25% of the students in the sample. 2) Counseling needs to know if these students are non-users, or a sub-group of users. 3) Identification of these students would enable counseling to assess their needs so as to better fulfill them, as well as to determine whether their problems were chronic or acute, results which would indeed add significantly to the counselor's body of knowledge.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, G. A survey of college counseling facilities. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 540-543.
- Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. A longitudinal study of the labor market experience of men. Manpower Research and Development Monograph 15, U.S. Department of Labor, 1975.
- Atkinson, D. R., Froman, T., Romo, J., & Mayton, D. M. The role of the counselor as a social activist: Who supports it? School Counselor, 1977, 25, 85-91.
- Backstrom, C. H., & Hursh, G. D. Survey research. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Baller, W. R. Characteristics of college students who demonstrate interest in counseling services. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1944, 35, 302-308.
- Berdie, R. F., & Stein, J. A comparison of new university students who do and do not seek counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 310-317.
- Bisno, H. Professional status and professional policies: A heterodox analysis. Counseling News and Views, 1960, 12, 4-11.
- Campbell, D. P. Achievements of counseled and non-counseled students twenty-five years after counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 287-293.
- Carmody, J., & Shevel, L. Two-year follow-up of responses to selected biographical inventory items among junior college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 126-128.
- Clark, D. D. Characteristics of counseling centers in large universities. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 817-823.
- Cooke, M. K., & Kiesler, D. J. Prediction of college students who later require personal counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 346-349.

- Davis, A. G. Student characteristics revealed through individual psychological counseling services. Unpublished manuscript, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC ED 087 494).
- Doleys, E. J. Differences between clients and non-clients on the Mooney Problem Check List. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1964, 6, 21-24.
- Fields, R. R. The community college movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962.
- Form, A. L. Measurement of student attitudes towards counseling services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 32, 1953, 84-87.
- Form, A. L. The construction of a scale on attitudes toward counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 96-102.
- Form, A. L. Users and non-users of counseling services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1953, 32, 209-213.
- Frank, A. C., & Kirk, B. A. Differences in out-comes for users and non-users of university counseling and psychiatric services: A 5 year accountability study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 252-258.
- Gaudet, F. J., & Kulick, W. Who comes to a vocational guidance center? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 33, 211-214.
- Gleazer, E. J. This is the community college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1968.
- Grant, C. W. How students perceive the counselor's role. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 32, 386-388.
- Greenfield, N. S., & Fey, W. F. Factors influencing utilization of psychotherapeutic services in male college students. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, 12, 276-279.
- Havighurst, R. J. Social and cultural changes molding the future of the American people. Buffalo Studies, 1966, 2, 17-29.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for the social sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

- Heilbrun, A. B. Personality differences between adjusted and maladjusted college students. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 341-346.
- Helfgot, S. R. A philosophical statement on student development and the role of counseling in Illinois community colleges. Illinois Council of Community Colleges, 1975.
- Hoover, B. College students who didn't seek counseling during a period of academic difficulty. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 28 (4-A), 1298.
- Hudesman, J., Weisner, E., & Waxman, M. Urban community college students' perceptions of counseling. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1976, 17, 410-412.
- Ivey, A. E. Performance of students counseled at a university counseling center. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 347-351.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research, (2nd Ed). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kerr, C. The open-door colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1974.
- King, P. T., & Matteson, R. W. Student perception of counseling center services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 37, 358-364.
- Knoell, D. M. Understanding diverse students. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1973, 1, 1-148.
- Koos, L. V. The community college student. Gainesville, Fla: University of Florida Press, 1970.
- Leaverton, W. W. The counselor's role as perceived by the students and counselors. Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, Denver, Colorado, July, 1976.
- Leedy, P. D. Practical research planning and design. New York: MacMillan, 1974.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1976.

- Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952.
- Litwack, L., Getson, R., & Saltzman, G. Research in counseling. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1968.
- McCants, G. Counseled and non-counseled Virginia State College students' perceptions of counseling and of personal adjustment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35 (6-A), 3428.
- McCloud, W. T. Student characteristics associated with use and non-use of Washington State University student counseling services. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University, 1968.
- McConnell, T. R. A general pattern for American public higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Mason, E. J., Arnold, D. S., & Hyman, I. A. Expectations and perceptions of the role of the guidance counselor as described by students and parents. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 188-199.
- Meadows, M. E., & Oelke, M. C. Characteristics of clients and non-clients. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 153-157.
- Mechanic, D., & Greenley, J. The prevalence of psychological distress and help-seeking in a college student population. Social Psychiatry, 1976, 11, 1-14.
- Medsker, L. L., & Trent, J. W. The influence of different types of higher institutions on college attendance from varying socio-economic and ability levels. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1965.
- Mendelsohn, G. A., & Kirk, B. A. Personality differences between students who do and do not use a counseling facility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 341-346.
- Miller, T. M. A study of counseling services in two-year colleges. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1979, 20, 9-14.

- Minge, M. R. Counseling readiness as readiness for change. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 197-201.
- Minge, M. R., & Bowman, T. F. Personality differences among non-clients and vocational-educational and personal counseling clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 137-139.
- Minge, R. M., & Cass, W. A. Student perceptions of a university counseling center. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 141-144.
- Minium, E. W. Statistical reasoning in psychology and education. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Mirels, H. L. Dimensions of internal versus external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 226-228.
- Monroe, C. R. Profile of the community college. Washington, D. C.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Musgrove, W. J., & Musgrove, G. L. High school students' attitudes toward guidance and counseling services. Paper presented at the Florida Personnel and Guidance Association, November, 1976.
- Nugent, F. A., & Pareis, E. N. Survey of present policies and practices in college counseling centers in the United States of America. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 94-97.
- O'Banion, T. Humanizing education in the community college. Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42, 657-658.
- O'Banion, T. New directions in community college student personnel programs. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Patton, K. Entering class of fall, 1973: Demographic data report. Atlantic Community College, Mays Landing, N.Y., 1974.
- Public Community Colleges in Illinois, Illinois Community College Board, Springfield, IL, 1979.
- Public Junior College (The), The fifty-fifth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, IL, 1956.

- Raines, M. R. The student personnel situation. Junior College Journal, 1968, 36, 6-8.
- Rehberg, R. A. The two-year college entrant: Comparisons with the high school graduate and with the four-year college entrant. Center for Social Analysis, State University of New York, Binghamton, 1976.
- Richardson, L. H. Grade patterns of counseled and non-counseled students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 160-163.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rossman, J. E., & Kirk, B. A. Comparison of counseling seekers and non-seekers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 184-188.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).
- Rotter, J. B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 56-67.
- Schneidler, G. G., & Berdie, R. F. Representativeness of college students who receive counseling services. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1942, 33, 545-551.
- Sharf, R. S., & Bishop, J. B. Adjustment differences between counseled and non-counseled students at a university counseling center. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 509-512.
- Shaw, M., & Wright, J. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Shea, T. H. The two-year college transfer student. . . An interim report. Buffalo Studies, 1966, 1, 155-171.
- Silber, E., & Tippet, J. S. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1,017-1,071.
- Simon, K. Projections of education statistics to 1979-1980. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971.

- Smith, N. A., & Lyon, M. E. High school seniors: A junior college or a four-year college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 105-108.
- Snyder, J. F., Hill, C. E., & Derksen, T. P. Why some students do not use university counseling facilities. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 263-268.
- Stringham, M. C. Factors pertaining to the utilization or non-utilization of psychological counseling services in a liberal arts college. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30 (2-A), 556.
- Student Characteristics Report, Fall, 1977. Metropolitan Community Colleges of Kansas City, Missouri, Division of Planning and Development, 1977.
- Survey of student and counselor perceptions of the emphasis placed on specific counselor functions in Michigan community colleges. Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1969.
- Thornton Community College 1979-80 Catalog. Hammond, IND: Sheffield Press, 1979.
- Thornton Community College Student Handbook, 1979-80. Thornton Community College, South Holland, IL, 1979.
- Tschechtelin, J. A picture of change: Characteristics and trends of Harford Community College students. Harford Community College, Bel Air, Maryland, 1974.
- Wagshal, P. Learning Tomorrow: Commentaries on the future of education. Praegar Special Studies, New York, 1979.
- Warnath, C. F. College counseling: Between the rock and the hard place. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1972, 51, 229-236.
- Warnath, C. New myths and old realities: College counseling in transition. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Wattenberg, W. W. Who needs counseling? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1953, 32, 202-205.
- Wells, C. E., & Ritter, K. Y. Paperwork, pressure, and discouragement: Student attitudes toward guidance services and implications for the profession. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1979, 58, 170-175.



- Williamson, E. G., & Bordin, E. S. Evaluating counseling by means of a control group experiment. School and Society, 1940, 52, 434-440.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.
- Winstead, P. C., & Hobson, E. N. Institutional goals: Where to from here? The Journal of Higher Education, 1971, XLII, 669-677.
- Wolf, J. C., & Dameron, J. D. Counseling center functions in two-year and four-year colleges. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 482-485.
- Wylie, R. C. The self-concept: A review of methodological considerations and measuring instruments (Rev. Ed.) Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

## APPENDIX A

## COUNSELING CENTER SURVEY

DEAR STUDENT:

THIS STUDY IS PART OF A RESEARCH PROJECT SPONSORED BY LOYOLA UNIVERSITY AND SUPPORTED BY THORNTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE. THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY IS ON COUNSELING CENTER SERVICES AND WHO DOES OR DOES NOT USE THEM. TO UNDERSTAND BOTH BETTER, YOUR OPINION IS IMPORTANT. PLEASE COMPLETE EVERY ITEM IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE UNLESS INSTRUCTED SPECIFICALLY TO DO OTHERWISE.

YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROJECT IS UNDERSTOOD TO BE COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY AND YOUR COOPERATION IS TRULY APPRECIATED.

### ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

ALL INFORMATION WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE AND WILL NOT BE RELEASED OR DISCLOSED TO OTHERS. THERE IS NO WAY FOR IDENTIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS OR INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES. YOUR ANSWERS (WHICH FORM THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY) WILL BE USED ONLY WHEN COMBINED WITH THOSE OF MANY OTHER PEOPLE.

Begin  
Deck  
I

Student Questionnaire	
Form 1A - 2A	1
User - Non-User Characteristics	2-3
May, 1979	01-75

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAVE HAD DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE COUNSELING CENTER. CIRCLE THE NUMBER UNDER THE ABBREVIATION FOR THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR FEELING.

Do you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD) that.....

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>	
1. ...the Counseling Center (hereafter referred to as the Center) is an asset to Thornton Community College?.....	5	4	3	2	1	4
2. ...the Center is inadequate to help with a personal kind of problem?.....	5	4	3	2	1	5
3. ...the reassurance and guidance offered by the Center helps students?.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
4. ...the Center's efforts to help students are impractical and inefficient?.....	5	4	3	2	1	7
5. ...the Center helps students with their vocational problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	8
6. ...talks with counselors are tension releasing if nothing else?.....	5	4	3	2	1	9
7. ...it is a complete waste of time to go to the Center?.....	5	4	3	2	1	10
8. ...the Center can be helpful to students needing counseling?.....	5	4	3	2	1	11
9. ...the Center is a necessary part of the College? ..	5	4	3	2	1	12
10. ...I can <u>not</u> trust anyone at the Center to help me?.....	5	4	3	2	1	13
11. ...the Center helps people with adjustment problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	14
12. ...the Center is not effective in helping Career Undecided Students?.....	5	4	3	2	1	15
13. ...the Center does not adequately interpret test results?.....	5	4	3	2	1	16

Do you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A),  
Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly  
Disagree (SD) that.....

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>	
14. ...the Center is a poor place for students to take their problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	17
15. ...the Center is a good way for academic advising?.....	5	4	3	2	1	18
16. ...the Center is of no direct help to students?....	5	4	3	2	1	19
17. ...more students should use Counseling Services?....	5	4	3	2	1	20
18. ...the tests used by the Center are worthwhile taking?.....	5	4	3	2	1	21
19. ...the Center is simply <u>not</u> interested in students or their problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	22
20. ...the services of the Center should be recommended to those who need help?.....	5	4	3	2	1	23
21. ...there appears to be a complete lack of organization at the Center?.....	5	4	3	2	1	24
22. ...I would rather do anything than ask for help?....	5	4	3	2	1	25
23. ...I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others?.....	5	4	3	2	1	26
24. ...my parents would approve of my using the Center if I needed help?.....	5	4	3	2	1	27
25. ...all in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure?.....	5	4	3	2	1	28
26. ...I would not want my friends to know I went to a counselor?.....	5	4	3	2	1	29
27. ...I feel that I have a number of good qualities?.....	5	4	3	2	1	30
28. ...people might think I was crazy if they knew I went to a counselor?.....	5	4	3	2	1	31
29. ...I feel that I do not have much to be proud of?...	5	4	3	2	1	32

Do you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A),  
Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly  
Disagree (SD) that.....

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>	
30. ...I am able to do things as well as most other people?.....	5	4	3	2	1	33
31. ...some of my problems are appropriate for a counselor?.....	5	4	3	2	1	34
32. ...my problems are important enough to bring to the Center?.....	5	4	3	2	1	35
33. ...I wish I could respect myself more?.....	5	4	3	2	1	36
34. ...the Center is okay for vocational/educational problems but not for personal/social problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	37
35. ...I take a positive attitude toward myself?.....	5	4	3	2	1	38
36. ...counselors are helpful in teaching students how to solve their own problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	39
37. ...I certainly feel useless at times?.....	5	4	3	2	1	40
38. ...my friends use the Counseling Center?.....	5	4	3	2	1	41
39. ...on the whole, I am satisfied with myself?.....	5	4	3	2	1	42
40. ...counselors are trained to deal mainly with areas of vocational and educational adjustment?.....	5	4	3	2	1	43
41. ...at times I think I am no good at all?.....	5	4	3	2	1	44
42. ...counselors support the establishment?.....	5	4	3	2	1	45
43. ...it is best to solve my own problems, alone?.....	5	4	3	2	1	46
44. ...counselors are more administrators than faculty?.....	5	4	3	2	1	47
45. ...it's okay for me to talk with someone about my problems?.....	5	4	3	2	1	48

THERE ARE NINE PAIRS OF STATEMENTS BELOW. READ EACH PAIR CAREFULLY. THEN, FOR EACH PAIR, CHOOSE ONE STATEMENT WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR BELIEF. PLACE A CHECK (✓) BESIDE THAT STATEMENT IN THE BLANK.

- |     |   |   |    |
|-----|---|---|----|
| 46. | (1) _____ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.                | (2) _____ Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.                      | 49 |
| 47. | (1) _____ The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  | (2) _____ Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings. | 50 |
| 48. | (1) _____ In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.                                | (2) _____ Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.                                | 51 |
| 49. | (1) _____ In the case of a well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.        | (2) _____ Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is useless.            | 52 |
| 50. | (1) _____ Who gets to be boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time. | (2) _____ Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.  | 53 |
| 51. | (1) _____ Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.                             | (2) _____ There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.                           | 54 |
| 52. | (1) _____ There is really no such thing as "luck".  | (2) _____ Most people can't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.    | 55 |
| 53. | (1) _____ Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.               | (2) _____ What happens to me is my own doing.   | 56 |
| 54. | (1) _____ It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.            | (2) _____ Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.                     | 57 |

The remaining questions are designed to help better understand students at Thornton Community College. Read the statements/questions and then respond with the ONE choice that best describes you, personally.

55. How would you rate your health? 58
- (1) Excellent  
 (2) Good  
 (3) Fair  
 (4) Poor
56. What is your race/ethnic group? 59
- (1) Black/Afro-American       (2) Latino/Spanish-American-Mexican  
 (3) White/Caucasian           (4) Native American/Eskimo-Indian  
 (5) Oriental                     (6) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
57. Marital Status..... 60
- (1) Single  
 (2) Married  
 (3) Living as married  
 (4) Other
58. With whom do you reside? 61
- (1) With parent(s)  
 (2) With friend(s)/Spouse  
 (3) Alone
59. Language spoken at home..... 62
- (1) English  
 (2) Spanish  
 (3) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
60. What was your high school grade average?..... 63
- (1) A  
 (2) B  
 (3) C  
 (4) D  
 (5) E
61. What is your opinion of your high school preparation? 64
- (1) Excellent                     (2) Below average  
 (3) Good                             (4) Poor  
 (5) Average



62. How do you usually get to Thornton Community College? 65
- (1) Drive your own car  
 (2) Drive your parent(s) car  
 (3) Get a ride from either one of your parents or friend  
 (4) Public transportation  
 (5) Walk
63. Did you know there was a Counseling Center at Thornton Community College?..... (1) Yes 66  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
64. Do you know what counseling services are available at Thornton Community College?..... (1) Yes 67  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
65. Where did you hear about the Counseling Center? 68
- (1) Orientation                       (2) Friend  
 (3) Parents                               (4) Printed college material  
 (5) Faculty                               (6) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
66. Is the Counseling Center conveniently located for you?..... (1) Yes 69  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
67. Have you made an appointment to see a counselor this semester?..... (1) Yes 70  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
68. If no to question 67, then skip to 73.  
 If yes, where did you see a counselor?..... (1) Counseling Center 71  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Divisional Cluster
69. Did you see your assigned counselor?..... (1) Yes 72  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
70. If yes, skip to number 71.  
 If no, did you see any convenient counselor?..... (1) Yes 73  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No

71. How many times have you been to counseling this semester? \_\_\_\_\_ 74-75
72. What specific counseling services do you use? 76
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Career counseling \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Social problems  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Academic advising \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Transfer  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Personal counseling \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Transcript evaluation  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (7) School policy
73. If you have seen a counselor this semester, skip this number. If not, 77-80  
 what are the main reasons that you do not use the Counseling Center?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- BEGIN DECK 2
74. In what curriculum are you enrolled? \_\_\_\_\_ 4-5
75. Age:..... \_\_\_\_\_ 6-7
76. Sex:..... \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Male 8  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Female
77. Are you a veteran?..... \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Yes 9  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
78. How many semester hours will you have completed by June, 1979? 10
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) 0 - 30  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) 31 - 60  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Over 60
79. Do you plan to graduate from Thornton Community College? \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Yes 11  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) No
80. a. What will you do when you finish/leave Thornton? 12
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Work full-time; no more education  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Work full-time; continue education part-time  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Work part-time; continue education full-time  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Work part-time; continue education part-time  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) No work; full-time education

80. b. What will you do when you finish/leave Thornton (Con't.)? 13
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Stay in the Chicago Area  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Move to another city
- c. .... (1) live with parents or relative? 14  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) live alone?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) live with friend or spouse?
81. What is your career goal? \_\_\_\_\_ 15
82. What is the highest degree you plan to obtain? 16
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Associate's Degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Bachelor's Degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Master's Degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Doctorate's Degree (Ph.D., etc.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
83. Indicate the campus activities in which you participate during the semester. 17  
 Check all that apply.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Sports/athletics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Student government  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Special interest groups/Social clubs (sororities, etc.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Informal social groupings  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) None
84. Indicate off-campus activities in which you participate during the semester. 18  
 Check all that apply.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Sports/Teams or Leagues  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Church groups  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Work  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Special interest groups/Hobbies  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) None
85. When did you decide to attend Thornton Community College? 19
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Early in high school/had thought about it some time  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Senior year of high school/year before attending  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Summer before freshman year of college began  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Just before the semester began

86. When you were choosing colleges, in what order of preference was Thornton Community College? 20
- (1) First  
 (2) Second  
 (3) Third  
 (4) Other
87. Why did you decide to attend Thornton Community College (Indicate as many as are appropriate to your considerations)? 21
- (1) Close to home  
 (2) Friends came here  
 (3) Financial reasons  
 (4) Older brothers or sisters are here  
 (5) Reputation of college  
 (6) Specific training program  
 (7) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
88. What do your parents want for your career goal? \_\_\_\_\_ 22-27
- \_\_\_\_\_
89. Father's education (highest attained) 28
- (1) Less than high school  
 (2) High school diploma (or GED)  
 (3) Some college or technical school  
 (4) College graduate  
 (5) Professional/Post-graduate degree
90. Father's occupation 29
- (1) Managerial/Administrative  
 (2) Professional  
 (3) Clerical/Semi-skilled  
 (4) Skilled/Trade  
 (5) Unskilled  
 (6) Unemployed
91. Mother's education (highest attained) 30
- (1) Less than high school  
 (2) High school diploma (or GED)  
 (3) Some college or technical school  
 (4) College graduate  
 (5) Professional/Post-graduate

92. Mother's primary occupation 31
- (1) Managerial/Administrative  
 (2) Professional  
 (3) Clerical/Semi-skilled  
 (4) Skilled/Trade  
 (5) Housewife  
 (6) Unskilled
93. Parents present marital status (check the most appropriate one). 32
- (1) Still married  
 (2) Divorced  
 (3) Widowed  
 (4) Both re-married  
 (5) Other, explain \_\_\_\_\_
94. Estimate your parents' combined income to the best of your knowledge. 33
- (1) Under \$5,000  
 (2) 5,001-10,000  
 (3) 10,001-15,000  
 (4) 15,001-20,000  
 (5) 20,001-25,000  
 (6) 25,001-30,000  
 (7) Over 30,000
95. Rate your parents' relationship to each other. 34
- (1) Close and relaxed  
 (2) Formal and reserved  
 (3) Congenial but argumentative  
 (4) Tense with much disagreement
96. Indicate the order of your birth in your family. 35
- (1) Only Child  
 (2) First  
 (3) Second  
 (4) Third  
 (5) Fourth  
 (6) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
97. For this academic year, estimate your total personal financial resources including all sources of income (parents, work, financial aid, loans, etc.). 36
- (1) Under \$3,000       (2) 9,001-12,000  
 (3) 3,001-5,000       (4) 12,001-15,000  
 (5) 5,001-7,000       (6) Over 15,000  
 (7) 7,001-9,000

98. Estimate in percent (%) what the following individual sources contribute to your total financial resources. The total should equal 100% 37-53

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Personal savings                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> % GI benefits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Work   | <input type="checkbox"/> % Spouse      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Parents  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Academic scholarships (NOT Illinois State Scholarship) |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Financial aid grants and scholarships                  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Repayable loans  |  |

99. How many hours per week do you usually work for pay during the semester? 54

- (1) 1-10
- (2) 11-20
- (3) 21-30
- (4) 31-40
- (5) Over 40
- (6) Not employed

100. Indicate the religious group in which you were raised. 55

- (1) Catholic
- (2) Protestant Sect
- (3) Jewish
- (4) Muslim
- (5) Non-religious family
- (6) Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

101. Do you still regularly practice a religion?..... 56

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

102. Rate your high school counseling experience. 57-59

- | a. <u>Number of times</u>                 | b. <u>Quality</u>                         | c. <u>Problem Discussed</u>                                   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) 1-5          | <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Satisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Anything (open)                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) 6-10         | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) Poor         | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) Mostly educational or vocational |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3) 11-15        | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) Harmful      | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) Mostly personal                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) More than 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) N/A          | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) N/A                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (5) None         |   |   |

103. Have you had counseling other than at Thornton Community College or at your high school?..... 60

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

104. If 103 was No, skip to question 105.  
If yes, specify .....
- a. where you had counseling \_\_\_\_\_ 61-62
- b. why you had counseling \_\_\_\_\_ 63-64
105. Indicate your general feelings about your childhood memories.  
Select the most descriptive one. 65
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) They are clear and happy  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2) They appear somewhat vague and mixed  
\_\_\_\_\_ (3) I had an average childhood  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) My memories are on the sad side  
\_\_\_\_\_ (5) They are unhappy and difficult to recall
106. How would you describe the way that your parents disciplined you as you  
were growing up? 66
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Very strict  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Somewhat strict  
\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Usually permissive  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Very permissive
107. Estimate the degree to which 67  
you now share your parent's values..... \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Exactly  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Somewhat  
\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Little  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Not at all
108. Rate your communication with your parents today. 68
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Excellent (Can discuss anything openly)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Good (Only a few things that can not be discussed)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Fair (There is a need for more trust)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Poor (There is almost no communication)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Not applicable - parents deceased
109. How would you rate your growth from high school teen-ager to responsible 69  
adult?
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Very difficult  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Difficult  
\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Average  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Very little difficulty  
\_\_\_\_\_ (5) No problems
110. Which of the following is the most important problem-related area for you 70  
at this time?
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Personal \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Social \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Marital  
\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Family/Parents \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Educational/ \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Vocational  
Courses





APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Michael Eugene Schnur has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. John A. Wellington, Director  
Professor, Guidance and Counseling  
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Manuel S. Silverman  
Associate Professor and Chairman  
Guidance and Counseling  
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Judith J. Mayo  
Assistant Professor  
Guidance and Counseling  
Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

17 April 1980  
Date

John A. Wellington  
Signature