

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1969

A Study of Adequacy and Cost of Secondary School Guidance Programs in Utah

Richard Roland Wootton
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wootton, Richard Roland, "A Study of Adequacy and Cost of Secondary School Guidance Programs in Utah" (1969). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2997.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2997>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



A STUDY OF ADEQUACY AND COST OF SECONDARY
SCHOOL GUIDANCE PROGRAMS IN UTAH

by

Richard Roland Wootton

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Psychology

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development and completion of a research project which culminates in a dissertation is usually a cooperative venture that involves the assistance of several significant individuals. Special appreciation is given to Dr. John R. Cragun and Dr. E. Wayne Wright. Other members of the committee including, at one time or another, Dr. Arden N. Frandsen, Dr. David R. Stone, Dr. Glendon Casto, and Dr. Helmut Hofmann, all provided inspiration in encouraging the author to progress professionally to this point.

Appreciation is expressed to the students, teachers, counselors, and administrators who responded to the various response forms and also to those professional educators and psychologists who assisted in the development and refinement of the response instruments. Special appreciation is given to Dr. Reese Anderson and his staff at the State Office of Education who were especially cooperative in providing the author with data used in this study.

For the cooperation, encouragement, support, and love received in this time consuming venture, the author wishes to express the deepest appreciation to his wife, Shirley, and to each of his five children. To them this study is dedicated.


Richard Roland Wootton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	3
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
What Has Been Done?	10
How Much Should Be Spent?	16
What Guidance Services Should Be Spent?	18
The Need For Program Evaluation	21
Is Effective Guidance Evaluation Possible?	23
Unanswered Questions	24
Summary	24
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	27
General Procedures	27
Sampling Selection	27
Measuring Device	30
Statistical Analysis	34
Summary	35
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	37
Dollar Cost of Basic School Programs in Utah Schools for 1967-68	37
Cost Analysis as Related to Stated Hypotheses	56
Perceived Adequacy of Guidance Programs in Four High Schools	62
Budgetary Planning and Perceived Adequacy of Guidance Programs by Counselors	73
Policies Governing Spending and Budgeting	81

V. DISCUSSION	85
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	93
Summary	93
Conclusions	95
Recommendations	98
LITERATURE CITED	100
APPENDIX	103
VITA	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total basic program expenditures and secondary school population for NDEA participating Utah school districts for 1967-68	41
2. Total basic program expenditures and secondary school population for non-NDEA participating Utah school districts for 1967-68	43
3. Expenditures for guidance in NDEA participating districts in relation to total budgets	44
4. Expenditures for guidance in non-NDEA participating districts in relation to total budgets	47
5. Rank order of school districts according to guidance expenditures	48
6. Dollar differences between current and recommended expenditures for guidance services	51
7. Expenditures for guidance sub-services by Utah NDEA school districts	54
8. Expenditures for guidance sub-services by non-NDEA school districts	54
9. Percent of district budgets allocated for guidance programs by NDEA versus non-NDEA participants	58
10. Mean dollar costs for guidance programs by NDEA versus non-NDEA participating school districts	58
11. A comparison of guidance spending by NDEA participating school districts in California and Utah	59
12. Relationship of district size to guidance spending	61

Table	Page
13. Perceived adequacy of guidance programs by school counselors in four selected high schools	64
14. Student perceptions of guidance programs in four high schools	67
15. Teacher perceptions of guidance programs in four selected high schools	70
16. Administrator perceptions of guidance programs in four selected high schools	72
17. Perceived adequacy of guidance programs by school counselors	75

ABSTRACT

A Study of Adequacy and Cost of Secondary
School Guidance Programs in Utah

by

Richard Roland Wootton, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1969

Thesis Professor: Dr. John R. Cragun
Major Professor: Dr. E. Wayne Wright
Department: Psychology

The study attempted to determine the current expenditures for secondary school guidance programs in Utah. In addition, the study attempted to evaluate the adequacy of selected guidance programs and to determine if a relationship existed between guidance expenditures and adequacy of guidance programs.

Fiscal data were collected, tabulated, and analyzed using financial reports from the Utah Office of Education. Further, response forms were administered to students, school administrators, counselors, and teachers in an attempt to elicit responses from these persons relative to their perceptions of guidance program adequacy in their respective schools.

Results indicated that Utah districts, as a group, spend 1.6 percent of their instructional budgets for guidance purposes. This figure is considerably below the three percent usually recommended in the current literature as being necessary for a "minimum" guidance program. Significant differences were observed in the per

pupil expenditures between National Defense Education Act, Title V participants and non-participants with the participants allocating the greater amount. Metropolitan districts were observed to be making significantly greater per pupil expenditures than districts with smaller populations. No significant differences were found in the number of "yes," or positive responses, of students or teachers from "minimum" and "maximum" spending effort schools.

A general conclusion was reached that Utah districts do not presently allocate percentages of instructional budgets that will allow them to develop or maintain sound guidance programs. Either larger budgetary consideration should be provided or else it should be clearly recognized by educators and the lay public that guidance programs that appear to be inadequate may be the result, in part, of unrealistic financing.

A general recommendation that encompasses several others presented in the study is that a total re-evaluation of fiscal policies, practices, allocation procedures, and record keeping for guidance programs is in order. Improvement of budgetary practices and guidance programs are such that changes cannot be expected without increased awareness and commitment by counselor educators, administrators, parents, State Office of Education officials, and counselors. Without such an awareness and commitment, we cannot expect to observe a change from undesirable budgetary practices and relatively unsound guidance programs now found in Utah.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

National legislation was enacted in 1958 which enabled guidance programs throughout the United States to grow at an unprecedented rate. This legislation, entitled the National Defense Education Act, not only aided in the initiation and expansion of guidance services, but also brought with it ever increasing difficulties and problems associated with program administration.

Administration of fiscal policies in school districts is a difficult and complex task. With the expansion of guidance services, administrators now face increased responsibilities associated with the fiscal regulation of these programs.

While the positive effects of NDEA and other federal programs on the growth of guidance services cannot be discounted, it would be presumptuous to assume that such services are void of severe and often glaring weaknesses. The editor of a leading journal in the field of industrial education has criticized school counselors for their demonstrated role as "college advisors and amateur psychologists" and further asserts that "if they do not fall into this category, they are primarily truant officers and attendance personnel" (Feirer, 1967, p. 21). Scott (1967) is equally adamant in declaring that high school counselors are the chief source of misinformation among those who give advice to college-bound students.

It is reasonable to assume that criticism of guidance services result, in part, from inferior programs that in turn can be partially explained on the basis of insufficient financing. Research conducted by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1965) indicated that the costs of administering guidance services varied considerably from one section of the country to another, from one section of a state to another, and even from one part of a county or city to another.

A study of costs to 1956 by Wellman (1957) reported that about three percent of a total school budget would provide for a minimum guidance program, and about five percent would provide for a superior program. The Wellman study further reported that, while guidance services in systems of varying sizes were about the same, the cost of guidance services in high schools were about one percent higher than those found in junior high schools.

Stockhouse (1965), on the basis of research conducted in California, concluded that data are now available which can be used by guidance administrators and school boards in budgeting guidance costs. He further suggested that we now continue to move closer to a "rule of thumb" of five percent of a total instructional budget as being realistically necessary for funding guidance and counseling services in school programs.

All of the forty school districts in Utah now allocate some funds for guidance services. It appears reasonable that differences in the amount of money spent for guidance programs in Utah secondary schools

will vary according to a variety of factors including size of district, size and type of community, and whether given districts participate in federally funded programs. It is important to analyze the amount of money being expended for various district guidance programs in relationship to the perceived adequacy or value of these programs by teachers, students, administrators, and counselors. If it could be demonstrated that there is a relationship between perceived adequacy of guidance programs and expenditures for such programs, it would provide a more objective basis for re-evaluating fiscal policies effecting these services. Provision for financial re-evaluation of guidance costs on a more objective basis would also occur if it were demonstrated by this, and related studies, that Utah was spending less for guidance services than other states. If the study provides evidence of a significant difference in expenditures and/or adequacy of programs between NDEA participants and non-participants, it will offer more objective information for re-consideration by non-participants as to the advantages of NDEA affiliation.

The knowledge of expenditures for guidance services in Utah will be helpful to school administrators, legislators, school guidance personnel, and the lay public in planning for and better understanding the strengths, weaknesses and needs of guidance services. This will, in turn, assist in planning more realistic programs.

The Problem

Statement of the problem

This study was designed to determine the current costs of secondary

school guidance services in the State of Utah. In addition, the study attempted to evaluate the adequacy of certain selected guidance programs in Utah. Finally, an attempt was made to analyze the relationship between total expenditures made for guidance programs and the adequacy of those programs.

In meeting its stated purposes, the following questions were formulated and partially answered:

1. How much money is being spent by Utah school districts for the various guidance services rendered, (e.g., counselor salaries, testing, clerical assistance, and others)?
2. Do district guidance expenditures differ according to: (a) NDEA participation versus non-participation, and (b) size of school district?
3. Are guidance expenditures currently available in Utah schools perceived by students, teachers, administrators, and counselors as being adequate?
4. Is there a relationship between perceived adequacy of guidance programs and the amount of money provided for such services?
5. Do districts have definite policies concerning guidance spending? Do counselors understand the fiscal policies relevant to the operation of guidance programs in their districts?
6. If districts are spending less than the amount of money generally recommended by related studies as being necessary for minimum or superior guidance programs, (e.g., three or five percent of a district instructional budget), what is the amount that would be

needed in order to bring these programs up to such levels?

On the basis of the preceding questions, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. No significant differences will be found in the per pupil expenditures for secondary school guidance programs between NDEA participants and non-participants.

2. No significant differences will be found in per pupil expenditures for guidance programs between schools with student populations of varying sizes.

3. Adequacy of guidance programs, as measured by the perceptions and stated responses of teachers, counselors, administrators, and students, will not be related to the amount of money spent for such programs.

Definitions

Small districts. For purposes of this study, small districts will refer to those having total high school populations of less than five hundred.

Medium districts. Medium districts refer to those high schools with total populations of between five hundred and one thousand.

Large districts. A large district is defined as one having a total high school population of between one and five thousand.

Metropolitan districts. A district with a total high school population in excess of five thousand.

Instructional budget. This term describes that which is often referred to in education as the maintenance and operation budget.

Maximum spending. This term will refer to a guidance spending effort by districts of twenty-five dollars or more per pupil at the secondary school level.¹

Minimum spending. Guidance spending by school districts in the amount of fifteen dollars or less per secondary school pupil.

Adequate guidance spending. When items concerning guidance programs are answered "yes," or in a positive direction, on student, teacher, counselor, and administrator response forms, the program will be termed "adequate."²

Average guidance program. If only one-third to two-thirds of the guidance response form items are answered by respondents in a positive direction, the guidance program will be termed "average."

Inadequate guidance program. If one-third or less of the items from the guidance response form are answered by respondents in a positive direction, the program will be termed "inadequate."

¹Dollar figures used in defining maximum and minimum spending were arbitrarily selected by the author after reviewing a rank order list showing Utah district guidance spending. The sub-categories approximate the upper and lower quartiles in district spending.

²The use of the upper and lower one-third of response form items in defining adequate and inadequate programs was based upon the recommendation of counselors and psychologists who participated in the pre-test of the various measuring instruments as well as upon the personal experience of the author.

Delimitations

The students who were asked to answer the response forms used in this study were restricted to junior and senior students at the high school level who were enrolled during the 1968-69 school year. In most cases these particular students had at least a one year opportunity to observe their respective school guidance program.

Limitations

This study was limited by the following:

1. The study utilized only guidance expenditures for 1967-68. A review of the guidance expenditure figures for Utah districts over the immediate past three years, however, indicates that the percent of instructional budgets allocated by school districts for guidance programs has remained very stable (Utah Office of Education, 1968).
2. The research was based, in part, on verbal reports of actual or assumed behavior which have occasionally been criticized as not being indicative of observed performance. While this may sometimes be true, Little (1960) found in his study that ninety percent of the seniors pursued post-graduation goals that they stated in questionnaires prior to high school commencement, thus reflecting that verbal reports are not totally unreliable.
3. Data obtained on guidance program adequacy were based on a sampling of school districts with only one high school. This was necessitated by the limited availability of guidance expenditure information from Utah school districts. Districts do not compile or

report guidance spending data on a school-by-school basis and, thus, it is impossible, in multi-high school districts, to determine whether a single, given high school is receiving a disproportionate amount of the available guidance budget. The lack of available guidance cost information for individual schools has been substantiated by the verbal and written reports of several large district pupil personnel directors as well as by the Director of Pupil Personnel Services for the State of Utah. Since, in one-high school districts, the district guidance budget and the high school budget in terms of per pupil expenditures are essentially one in the same, the portion of the study relating to adequacy was limited to an investigation and analysis of these types of districts.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter II of this study reviews the literature as it relates to the subject under inquiry. Chapter III presents a detailed method of investigation in which the following sections are included: (a) General Procedures, (b) Population, (c) Selection of the Sample, (d) Data Reviewed in the Study, and (e) Statistical Analysis. Chapter IV offers findings of the study while Chapter V presents a discussion based primarily on observations and the intuition of the author. Chapter VI summarizes the findings and presents conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As one begins to explore the literature relevant to the financing of guidance programs, it becomes increasingly evident how woefully inadequate quantitative contributions have been. Although progress in this important area of research has been slow, Mathewson (1962), Hill (1965), and others have been quick to point out the felt need of school administrators and guidance personnel as they attempt to identify and justify sound budgetary practices and procedures governing guidance programs. Mathewson (1962), for example, has written that the Regents Council on Readjustment of High School Education in New York in 1954 recommended that the appropriate ratio of pupils per full-time counselor be 200 to 250. He further contends that school administrators would argue that such a ratio would be quite unthinkable in our current economy and may become even more unattainable in view of the existing shortage of schoolrooms and teachers. Thus the factor of costs plays a tremendous part in the accessibility of guidance facilities in many parts of the country.

While the need for greater understanding of guidance expenditures has increased with the advent of the National Defense Education Act, Title V, and other federal programs, the status of guidance cost research has really remained quite unchanged since the following

observation was made in 1958:

The "what?" and "why?" of guidance programs are to be found in generous quantities in the professional literature. The specific information as to the cost is very hard to locate either in a hypothetical or factual context. The range of progress in programs and services has made it very difficult to ascertain cost figures; but the guidance worker needs general guides at least, if he is to fulfill his obligation as a professionally trained individual. (Hatch and Steffler, 1958, p. 246)

Stockhouse (1965) found that a search of the Educational Index, dissertation indices, and recent books on guidance administration revealed only a handful of studies on guidance costs. Many of the authors of guidance texts have omitted the topic completely from their outline while others have provided only gross estimates or "rules of thumb" for this subject. McDaniel (1956) approached the topic of guidance funding by asking rather than giving answers to vital questions concerning guidance costs. The following questions posed by McDaniel have remained significant although generally unanswered: (a) what are the building space requirements for counseling? (b) what proportion of the total school expenditures should be budgeted for guidance services? and (c) can tentative but workable estimates be developed for various types of guidance programs?

What Has Been Done?

The status of guidance cost research is limited, but not entirely void of some interesting and occasionally rather sophisticated studies.

Crosby (1956) wrote his dissertation in the area of guidance costs and later had it published, in pamphlet form, by the California Test Bureau. The study separated guidance expenditures into personnel, materials, and operational costs such as tests, books, and special materials, and in doing so found costs ranging from \$5.24 to \$13.03 per pupil in average daily attendance in the selected high schools studied.

A study by Wellman (1956) concluded that about three percent of a total school budget would provide for a minimum guidance program while five percent would provide for a superior program. He further reported that the percent of the total budget for guidance services in school systems of various sizes averaged about the same; the costs for guidance in senior high schools was, however, approximately one percent higher than in junior high schools.

An article co-authored by Acree and Marquis (1957) reported the results of two separate studies conducted in Tennessee in 1952 and 1955 and which revealed that only eight percent of the sampled schools provided any budget allotment at all for guidance programs. Special allowance in the budget for guidance services were extremely small with forty percent of the schools failing to indicate any form of a guidance program.

Robert Stockhouse analyzed costs of guidance services in the public secondary schools of Santa Clara, California for the 1957-58 school year and reported the following findings:

Twenty-nine schools in ten school districts were studied. Data were obtained by questionnaires and by interviewing administrative and guidance personnel at each school, and at district and county offices. He concluded as follows: Eight districts operating four-year high schools with an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of 15,397 pupils, spent an average of \$16.68 per pupil in ADA. Range in costs per pupil for these eight districts ran from \$10.43 per pupil to \$19.84. Guidance programs represented 3.5 per cent of the total costs of education for these districts. Two districts operated junior high schools with a total ADA of 7,053 students. The average cost per pupil in ADA for the total guidance program at the junior high level was \$19.49. These same districts operated three-year senior high schools and costs for 5,393 ADA averaged \$25.84. The average cost per pupil for all public secondary schools, a total ADA of 27,843, in the Santa Clara County was \$19.16 per ADA for the school year 1957-58. Guidance represented 3.9 per cent of the total cost of education for all secondary schools in the study. (Stockhouse, 1965, p. 6)

Costa (1961) found that sixty-four Minnesota schools participating in the National Defense Education Act, Title V, during the 1959-60 school year, reported guidance costs ranging between \$13.88 and \$38.37 per pupil. When these costs were translated into percentage figures, it was found that expenditures for guidance ranged between 2.26 to 6.60 percent with average expenditures of 4.6 percent.

Palm (1961) studied six Minneapolis-St. Paul high schools and found that the mean expenditure for guidance services was \$24.98 per student as contrasted with a total per pupil cost for all education in the six schools of \$464.00. When these figures were expressed in terms of percentages, it was discovered that the total per pupil cost for guidance services in the six sampled Minneapolis-St. Paul high schools was 5.3 percent of the total cost of educating these students.

Another study conducted by Stockhouse (1965) during the 1963-64

school year reported the guidance expenditures for 151 California school districts that participated in the National Defense Education Act, Title V. Costs were divided into five categories according to secondary school populations, (e.g., 100-299; 10,000 and over). Findings indicated that guidance costs averaged \$32.90 with a range from \$29.37 to \$37.58. Salaries for professional staff ranged from a low of \$22.60 to a high of \$29.99 per student enrolled. Clerical costs ranged from a low of \$2.80 to a high of \$5.88 per pupil with a mean expenditure of \$3.93. Guidance and clerical salaries accounted for ninety-five percent of the total cost while the remaining five percent included per pupil costs of: (a) staff travel (\$0.90), (b) fees for consultants (\$0.10), (c) travel expenses for consultants (\$0.01), (d) equipment (\$0.15), (e) equipment rental (\$0.24), (f) test scoring services (\$0.33), and (g) test materials (\$0.40).

One of the most surprising and unusual attempts at guidance cost analysis found in the literature related to budgetary estimates suggested by Mathewson (1962) in which he concluded that the per pupil cost for guidance could amount to \$60.00 if based upon (a) a nationally recommended ratio of one counselor to every 250 secondary school students, and (b) a total educational cost of \$1,200.00 per pupil. Mathewson's educational total of \$1,200.00 per pupil may appear to be outlandishly and unrealistically large, but it was actually based upon a real school budget published by a suburban board of education which did, indeed, allow \$1,200.00 per pupil for educational expenses. Sixty percent of the expenditures of the district in this

particular geographic location were for salaries of professional personnel while the remaining forty percent was used for all other expenditures. Mathewson's estimated cost of guidance was based upon a figure that was slightly less than three percent of the total per pupil educational expenditures.

According to Mathewson:

The suburb in question pays instructional salaries in the ranges of the wealthier towns in the area and is reputed to have a good school system . . . If we postulate one counselor for every 250 pupils in such a unit for the secondary level, estimated costs in an Eastern suburban township of the type just cited might run as follows:

Counselor salary (median)	\$7,500.00
Part-time clerk	2,000.00
Supplies	2,500.00 (a)
Administrative overhead (25%)	3,000.00 (b)
Total	\$15,000.00
Per pupil expenditure	\$60.00

(a) This figure is probably an overestimate, it includes special guidance tests not incorporated in the over-all school testing program, such as an aptitude battery, interest inventory and personality blanks. Also included are expenses for films, special information materials, instruments and forms compiled locally for use in guidance, etc.—all apportioned to the block of 250 students at a cost of \$10.00 per student.

(b) Administrative overhead includes school maintenance costs (other than personnel expenditures) calculated at a rate of twenty-five per cent of the sum of preceding expenses, which totaled \$1,200.00. (Mathewson, 1962, p. 335-339)

Mathewson has estimated that the above expenditures would be less than five percent of the total educational budget; a figure often used by authors in applying a "rule of thumb" to projected

estimates deemed necessary in the development of superior guidance programs.

The suggested budgetary figures alluded to by Mathewson may seem especially ambitious when compared with earlier research conducted and reported on this topic. One of the few early studies, by way of contrast, was initiated by Emery (1952) and was considered quite valuable as an early guide for later studies even though it had obvious limitations in that only cities and towns in the metropolitan Boston area were investigated. Emery's findings of actual guidance expenditures offered rather dramatic contrast to those suggested later by Mathewson. It was revealed, for example, that only sixteen of the twenty-five contacted guidance directors were willing to respond to the questionnaire. When Emery did analyze the responses of those who did reply, he found costs ranging from \$2.66 to \$15.74 per pupil with a mean expenditure of \$6.21 and a median of \$4.92. Translated into percentages of total school budgets, the costs of guidance services in the Emery study ranged from 0.31 to 3.40 percent with a mean percent of 1.64.

Textbook authors have recently begun to consider the topic of guidance funding with more care, depth, and commitment. Hollis and Hollis (1965) have given a complete chapter to a discussion of time and money budgets for guidance and, in doing so, have alluded to such topics as: (a) items to be included in budgetary considerations, (b) techniques in formulating sound budgets, (c) suggested format for a financial budget, and (d) postulates and action guidelines. In spite

of hypothetical suggestions for dealing with the question of guidance costs, the Hollis' book says little of cost studies that have actually been conducted other than in referring to and quoting from the study by Palm alluded to earlier in this chapter.

Another book of recent origin has been authored by Hill (1965) and presents a brief review of the literature upon which the author concludes that complete and careful determination of guidance costs would usually require at least three percent of total educational expenditures for sound guidance programs and that they should probably have five percent. Hill further suggests that these figures be employed with considerable caution since it is far more important for a given school to begin its budgetary planning, if it has not already been done, by determining actual current guidance costs. These then can be analyzed in terms of needed improvements and extensions of guidance services, and budgeting can be planned on a sensible and forward looking basis.

How Much Should Be Spent?

A review of the literature soon reveals a wide range in the per pupil expenditures actually being allocated for guidance services. A partial cause for the observed variance in guidance funding exists in the various definitions that have been applied to the term "guidance." Hill (1965) stressed that it was essential to identify "non-guidance" functions and to keep these from wasting the money allotted to guidance.

Stockhouse (1965) reported that per pupil costs for guidance programs averaged \$19.16 in Santa Clara while a later study that he conducted in California revealed a per pupil expenditure for guidance services, at least for NDEA participating schools, that ranged from \$29.37 to \$37.58. Mathewson (1962) in his analysis of guidance costs based on a ratio of one counselor to every 250 students concluded that \$60.00 per pupil would not be an unrealistic figure to use in planning guidance expenditures.

Why the wide discrepancy between the various researchers? Obviously time, with its constant increase in costs and decrease in dollar buying power, represents one important influencing factor and since some of the reported studies were conducted over a period of a decade or more, this factor must be carefully considered. Further, the National Defense Education Act, Title V, and other federally funded programs have assisted in increasing the total dollar sum that is allotted for guidance services which, in turn, partially accounts for the observed differences in the percent and the per pupil expenditures reported in various guidance cost analysis studies.

It would appear that there is general agreement, as one reviews current guidance literature, to indicate that researchers have felt that approximately three to five percent of total educational budgets should be reserved for guidance programs. The term "educational budget" is interpreted in most studies to mean instructional budgets or maintenance and operation budgets. Stockhouse (1965) concluded that data are now available which can be used by guidance administrators and school boards in budgeting guidance costs. It would

appear that we continue to move closer to that "rule of thumb" of five percent of the total instructional budget going for guidance and counseling services in the school program. Stockhouse has further asserted that we now have sufficient data to justify five percent, where twenty years ago this figure was more or less "pulled out of mid-air."

What Guidance Services Should Be Purchased?

A question of long standing concern has been raised by counselors, principals, and others as to whether or not money spent for guidance programs actually buys anything of very great significance or value. Hill (1965) cautioned that careful cost analysis and budgeting meant little unless the most vigorous professional attention was given to an appropriate definition of guidance functions and the protection of guidance personnel from assignments of duties which were not legitimately identifiable with guidance. He suggested that this approach represented the heart of good guidance programs and thus the foundation for effective budgeting.

The most recent and ambitious attempt to identify an appropriate counselor role and function was developed by the American School Counselor Association (1964) and published for national circulation as a statement of policy for secondary school counselors. The fact that this publication grew out of a "grass roots" contact with counselors from throughout the United States and was officially adopted by the Governing Board of the American School Counselor

Association as well as by this organization's entire membership, helped to make it not only representative of the expressions and feelings of practicing school counselors, but also provided a particularly helpful tool that could be used in identifying those services that should be included as an integral part of a sound guidance program. The working environment of the secondary school counselor was defined by the ASCA statement as follows:

First, he should be free from administrative and clerical assignments which would interfere with his responsibilities as a professional school counselor.

Second, he should have the physical facilities appropriate to his work. This should include a private office which offers visual as well as auditory privacy, and provides a relaxed, comfortable atmosphere in which he may communicate with pupils and others in confidence and without interruption.

Third, he should have paid clerical assistance and such equipment as will help him to carry out his functions as a counselor and a guidance specialist.

Fourth, he should have the opportunity to initiate and carry on conferences with pupils during school hours but with due regard for their academic programs.

Fifth, his employment should be on a full-time basis and should extend beyond the normal school year. His salary should be commensurate with his level of training and experience and should compensate him for the time he works beyond the regular school year.

Sixth, the number of pupils for whom a counselor is responsible should be such that he can carry out his functions effectively for all of them. It is recommended that this pupil load should not exceed 250 to 300 pupils per counselor.

Seventh, he should have a time schedule which will permit him to grow professionally and which will permit him to pursue such activities as research, participation in professional conferences, and visitation of other schools, colleges, places of employment, etc.

Eighth, budgetary provision should be made that will allow the school counselor to have the equipment, materials, travel allowance, etc. necessary for him to carry out his functions.

Ninth, he should have access to professional supervision and consultation as needed. His role as a member of the pupil personnel team, as well as his relationship to other members of the team and to teachers and administrators, should be firmly stated. (American School Counselor Association, 1964, p. 3-11)

Hill further recommended that the following items be, of necessity, considered as a part of an effective guidance program:

1. Staff personnel costs: These include salaries of counselors, guidance directors, secretaries, clerks, and any other staff members who may perform part-time guidance functions . . . the time spent by school psychologists, health workers, and school social workers in helping children should be charged to their own services, not to guidance.

2. Materials and supplies: These include anything used by the guidance staff in their relations with students, staff members, parents, and community agencies. Regular office supplies, tests, books, films, tapes and records, materials for duplicating local forms and inventories, and any other supplies common to the guidance program.

3. Equipment and its maintenance: Tape recorders, typewriters, projection equipment, record players, desks, file cabinets, chairs, are among the many items that must be provided for the guidance program.

4. Travel and other out-of-school expenses: Travel allowance for the guidance staff should provide for attendance at professional meetings, travel to referral and consultative agencies, travel for home visitations.

5. Service charges: Mailing costs, telephone, may be specifically identified with the guidance office or with general administrative costs and provided for by the overhead item.

6. Research and evaluation costs.

7. Administrative overhead: This covers maintenance costs for facilities, lights, heat, and janitor service. It may also, as indicated for items 2, 3, and 5 above, cover certain aspects of these items, depending upon how detailed cost analysis is carried. (Hill, 1965, p. 251)

The Annual Report of Federal Assistance Program for the National Defense Education Act of 1958 compiled under the auspices of the Utah Board of Education (1967) listed the following items for budgetary consideration in guidance programs. The items were almost identical to those usually recommended in related studies: (a) counselor salaries, (b) additional secondary guidance personnel salaries, (c) secretarial and clerical salaries, (d) test scoring materials and services, (e) equipment, materials, and supplies, and (f) travel.

The Need for Program Evaluation

Although several valuable studies have been reported in the literature which attempted to evaluate effectiveness of guidance programs, none had been focused specifically on the Intermountain Region. It was also observed that none of the studies attempted to compare guidance program effectiveness with money expended for such programs. The conspicuous lack of this latter factor was partially noticed in a statement by Tyler (1961) in which she expressed a concern for the severe shortage of clear-cut criteria for evaluating counselor effectiveness.

Several contemporary authors have expressed the desirability and need for an increased quantity of studies that would evaluate

guidance programs. McDaniel (1966) suggested that one of the difficulties with doing counseling was the problem of getting feedback, and that it was only as one received feedback that modification in counselor behavior could be made. Schmidt (1965) felt that counseling demanded self-disclosure from counselors and that if counselors concealed themselves, that even this was a revelation. Hansen (1967) maintained that counselors could obtain some evidence of personal effectiveness by thinking about the following questions: (a) whom have I helped? (b) whom have I not helped? (c) how could I have been more helpful? (d) what kinds of strategies or methods might I have used to be a helping person? Hill has suggested several variables that he has felt are most important and almost always present when research has been conducted on guidance programs:

1. The question regarding results can be answered sanely only if the guidance program has clarity of purpose and objective. Not only must there be objectives, but these must be specifically defined as outcomes which can be identified, measured, and evaluated.
2. The guidance efforts expended by persons identified as guidance workers or counselors in the school represent service efforts, in two ways: they are an aid to students they seek to enhance (and thus "serve") the efforts of the instructional staff and the administrative staff of the school. Guidance activities cannot effectively be siphoned off from the instructional outcomes. It is almost impossible to isolate the effects of one aspect of the total program which seeks to help young people become more humane, more productive, more sane.
3. The attempt to identify outcomes of the school's guidance efforts is further complicated by the impact of a multitude of out-of-school influences, including the influence of parents.
4. The processes of evaluation are complicated by the society, the subjectivity, the elusiveness of variables of great significance.

5. The evaluation of a set of services is further complicated by the temptation to get too involved in looking at services, rather than at results . . . but, basically, such evidence is woefully incomplete if we cannot step beyond it to assess the impact of the processes, these services, upon boys and girls.

6. Evaluation of guidance takes a great deal of ingenuity, time, and effort. Thus, it often does not get done. One of the most serious sins of our profession--and a sin that marks us as still being far from being a true profession--is our failure to strive harder to define, and thus limit, our functions . . . time for evaluation is an imperative must. (Hill, 1965, p. 264)

Is Effective Guidance Evaluation Possible?

A multitude of studies have been conducted in an attempt to evaluate guidance program effectiveness but it is quite difficult to find agreement as to the best procedures to be followed in doing evaluative studies. Roeber, Smith, Erickson (1955) presented, in their book on guidance administration, an extensive list of studies that had been conducted in the twenties, thirties, and forties. Tyler (1966) also reviewed a selected number of important evaluative guidance studies in her book including several that were longitudinal in nature. One of these, a study by Rothney, followed 129 students who were exposed or not exposed to a variety of guidance experiences during a five year period that covered both the junior and senior high school levels. Later follow-up indicated significant differences which favored the counseled groups when compared on a variety of criteria selected for evaluative purposes. Other studies quoted by Tyler reported results similar to those found in the Rothney study and led her to state that "in general, then, it can be concluded that guidance programs are having a

desirable effect on students." (Tyler, 1966, p. 266)

Unanswered Questions

A major question left obscured or unanswered following a review of the literature was whether or not a relationship existed between the adequacy of various guidance programs and the amount of money expended for these programs. Indeed, the current literature appeared to be quite void of reported data concerning this important question.

Other questions that remained unanswered were primarily local in nature and included: (a) how much was being spent by Utah secondary schools for guidance services? (b) was there a difference in the amount of money expended for guidance programs by NDEA participants and non-participants? (c) was there a difference in guidance expenditures among school districts with student populations of varying sizes? (d) how much was spent by Utah secondary schools for guidance in relation to services rendered, (e.g., testing, counselor salaries) and, (e) were there specific policies governing spending in Utah districts and schools?

Summary

The administration of fiscal policies in school districts has long been recognized as a difficult and complex task. Enactment of federal legislation aimed at the support of guidance programs

has aided in the initiation and expansion of some services but, at the same time, has brought it increasingly complicated questions concerned with the discovery of ideal methods for administering guidance program funds.

A review of the literature revealed that, although useful studies had been conducted relative to guidance spending, many authors continued to disagree as to the most appropriate procedures to be followed in either the development of fiscal policies or in the evaluation of existing guidance programs. In spite of some disagreement, researchers using a variety of methods have arrived at several similar conclusions concerning guidance funding. A significant point of agreement was that school districts should allocate and actually spend between three and five percent of their instructional budgets for guidance programs.

The literature also revealed the fact that important cost analysis studies have and, in all probability, would continue to be conducted in many states. It was further indicated that meaningful research in the area of guidance program evaluation in relation to the adequacy of services had been conducted; the results generally demonstrating the value of such programs to individuals who were recipients of guidance services.

A major question left unanswered in the literature was whether or not the amount of money budgeted for and spent by various guidance programs had an important influence on the soundness

or adequacy of that program. The literature also revealed that there were questions of local and state significance that remained unanswered. One method of obtaining answers to questions and solutions to problems surrounding the topic of guidance expenditures was thought to be through new and meaningful research. This study was based on that premise.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to determine the amount and nature of guidance expenditures for secondary schools in the State of Utah. In addition, the study attempted to evaluate the adequacy of certain selected Utah high school school guidance programs. Finally, an attempt was made to analyze the relationship between total expenditures made for guidance programs and the adequacy of those programs.

The procedure used in this study are described in five sections as follows: (a) General Procedures, (b) Sampling Selection, (c) Measuring Device, (d) Statistical Analysis, and (e) Summary.

General Procedures

This study was conducted in the school districts of Utah during the 1968-69 school year. Data were collected from the following sources: (a) Utah Office of Education financial reports, (b) verbal and written reports from selected district directors of pupil personnel as well as from the State Director of Pupil Personnel, and (c) responses from forms completed by high school students, teachers, school administrators, and counselors.

Sampling Selection

In meeting its stated purpose, this study obtained information

from the Utah Office of Education relative to the amount of money expended for guidance services at the secondary level for Utah school districts during the 1967-68 school year. Districts were divided, for purposes of further study, into three major categories: (a) NDEA participants versus non-participants, (b) districts making minimum spending efforts as opposed to those making maximum spending efforts, and (c) school district size as determined by the student population, (e.g., small, medium, large, metropolitan).

In addition to the cost analysis conducted with the use of data from the Utah Office of Education and which included general budgetary information from all Utah school districts, four school districts were selected for a relatively detailed, in-depth study of guidance expenditures as they related to the adequacy of their respective programs. The selection of only four districts, namely, Provo, Wayne, Wasatch, and North Sanpete, was related to the fact that only these four districts met each of the following criteria: (a) their participation or non-participation in NDEA, (b) identification of the particular school district as one that was making either a minimum or a maximum spending effort for guidance programs, (c) the size of the secondary school population being such as to classify the district as either large or small, (d) the willingness of the district to participate in the study, and (e) the requirement that the district have only one high school. The latter criterion was necessitated by the limited availability of guidance expenditure information from Utah school districts. Districts do not compile fiscal data related to guidance programs on a school-by-school basis and it is, therefore,

impossible to determine, in multi-high school districts, whether an individual, given school in a district has received a disproportionate amount of the available guidance budget. The verbal and written reports of district pupil personnel directors indicate, nevertheless, that the budgets in one-high school districts for the high school and for the district in general are, for guidance services, essentially one and the same. This factor, under the circumstances described, was a major factor in limiting the study of adequacy of guidance programs to one-high school districts. Each of the four schools selected for the part of the study dealing with adequacy cooperated fully with the author in carrying out its portion of the research.

Separate response forms were developed as tools to be used in determining guidance program adequacy as perceived by students, teachers, administrators, and counselors. The instruments were subsequently administered to the following number of individuals from the four schools selected for study: (a) ninety-six teachers, (b) six administrators, (c) eight counselors, and (d) 402 students. The teachers, administrators, and counselors sampled represented the total professional staffs for each of the four schools. Randomly selected, heterogeneously grouped English classes were utilized in drawing out a sample of junior and senior student respondents in each school.

Limitations restricting the number of high schools selected for the study of guidance program adequacy has already been discussed. Although it was impossible to collect and compile responses of teachers, students, and administrators from more than the four schools selected for in-depth analysis, it was both possible and seemingly

advisable to further expand the study in an attempt to analyze responses of counselors from as many minimum and maximum spending effort schools, other than the four already mentioned, as would be willing to cooperate. Response forms were mailed, therefore, to counselors from each of the following high schools representing maximum spending effort districts: Granite, Provo, Carbon, Beaver, Weber, Kane, Uintah, Piute, and Emery. Identical response forms were also mailed to counselors from high schools located within the following minimum spending effort school districts: North Sanpete, North Summit, Park City, Duchesne, Wayne, and Iron. A total of sixty high school counselors were asked to complete and return, by mail, a "Counselor Response Form" (Appendix). Of this number, forty-eight, or eighty percent, responded relative to their personal evaluation of guidance programs in which they were currently employed.

Measuring Device

Response forms, consisting of twenty questions each, were developed for use with students, teachers, and administrators. A considerably longer response form, consisting of nine sub-sections and sixty-four items, was adapted from a previously developed guidance evaluation form (Warner and Porter, 1962) and was used in eliciting responses from counselors concerning personal perceptions of guidance program adequacy at their respective schools. The original drafts of the response forms used in the study were submitted to three school

psychologists and three professional school counselors for critical evaluation and for suggestions. Recommended changes were acted upon, whereafter the instruments were administered in a pre-test to a small, selected sample of three counselors, five teachers, ten students, and one administrator in an attempt to determine whether further changes were in order. Each of the individuals who responded in the pre-test of the measuring instruments expressed ease in understanding the items and indicated the questions were appropriate for inclusion in the response forms. The sample response forms found in the Appendix of this study are identical to those which, following a critical evaluation and pre-test, were used in eliciting the responses of teachers, students, counselors, and administrators that were subsequently analyzed as a part of this study. Particular care was taken in the development of the response forms to include those items that were quite clearly consistent with a desirable counselor role as defined by existing professional guidance organizations and in the current literature.

Student response forms

The student response form, developed and administered to high school juniors and seniors, consisted of twenty items and had the following objectives:

1. To determine whether students knew the identity of the school counselor and the location of the counseling offices.
2. To determine whether students perceived themselves as having been the recipients of counselor assistance in any of the following

areas: (a) vocational planning, (b) educational planning, (c) strengthening of study skills, (d) assistance with solving personal problems, (e) test interpretation, or (f) school adjustment.

3. To determine student attitude toward future continuance of guidance programs at their respective schools.

Administrator and teacher
response forms

The teacher response form and the administrator response form were developed and administered to all teachers and administrators from the four high schools sampled. The two individual response forms each consisted of twenty items and had the following common objectives:

1. To determine whether faculty members have a good professional relationship with counselors.

2. To determine whether faculty members perceive the guidance programs in their respective schools as being worth the time, money, and effort required to keep them functioning.

3. To determine if faculty members perceive students as receiving significant counselor assistance in any of the following areas: (a) educational planning, (b) vocational planning, (c) school adjustment, (d) assistance in understanding personal problems, or (e) test interpretation.

4. To determine if faculty members perceive themselves as being the recipients of counselor assistance in any of the following areas: (a) standardized test interpretation, (b) in-service experiences, (c) interpretation of follow-up or other studies, or (d) better

understanding or individual student or group behavior.

5. To determine if faculty members perceived the guidance program as having a primary role in the discipline of the school.

Counselor response form

A response form, consisting of sixty-four items and divided into nine sub-sections, was developed and administered to counselors. This form had the following objectives:

1. To determine the adequacy of physical facilities, as perceived by counselors, in the schools where they were employed.

2. To determine whether counselors engaged in local research and whether the results of significant guidance research was reported by school counselors to teachers, parents, and others.

3. To determine whether counselors regularly engaged in follow-up studies with students leaving their respective schools.

4. To determine if orientation services were provided as a regular part of the guidance program.

5. To ascertain if occupational and educational information services were available as an important part of the guidance program and whether these services seemed, in a practical sense, to be used.

6. To elicit responses relevant to the types of duties that counselors engaged in as a part of their regular responsibilities, (e.g., checking attendance, health room responsibilities, routine scheduling of students into classes).

7. To determine if and how standardized test information was utilized by counselors.

8. To obtain general information concerning counselors and their respective guidance programs, (e.g., certification of counselors; whether they have participated in a counseling practicum class).

9. To determine whether counselors kept current cumulative records and to further ascertain if and how they were used in a particular school.

Statistical Analysis

Fiscal data obtained from the Utah Office of Education concerning guidance expenditures were compiled and tabulated so as to determine the spending practices of Utah school districts according to the following classifications: (a) NDEA participation versus non-participation, (b) size of school district as determined by student population, and (c) maximum spending effort versus minimum spending effort being made by school districts for guidance services. Percentages were utilized in reporting the total expenditures for the various guidance services provided on an individual district basis, (e.g., testing, salaries, clerical assistance). T-ratio and analysis of variance were employed as statistical tools in determining significance of difference in per pupil expenditures according to large and small schools; NDEA participants and non-participants; maximum versus minimum spending effort school districts for guidance services.

Percentages were also employed in reporting "yes" and "no" responses elicited from teachers, students, administrators, and counselors from their respective response forms. Chi-square was used, when possible, in determining significance of difference between

students, teachers, administrators, and counselors representing minimum and maximum spending effort schools. It was discovered in computing chi-square problems that there were occasions when expected or observed frequencies were unusually small. Wert (1954) and Guilford (1956) have described some of the difficulties that may be encountered in testing hypotheses under similar conditions, even when using Yate's correction. Wert contended that with a small number of cases it was extremely difficult to demonstrate significant departures from the null hypothesis even though departures from the expected frequencies were proportionately quite extreme. In view of Wert's caution, the writer used chi-square only when the number of cases indicated that the results would be valid. Conversely, when the number of expected frequencies were less than five, the chi-square test was not applied.

Summary

Data from this study were obtained, in part, from the fiscal records of the Utah Office of Education. In addition, all teachers, counselors, administrators plus 402 junior and senior students from four selected Utah high schools constituted a sample which was utilized in determining adequacy of existing guidance programs as they related to the expenditures for such programs in their respective schools. Finally, forty-eight counselors completed a response form relating to their individual perceptions of guidance program adequacy in the schools in which they were currently employed. These particular counselors, representing an eighty percent return, were from high schools located within school districts identified as making either

maximum or minimum spending efforts for guidance services.

Percentages were employed in reporting teacher, student, counselor, and administrator responses elicited from various response forms. Chi-square, t-ratio, and analysis of variance were also used, when indicated, to determine significance of difference between sub-groups.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present findings concerning the current costs of existing secondary school guidance services in the State of Utah. Cost information has been reported in several ways: (a) by type of service offered, (e.g., clerical assistance, travel), (b) by size of the school district according to student population, (c) by amount of money presently being expended for guidance services in the various school districts, and (d) by participation or non-participation of school districts in NDEA or other federally funded programs for guidance services. Further, the chapter presents findings relative to the adequacy of certain selected high schools in Utah and attempts to determine the relationship between the characteristic of adequacy and the amount of money allocated and expended for secondary guidance programs in those schools.

Dollar Cost of Basic School Programs
in Utah Schools for 1967-68

District student population
and budgets

As a first step in the analysis of the data, total expenditures as well as the student populations of NDEA participating school districts were tabulated. This particular data was important to collect as a prerequisite to a subsequent determination of percent and per pupil expenditures that were being made by school districts

for guidance programs and particularly as these efforts related to the total maintenance and operation budgets of the various districts. Table 1 introduces data relevant to the total expenditures of NDEA participating school districts and divides the information into the three budgetary sub-categories ordinarily used by school districts, namely, maintenance and operation, capital outlay and debt service, and school lunch. It is especially important to note the maintenance and operation budget inasmuch as this is the one most often recommended in the literature as the base from which to determine the percent of the total budget to be expended for guidance services. The rationale for this particular recommendation is based upon the fact that capital outlay budgets are generally long-term in nature and are not subject to significant fluctuations or modification while school lunch budgets, which are heavily funded through federal programs, are not easily modified or controlled by local school districts. M and O budgets, under the stated circumstances, are those that are most easily changed and subject to some control by local school boards and districts and, thus, are the budgets that must be modified if adjustments in guidance expenditures are to be made.

Table 2 considers data which are comparable to those found in Table 1 except that non-NDEA rather than NDEA participating districts are examined. The first two tables are separated into NDEA and non-NDEA participating categories for the following reasons: (a) as a method of limiting the length of a single table and, thus, providing for ease in reading, and (b) for consistency with the State Office of

Education where a pattern has been established of reporting fiscal data according to participation in federally funded guidance programs. It will also be noted that the names of districts found in column 1 are not consistently alphabetized but, rather, observe a pattern followed by the Utah Office of Education of placing class "A" city school systems at the bottom of published lists. The pattern has been followed in this study so as to facilitate subsequent comparisons with data from the State Office.

Guidance budget allocations

In order to consider the question of guidance program adequacy as it relates to spending effort, it became necessary to further analyze the data from Tables 1 and 2.

Table 3 presents information concerning the budgets allocated by Utah school districts for guidance services in relation to their total maintenance and operations budgets. The data in Table 3 is displayed and reported in the following two ways: (a) in terms of percentage figures showing that portion of M and O budgets used for guidance services, and (b) according to the per pupil expenditures for secondary schools in each of Utah's school districts. The columns, "Total Pupil Personnel" and "Pupil Personnel Minus Guidance," may be confusing to the reader and, consequently, need further explanation. Data reported from Utah school districts relevant to "Total Pupil Personnel" services includes several sub-categories, (e.g., clerical salaries, travel, and others). One of

Table 1. Total basic program expenditures and secondary school population for NDEA participating Utah school districts for 1967-68

NDEA districts	Student population (grades 7-12)	M and O budget	Capital outlay and debt service	School lunch	Total
Alpine	7,244	\$ 7,644,549	\$ 2,453,548	\$ 816,161	\$10,934,258
Beaver	509	685,571	123,928	43,644	853,143
Box Elder	3,967	4,388,254	986,061	341,534	5,715,849
Cache	2,779	3,098,650	744,000	300,000	4,142,650
Carbon	2,020	2,495,104	1,988,891	169,535	4,653,530
Davis	13,181	14,646,200	4,876,330	1,834,756	21,357,286
Emery	748	965,932	442,945	73,500	1,482,377
Garfield	484	690,763	69,012	47,158	806,933
Grand	852	1,035,731	798,566	70,442	1,904,739
Granite	25,601	28,321,235	10,378,135	2,318,513	41,017,883
Jordan	8,059	9,759,666	7,059,281	748,650	17,567,597
Juab	505	529,205	112,386	37,940	679,531
Kane	348	553,158	415,382	11,000	979,540
Morgan	538	587,468	303,045	52,169	942,682
Nebo	3,660	4,799,800	2,050,656	436,400	7,286,856
North Summit	360	435,576	154,303	33,508	623,387
Park City	188	270,689	36,302	18,162	325,153
Piute	222	386,119	548,725	32,000	966,844
Rich	215	331,757	54,157	25,000	410,914
South Summit	316	437,348	900,217	26,100	1,363,665
Tintic	96	212,863	27,933	9,300	250,096
Uintah	1,851	2,212,151	781,644	180,353	3,174,148

Table 1. Continued

NDEA districts	Student population (grades 7-12)	M and O budget	Capital outlay and debt service	School lunch	Total
Wasatch	855	\$ 865,990	\$ 98,863	\$ 50,700	\$ 1,015,553
Weber	7,853	8,731,800	3,839,000	810,000	13,380,800
Ogden	7,981	9,868,857	5,072,617	744,717	15,686,191
Provo	3,203	3,983,221	2,066,423	325,000	6,374,644
Logan	1,965	2,159,603	827,270	202,670	3,189,543
Murray	2,737	2,957,951	2,040,306	291,000	5,289,257

Table 2. Total basic program expenditures and secondary school population for non-NDEA participating Utah school districts for 1967-68

Non-NDEA districts	Student population (grades 7-12)	M and O budget	Capital outlay and debt service	School lunch	Total
Daggett	70	\$ 246,782	\$ 21,553	\$ 7,813	\$ 276,148
Duchesne	1,136	1,209,764	588,105	132,286	1,930,155
Iron	1,486	1,939,000	1,470,000	117,900	3,526,900
Millard	1,135	1,481,685	545,413	129,563	2,156,661
North Sanpete	584	658,565	104,300	50,000	812,865
San Juan	773	1,267,100	192,500	91,300	1,550,900
Sevier	1,543	1,700,694	161,800	136,000	1,998,494
South Sanpete	872	953,510	373,150	82,700	1,409,360
Tooele	2,901	3,178,501	1,313,457	293,057	4,785,015
Washington	1,749	1,757,780	544,714	89,765	2,392,259
Wayne	252	403,572	47,048	30,442	481,062
Salt Lake City	16,442	18,956,883	5,212,300	0	24,169,183

Table 3. Expenditures for guidance programs in NDEA participating districts in relation to total budgets

NDEA districts	Cost of total pupil personnel services	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Cost of pupil personnel minus "guidance"	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Per pupil costs for guidance programs
Alpine	\$185,306	2.4	1.7	\$173,464	2.3	1.6	\$23.94
Beaver	13,560	2.0	1.6	13,560	2.0	1.6	26.64
Box Elder	90,287	2.1	1.6	90,287	2.1	1.6	22.76
Cache	64,379	2.1	1.6	57,879	1.9	1.4	20.83
Carbon	71,434	2.9	1.5	52,720	2.1	1.1	26.10
Davis	343,655	2.4	1.6	260,177	1.8	1.2	19.74
Emery	26,216	2.7	1.8	21,337	2.2	1.4	28.59
Garfield	10,730	1.6	1.3	9,154	1.3	1.1	18.91
Grand	18,721	1.8	1.0	17,149	1.7	.9	20.13
Granite	831,500	2.9	2.0	773,294	2.7	1.9	30.21
Jordan	207,926	2.1	1.2	160,533	1.6	.9	19.93
Juab	9,335	1.8	1.4	9,335	1.8	1.4	18.49
Kane	10,931	2.0	1.1	10,931	2.0	1.1	31.41
Morgan	11,807	2.0	1.3	8,567	1.5	.9	15.92
Nebo	115,701	2.4	1.6	98,999	2.1	1.4	27.05
North Summit	8,177	1.9	1.3	4,467	1.0	.7	12.41
Park City	2,594	1.0	.8	2,594	1.0	.8	13.80
Plute	6,416	1.7	.6	6,416	1.7	.6	28.90
Rich	5,930	1.8	1.4	817	.3	.2	4.80
South Summit	7,711	1.8	.6	7,711	1.8	.6	24.41
Tintic	5,777	2.7	2.3	5,777	2.7	2.3	60.18
Uintah	73,778	3.3	2.3	69,469	3.1	2.2	37.53

Table 3. Continued

NDEA districts	Cost of total pupil personnel services	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Cost of pupil personnel minus "guidance"	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Per pupil costs for guidance programs
Wasatch	\$22,331	2.6	2.2	\$ 20,543	2.4	2.0	\$24.03
Weber	239,085	2.7	1.8	215,370	2.5	1.6	27.43
Ogden	216,208	2.2	1.4	191,528	1.9	1.2	24.00
Provo	96,791	2.4	1.5	81,406	2.0	1.3	25.42
Logan	47,450	2.2	1.5	37,690	1.8	1.4	19.18
Murray	74,330	2.5	1.4	63,305	2.1	1.2	23.13

the sub-categories, "guidance," includes salaries and related costs that are incurred by districts for psychologists, school nurses, and individuals, other than counselors, who generally come under the "umbrella" of pupil personnel services. In discussing the fiscal data reported by school districts with the professional staff of the Utah Office of Education as well as with two district pupil personnel directors, it was agreed that if the sub-category "guidance" was excluded from the rest of the reported guidance budget data, the remaining funds would essentially represent a secondary school budget for guidance and counseling services. This, then, is the rationale for determining and reporting the column "Pupil personnel minus guidance" in Table 3. This same column title was subsequently used in arriving at per pupil expenditures for counseling and guidance services. Table 4 presents data comparable to that found in Table 3 with the exception that non-NDEA school districts, rather than the opposite, are considered.

District rank order

School districts were ranked according to per pupil expenditures for guidance services and this ranking was later utilized in identifying minimum and maximum spending effort districts. Districts making guidance expenditures of less than \$15.00 per student are classified as minimum spending effort districts while those making expenditures of \$25.00 or more per pupil are called maximum spending effort districts. Information relating to rank order is presented in Table 5. It should be noted that, while Tintic is seen as making a

Table 4. Expenditures for guidance programs in non-NDEA participating districts in relation to total budgets

Non-NDEA districts	Cost of total pupil personnel services	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Cost of pupil personnel minus "guidance"	% of M and O budget	% of total district budget	Per pupil costs for guidance programs
Daggett	\$ 18	.007	.007	18	.007	.007	\$.27
Duchesne	11,916	1.0	.6	11,916	1.0	.6	10.49
Iron	19,878	1.0	.6	19,878	1.0	.6	13.38
Millard	20,471	1.4	.9	17,137	1.2	.8	15.10
North Sanpete	9,401	1.4	1.2	8,401	1.3	1.0	14.39
San Juan	13,481	1.1	.9	13,481	1.1	.9	17.44
Sevier	33,202	2.0	1.7	24,322	1.4	1.2	15.76
South Sanpete	18,110	1.9	1.3	15,910	1.7	1.1	18.25
Tooele	63,305	2.0	1.3	52,779	1.7	1.1	18.19
Washington	33,886	1.9	1.4	33,886	1.9	1.4	19.36
Wayne	3,684	.9	.8	3,684	.9	.8	14.62
Salt Lake City	570,777	3.0	2.4	344,216	1.8	1.4	20.94

Table 5. Rank order of school districts according to guidance expenditures

District	Per pupil expenditure	Rank according to percent of M and O budget
Tintic (1)	\$60.18 b	3
Uintah (2)	37.53 b	1-2
Kane (3)	31.41 b	12-14
Granite(4)	30.21 b	1-2
Piute (5)	28.90 b	23-26
Emery (6)	28.53 b	7
Weber (7)	27.43 b	4
Nebo (8)	27.05 b	8-11
Beaver (9)	26.64 b	12-14
Carbon (10)	26.10 b	8-11
Provo (11)	25.42 b	12-14
So. Summit (12)	24.41	19-22
Wasatch(13)	24.03	5
Ogden (14)	24.00	15-17
Alpine (15)	23.94	6
Murray (16)	23.13	8-11
Box Elder (17)	22.76	8-11
S.L.C. (18) a	20.94	19-22
Cache (19)	20.83	15-17
Grand (20)	20.13	23-26
Jordan (21)	19.93	27
Davis (22)	19.74	19-22
Washington (23)	19.36	15-17
Logan (24)	19.18	18
Garfield (25)	18.91	30-31
Jusb (26)	18.49	19-22
So. Sanpete (27) a	18.25	23-26
Tooele (28)	18.19	23-26
San Juan (29) a	17.44	33
Morgan (30)	15.92	28
Sevier (31) a	15.76	29
Millard(32) a	15.10	32
Wayne (33) a	14.62 c	38
No. Sanpete (34) a	14.39 c	30-31
Park City (35)	13.80 c	34-37

Table 5. Continued

District	Per pupil expenditure	Rank according to percent of M and O budget
Iron (36) a	\$13.38 c	34-37
No. Summit (37)	12.41 c	34-37
Duchesne (38) a	10.49 c	34-37
Rich (39)	4.80 c	39
Daggett (40) a	.27 c	40

^aNon-NDEA participating school districts.

^bMaximum spending effort school districts.

^cMinimum spending effort school districts.

Herculean effort toward guidance spending in the amount of \$60.00 per student, that this is more of a reflection of the very small number (96) of secondary school students in the district. It is also important to recognize that a few school districts are ranked quite differently when both percent of M and O budget as well as per pupil expenditures are employed as ranking methods. The discrepancy can be best explained in terms of the student population of a given school district. A district may, for example, be making a moderate or even less than minimal percentage spending effort for guidance in relation to the M and O budget but an unusually small number of students in the secondary schools of the district will help to inflate the figure obtained in an analysis of per pupil expenditures. This is yet another justification for using per pupil costs as a method in ranking schools according to guidance expenditures.

Dollar deficits

Chapter II indicated that the current national literature suggests a figure of five percent as being realistic in terms of a percentage of an instructional budget to be allocated for a superior program. Tables 1 through 4 demonstrate that Utah school districts, with the exception of only one district, spend less than the three percent usually suggested as being necessary for even a minimum program. It is important to determine the amount of money that will be needed in order to bring Utah school district spending efforts up to a three percent minimum level, five percent superior level, or a "middle-ground" level of four percent. Table 6 presents data relative to this issue and suggests that even though the percentage of a district M and O budget allocated for guidance services may be average or above average in relation to Utah standards, the number of dollars needed to raise most district spending efforts to even a three percent minimum standard is, to say the least, substantial. Granite School District, as an example, now provides 2.7 percent of its annual M and O budget for guidance programs. To increase expenditures to a minimally recommended level of three percent would, however, require the district to allocate an additional \$76,342 for such services.

Sub-service expenditures

The question of how much of a guidance budget is allowed for various sub-services, (e.g., salaries, travel, testing), is

Table 6. Dollar differences between current and recommended expenditures for guidance services

Districts	1967-68 M and O budget	Current guidance costs	3% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 3%	4% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 4%	5% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 5%
Alpine ^a	\$ 7,664,549	\$173,464	\$229,936	\$ 56,471	\$ 306,581	\$133,117	\$ 383,227	\$209,762
Beaver ^a	685,571	13,560	20,567	7,006	27,422	13,862	34,278	20,718
Box Elder ^a	4,388,254	90,287	131,647	41,359	175,530	85,242	219,412	129,124
Cache ^a	3,098,650	57,879	92,959	35,239	123,946	66,067	154,932	97,053
Carbon ^a	2,495,104	52,720	22,133	99,804	47,084	47,084	124,755	72,035
Davis ^a	14,646,200	260,177	439,386	179,209	585,848	325,671	732,310	472,133
Emery ^a	965,932	21,337	28,977	7,640	38,637	17,300	48,296	26,959
Garfield ^a	690,763	9,154	20,722	11,568	27,630	18,476	34,538	25,384
Grand ^a	1,035,731	17,149	31,071	13,922	41,429	24,279	51,786	34,606
Granite ^a	28,321,235	773,294	849,637	76,342	1,132,849	359,554	1,416,061	642,767
Jordan ^a	9,759,666	160,533	292,789	132,256	390,386	229,853	487,983	327,450
Juab ^a	529,205	9,335	15,876	6,540	21,168	11,832	26,460	17,124
Kane ^a	553,158	10,931	16,594	5,662	22,126	11,194	27,657	16,726
Morgan ^a	587,468	8,567	17,624	9,057	23,498	14,931	29,373	20,806
Nebo ^a	4,799,800	98,999	143,994	44,995	191,992	92,993	239,990	140,991
No. Summit ^a	435,576	4,467	13,067	8,600	17,423	12,956	21,778	17,311
Park City ^a	270,689	2,594	8,120	5,526	10,827	8,233	13,534	10,940
Piute ^a	386,119	6,416	11,583	5,167	15,444	9,028	19,305	12,889
Rich ^a	331,757	817	9,952	9,135	13,270	12,452	16,587	15,770
So. Summit ^a	437,348	7,711	13,120	5,408	17,493	9,782	21,867	14,155
Tintic ^a	212,863	5,777	6,385	608	8,514	2,737	10,643	4,865
Uintah ^a	2,221,151	69,469	66,364	0	88,486	19,017	110,607	41,138
Wasatch ^a	865,990	20,543	25,979	5,436	34,639	14,095	43,299	22,755

Table 6. Continued

Districts	1967-68 M and O budget	Current guidance costs	3% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 3%	4% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 4%	5% of M and O budget	Added amount needed to meet 5%
Weber ^a	\$ 8,731,800	\$215,370	\$261,954	\$ 46,853	\$349,272	\$ 133,901	\$ 436,590	\$ 221,219
Ogden ^a	9,868,857	191,528	296,065	104,573	394,754	203,225	493,442	301,914
Provo ^a	3,983,221	81,406	119,496	38,090	159,328	77,922	199,161	107,755
Logan ^a	2,159,603	37,690	64,788	27,097	86,384	48,693	107,980	70,289
Murray ^a	2,957,951	63,305	88,738	24,432	118,318	55,012	147,897	84,591
Daggett ^b	246,782	18	7,403	7,384	9,871	9,852	12,339	12,320
Duchesne ^b	1,209,764	11,916	36,292	24,375	48,390	36,473	60,488	48,571
Iron ^b	1,939,000	19,878	58,170	38,291	77,560	57,681	96,950	77,071
Millard ^b	1,481,685	17,137	44,450	27,313	59,267	42,130	74,084	56,946
No. Sanpete ^b	658,565	8,401	19,756	11,355	26,342	17,940	32,928	24,526
San Juan ^b	1,267,100	13,481	38,013	24,531	50,684	37,202	63,355	49,873
Sevier ^b	1,700,694	24,322	51,020	26,698	68,027	43,705	85,034	60,712
So. Sanpete ^b	953,510	15,910	28,605	12,694	38,140	22,230	47,675	31,765
Tooele ^b	3,178,501	52,779	95,355	42,575	127,140	74,360	158,925	106,145
Washington ^b	1,757,780	33,866	52,733	18,866	70,311	36,444	87,889	54,022
Wayne ^b	40c,572	3,684	12,107	8,422	16,142	12,458	20,178	16,494
S.L.C. ^b	18,956,883	344,216	568,706	224,490	758,275	414,059	947,844	603,628

^aNDEA participating districts.^bNon-NDEA participating districts.

important enough that it should be answerable in terms of a school-by-school analysis. One of the significant, yet unfortunate, findings of the study was that it was impossible to obtain data that could be used in making a guidance cost analysis possible on an individual school basis since, in most instances, records pertaining to individual schools are not kept. Cost data are, nevertheless, compiled and reported for total districts so that it is possible to analyze information concerning expenditures for guidance sub-services on a district level. Table 7 reports the spending figures for guidance sub-services by NDEA school districts. It is impossible to ascertain from the data just what percentage of the expenditures allocated for the various sub-services are provided to counselors and their programs as opposed to the amount that may be allocated to other guidance services, (e.g., school psychologists, nurses). Pupil personnel directors in several Utah districts indicate that expenditures, minus the "Guidance services" category found in Table 7, essentially constitute a "pure" counseling budget. It is known through personal experience of the author, however, that none of the \$3,000.00 clerical budget reported by the Provo School District is used directly by the district's counselors but, rather, is used by the office of the Pupil Personnel Director. The data in Table 7 and 8 is, therefore, to be considered as tenuous; a helpful guideline perhaps but not "hard and fast" factual material. Table 8 reports spending figures for guidance sub-services for non-NDEA participating school districts rather than NDEA school districts.

Table 7. Expenditures for guidance sub-services by NDEA school districts

Districts	Counselor salaries	Guidance services	Clerical	Travel	Misc. supplies, printing	Care of office equip.	Purchase of office equip.	Test supplies	Test rentals
Alpine ^a	\$159,284	\$11,842	\$ 10,938	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 3,242	\$ 0
Beaver ^a	12,148	0	440	501	200	0	0	0	270
Box Elder ^a	83,853	0	1,500	429	560	0	0	795	3,150
Cache ^a	53,114	6,500	2,550	225	500	140	125	600	625
Carbon ^a	44,028	18,714	4,913	1,231	632	12	717	620	564
Davis ^a	242,352	83,478	10,000	75	400	0	300	50	7,000
Emery ^a	20,514	4,879	218	140	18	0	0	447	0
Garfield ^a	7,624	1,576	720	90	105	0	315	0	300
Grand ^a	16,087	1,572	0	155	181	25	0	127	574
Granite ^a	632,934	58,206	113,383	10,035	4,222	16	2,320	10,380	0
Jordan ^a	153,099	47,393	0	697	1,299	456	1,240	2,134	1,608
Juab ^a	7,920	0	538	266	10	45	286	174	95
Kane ^a	8,100	0	792	335	1,217	8	114	260	103
Morgan ^a	8,170	3,240	0	50	60	0	0	65	222
Nebo ^a	93,699	16,702	1,500	200	450	0	0	1,350	1,800
No. Summit ^a	3,650	3,650	160	84	154	16	24	196	243
Park City ^a	2,350	0	0	0	25	0	0	219	0
Piute ^a	6,026	0	250	65	25	0	0	50	0
Rich ^a	0	5,113	300	358	3	0	59	52	25
So. Summit ^a	6,885	0	675	42	0	0	0	109	0
Tintic ^a	4,146	0	891	275	350	0	71	6	38
Uintah ^a	58,001	4,309	6,899	1,766	500	25	360	798	1,120
Wasatch ^a	18,005	1,788	1,841	180	213	0	23	133	146
Weber ^a	181,242	23,715	23,520	2,720	759	136	730	3,617	2,644

Table 7. Continued

Districts	Counselor salaries	Guidance services	Clerical	Travel	Misc. printing, supplies	Care of office equip.	Purchase of office equip.	Test supplies	Test rentals
Ogden ^a	\$180,313	\$24,680	\$ 6,407	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$2,135	\$2,673
Provo ^a	71,906	15,385	3,000	1,500	900	450	450	2,700	500
Logan ^a	34,116	9,760	1,400	50	323	28	286	787	700
Murray ^a	60,989	11,025	0	100	0	0	0	1,177	1,038

^aNDEA participating school districts.

Table 8. Expenditures for guidance sub-services by non-NDEA participating school districts

Districts	Counselor salaries	Guidance services	Clerical	Travel	Misc. printing, supplies	Care of office equip.	Purchase of office equip.	Test supplies	Test rentals
Daggett	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 18	\$ 0
Duchesne	10,072	0	1,000	125	50	0	0	396	273
Iron	18,125	0	305	294	240	30	0	72	809
Millard	14,811	3,334	1,000	276	50	0	0	0	1,000
No. Sanpete	6,940	1,000	900	219	125	0	0	217	0
San Juan	12,888	0	0	0	25	0	25	353	189
Sevier	24,007	8,880	0	45	0	0	0	115	155
So. Sanpete	14,170	2,200	0	304	300	40	65	399	630
Tooele	46,061	10,533	3,520	1,500	500	90	714	387	0
Washington	31,769	0	0	487	93	0	0	1,515	0
Wayne	3,000	0	115	191	211	0	0	166	0
S.L.C.	314,376	226,561	21,540	4,500	3,800	0	0	0	0

Discussion of dollar costs

It is significant to observe from an analysis of the various tables in this section that only one Utah school district, Uintah, is clearly meeting the three percent figure that is usually suggested in the current literature as being necessary for the satisfactory operation of an even minimum guidance program. As one attempts to translate percentage figures into dollar costs, it is evident that the expenditure figure of five percent recommended in the literature as being required for a superior guidance program is so beyond the reach of most Utah school districts as to make it appear almost impossible to attain in the foreseeable future. In the Provo School District, for example, it would require an additional secondary school guidance expenditure of \$38,090 just to reach the three percent minimal level much less the \$107,755 that would be necessary for a five percent superior program—a seemingly impossible task. Tables 1 through 8, and particularly Tables 7 and 8, clearly demonstrate that Utah school districts as a group spend far less for secondary school guidance services than the figure recommended in related studies.

A particularly significant finding of Tables 1 through 8 has been referred to previously but bears repeating because of its special importance. That is, that data are not available or obtainable for conducting a school-by-school guidance cost analysis. It is quite impossible, at present, to ascertain the percentage of the various district guidance budgets that are allocated to schools

within multi-high school districts. It seems reasonable to speculate that a given high school in a multi-high school districts can receive considerably more guidance income than a companion school and, yet, to further find that there is no one district employee who can be identified as being specifically responsible for the disposition of such funds. Under present circumstances it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain an accurate accounting of secondary school guidance expenditures regardless of how desirable or necessary such an accounting may be.

Cost Analysis as Related to Stated Hypotheses

NDEA versus non-NDEA

The first hypothesis in the study was stated in the null form and suggested that there would be no significant differences in the per pupil expenditures for secondary school guidance programs between NDEA participants and non-participants.

Tables 9 and 10 illustrate the differences that do exist between per pupil expenditures of NDEA and non-NDEA participating school districts. Table 9 presents the data in terms of percentages of M and O budgets and total district budgets that are allocated for guidance programs while Table 10 deals with the same data, but in terms of mean dollar expenditures per pupil for these services. Statistical analysis of the data in Table 10 with the use of a t-test yields a significant ($p .01$) value of 4.16 which, in turn, indicates that the first hypothesis must be rejected.

Table 9. Percent of district budgets allocated for guidance programs by NDEA versus non-NDEA participants^a

Participation	Percent of M and O budget	Percent of total district budget
NDEA	1.9	1.3
Non-NDEA	1.3	.9
Mean Total	1.6	1.1

^aAll percents based on the "Total pupil personnel minus 'guidance'" column found in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 10. Mean dollar costs for guidance programs by NDEA versus non-NDEA participating school districts

Expenditures	NDEA participation	Non-NDEA participation	df	t-ratio
Per pupil dollar expenditures	\$24.14	\$14.85	38	4.16 ^{**}

^{**}Significant at 1 percent level.

It is perhaps important to draw attention to the fact that the mean per pupil expenditure of \$14.85 found in Table 10 is reduced to \$13.04 with the exclusion of the Salt Lake City School District from consideration. As a non-NDEA participant, the SIC School District makes a substantially greater spending effort for guidance services than do other non-NDEA participants. A further analysis of

NDEA participating school districts reveals that the mean per pupil expenditure of \$24.14 would increase to \$27.62 with the exclusion of both Tintic and Rich Districts which, partially because of limited student populations, represent the extremes in high and low guidance spending effort among NDEA participating school districts.

It is interesting, at this point, to consider the data in Tables 9 and 10 with a study of guidance costs reported from 151 California school districts during the 1963-64 school year (Stockhouse, 1965). All of the California districts were NDEA participants and are compared, in Table 11, with Utah NDEA participating school districts.

Table 11. A comparison of guidance spending by NDEA participating school districts in California and Utah

NDEA participants	Range of expenditures	Mean per pupil expenditure for guidance services
Utah (28 districts)	\$4.80-\$37.53	\$24.14
California (151 districts)	\$29.37-\$37.58	\$32.90

It will be observed that, while California school districts were studied four years prior to the Utah study, that California was, even at that time, spending more for guidance services than

the amount currently being expended by Utah NDEA participating school districts. The difference has added significance in view of the conclusion reached in the California study that their expenditures were considered only slightly better than those required for minimum programs.

District size

The second stated hypothesis in this study proposes that no significant difference will be found in the per pupil expenditures of school districts of varying sizes. Table 12 separates high schools, from all of Utah's forty districts, into the following four categories: (a) small, (b) medium, (c) large, and (d) metropolitan. A comparison of the four size categories in relation to their collective mean expenditures for guidance services yields, through analysis of variance, an F value of 12.77 which is significant at the one percent level of confidence. A further analysis of the data illustrates that it is the collective group of metropolitan schools, as opposed to the other three categories, that is making significantly greater expenditures for guidance services. A comparison of only small, medium, and large schools with analysis of variance yields an F value (p. 01) of .011. Thus, it is observed that the null hypothesis concerning size of school districts in relation to guidance spending is rejected and that significantly greater funding favors metropolitan districts, as a group, when compared with the other three size categories of small, medium, and large.

Table 12. Relationship of district size to guidance spending^{a,b}

Small districts	Per pupil expenditures	Large districts	Per Pupil expenditures
Garfield	\$18.91	Box Elder	\$22.76
Kane	31.41	Cache	20.83
No. Summit	12.41	Carbon	26.10
Park City	13.80	Nebo	27.05
Piute	28.90	Uintah	37.53
Rich	4.80	Provo	25.42
So. Summit	24.41	Logan	19.18
Tintic	60.18	Murray	23.13
Daggett	.27	Duchesne	10.49
Wayne	14.62	Iron	13.38
		Millard	15.10
		Sevier	15.76
		Tooele	18.19
		Washington	19.36
Mean			
Total	\$20.97		\$21.02
Medium districts	Per pupil expenditures	Metropolitan districts	Per pupil expenditures
Beaver	\$26.64	Alpine	\$23.94
Emery	28.59	Davis	19.74
Grand	18.49	Granite	30.21
Juab	18.49	Jordan	19.93
Morgan	15.92	Weber	27.43
Wasatch	24.03	Ogden	24.00
No. Sanpete	14.39	S.L.C.	20.94
San Juan	17.44		
So. Sanpete	18.25		
Mean			
Total	\$20.42		\$23.74

^aF value of 12.77 found in comparing four sub-categories (df 3, 36)

^bMean total expenditures for all districts equaled \$21.35

Discussion

A critical observation that can be made from Tables 10, 11, and 12 is that NDEA participating school districts allocate significantly more money for guidance programs than do non-NDEA participating school districts. It is not intended, under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, Title V, that the United States Government will continue to allot large sums of money for guidance support. It is anticipated, rather, that local districts will, in time, assume the major portion of the financial burden for guidance services that are initially supported quite heavily by federally funded programs. It appears from the data presented in Tables 9 and 10 that the hope of the NDEA designers has been partially realized, that is, NDEA participating school districts do provide more per pupil assistance for guidance services than do non-participants and it can be reasonably assumed that much of the cost is borne through local effort. It is also important to note in Table 11, however, that even though Utah NDEA participating school districts spend substantially more for guidance programs than do non-participants, they are still providing less than the mean per pupil expenditure of California NDEA participating school districts. This realization has increased meaning when it is seen in light of the fact that the California study preceded the present study by four years.

Perceived Adequacy of Guidance Programs in Four High Schools

A more comprehensive examination of guidance programs in four selected high schools was undertaken as a part of the study in an attempt to determine whether adequacy, as measured by the perceptions of teachers, counselors, students, and administrators, differed in schools that were identified as making either maximum or minimum spending efforts for guidance programs. Provo and Wasatch High Schools were identified as maximum spending effort schools while North Sanpete and Wayne High Schools were similarly selected as minimum spending effort schools. The necessity of limiting the perceptions of teachers, students, counselors, and administrators to four schools were, again, contingent upon the following: (a) the participation or non-participation of the school in NDEA, (b) identification of the particular school district as being one that was making either a minimum or a maximum spending effort for guidance programs, (c) the size of the secondary school student population being such as to classify the school as either large or small, (d) the willingness of the district to participate in the study, and (e) the requirement that the district have only one high school.

Counselor responses

Table 13 considers the responses elicited from counselors in the four selected high schools. The very limited sample used in

Table 13. Perceived adequacy of guidance programs by school counselors in four selected high schools^a

Response form items 1-16	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne				Response form items 17-32	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne			
	Yes		No		Yes		No			Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Physical facilities</u>									Student help	2	20	8	80	2	100	0	0
Provision	6	60	4	40	2	100	0	0	Graduates	0	0	10	100	1	50	1	50
Furnishings	6	60	4	40	1	50	1	50	<u>Orientation</u>								
Reception	6	60	4	40	0	0	2	100	New students	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0
Multipurpose	4	40	6	60	2	100	0	0	Transition	7	70	3	30	2	100	0	0
Records	6	60	4	40	1	50	1	50	Parents	9	90	1	10	1	50	1	50
Storage	5	50	5	50	1	50	1	50	Handbooks	7	70	3	30	1	50	1	50
Traffic	8	80	2	20	2	100	0	0	<u>Educ-Occup.</u>								
<u>Research</u>									Teacher plan.	6	60	4	40	1	50	1	50
Obtaining	5	50	5	50	1	50	1	50	College rel.	6	60	4	40	2	100	0	0
Criteria	3	30	7	70	1	50	1	50	Re-evaluation	3	30	7	70	0	0	2	100
Acquaints	5	50	5	50	1	50	1	50	Informed	8	80	2	20	2	100	0	0
Compiles	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0	Trade schools	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0
Test info.	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	Post-high	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0
Forms	2	20	8	80	0	0	2	100	Exploring	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
<u>Follow-up</u>									<u>Counseling</u>								
Conducted	2	20	8	80	1	50	1	50	Privacy	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
Strengths	7	70	3	30	1	50	1	50									
Leavers	1	10	9	90	2	100	0	0									

Table 13. Continued^a

Response form items 32-48	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne				Response form items 49-64	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne			
	Yes		No		Yes		No			Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One conference	2	20	8	80	1	50	1	50	<u>General</u>								
Health	1	10	9	90	0	0	2	100	Clerical	1	10	9	90	1	50	1	50
Discipline	3	30	7	70	0	0	2	100	Certification	9	90	1	10	1	50	1	50
Attendance	4	40	6	60	0	0	2	100	Master's degree	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0
Teaching	1	10	9	90	1	50	1	50	Internship	6	60	4	40	0	0	2	100
Get acquainted	7	70	3	30	2	100	0	0	USCA	10	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
Scheduling	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	ASCA	5	50	5	50	1	50	1	50
Fifty percent	8	80	2	20	2	100	0	0	Literature	3	30	7	70	1	50	1	50
Case conf.	9	90	1	10	1	50	1	50	Annual report	3	30	7	70	2	100	0	0
Test scores	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0	Philosophy	8	80	2	20	2	100	0	0
Forms	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0	Teaching exper.	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0
<u>Testing</u>									In-service	3	30	7	70	1	50	1	50
Results-teachers	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0	<u>Records</u>								
Modification	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	Couns. office	5	50	5	50	1	50	1	50
Parent visits	7	70	3	30	2	100	0	0	Permanent data	6	60	4	40	2	100	0	0
Local norms	3	30	7	70	0	0	2	100	Sequential	6	60	4	40	1	50	1	50
Predictive	2	20	8	80	0	0	2	100	Duplication	7	70	3	30	1	50	1	50
Administration	8	80	2	20	2	100	0	0	Staff use	10	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
									Accessibility	9	90	1	10	2	100	0	0

^aKey words from the response form are listed above. The complete items are available in the Appendix.

tabulating Table 13 prohibits sound statistical treatment and thus the information is valuable, not so much as predictive data, but as descriptive data. Perhaps the most legitimate use of the data in Table 13 can be made by the sampled schools themselves as they attempt to improve existing programs through a careful examination of perceived strengths and weaknesses as measured by counselor responses.

Student responses

The question of how adequate existing guidance programs are as they are perceived by student recipients or non-recipients, as the case may be, is treated in Table 14. Application of chi-square to the mean number of "yes" responses of students representing the two types of schools yields a value of .42 ($p .01$) and illustrates that there is no significant difference in the way these students perceive their respective guidance programs.

It should be observed that there are five of the twenty items from the student response form for which there is a percentage point variance of fifteen or more points between the two sampled groups. It is interesting to note that this percentage variance almost disappears when Provo High School is eliminated from consideration, and that this particular finding is evident in like responses from teachers and counselors. It appears that there may not be as much difference in the schools identified as minimum and maximum spenders as there is between Provo High School and the other

Table 14. Student perceptions of guidance programs in four high schools

Response form items	Maximum spending schools												Minimum spending schools											
	Provo				Wasatch				Total				No. Sanpete				Wayne				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Identification	96	92	8	8	97	99	1	1	193	96	9	4	103	100	0	0	97	100	0	0	200	100	0	0
2. Location	100	96	4	4	97	99	1	1	197	98	5	2	103	100	0	0	96	100	0	0	199	100	0	0
3. Appointments	74	71	19	18	78	80	19	20	152	76	38	19	94	92	8	8	90	93	7	7	184	92	15	8 ^a
4. Personal inter.	49	48	54	52	70	72	27	28	119	60	81	40	75	81	18	19	70	77	21	23	145	79	39	21 ^a
5. Privacy	79	77	24	23	72	74	25	36	151	76	49	24	81	83	17	17	86	91	9	9	167	87	26	13
6. Jobs	33	33	67	67	56	58	40	42	89	45	107	55	55	56	44	44	61	64	35	36	116	59	79	41
7. Recent interv.	71	67	35	33	92	94	6	6	163	80	41	20	74	72	29	28	81	84	16	16	155	78	45	22
8. Felt good	49	48	53	52	76	78	22	22	125	63	75	37	71	72	9	9	74	76	6	6	145	74	15	8
9. Confidentiality	6	6	98	94	30	31	67	69	36	18	165	82	19	19	79	81	20	21	76	79	39	20	155	80
10. Permission	84	82	19	18	76	78	21	22	160	80	40	20	81	79	21	21	77	79	20	21	158	79	41	21
11. Test informa.	40	39	63	61	68	70	29	30	108	54	92	46	84	83	17	17	41	43	55	57	125	63	72	37
12. Personal prob.	27	26	76	74	47	48	50	52	74	37	126	63	62	63	37	37	40	42	56	58	102	52	93	48 ^a
13. Vocational	25	24	79	76	47	49	49	51	72	36	128	64	26	26	75	74	50	52	47	48	76	38	122	62
14. Getting along	17	16	87	84	35	36	61	64	52	26	148	74	43	43	57	57	28	29	69	71	71	36	126	64
15. Group counsel.	23	22	81	78	17	18	79	82	40	20	160	80	91	90	10	10	54	56	43	44	145	73	53	27 ^a
16. Career infor.	22	22	77	78	46	47	51	53	68	35	128	65	59	59	41	41	52	54	45	46	111	56	86	44 ^a
17. Scheduling	47	45	58	55	92	94	6	6	139	68	64	32	67	65	36	35	69	73	26	27	136	69	62	31
18. Discipline	62	60	42	40	22	23	74	77	84	42	116	58	30	39	46	61	32	33	64	67	62	36	110	64
19. Study skills	12	12	87	88	20	21	77	79	32	16	164	84	26	27	72	73	19	20	77	80	45	23	149	77
20. Value of prog.	91	88	12	12	90	92	8	8	181	90	20	10	100	97	3	3	93	96	4	4	193	97	7	3

^aPercentage variance of fifteen or more points between the two major sub-groups.

three schools sampled.

The student respondents from maximum spending effort schools had a total mean score of eleven "yes," or positive responses, out of the twenty possible answers while those from minimum spending effort schools had a total mean score of thirteen "yes" answers. The number of "yes" responses by students in both groups would, by using the definition of adequacy described earlier, be slightly less than the number required for placement in the adequate guidance program range. In both instances, however, the groups are very close to the dividing line between the categories of "adequate" and "average."

Perhaps more important than the possible total mean "yes" differences that can be observed between students from maximum and minimum spending effort schools, is an item by item analysis of the responses of all sampled students. It is interesting to note, through such an analysis, that students often answer "yes" to items relating to the identification of counselors and to the location of counseling offices but respond "no" in approximately fifty percent of the cases, to items concerning participation in individual or group counseling. It appears that the students sampled in this study, (a) know who the counselors are, (b) are able to get appointments, (c) favor continuing guidance programs, and (d) receive counselor assistance in filling out class schedules. About one-half of the student respondents, however, do not see themselves as receiving assistance, (a) in vocational or career planning, (b) in receiving feedback from counselors relevant to

the results of standardized tests, (c) in having counselors assist them in "getting along with others," (d) in improving study skills, or (e) in discussing their personal problems.

Teacher responses

Table 15 compares and reports the responses elicited from teachers currently employed in the four sampled high schools. The total mean number of "yes" and "no" responses of teachers representing the minimum and maximum categories yields, when treated with chi-square, a value (p .01) of 1.14. Once again, as in the case with students, the observed differences are not significant which may, in part, be attributed to an inappropriate use of the terms "minimum" and "maximum." This point is elaborated upon in the next chapter but, for now, it is enough to suggest that, by nationally recommended standards, all of the schools in Utah are spending less for guidance services than the amount considered necessary for even a minimum program.

It is again interesting to note that there are seven individual items on which there is a percentage variance of fifteen or more points between the two groups of teachers but that, as before, the items on which there are considerable differences are reduced to two when Provo High School is eliminated from consideration. The number of positive responses by both groups of teachers meet the requirement for adequacy defined earlier in the study.

An analysis of the responses of all sampled teachers on the various individual items reveal that they tend, in the majority, to

Table 15. Teacher perceptions of guidance programs in four selected high schools

Response form items	Maximum spending schools												Minimum spending schools																							
	Provo						Wasatch						Total						No. Sanpete						Wayne						Total					
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No									
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%								
1. Relationship	50	98	1	2	11	100	0	0	61	98	1	2	15	100	0	0	18	100	0	0	33	100	0	0												
2. Dropout	47	92	4	8	11	100	0	0	58	94	4	6	15	94	1	6	17	94	1	6	32	94	2	6												
3. Program value	41	84	7	14	10	91	1	9	51	86	8	14	16	100	0	0	18	100	0	0	34	100	0	0												
4. Encouraged	47	92	4	8	11	100	0	0	58	94	4	6	15	94	1	6	18	100	0	0	33	97	1	3												
5. Case confer.	45	90	5	10	10	91	1	9	55	90	1	10	13	87	2	13	17	94	1	6	30	91	3	9												
6. Feedback	34	67	17	33	7	64	4	36	41	66	21	34	9	64	5	36	13	76	4	24	22	71	9	29												
7. Positive feeling	30	61	14	29	6	55	5	45	36	65	19	35	15	94	1	6	17	100	0	0	32	97	1	3				^a								
8. Referred parents	45	89	5	10	9	82	2	18	54	89	7	11	13	81	3	19	18	100	0	0	31	91	3	9												
9. Cum. records	34	81	7	15	10	91	1	9	49	86	8	14	15	100	0	0	18	100	0	0	33	100	0	0												
10. In-service	10	23	31	70	7	64	4	36	17	33	35	67	4	31	9	69	12	71	5	29	16	53	14	47				^a								
11. Test interp.	12	26	37	74	6	55	5	45	18	30	42	70	9	64	5	36	14	82	3	18	23	74	8	26				^a								
12. Vocational	25	52	17	35	9	90	1	10	34	65	18	35	14	93	1	7	11	73	4	27	25	83	5	17				^a								
13. Better unders.	34	68	16	32	10	91	1	9	44	72	17	28	13	87	2	13	13	76	4	24	26	81	6	19				^a								
14. Underachievers	30	60	16	32	7	64	4	36	37	65	20	35	12	86	2	14	9	56	7	44	21	70	9	30				^a								
15. Educational	24	50	16	33	10	100	0	0	34	68	16	32	14	93	1	7	12	80	3	20	26	87	4	13				^a								
16. Dress stand.	25	49	21	42	2	22	7	78	27	49	28	51	8	53	7	47	8	47	9	53	16	50	16	50				^a								
17. Occupational	4	8	44	90	4	36	7	64	8	14	51	86	8	50	8	50	5	29	12	71	13	39	20	61				^a								
18. Research	12	25	30	64	6	60	4	40	18	35	34	65	8	50	8	50	11	65	6	35	19	58	14	42												
19. Discussions	10	21	38	79	5	63	3	37	15	27	41	73	7	47	8	53	3	20	12	80	10	33	20	67												
20. Responsibilities	43	88	3	6	10	91	1	9	53	93	4	7	16	100	0	0	18	100	0	0	34	100	0	0												

^aPercentage variance of fifteen or more points between the two compared groups, (e.g., minimum and maximum).

have positive feelings toward the guidance programs in their respective schools. This attitude is evidenced by their stated willingness to refer students and parents to counselors as well as by the fact that over ninety percent of all teacher respondents say that they perceive guidance programs in their schools as being of value. It is also evident, however, that at least one-fourth of the responding teachers feel that they do not receive adequate feedback from counselors and, in addition, think that there are not enough services provided students. Twenty-five percent of the teachers, for example, answered "no" to questions relating to whether students make positive growth in academic achievement, vocational or educational planning, understanding of test results, or improved dress standards as a result of their respective school's guidance program.

Administrator responses

The responses of administrators from maximum and minimum spending effort schools are presented in Table 16. Percentages are not reported in Table 16 since, with the very small number of respondents, this type of reporting can too easily distort and lead to confusion, rather than clarification, of the data. Perhaps the most appropriate use of the data in Table 16 is that of assisting school administrators in identifying programs that they wish to implement and that are not now available in their schools. It appears, for example, that administrators can encourage counselors

Table 16. Administrator perceptions of guidance programs in four selected high schools

Response form items	Maximum spending schools						Minimum spending schools					
	Provo		Wasatch		Total		No. Sanpete		Wayne		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Relationship	3	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
2. Program value	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
3. Encourage visits	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
4. Feedback	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
5. Positive feelings	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
6. Compiles information	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
7. Dropout	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
8. Case conferences	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
9. In-service	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
10. Test information	1	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	2	0
11. Vocational	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
12. Understanding	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
13. Underachievers	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
14. Educational	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
15. Dress standards	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
16. Responsibility	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
17. Annual report	0	3	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	1
18. Research	0	3	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	0
19. Written statement	0	3	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	0
20. Parents	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0

to submit annual reports, initiate research projects, and prepare written statements on departmental role and philosophy as possible methods in further up-grading existing standards.

Discussion of the four
high school study

A careful study of Tables 13 through 16 reveal several important findings. First, it is impossible to generalize concerning the adequacy of guidance programs on the basis of responses elicited from counselors and/or administrators. The very small number of counselors and administrators sampled in the four selected high schools makes such a generalization extremely risky. Second, the number of "yes" responses elicited from students is less than the number needed for placement of the various school guidance programs in the "adequate" range according to the definition of adequacy given in this study. The minimum and maximum groups are, however, very close to the line used to divide the categories of "adequate" and "average." Third, teachers tend to answer response form items in a positive direction often enough to indicate that they perceive their respective school's guidance program as being adequate. Fourth, a careful item analysis of the response forms reveal that "yes" answers are usually elicited from teachers and students on questions relating to "non-counseling" functions, (e.g., do you know who the counselor is? do you know the location of the counseling offices? are you willing to refer students to counselors?) "No" responses from students and teachers are usually given on items relating to

personal contact between teachers, students, and counselors, (e.g., do you receive adequate feedback? do students receive vocational, educational, and personal counseling from the counselors?) There is more than a mere suggestion that the various guidance programs, as measured by the perceptions of significant persons in the four sampled high schools, barely meet the requirements for adequacy as defined in this study and that, furthermore, the meeting of the requirement is based primarily upon non-counseling items on the various response forms. It seems that counselors either lack the necessary skill that is needed in relating to teachers and students in a personal way or else they fail to communicate to others a role, including personal counseling, that they may actually be performing.

Budgetary Planning and Perceived Adequacy
of Guidance Programs by Counselors

Because of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of conducting a broad analysis of guidance programs in Utah schools because of limited samples and related problems, a decision was made by the author to at least attempt to elicit responses from school counselors employed in all of the minimum and maximum spending effort high schools, including schools in multi-high school districts. Responses of secondary school counselors representing schools from minimum and maximum spending effort districts are presented in Table 17. Only key introductory words are given in the column labeled "Response form items" and the reader is again referred to the Appendix for all of the complete response forms used in the study.

Table 17. Perceived adequacy of guidance programs by school counselors

Response form items 1-16	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne				Response form items 17-32	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne					
	Yes		No		Yes		No			Yes		No		Yes		No			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
<u>Physical Facilities</u>										<u>Student help</u>									
Provision	37	100	0	0	7	100	0	0	Graduates	18	47	20	53	4	57	3	43		
Furnishings	35	95	2	5	6	86	1	14	<u>Orientation</u>										
Reception	23	62	14	38	2	29 ^a	5	71	New students	30	83	6	17	6	86	1	14		
Multipurpose	21	57	16	43	4	57	3	43	Transition	23	62	14	38	4	57	3	43		
Records	36	100	0	0	6	86	1	14	Parents	31	84	6	16	4	57 ^a	3	43		
Storage	27	73	10	27	4	57	3	43	Handbooks	35	95	2	5	6	86	1	14		
Traffic	34	92	3	8	7	100	0	0	<u>Educ-Occup.</u>										
<u>Research</u>										Teacher plan.	14	38	23	62	5	71 ^a	2	29	
Obtaining	24	65	13	35	4	57	3	43	College rela.	37	100	0	0	7	100	0	0		
Criteria	19	51	18	49	2	29	5	71	Re-evaluation	30	81	7	19	4	57	3	43		
Acquaints	19	51	18	49	2	29	5	71	Informed	27	75	8	25	3	50 ^a	3	50		
Compiles	30	81	7	19	3	50 ^a	3	50	Trade schools	37	100	0	0	5	71 ^a	2	29		
Test info.	35	95	2	5	6	86	1	14	Post-high	37	100	0	0	7	100	0	0		
Forms	8	16	32	84	1	14	6	86	Exploring	36	97	1	3	7	100	0	0		
<u>Follow-up</u>										<u>Counseling</u>									
Conducted	20	54	17	46	2	29 ^a	5	71	Privacy	35	95	2	5	7	100	0	0		
Strengths	22	59	15	41	3	43	4	57	Discipline	13	35	24	65	0	0 ^a	7	100		
Leavers	20	54	17	46	3	43	4	57	Attendance	23	62	14	38	1	14 ^a	6	86		

Table 17. Continued

Response form items 33-48	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne				Response form items 49-64	Provo Wasatch				No. Sanpete Wayne			
	Yes		No		Yes		No			Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One conference	22	60	15	40	2	29 ^a	5	71	Certification	35	95	2	5	4	57 ^a	3	43
Health	6	16	31	84	0	0	7	100	Master's degree	30	86	5	14	5	71	2	29
Teaching	5	14	32	86	3	43 ^a	4	57	Internship	25	71	10	29	4	57	3	43
Get-acquainted	25	68	12	32	3	43 ^a	4	57	USCA	28	80	7	20	5	71	2	29
Scheduling	31	84	6	16	5	71	2	29	ASCA	16	44	20	56	4	43	4	57
Fifty percent	35	95	2	5	5	71	2	29	Literature	22	61	14	39	3	43	4	57
Case conferences	28	76	9	24	5	71	2	29	Annual report	25	69	11	31	3	43 ^a	4	57
Test scores	34	92	3	8	7	100	0	0	Philosophy	33	92	3	8	7	100	0	0
Forms	27	73	10	27	5	71	2	29	Teaching exper.	33	92	3	8	5	71	2	29
									In-service	13	36	23	64	2	29	5	71
<u>Testing</u>																	
Results-teachers	30	83	6	17	5	71	2	29	<u>Records</u>								
Parentification	37	100	0	0	5	71 ^a	2	29	Couns. office	32	89	4	11	6	86	1	14
Parent visits	30	81	7	19	6	86	1	14	Permanent data	31	86	5	14	5	71	2	29
Local norms	12	32	25	68	1	14	6	86	Sequential	32	89	4	11	3	43 ^a	4	57
Predictive	14	38	23	62	0	0 ^a	7	100	Duplication	33	92	3	8	4	57 ^a	3	43
Administration	32	86	5	14	6	86	1	14	Staff use	35	97	1	3	7	100	0	0
<u>General</u>									Accessibility	36	100	0	0	7	100	0	0
Clerical	34	92	3	8	3	43 ^a	4	57									

^aVariance of twenty-five or more percentage points between counselor responses from the minimum and maximum spending effort schools.

Caution must be used in interpreting and/or generalizing too broadly from the data reported in Table 17. Each of the counselors in the sample that are from minimum spending effort districts are employed in single-high school districts whereas most of the responding counselors from maximum spending effort districts are employed in multi-high school districts. Inasmuch as fiscal data are not available on a school-by-school basis within multi-high school districts, it is impossible to relate guidance program adequacy in these schools to cost factors. It was suggested earlier in the study that a given high school within a multi-high school district can be receiving a disproportionately larger share of a district's available guidance budget and yet, at present, to discover that it is impossible to determine if and when this condition may exist. Thus we have reported in Table 17, a comparison of multi-high school counselor responses with those of counselors from single-high school districts; a factor that must be considered as the data are interpreted.

The data in Table 17 were used in comparing, with use of chi-square, the total mean number of "yes" and "no" responses from counselors employed in either minimum or maximum spending effort school districts. A value of 1.28 ($p .01$) indicates that there is no significant difference between the two major groups. There are, however, nineteen individual items on which the two major groups, maximum versus minimum, differ by as much as twenty-five percentage

points or more. It is, nevertheless, necessary to be cautious in overgeneralizing from the percentages reported in Table 17 since the number of responding counselors from minimum spending effort schools is quite small and, thus, subject to some distortion. It is noteworthy to observe that counselors representing maximum spending effort schools have responded to response form items in a positive direction slightly more often than counselors employed in minimum spending effort schools. Counselors from maximum spending effort schools have, according to the tabulated data in Table 17, a total mean score of forty-eight "yes" responses which, in using the definition of adequacy found in this study, places them in an adequate guidance program category as measured by their own self-evaluation and perceptions. The total mean number of "yes" responses from counselors employed in minimum spending effort schools is forty which, in applying the same definition of adequacy, places them in the average program classification. In reality, however, both major groups are very close to the "cutting line" defined as average and adequate and are not, according to statistical analysis, significantly different.

In spite of the caution expressed by the author advising against rigid interpretation of Table 17, there are aspects of the data that are both interesting and meaningful. Strengths and weaknesses of guidance programs, as perceived by counselors, can be identified through a careful review of the nine subsections that are a part of the "Counselor Response Form" (Appendix). A review and discussion of the nine sub-sections follows.

Physical facilities (category 1)

Approximately one-half of all responding counselors indicate that multipurpose rooms are not available as a part of the guidance facilities at their schools. Further, counselors from minimum spending effort schools respond, about twice as often as counselors from maximum spending effort schools, to a lack of reception areas and adequate storage space in their guidance programs.

Research (category 2)

Perhaps the most apparent weakness observed in an examination of the data in Table 17, is in the area of research. It appears that counselors do not become actively involved in research and that they are unaware of forms that may be useful in evaluating existing guidance programs. An examination of Table 17 reveals that counselors do not see themselves as acquainting the professional staff of the school and/or parents with the results of significant research. This finding is very consistent with the responses of teachers and administrators to similar items on research.

Follow-up (category 3)

At least one-half of all the responding counselors reply "no" to items concerning their involvement in the follow-up of former students. This sub-section is related to research and, again, constitutes one of the areas of greatest weakness within guidance programs.

Orientation (category 4)

The development of student handbooks and the provision for new student orientation programs seem to constitute major strengths within most guidance programs. A study of Table 17 reveals that over three-fourths of all responding counselors answer "yes" to items concerning the fulfillment of orientation responsibilities.

Educational and occupational services (category 5)

The data in Table 17 illustrates that counselors perceive themselves as spending and utilizing much of their time and energy in providing educational and occupational services to students and, further, that they see these services as being rather broad in scope. Three-fourths of the counselors from maximum spending effort schools are reported as answering "yes" to questions concerning educational and occupational services. Although fewer counselors from minimum spending effort districts respond in a positive direction, at least one-half or more are observed as answering "yes" to educational and occupational items. This finding is particularly interesting in view of the responses of students that are reported in Table 14 and which indicate that the students responding from the four sampled high schools do not see themselves as being regular recipients of occupational assistance from counselors.

Counseling (category 6)

According to Table 17, counselors are usually responsible

for scheduling students into classes which, depending on one's personal guidance philosophy, can be seen as either a vice or a virtue. Counselor respondents also indicate that all students have an opportunity to review the results of standardized tests; a perception that is inconsistent with the responses of students when answering related items. It is also interesting to note that counselors employed in maximum spending effort schools seem to have far more responsibility for keeping student attendance records than do counselors from minimum spending effort schools. This latter finding may be "clouded" by the fact that the single, largest number of respondents, as a group, from maximum spending effort schools are from Granite School District and that this district has a practice of requiring counselors to assume a major responsibility for attendance accounting in the various secondary schools.

Testing (category 7)

An examination of Table 17 reveals that counselors generally see themselves as being involved in the administration and interpretation of tests. They also express, however, that the use of test results in the development of local norms or for use in predictive studies is very limited.

General services (category 8)

The data in Table 17 appears to illustrate that: (a) fewer

counselors in minimum spending effort schools have clerical assistance when comparing them to counselors in maximum spending effort schools, (b) seventy-nine percent of all counselor respondents have master's degrees, (c) thirty-six percent of all respondents have never participated in a supervised experience or internship in counseling, (d) seventy-six percent of the responding counselors presently affiliate with the Utah School Counselor Association while, in addition, forty-four percent are current members of the American School Counselor Association, (e) almost one-half of the respondents say that they are unable to read at least one professional article per week, (f) forty-four percent of all responding counselors do not prepare an annual report of guidance program activities, and (g) sixty-eight percent of the respondents express failure to provide in-service experiences for teachers and/or administrators in their respective schools.

Records (category 9)

The very high percentage of "yes" responses from counselors on items relating to record keeping systems, (e.g., cumulative records), seems to indicate satisfaction with this particular phase of existing guidance programs.

Policies Governing Spending and Budgeting

Do Utah school districts have definite, stated policies relating to the allocation of funds for guidance programs at individual schools? Do counselors understand fiscal policies

and practices, if available in stated form, that are relevant to the operation of guidance programs in their respective schools?

Eight of thirty-seven responding counselors, sampled as a part of the attempt to analyze counselor responses of those employed in all minimum and maximum spending effort school districts, indicate that there are definite policies governing the allocation of guidance program funds in their districts. Conversely, twelve of the thirty-seven of the responding counselors, or thirty-two percent, report that there are no budgetary policies concerning guidance funding while, finally, forty-four percent of the responding counselors say that they are uncertain as to whether or not such district policies exist. Although a number of counselors seem to be uncertain concerning the existence of guidance funding policies, several unsolicited statements seem to indicate that a familiar budgetary practice for guidance departments is simply that of requesting funds or materials only as special needs develop. The receipt of such funds or materials apparently depends on the ability or desire of a district or an individual school to honor the requests.

Ten counselors, or twenty-seven percent, indicate that they understand the fiscal policies relevant to the operation of guidance programs in their respective districts. The remaining twenty-seven counselors, or seventy-three percent, state that they do not understand such policies. Unsolicited, volunteer responses from several counselors seem to indicate that an understanding of

district fiscal policies is often limited to a knowledge that requests for funds must be made through a principal of an individual school or else through a district pupil personnel director.

Discussion of perceived
adequacy and budget

Responses from forty-four counselors representing maximum and minimum spending effort districts are analyzed in this section according to the respondent's perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of their respective guidance programs. It appears that counselors generally see the following facilities and services as being present and adequate as sub-areas within their various guidance programs: (a) physical facilities that are functional and attractive, (b) orientation programs for new students, (c) provision for educational and occupational services to students, (d) test administration and interpretation, and (e) satisfactory location and use of cumulative records. Counselors in this sample indicate that program weaknesses center in the general lack of research involvement and follow-up studies of students leaving their schools.

Individual and group counseling is generally accepted, at least in theory, as being at the very "heart" of the guidance function. It is difficult, however, to clearly identify whether responding counselors in this study perceive counseling in their various programs as strong or weak. Apparently the counselor respondents do see their respective guidance programs, in terms of the counseling process, as being: (a) private, (b) heavily oriented

toward the scheduling of students into classes, (c) void of disciplinary duties, health room responsibilities, or teaching assignments, (d) not involved with routine "get-acquainted" conferences with each new student, and (e) able to spend at least fifty percent of their day in face-to-face counseling. It is important to compare these perceptions with those of students and teachers found in Tables 14 and 15. An analysis and comparison of responses from counselors with those of students and teachers indicate that, while counselors seem to perceive themselves and the counseling function in their programs as being personal, educational, and occupational in nature as well as being positive and readily available, teachers and students do not always see themselves as being the regular recipients of these services. It is possible to speculate that a partial explanation for the observed inconsistency between the responses of counselors and those of teachers and students center in the lack of research involvement by counselors, weak or non-existent in-service programs for teachers, and ineffective informational feedback from counselors to students, teachers, administrators, and parents. Any one or all of these factors may partially explain the inconsistencies observed in the replies from the various respondents.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The development and completion of a descriptive research project which cumulates in a dissertation usually offers the researcher an opportunity to observe conditions and situations that are related to the research under question but which are also often difficult to substantiate through objective data. While the observations and even intuition of a researcher may not be purely objective, the understanding of a problem that has been researched may be enhanced, at least for the reader, by the willingness of an author to share his personal and often subjective feelings. It is upon this premise, as well as upon the support and encouragement of this premise by the author's graduate committee, that Chapter V is presented.

The author observed a prevailing attitude among counselors and administrators that guidance programs were important for some reason but that the exact reason had not yet been clearly identified. Personal interviews with numerous counselors and several administrators revealed that they were still primarily concerned with discovering an appropriate role and function for counselors. Statements discussing counselor role and function appear almost monthly in professional journals and tend to be amazingly consis-

tant in outlining appropriate responsibilities for counselors. It is, therefore, discouraging to find counselors and administrators still struggling to discover a list of counselor "do's" and "don't's." It was equally unsettling to read the tabular data in this study and to realize that counselors apparently felt that they were providing appropriate and necessary guidance services but that students and teachers, the would-be recipients of those services, often reported them as being unavailable.

The observed confusion concerning appropriate role and function appeared, to the author, to be quite naturally related to a lack of firm commitment to the entire field of guidance by counselor educators, administrators, officials of the State Office of Education, and others. The lack of commitment seemed, in turn, to result from confusion related to guidance services so that it was apparent that the familiar "vicious cycle" was in operation.

In order to reverse a trend that seems to have taken guidance programs in Utah secondary schools to a point of considerable confusion and only token financial commitment, several types of agencies and individuals will find it necessary to reconsider their influence on and commitment to the guidance field. The next few paragraphs consider some of these more prominent individuals and agencies.

Counselor educators

It is herein suggested that university counselor educators, as a group, have been reluctant and negligent in assisting school

counselors and administrators with the implementation of sound guidance programs in the public schools of Utah. Professional responsibility should not end at the door of a university classroom but must, rather, travel through the portals of the public school and into the office of the counselor and administrator. It is suggested that counselors and counselor educators from the major institutions of higher learning in Utah need to sponsor workshops or dialogs for the purpose of exploring practical approaches in implementing sound guidance programs in public schools. This exploration should, at all times, focus in on the necessity of counselor educator involvement in such implementation.

Professional organizations

The author recently had the opportunity of observing the Senate of the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the Delegate Assembly of the American School Counselor Association during the 1969 APGA Convention in Las Vegas. Resolutions were introduced in both of these professional organizations which asked and, in one instance, demanded that the associations minimize their traditional concerns with dues collection, the publication of a monthly journal, and other relatively insignificant matters and, instead, address themselves to issues concerned with human dignity, the implementation of excellent counseling and guidance programs, and problems of equal national and personal

importance.

Professional organizations have concerned themselves with the development of statements of appropriate role and function but, thus far, appear to have left the evaluation of role performance to individual researchers. There is an evident need for evaluative criteria that extends beyond the response form method since perceptions on such forms, although widely used in research, may not discriminate nearly well enough. Response forms are often, however, all that an individual researcher has the time, funds, or inclination to develop. It is the author's observation that only an organization with sufficient personnel, time, and money is very apt to develop instruments and techniques that are sophisticated and sensitive enough for sound guidance program evaluation. It would appear that professional organizations such as the American School Counselor Association and the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors must begin addressing themselves to their professional responsibility for the development and publication of appropriate criteria for the evaluation of guidance programs, (i.e., the selection and training of evaluation teams, development of more sophisticated measuring instruments).

State Office of Education

It is the judgement of the author that the department within the State Office of Education that is responsible for pupil personnel services is severely under-staffed. The depart-

ment currently employs specialists in vocational education and in testing but, interestingly enough, none in the area of counseling theory and practice which is generally agreed as constituting the "heart" of sound guidance programs. It should not be assumed that practicing school counselors have had the educational background or practical experiences that would enable them to deal with other individuals on a very personal level. On the contrary, responses from counselors in this study indicated that many had never participated in a supervised counseling experience or in an internship of any kind. It seems that the State Office of Education staff that is responsible for pupil personnel services must re-assess their responsibility for the implementation of excellent guidance programs in the public schools and, further, that they give serious consideration to their role in up-grading the counseling skills of practicing counselors. It is concluded by the author, on the basis of observation of several on-going guidance programs, that a critical priority of the State Office of Education is the employment of a specialist in counseling theory and practice. In conclusion, it appears to the author that an observed inadequacy in the form of services rendered by the State Office of Education demonstrates a serious lack of commitment and/or drive by those in key positions to effect positive change.

Counselors

It was observed that counselors quite regularly expressed uncertainty as to what constituted a proper counselor role and that the confusion was often related to a perceived conflict between counseling theory, as taught in university classes, and the realities of actual practice in the public schools. The author often found counselors expressing a desire to perform roles that were more consistent with recommended statements and theory but also indicating that they were uncertain as to how they could overcome long standing policies or practices of their respective schools.

In the estimation of the author, counselors must come to understand that it is they who must help others to recognize and eventually accept the appropriate role and service that they have to offer. Other agencies and individuals can support the counselor in this effort but they cannot totally assume this responsibility for him. Although it may seem idealistic to some, it appears that counselors must become more willing to discover and assume, even when faced with obvious risks of employment change or the initial misunderstanding of others, a truly professional stance. Counselors appear to have been successful in overcoming a once acceptable, but now unpopular, image of "teacher-counselor." It appears from observation of several existing programs, however, that the "teacher-counselor" role has merely been traded for one that could

be titled "administrator-counselor" which, in terms of the total success and value of guidance programs to students and others, is seemingly far less desirable than the former role.

Local administrative
commitment

The tabular data in this study clearly demonstrated that Utah districts were spending only about one-half of the three percent generally recommended in related studies. The fact that one school district, Uintah, did spend the suggested three percent of its instructional budget demonstrates that increased spending for guidance programs is possible. It would seem that the primary obstacle that must be overcome in obtaining budgets required for even minimum guidance services is the apathy or lack of full commitment on the part of those administrative officers who determine local school spending. Unless this type of commitment is forthcoming, it is foolish to expect sound, minimum guidance programs, much less superior ones, in the public schools of Utah.

In the opinion of the author, counselors have been placed at a serious disadvantage as a result of limited funding. It seems very possible that teachers, administrators, parents, and others may have read or heard of guidance programs in other geographic locations which were excellent in the quality and quantity of services offered and, yet, fail to understand that these programs have been substantially better financed than those found in Utah. Observers and possible critics of guidance programs in Utah should

not assume that they can benefit from the same quality of services offered in other places without engaging in comparable spending. It seems, then, that a true commitment to guidance by administrators must begin, in large measure, with the allocation of realistic budgets.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the current costs of secondary school guidance services in the State of Utah. In addition, the study attempted to evaluate the adequacy of certain selected guidance programs and, finally, to determine if a relationship existed between total expenditures made for guidance programs and the adequacy of those programs.

The literature would suggest that it is possible to determine a guidance spending figure that will enable a school district to develop a minimum or a superior guidance program. The "rule of thumb" usually agreed upon is three percent of the instructional budget of a school district being required for a minimum program and five percent of the instructional budget being necessary for a superior program.

In meeting its stated purposes, this study collected, compiled, and analyzed fiscal data from the State Office of Education that was concerned with district guidance expenditures. In addition, response forms were administered to students, school administrators, counselors, and teachers. The forms were designed to elicit responses concerning perceived adequacy of guidance programs in the respondents'

respective schools.

Percentages were employed in reporting the responses of teachers, students, administrators, and counselors and also in reporting information relevant to the fiscal data obtained from the State Office of Education. Chi-square, t-ratio, and analysis of variance were used, when indicated, in determining significance of difference between various sub-groups.

Results illustrated that Utah school districts spend a per pupil total dollar mean of \$21.35 for secondary school guidance programs. When this figure is translated into a percentage of total instructional budgets allocated by all Utah districts, it is discovered that the districts spend 1.6 percent which, in terms of national recommendations found in the literature, is below the amount suggested for even a minimum guidance program.

NDEA participating school districts make a greater spending effort for guidance services than do non-NDEA participants. It is also noticed that metropolitan sized districts with student populations of over five thousand make greater guidance expenditures than smaller size districts.

Counselors and students from both minimum and maximum spending effort schools perceive the guidance programs in their respective schools as ranging from "average" to "adequate" while teachers and administrators generally see the programs as being "adequate." An item analysis of the various response forms indicate that counselors usually perceive their programs as providing a broad

variety of guidance services that are considered important to a sound program. The analysis also indicates, however, that students and teachers do not often see themselves as the recipients of such services.

Counselors appear, according to the reported data, to be poorly informed as to the existence of district policies governing guidance spending or to the methods of utilizing such policies if, indeed, they do exist.

Conclusions

Various sub-groups identified in this study make greater guidance expenditures than others, namely, metropolitan districts as opposed to large, medium, or small districts; NDEA participating school districts as opposed to non-participants. The minimal requirements imposed by the various federal agencies which sponsor programs of financial assistance to schools has apparently influenced some districts in releasing more of their local funds for the support of guidance programs. To this extent, the federal programs which attempt to improve local guidance programs through the use of "priming" funds seem to have been successful in the encouragement of some improvement in twenty-eight of the forty districts in Utah. Although the improvements can be considered positive, they must nevertheless be interpreted with some degree of pessimism since all of the districts in Utah, except Uintah, allocate less for guidance programs than the amount usually considered necessary for even minimum services.

The desire in this study to determine whether a positive relationship existed between guidance program expenditures and the adequacy of those programs was not realized. It would be presumptuous to attempt, on the basis of the limited available data, any kind of objective cause and effect explanation of expenditures as they relate to guidance program adequacy. It is concluded, nevertheless, that the allocation of larger sums of money is not guarantee, by itself, of guidance program success. Provo High School, for example, was identified in the study as a maximum spending effort school but was seen by its students as having only an average program. North Sanpete High School was, conversely, classified as a minimum spending effort school but was perceived by its students as having an adequate program. This particular conclusion must, however, be interpreted in recognition of the fact that all but one of the forty Utah school districts would, under the recommendations of related studies, be considered as making expenditures considerably under the amount deemed necessary for even minimum guidance programs. It is important to recall that the categories "maximum" and "minimum" used in this study apply to districts making greater or lesser guidance expenditures in relation to a total mean for all Utah districts rather than to any nationally suggested figure.

It is concluded, from an analysis of the data as well as from personal interviews with several district pupil personnel directors, that the per pupil expenditure figures reported in the study may not be entirely accurate but, instead, are somewhat

inflated and represent an overestimate of what is actually spent. The apparent discrepancy is due to the impossibility of obtaining a detailed, factual breakdown of the various sub-category budgets, (e.g., testing, clerical assistance), that may be allocated to other pupil personnel professional employees such as psychologists or school nurses. While pupil personnel directors report that almost the entire combined sub-category budget is allocated to guidance departments, it would be unusual to find the total sum going for such services. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the per pupil expenditures for guidance may be slightly lower than those reported in the tabular data.

It is concluded that the terms "minimum" and "maximum" as used in this study to describe Utah school districts representing the extremes in guidance spending, were inappropriately used. In reality, only one school district allocated the three percent figure recommended by the current literature as being necessary for a minimum program. It appears, therefore, inaccurate to speak of "minimum," "adequate," or "superior" guidance programs in Utah since, in terms of nationally suggested figures, they do not exist.

The recommendations and conclusions in this study are made as forthright criticisms of existing guidance programs and fiscal policies. It does not suppose that blame could or should be assessed to any single source but, rather, concludes that the responsibility for existing programs, whether good or bad, must be shared by counselors, administrators, parents, counselor educators, state officials, and others.

Recommendations

Suggested recommendations resulting from this study are as follows:

1. It is recommended that school-by-school guidance records, as they particularly relate to funding and actual expenditures, be required of schools and local districts and, further, that the Utah Office of Education require such reporting as a prerequisite for state educational and financial support to districts. It is understood that this recommendation, if accepted, could impose a temporary inconvenience or even hardship on some districts but it appears to be the only realistic method for collecting and accurately evaluating guidance expenditure data in Utah. Subsequent studies concerning the relationship of program adequacy to spending effort, if attempted, will demand that such data are available.

2. It is recommended that the computer service now available through the State Office of Education be utilized in annually gathering and reporting data concerned with guidance spending and that this information be openly circulated and distributed to counselors, professional educators, P.T.A. organizations, and to the lay public in general.

3. It is recommended that district fiscal policies be clarified for all district professional staff members and that, additionally, guidance departments in individual schools be required to submit proposed budgets each year. The proposed budgets should subsequently be acted upon by school administrators so as to encourage long-range

planning by guidance departments rather than the emergency type of planning and spending that is all too prevalent in the public schools.

4. It is recommended that school districts move as rapidly as possible in the direction of allocating guidance funds in the amount of three percent of their M and O budgets. It is further recommended that districts adjust guidance expenditures in order to provide at least four percent of the M and O budget and that this adjustment be accomplished within the next five years.

5. Finally, it is recommended that research in the area of guidance spending continue. It is hoped that individuals will attempt similar studies in the future and that they will find it possible, as a result of improved standards of reporting, to better analyze guidance funding and program adequacy in Utah schools.

LITERATURE CITED

- Acree, Nathan E., and Benjamin Marquis. 1957. Counseling in secondary schools of Tennessee. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 36:279-281.
- American School Counselor Association. 1964. Proposed statement of policy for secondary school counselors and proposed guidelines for implementation of the ASCA policy for secondary school counselors. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C. 11 p.
- California State Department of Education. 1956. Staff ratios and costs of guidance services. *Research Briefs* 11:1-4.
- Costa, A. 1961. An analysis of the cost of guidance services in 168 Minnesota high schools. Unpublished MS thesis. University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Cramer, Stanley H., and Edwin L. Herr. 1966. The secondary school guidance experience and reaction to college counseling services. *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly* 15:181-185.
- Crosby, Joseph W. 1956. The cost of guidance services in selected high schools. *California Test Bureau Report E.* 15 p.
- Emery, Clifton. 1952. The cost of guidance. *Occupations* 30:525-526.
- Feirer, John L. 1967. An outsider looks at guidance counseling. *Industrial Education* 21:1.
- Gaskins, John R. 1967. Expenditures for pupil personnel services. Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services, Silver Spring, Maryland. 90 p.
- Guilford, J.P. 1956. *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education.* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. 317 p.
- Hansen, Lorraine. 1967. Pressures on the counselor, p. 158-162. In Alfred Stiller (Ed.). *School Counseling 1967: A View From Within.* American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C. 273 p.
- Hardaway, Charles W., Grace Bosak, and Helen Ederle. 1964. Budgetary and financial provisions for guidance services in Indiana public secondary schools. *The Teachers College Journal* 35(6):229-243.

- Hatch, Raymond N., and Buford Steffler. 1958. Administration of guidance services. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 346 p.
- Hill, George E. 1965. Management and improvement of guidance. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 556 p.
- Hollis, Joseph W., and Lucile U. Hollis. 1965. Organizing for effective guidance. Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois. 495 p.
- Hopke, William E., and James P. Brahaney. 1967. A survey of junior high school guidance programs in Florida. The School Counselor 15:125-129.
- Little, Kenneth J. 1960. Explorations into the college plans and experiences of high school graduates. The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. 23 p.
- Mathewson, Robert H. 1962. Guidance policy and practice. Harper and Row, New York. 349 p.
- McDaniel, Henry B. 1956. Guidance in the modern school. The Dryden Press, New York. 378 p.
- McDaniel, Henry B. 1966. Address to the Fifth Annual Articulation Conference, Provo, Utah. October, 1966.
- Palm, Harold S. 1961. High school guidance: what does it cost today? The Vocational Guidance Quarterly 9:169-172.
- Roeber, Edward C., Clifford E. Erickson, and Glenn E. Smith. 1955. Organization and administration of guidance services. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York. 377 p.
- Schmidt, L. 1965. Some ethical, professional, and legal considerations for school counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal 44:376-382.
- Scott, John Finley. 1967. Where to get bad advice about college. Ladies' Home Journal 53:39-42.
- Stockhouse, Robert E. 1965. Address at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota. April 14. (Mimeographed). 23 p.
- Tyler, Leona E. 1961. The work of the counselor. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 323 p.
- Tyler, Leona E. 1966. The work of the counselor. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 327 p.

- Utah State Board of Education. 1968. Annual report of federal assistant programs for the N.D.E.A. of 1958. Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah. 47 p.
- Utah State Board of Education. 1967. Suggested research problems. Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah. 4 p.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1964. Commitment to youth. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 44 p.
- U.S. Department of Labor. 1962. Career guidance. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 23 p.
- Warner, O. Ray. 1964. Cost of secondary school guidance services. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 19 p.
- Warner, O. Ray, and LeRoy Porter. 1962. Guidance services evaluation. Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah. 7 p.
- Wellman, Frank E. 1957. The cost of guidance services. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa. 33 p.
- Wert, James E. 1954. Statistical methods in educational and psychological research. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 362 p.

APPENDIX

Counselor response form

Please check "yes" or "no" in the appropriate column:

YES NOPhysical Facilities

- ___ ___ 1. Specific provision has been made for physical facilities for guidance at the school or schools where you work.
- ___ ___ 2. Furnishings are functional and attractive.
- ___ ___ 3. The reception area is adequately spacious and attractive.
- ___ ___ 4. A conference and/or multipurpose room is provided.
- ___ ___ 5. Student records are readily accessible.
- ___ ___ 6. Storage facilities are adequate and conveniently located.
- ___ ___ 7. The guidance unit is readily accessible to students, and near the main flow of student traffic.

Research and Evaluation

- ___ ___ 8. The counselor secures information on the effectiveness and value of guidance services in the school.
- ___ ___ 9. The counselor formulates criteria by which the school's guidance program can be evaluated, conducts local studies on the effectiveness of guidance services, and presents findings of such research to the school administrator.
- ___ ___ 10. The counselor acquaints staff and community with results of research.
- ___ ___ 11. The counselor compiles information which is summarized, interpreted, and made available to the administration.
- ___ ___ 12. The counselor interprets standardized test results to staff members as they have implication for curriculum planning and program evaluation.
- ___ ___ 13. Forms are developed and procedures organized for the periodic evaluation of guidance services by teachers, administrators, students, and parents.

Follow-up

- ___ ___ 14. Follow-up studies are conducted to secure information from school leavers concerning strengths and weaknesses of the guidance services.

- ___ 15. Follow-up studies are conducted to secure information on strengths and weaknesses of the school program in general.
- ___ 16. Periodic surveys are conducted on the activities of all school leavers including graduates.
- ___ 17. Opportunities are provided for students now in school to help with follow-up studies.
- ___ 18. Follow-up studies include all school leavers--those dropping out as well as those being graduated.

Orientation Services

- ___ 19. A planned orientation program is provided for students coming to the school for the first time.
- ___ 20. An orientation is provided for each transition point in the child's educational career.
- ___ 21. Meetings with parents to explain the school's objectives and programs are planned.
- ___ 22. Handbooks and other materials on the school's program and objectives are provided for use by students and parents.

Occupational and Educational Information Services

- ___ 23. As a counselor, I actively help teachers in the planning and teaching of units and courses in guidance.
- ___ 24. Our school participates in the Utah High School-College Relations Committee program for orienting students to post-high school educational opportunities.
- ___ 25. All occupational and educational information is re-evaluated annually, and out-dated material is discarded.
- ___ 26. As a counselor, I am able to keep informed on current occupational trends and opportunities on local, state, and national levels.
- ___ 27. As a counselor, I am able to keep apprised of current college and trade and technical school requirements, costs, and scholarship information.
- ___ 28. Information is available at our school to students concerning post-high school educational opportunities.

- ___ ___29. Information is available at the school for students interested in exploring occupational opportunities.

Counseling Services

- ___ ___30. Space is available for conducting private counseling interviews.
- ___ ___31. I have the responsibility for disciplining students (punishing students).
- ___ ___32. I am responsible for checking attendance.
- ___ ___33. Each student was scheduled for at least one conference during the year.
- ___ ___34. I have responsibility for the student health room.
- ___ ___35. I carry a teaching assignment in addition to my counseling responsibilities.
- ___ ___36. "Get-acquainted" interviews are scheduled for all new students.
- ___ ___37. I am responsible for scheduling students into classes.
- ___ ___38. I am able to spend the greater part of the day (half or more) in conferences with people (group or individual).
- ___ ___39. Regular case conferences are scheduled with teachers and/or parents on individual student problems.
- ___ ___40. All students have the opportunity to have their standardized test scores interpreted on an individual or selective group basis.
- ___ ___41. Standard forms and procedures have been established and are used for scheduling counseling interviews.

Scholastic and Test Information

- ___ ___42. Test results are used in helping teachers individualize instruction.
- ___ ___43. Test results are made available to the administration for curriculum modification.
- ___ ___44. Parents are periodically invited to visit the counselor's office for test interpretation and/or other assistance.
- ___ ___45. As a counselor, I prepared or supervised the preparation of local norms for standardized tests.
- ___ ___46. Predictive studies have been attempted at the school utilizing the results of grades and standardized test results.

- ___ ___47. As a counselor, I have been responsible for the administration of the standardized testing program.

General Information

- ___ ___48. Paid clerical assistance (non-student help) is available as part of the guidance department staff.
- ___ ___49. I currently hold a professional Pupil Personnel Certificate for Utah.
- ___ ___50. I have a master's degree or equivalent hours in some area of education.
- ___ ___51. I have had a supervised experience or internship in counseling.
- ___ ___52. I am affiliated with the Utah School Counselor Association.
- ___ ___53. I am affiliated with the American School Counselor Association.
- ___ ___54. I take time to read at least one article a week from current professional guidance literature.
- ___ ___55. As a counselor, I prepare an annual report of guidance activities for the administration.
- ___ ___56. The guidance program at our school is based on a written statement of goals and philosophy.
- ___ ___57. I have had at least three years of teaching experience.
- ___ ___58. In-service guidance experiences are provided for teachers and administrators at our school.

Cumulative Records

- ___ ___59. Cumulative records are available in the counselor's office.
- ___ ___60. Only data of permanent value are kept in the permanent cumulative folder.
- ___ ___61. Student records are so organized that data are entered in sequential order so relationships and progress are traced easily.
- ___ ___62. Provision has been made for convenient duplication of parts of student records.
- ___ ___63. Student records are consulted by staff members in cases involving choice of courses or vocation, attendance, failure, conduct, and similar problems.

- ___ 64. Records containing information are readily accessible to all who are authorized to use them.

Administrator response form

Please check "yes," "no," or "none" in the appropriate spaces:

YES NO NONE

- ___ 1. Have a good professional relationship with the counselor (s).
- ___ 2. Have felt that the guidance program is worth the time, energy, and space required.
- ___ 3. Have encouraged students to schedule visits with the counselor.
- ___ 4. Have felt adequate feedback has been given when I have referred a student for counseling.
- ___ 5. Believe that other teachers have a positive feeling toward guidance.
- ___ 6. The counselor compiles information which is summarized, interpreted, and made available to the administration.
- ___ 7. Have asked potential dropout students to visit with a counselor.
- ___ 8. Have found it easy to initiate case conferences with the counselor concerning students with problems.
- ___ 9. In-service guidance experiences are provided for teachers and administrators by the counselors at our school.
- ___ 10. The counselor(s) have interpreted standardized test information in faculty, or other meetings, which has helped the teachers in individualizing instruction.
- ___ 11. Have felt that students made realistic vocational choices as a result, in part, of the guidance program at our school.
- ___ 12. Have felt that the counselor(s) have helped me to understand students better.
- ___ 13. Have attributed improved motivation of under-achievers, in part, to the guidance program at our school.

- ___ ___ ___ 14. Have felt most students make realistic educational choices as a result, in part, of the guidance program at our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 15. Have attributed improved standards of dress or other behavior, in part, to the guidance program.
- ___ ___ ___ 16. The counselor accepts and performs the same or equivalent responsibilities (ticket taking, supervision, etc.) as other faculty members at the school.
- ___ ___ ___ 17. The counselor(s) prepare an annual report of guidance activities for the administration.
- ___ ___ ___ 18. The counselor(s) acquaints staff and community with the results of pertinent research in the area of guidance and/or follow-up studies of students from our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 19. The guidance program at our school is based on a written statement of goals and philosophy.
- ___ ___ ___ 20. Have referred, or would be willing to refer, parents to the counselors at our school on questions not appropriate to subjects taught or to administrative problems.

Teacher response form

Please check "yes," "no," or "none" in the appropriate columns:

YES NO NONE

- ___ ___ ___ 1. Have a good professional relationship with the counselor.
- ___ ___ ___ 2. Have asked potential dropout students to visit with a counselor or would be willing to do so if the occasion should arise.
- ___ ___ ___ 3. Have felt that the guidance program is worth the time, energy, and space required.
- ___ ___ ___ 4. Have encouraged, or would be willing to encourage, students to visit the counselor.
- ___ ___ ___ 5. Have found it easy to initiate case conferences with the counselor concerning students with problems.
- ___ ___ ___ 6. Have received adequate feedback, or know of other faculty members who have received adequate feedback, from the counselor regarding students who have been referred by teachers to counselors.

- ___ ___ ___ 7. Believe that other teachers have a positive feeling toward the school's guidance program.
- ___ ___ ___ 8. Have referred parents, or would be willing to refer parents, to a counselor on questions not appropriate to the subject taught.
- ___ ___ ___ 9. Cumulative records are readily available to all who are authorized to use them.
- ___ ___ ___ 10. In-service guidance experiences are provided for teachers and administrators at our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 11. The counselor(s) have interpreted standardized test information in faculty, or other meetings, which has helped the teachers in individualizing instruction.
- ___ ___ ___ 12. Have felt that students have made realistic vocational choices as a result, in part, of the guidance program at our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 13. Have felt that the counselor has helped me to understand students better.
- ___ ___ ___ 14. Have attributed improved motivation of under-achievers, in part, to the guidance program.
- ___ ___ ___ 15. Have felt most students make realistic educational choices as a result, in part, of the guidance program.
- ___ ___ ___ 16. Have attributed improved standards of dress or other behavior, in part, to the guidance program at our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 17. Have been assisted by counselors in developing units on occupational information in my own field.
- ___ ___ ___ 18. The counselor(s) acquaints staff and community with results of pertinent research in the area of guidance and/or follow-up studies of students from our school.
- ___ ___ ___ 19. The counselor(s) have conducted guidance discussions, upon request, in my class.
- ___ ___ ___ 20. The counselor accepts and performs the same or equivalent responsibilities around the school (ticket taking, supervision, etc.) as other faculty members.

Student response form

Please check "yes," "no," or "none" in the appropriate column:

YES NO NONE

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|--|
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 1. I know who the counselor(s) is. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 2. I know the location of the counseling office. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 3. I have been able to get to see a counselor when I have tried. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 4. I have felt that the counselor(s) has a personal interest in me. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 5. I feel that there is privacy in the counseling office. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 6. The counselor has made information available on jobs that are of interest to me. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 7. I have talked to the school counselor in his (her) office during the current school year or during the last school year. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 8. I have felt good about what occurred in the counseling office (if you have never had a counseling interview, check "none"). |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 9. I felt that the counselor might tell someone about the things that we talked about together. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 10. I feel that the things discussed with a counselor should not be discussed with others without my permission. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 11. The counselor has helped me to understand the scores of standardized tests that I have taken. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 12. I feel free to discuss my personal problems with the counselor. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 13. I have talked to the counselor about vocational planning. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 14. I have been helped by the counselor in finding better ways of getting along in school. |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | 15. I have participated, or know of others who have participated, in group counseling with the counselor. |

- ___ ___ ___16. The counselor has encouraged me to study career information.
- ___ ___ ___17. The counselor has helped me in planning my high school class schedule.
- ___ ___ ___18. The counselor(s) at my school are responsible for taking care of discipline problems.
- ___ ___ ___19. The counselor has helped me in improving study habits or skills.
- ___ ___ ___20. The counseling program seems, to me, to be worth the time, space, and energy that is devoted to it.

VITA

Richard Roland Wootton

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A Study of Adequacy and Cost of Secondary School Guidance in Utah

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born in Washington, D.C., June 30, 1931, son of Roland H. and Ouida Pelton Wootton; married Shirley Ann Potter May 25, 1956; five children--Shari, Mark, Wade, Julie, and Greg.

Education: Attended Henry D. Cooke elementary school, Powell Junior High School, and Central High School in Washington, D.C., and graduated from the latter school in 1951; received a Bachelor of Science degree from Brigham Young University, with a major in Political Science and a minor in sociology, in 1955; did post-graduate work in teacher education and was certified as a professional teacher in 1956; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree, specializing in counseling and psychology, at Brigham Young University in 1961.

Professional Experience: 1968 to present, assistant professor of education, Brigham Young University; 1962-67, chairman of guidance services, Brigham Young University Laboratory School; 1956-61, counselor, teacher, and coach, Murray High School.

Professional Affiliations and Honors: Phi Delta Kappa; American School Counselor Association, served as president-elect during 1967-68; Utah School Counselor Association, served as president in 1962-63; Utah Personnel and Guidance Association, acted as president-elect, 1964-65; American Personnel and Guidance Association.