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ABSTRACT

The Effect of Freshman and Sophomore College Students' Impressions of Counseling on Awareness and Use of the Utah State University Counseling Center

by

William Richard Wood, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1970

Major Professor: Dr. Michael Bertoch
Department: Psychology

This study was designed to provide information about: (1) Utah State University students' impressions of counseling, (2) the sources of these impressions, (3) students' awareness of the University Counseling Center, and (4) the effect of the foregoing factors on student use of the counseling facilities.

The sample consisted of a group of 107 freshmen and 43 sophomores randomly selected from the general psychology courses at Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Student information was obtained by a questionnaire and students' impressions of counseling were assessed by a semantic differential. The data were analyzed by t-test, chi-square and analysis of variance.

The implications from the results indicated that:

1. The single "most important" source of impression was the counselor, which indicated that high school counselors could be effective in orienting students to professional facilities available at the university level. This infers that college personnel should increase their communication with high school
counselors.

2. The Utah State University (USU) Counseling Center needed to develop other means of making students aware of the counseling facilities. Since so few students indicated the newspaper as being their source of awareness, perhaps this indicates an effective instrument for creating awareness. The bulletin board, however, appeared to have been effective in alerting students to the counseling center and should be continued.

3. Parents seemed to convey an impression of counseling to students which encouraged their use of the facilities more than the other sources of impressions studied in this investigation. Parents were also indicated as the second "most important" source of students' impressions of counseling. These support the need for increased counselor-parent communication.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Origin and nature of problem

The process and the outcomes of school counseling experiences create impressions of the counseling profession upon students. Their future use of counseling will likely be influenced to a considerable degree by these impressions. Likewise, the attitudes of peers, parents and other influential people may strongly influence students' views of counseling.

It seems reasonable to expect that college students' awareness of and use of the college counseling facilities would be related to their impressions. Several studies concerned with these questions have been conducted. Brough (1965) tallied the responses of 631 eighth grade students in one junior high on the origin of their views of the counselor and his functions. The students indicated that their impressions developed from diverse sources, the three most frequent being: the counselor's discussions of his role with students, actual interviews, and the description of the counselor in the student handbook. This study proved important in increasing the efficiency and productivity of counseling by aiding the development of a program to reduce the gap between students' and counselors' expectations of the counseling function. Another study was conducted by Clark (1966) which assessed the methods of making students aware of counseling facilities. Each of the 36 major university counseling centers studied had various means of making itself known. The
student newspaper was mentioned by 54% of the universities, freshman orientation by 38%, faculty and word of mouth by 40%. Many centers commented that information spread by word of mouth from "satisfied customers" was their best advertising. Other methods used were: college catalog (33%), pamphlets and talks by staff to student groups (25%), dormitory counselors (21%), student handbook (19%), and displays (10%). As far as studies on the use of counseling facilities are concerned, Koile and Bird (1956) used the Mooney Problem Check List on freshmen students, 266 males and 176 females, to assess freshmen problems. For 58% of the problems indicated, certain individuals were preferred for help. The counselor was chosen most frequently and the faculty advisor second. These and other studies have measured sources of students' attitudes of counseling, awareness of available facilities and use of these facilities. As yet, however, no study has been conducted to indicate a relationship between these variables. The Utah State University (USU) Counseling Staff also expressed concern over this problem. They suggested that a need existed for a study of the effect of students' impressions of counseling on their awareness and use of the Utah State University Counseling Center.

**Problem**

The problem with which this research deals is the lack of adequate assessment of the relationship between students' impressions of counseling, and their awareness and use of the Utah State University Counseling Center.

**Purpose and objectives**

It seems apparent that university services such as counseling
do not function optimally unless students are aware of and use the services. As part of this research it was considered important to measure specific variables which affect students' awareness and use of the counseling facilities. The purposes, therefore, of this study were to determine: (1) Utah State University (USU) students' impressions of counseling, (2) the sources of their impressions, (3) students' awareness of the university counseling center, and (4) the effect of the foregoing factors on their use of the counseling facilities.

Specifically, the objectives were to determine:

1. The impressions of counseling for:
   a. Freshmen and sophomores,
   b. Those who have received counseling and those who have not,
   c. Those who have received pre-college counseling for 1-2 sessions and 3 or more sessions, and
   d. Those who have received college counseling for 1-2 sessions and 3 or more sessions.

2. The most important source of impressions of counseling as indicated by the total sample.

3. The frequency each media was indicated as being the means of awareness of the USU Counseling Center.

4. The frequency of the following categories which use the USU Counseling Center:
   a. The total sample,
   b. Those with a greater than average impression of counseling and those with less than average impression of counseling,
   c. Freshmen and sophomores,
d. The different sources of impressions of counseling, and
e. The various sources of awareness of the USU Counseling Center.

Definition of terms

To help clarify the variables under consideration in this study, the following definitions have been established:

1. Awareness--knowledge specifically related to the location of the USU Counseling Center.

2. Use--having established contact and had a counseling session with one of the counselors on the USU Staff.

3. Significant Difference--the probability that the results will occur by chance five times in a hundred.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is divided into various segments of research: (a) sources of students' impressions of counseling, (b) teachers' impressions of counseling, (c) parents' impressions of counseling, (d) counselors' impressions of counseling, (e) students' impressions of counseling, (f) assessment of impressions of counseling, (g) students' awareness of counseling facilities, and (h) students' use of counseling facilities.

Sources of students' impressions of counseling

Several studies have researched the question, "Who is responsible for the various existing impressions created concerning counseling?"

One study was undertaken by Brough (1965) with 631 eighth grade students in a Minnesota junior high school. The various sources examined were:

... a counselor's discussion of his services in a class setting, actual talks with counselors, student handbook, the counselor's meeting with an entire grade at the beginning of the school year, information from teachers, orientation program to junior high, experiences with scout, church, and camp counselors, talks with other students, parents, siblings, discussing the counselor, magazines or books, T.V., radio, and information from a doctor or minister. (p. 598)

The results indicated that:

1. A student's perceptions developed from diverse sources.
2. The three most frequent sources were a counselor's discussion of his role with students, actual counseling sessions, and
the description of the counselor in the student handbook.

3. The single most influential source of perception was the counselor himself. (p. 597)

This information made it possible to develop a program to reduce the gap between the students' and counselor's expectations of the counseling function. The study also best represented the variety of sources which contribute to a student's total impression of counseling.

According to Brough (1965) the determination of the source of an impression is important because it gives an indication of the discrepancies between what should be the impression of counseling as compared to what actually exists, thereby providing a basis for change. He also indicated that determining the impression was just as important as revealing its source. The present research investigated the importance of peers, teachers, counselors, parents, readings and other sources in determining the sample's most significant source of impressions of counseling. The following sub-sections will examine the studies in the literature relative to the specific impressions conveyed by various sources.

Teachers impressions of counseling

Teachers maintain daily contact with students and because of this are very influential in forming their impressions. It is, therefore, of utmost importance that teachers understand and support counselors and counseling programs. The amount of support given to counseling by teachers was investigated by Russell and Willis (1964). Their study used 135 teachers in five of the thirteen Fairfax County, Virginia, intermediate schools. The study indicated
a significant difference of opinion on the disciplinary functions of counseling and on the support rendered by the teachers. It also indicated the need for teachers to understand the specific roles of counselors and implied that with some of the impressions of counseling conveyed by teachers to students, there might be a serious waste of professional counseling services. Besides this information, 18 of the participants made additional comments on counseling. Some were "... we need more, a great help, sentimental counselors undermine the authority of teachers, guidance needs to understand its own role, and teachers and counselors misunderstand each other's roles." (p. 707)

How teachers obtain their impressions of counseling was studied by Stewart (1961), who used a random sample of 32 Washington teachers. The results indicated a more positive attitude toward counseling for women than for men, and found that teachers' attitudes toward counseling were related to their general attitudes toward teaching. This study implied that teachers convey an impression of counseling which is closely related to their own feelings about their profession.

The support and the variety of impressions given by teachers toward counseling, raises the question of how perceptive a teacher is of student problems. Such a study was conducted by Perrone, Weiking and Nagel (1965) which incorporated the perceptions of student problems by teachers, parents and students' self evaluations. Nine junior high school teachers were administered a counseling instrument used to measure how much counseling they would suggest for 371 junior high students. The students made self evaluations by completing the Mooney Problem Check List. At the same time
teachers and parents made evaluations of the students' needs and then the three were compared. Teachers agreed on the rank order of students' predicted counseling needs, but were lower in assessing the need for intensive counseling than were the parents. The study showed that parents were more supportive of counseling than were teachers.

Kaback (1963), in a review of the literature, stated that teachers had different expectations of the counseling services, as well as different impressions of counselors' roles. However, they played an important part in evaluating a student's counseling needs, referring students to counselors for help and, therefore, their impressions were most important.

Parents' impressions of counseling

Parents have the greatest contact with students and, therefore, have the greatest opportunity to convey their various impressions to their children. One facet of parental impressions is their perception of a counselor's role. These were studied in 1961 by Berstein and Grant who used 200 pairs of parents (187 mothers and 179 fathers) in Huntington, New York. Parents were matched by their children's grade 6, 8, 10, 12, school performance, I. Q., and social-economic standing by the Gardner and Thompson Social Relations Scale.

The results indicated that:

1. A greater proportion of parents of students in the higher grade levels freely nominated the counselor as a helpful person.

2. For each grade and each problem area, the counselor was rated
significantly higher as a helping agent than a person with "average" ability.

3. There was an equal degree of variability in parental perceptions of counselors' roles at each grade level.

4. Counselors were rated significantly more helpful with various problems than the best family friend or school principal (except in one case).

5. Counselors were considered more helpful with educational-vocational problems than with personal-emotional-social problems.

Parents tended to have a healthy, positive-impression of counselors in the public school systems and were the most supportive of an intensive counseling service at the junior high level in comparison to teachers' and students' evaluations as found by Perrone, Weiking and Nagel (1965).

Mothers' impressions, being a part of the parental influence, were studied by Dunlop (1965). The study used mothers of 50 high school seniors, 25 from job-bound seniors and 25 from college-bound seniors, who were selected randomly from San Diego's Grossmont Union High School District. Mothers of the job-bound seniors supported counselors in educational counseling but were significantly less supportive for vocational counseling, with 70% responding favorably to personal counseling. Mothers of the college-bound seniors differed only by significantly higher support for vocational guidance than the mothers of the job-bound seniors.

Parents seemed, in general, to be concerned about their children's welfare and were supportive of counseling programs established for student benefit.
Counselors impressions of counseling

Counselors have impressions of their functions but the lack of agreement concerning their responsibilities is a great drawback to their effectiveness. Hitchcock (1953) conducted a study to determine exactly what counselors felt they should be doing. Questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 2002 counselors in the United States with 66% return. The counselors indicated spending approximately one-half their time in counseling per se with an average counseling load of 376 clients. Eighty-eight percent were performing general counseling with about half working in the special areas of educational, vocational or personal counseling. On the whole the counselors did not believe clerical duties, filing information and administrative paper work were their responsibilities. Concern has also been expressed over teacher, administrator and counselor variations in impressions of the counselor's role. One reason for the differences was implied when only a few counselors said they had received training in understanding the relationships within the total school program. Hitchcock, therefore, implied a need for in-service training for both counselors, administrators and teachers in order to fully understand each others roles and to fully integrate these efforts into a teamwork effort for the betterment of the school pupils.

Besides the previously mentioned differences in role perceptions, the variable dealing with counselor personality and how this effects impressions of counseling is important to consider. A study by Weitz (1957) suggested that the personality traits of a counselor and how these are communicated to clients would to a large degree determine his effectiveness. He commented that peer ratings of how
a counselor communicates his personality as related to counseling skills would be the greatest challenge to a counselor. Such a study was conducted by Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) who used 40 counselors or counselor trainees in an NDEA Guidance Institute. Each participant was rated by the group. The most significant finding was that counselors were able to agree on those believed to be good counselors and those not. The nine most chosen and the nine least chosen as good prospective counselors were compared on a number of variables. The analysis indicated that those most chosen; (a) had higher grades, (b) had more appropriate Strong scores and (c) were less dogmatic. The authors were impressed with these findings but also indicated that the nature of difference between counselors was largely hidden, which suggested basic personality differences. These findings would agree with Miller (1963) who stated that a counselor's personality was of paramount importance in conveying impressions of the profession.

Students impressions of counseling

How students perceive the counselor's role is a question which concerns the effectiveness of counseling. Grant (1954) explored the question by asking if those outside counseling perceived those in counseling as they perceived themselves. Nine New York State high schools were chosen which had two full-time counselors with programs having existed at least 10 years. The results indicated students preferring counselors over other school personnel and non-school people for vocational and educational planning but preferred nonschool people for personal-emotional problems. This lead the author to undertake another study based upon the premise that the first study indicated that: (1) adolescents found it difficult to
talk to adults about personal-emotional problems and (2) that students' perceptions may be reflections of administrators', teachers' or counselors' impressions of the counselor's role. This study used a random sample of 100 administrators and 100 counselors who were asked to rank their choices of when and with what kind of a problem they would send a student to the counselor. The data indicated student perceptions due mainly to teachers, administrators, and counselors and the need for counselor training programs which would provide greater competence in dealing with personal-emotional and social type problems and that an effort must be made by the counselors to promote their services.

Another study focusing on student opinions of high school guidance programs was conducted by Gibson (1962) in which 904 high school seniors in 12 secondary schools in three states cooperated. The results indicated that 94% of the students felt the guidance program was valuable, with only 27% saying it had not assisted them personally. Concerning counseling, the students preferred their fellow students, because, "We know they can be trusted" and "They understand our problems," being the most frequently mentioned reasons. The implications from the study were that:

1. Counselors needed more training in the art of communication.
2. Students were not receiving full benefit of test interpretation and other data.
3. Counselors functioned in many areas which were not specifically counseling.
4. Coordination between subject matter classes, occupational and vocational information was not sufficient.
5. Counselors could be effectively used in assisting students
Another study performed by Heilftron (1960) indicated that students perceived counselors as giving more time to the intellectually inferior, socially immature and those with unrealistic aspirations. They indicated that those who possessed definite character disorders should be referred to outside agencies. These opinions were also confirmed by Bacon (1949) and Durnall (1952). These studies indicated a need for functional guidance programs focused on meeting student needs. Students also felt strongly about the different types or kinds of guidance personnel available and the effectiveness of their high school guidance programs. Caravello (1958) studied the personnel problem by examining student preferences for a teacher-counselor versus a guidance specialist. The conclusion was that trained and experienced guidance specialists with sufficient counseling time could meet the basic needs of high school students most effectively. This finding was also supported by Ivey (1962).

One of the most important sources for student impressions stems from counselor behavior itself, therefore, counselor behavior, which varies in different situations, has been the object of many studies. One study by Bordin (1955) examined the relationship of client expectations of counseling to the effects of the counseling process. The results showed how infantilismal the knowledge of a client-counselor interaction really was. The study implied that counselor sensitivity was the best means of coping with various situations.

The possibility of having impressions clouded by being too close to a situation was suggested as a variable factor in how counselors are perceived. In looking over high school counseling
from the college freshman's point of view, the majority of freshmen at Stanford studied by Barahal and Brammer (1950) were not happy with their previous high school counseling. They wanted more expert interpretation of tests, more occupational information, and a greater opportunity to discuss plans in a permissive atmosphere with a competent counselor. Talks with sympathetic teachers were appreciated and partially helpful, but did not satisfy their needs. One of the most annoying features of high school counseling was uninterpreted tests, especially in relation to educational and vocational planning. This study offered many suggestions concerning ways a secondary school counselor could be of benefit to students.

College counselors are plagued with the same role conflict issue confronted by secondary school counselors. Ivey (1962) studied students in a required guidance course at Boston University and concluded that counselors who taught were most effective in an occupation-vocational setting rather than a personal-emotional problem setting and that those needs should be met by a professional counselor without teaching duties. It appeared that these individuals could build student confidence and trust more easily.

Another study by Braden (1953) evaluated the impressions of counseling of 420 former students of the Colorado Agriculture and Mechanical College from 1947-1949. Those in the study who had visited the guidance counselor, completed testing and had returned for an evaluation, were considered to have completed counseling. Of the returned questionnaires which were usable 136 were nongraduates and 22 were graduates. The conclusions reached were that counseling had not been helpful in post-school adjustment, but that the tests were of considerable value. Five areas were indicated as beneficial
in decreasing frequency:

1. Realization of interests and abilities,
2. Self-worth in trained field,
3. Ability to achieve success and or satisfaction in the occupation coherent with interests and abilities,
4. Ability to obtain a desired level of happiness, and
5. Achieve self-set goals.

Personal-social was not indicated as an area which had been helpful. 

Kiell (1957), as a member of the General Counseling Panel at Brooklyn College, also studied college students' impressions of counseling. Each member was assigned a group of incoming freshmen for the duration of his college career. After one year of service an evaluation by checklist and sentence completion was conducted on a sample of 200 students. Fifteen percent suggested that counselors might be more helpful if they had more time to spend with them. An over-all student impression of the counselor (91.5%) was that he was a "great comfort" and was seen as a person available when the student was in need. Almost half said the counselor was helpful in program planning and 15.5% had been aided in understanding college procedures. Several stated that counselors would be more available if they did not have to teach and 14.5% felt the counselor could have been of more help if a personal interest had been taken in the student rather than the formal or business-like manner. Eighteen percent did not expect counselors to help solve personal problems. The future implication from the evaluation indicated emphasis on the need for an on-going public information or information giving program. Many of these studies are valuable in starting a counseling program, but Bixenstine (1959) faced a puzzling problem in the initiation of a
counseling program at Hyrum College in Ohio. The preparatory stages were laid by an address to the administration by Dr. Dana L. Farnsworth (1957) on the broad problems of mental health and the need for someone responsible for student psychological problems on college campuses. Finally faculty and administration backing was obtained and the program was launched. After two months "virtually no" students had come in for help. The problem was puzzling. The students were largely from an upper-middle class. The hypothesis was that the program had not been effectively announced to the students. Later analysis established the hypothesis that group attitudes were probably influencing student acceptance and participation in the program. It was found that the student body had, without pre-meditation, "boycotted" the program perhaps because they had not been consulted or adequately informed of the new program. Many students commented after that they had read the signs, but that it just had not registered with them. Some expressed the view that, "Going to the psychologist means you're a jerk." Finally the psychologist met with student groups two weeks prior to a vacation and after school resumed, the "new" counseling services began to function.

**Assessment of the impressions of counseling**

The assessment of counseling impressions may be in terms of objectives achieved as measured by a statistical analysis, or may be the impression one has of counselors or counseling. In either case the impression one has is valuable in determining whether or not a person will participate in a counseling experience.

Coleman (1957) listed three evaluative instruments; a Student Personnel Services Inventory by Rackham (1950), an Inventory of
Student Reactions to Student Personnel Services by Kamm and Wrenn (undated) and a measurement of student attitudes toward counseling services by Form (1953a). Coleman stressed the importance of adequate evaluation procedures and a successful counseling program not being rated by the intrinsic satisfaction of the personnel worker.

Berdie (1954) suggested a self-rating method of evaluating counseling to determine whether counseling freshmen entering the University of Minnesota resulted in students learning more about abilities, interests, and personal characteristics.

The effectiveness of any counseling program depends on the willingness of students to use the services, and this reflects the value students attach to counseling. However, students not having had counseling will have varying impressions of it which may be attributed to social and cultural backgrounds (Landis, 1963). The differences in student opinions of counseling as related to differences in background were studied by Form (1953a). The results indicated that student attitudes toward counseling were possible to measure and that an attitude scale was a valuable technique for this purpose. This has advantages over the follow-up questionnaire technique by making it possible to distinguish degree of satisfaction with the counseling services. Likewise, it has advantages over an interview because of the limitations to subjective interpretation of responses, time and other extraneous variables.

One of the recent trends in measuring has been the use of a semantic differential. Lately these have been constructed to evaluate student attitudes toward professors and college environments. Gulo (1966) reported that there was a substantial difference in student opinions in these areas. He proposed a multi-dimensional
approach to evaluation, since there seemed to be no general all-inclusive trait or traits for these areas. This technique reflected the complexity of measuring an attitude toward something and made possible a more complete evaluation of an individual's impressions or attitudes. For these same reasons, the author chose a semantic differential scale to more fully measure the students' impressions.

**Student awareness of counseling facilities**

A study on the present use and needs of the future for 36 major universities' counseling departments in the United States was conducted by Clark (1966). The mean number of students seen per year was 12%. The average time spent with each client was 3½ hours. The mean ratio of counselors to students was one to 3,000. In order to determine the future needs of the departments, an evaluation of the most effective means of making students aware of the facilities was conducted. Awareness of the centers was made through various means as shown in Table 1.

This study did not indicate how many students were made aware by these publicity means, nor was any study found which gave that information.

Another study undertaken by Harrington (1962) showed that articles in student newspapers were contributions to the awareness of guidance services and increased students' positive impressions toward counseling if they were not duplications of the college handbook and contained human interest topics. Some of the topics included, "Counseling Services, how to study, how to use library, programs for student aid, and use of reading improvement clinics." (pp. 729-730)
Table 1. Evaluation of the means of making students aware of counseling center facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percent of Centers Using Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Newspaper</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Orientation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contact</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Catalog</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Talks to Student Groups</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory Counselors</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student use of the counseling facilities

Students seek help from individuals in whom they have confidence. If students feel counselors can be of most benefit for a particular need, they will seek their services. Just what high school students perceive as problems with which counselors can be helpful was studied by Carlson and Sullenger (1957). Their study used a sample of 2,000 students from four secondary schools in the Omaha vicinity.

The problems indicated most were:

... how to protect one's physical and mental health, how to be more charming, how to get along with others, how to insure a happy home life, how to choose a vocation (including college choice), how to use leisure time, how to work and study effectively and how to develop a philosophy of life. (p. 179)

Comments on the questionnaires showed that high school students were eager to be more responsible for managing their own affairs if their counseling needs were satisfied.

In a college setting Berdie and Stein (1966), conducted a study
comparing the needs of new university students who sought counselors versus those who did not. The study evaluated the counseling records of the 1963 University of Minnesota freshmen. Those who were counseled for study skills and reading ability tended to have less academic ability and lower achievement than other counseled students. The higher achieving counseled students were then matched on ability and achievement with noncounseled students. The results indicated that counseled women had slightly higher ability but more deviant personality inventory scores than females not counseled.

The personality differences between counseled and noncounseled students were also investigated by Mendelsohn and Kirk (1962). They reported that significant differences could be measured between users and nonusers of counseling facilities. The study referred to the California Personality Inventory and the Minnesota Personality Scale as sensitive instruments for this purpose. Their study, nevertheless, used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which measured personality traits based on four dimensions: Judgment-Perception, Thinking-Feeling, Sensation-Intuition, and Extraversion-Introversion. The subjects were a random sample of one-sixth of the 1959 freshmen at the University of California at Berkeley. Two matched groups were studied, those who used and those who did not use the counseling facilities. The results indicated differences between the two groups relative to cognitive and perceptual construct. The Judgment-Perceptual and Sensation-Intuition scales differentiated significantly between the two groups. High ratings on these two scales indicated those who sought counselors for help.

In another college study Roth (1963) examined the scores on the California Test of Personality and Taylor's Manifest Anxiety
Scale of 18 male and 27 female freshmen at the Hampton Institute. It was found that poor adjustment and high anxiety were indicative of students who sought counselors. In a study by Koile and Bird (1956), a modified Mooney Problem Check List was administered to freshmen in order to gather data on their problems and their preferences for source and sex of those to whom they would go for help. For 58% of the problems indicated, certain individuals were preferred for help. The counselor was chosen most frequently and the faculty advisor second. Women were more likely than men to indicate no preference as to the sex of the counselor, and preferred a male counselor more than men preferred women. Students of both sexes were more willing to seek help from a counselor of their own sex than from one of the opposite sex.

Cartwright (1963), explored college students patterns of self-conceptions in relation to college life adjustment and used 30 students seeking personal counseling compared to 22 nonhelp seeking controls. Those who sought help scored higher on their college board exams than the controls, which indicated that their trouble was definitely personal rather than ability related. The inference from this study, that "good students" also wanted counseling, was explored and substantiated many years previous by Dement (1957). Q sorts were analyzed for college and high school impressions of self and were found to be in four patterns: (1) hard-working achievers, (2) social butterflies, (3) late bloomers, and (4) adolescent explorers. Those who sought counselor help had high school self concepts of: (1) well-adjusted achievers, (2) poorly adjusted late bloomers, and (3) poorly adjusted adolescent explorers. The controls, on the other hand, had self
concepts of well-adjusted achievers and well-adjusted social butterflies.

A longitudinal study analyzing the achievements of counseled and noncounseled students twenty-five years after counseling was conducted by Campbell (1965). The study followed up on one which was initiated by Williamson and Bordin (1940), which reported that a group of counseled students adjusted better to college and had better grades than a control group of noncounseled students. The groups were matched on ability and background before the study to insure the control of these variables. In 1962-3, Campbell contacted 99% of the 768 subjects to determine the "lasting differences" between the counseled and noncounseled in adult achievement. Ninety percent responded with results based on publications, income, patents, and global rating of society as criteria. Those in the counseled group were rated considerably more successful as adults than those who were not counseled.

In another study by Form (1953) users and nonusers of counseling were investigated. A 5% stratified representative sample of the Michigan State College student body received a counselor rating scale. Over 90% of the sample (544) returned usable questionnaires. The findings were that 40% of the students had never used the counseling center, 30% sought help once or twice, 18% between 3-5 times and only 14% used the services more than 5 times. "The fact that two-fifths of the sample did not use the center was not due to their ignorance to the center's purposes, functions or location." (p. 209) Many indicated having no problems or a preference for going elsewhere. Nevertheless, those who were "more" aware of the center's functions used the services more often. The study found no relation
between student appraisal of the center and their use of the facilities and no significant differences in appraisal of the facilities according to frequency of use.

Speculation concerning the use of counseling services by sex revealed no significant differences. The data, however, tended to suggest that men visited the center somewhat less than women. This appeared to be true among the nonusers. Among the men who had counseling experiences, problems of educational and vocational planning were most pervasive, while women were more concerned with personal and social problems as well as with changing their original vocational plans. (Form, 1953b, p. 210)

Results indicated also that:

1. Lower achieving students visited the counseling center more frequently than higher achieving students.

2. The number of extra-curricular activities was not an important factor in categorizing those who used the center.

3. High school counseled students were more frequently seen by college personnel.

4. Appraisal of high school counseling programs was mostly negative.

5. No statistical significance in difference was found between socio-economic level of family and frequency of center visits.

6. Students preferred to take their problems to; family, friends counseling center, instructors, close relatives, church officials, Dean of Students, Psychology Clinic and dormitory advisors, in that order.

7. Educating students to use and have confidence in counseling services must begin early, the reason being that once such services were used the tendency to use them again was higher.

8. Counseling effectiveness increased with the number of contacts.
Summary

This review of literature has shown that:

1. Student impressions of counseling develop from diverse sources.

2. Teacher impressions of counseling relate closely to their feelings about their profession and teachers have different expectations of counseling services.

3. Parent impressions of counseling are generally healthy and positive and are most supportive of counseling programs viewed or established for student benefit.

4. Counselor impressions of counseling lack agreement but are generally identical on clerical duties and most counselors express concern over teacher, administrator and counselor variations in the impressions of their role.

5. Student impressions of counseling may be reflections of administrator, teacher and counselor impressions and adolescents find it difficult to discuss personal-emotional matters with adults. Nevertheless, a well trained guidance specialist with sufficient counseling time was felt to be most effectively able to meet the emotional, vocational-educational, and personal needs of high school students.

6. Assessment of the impressions of counseling may be in terms of reaching pre-determined objectives, or measuring student reactions to or attitudes toward counseling.

7. Student awareness of counseling facilities was established through various means. The most frequently expressed were; student newspaper, freshmen orientation, word of mouth and faculty contact.
8. Student use of the counseling facilities was found to be directly related to whether or not they felt a counselor was the best qualified to meet particular needs.
CHAPTER III
THE METHOD OF STUDY

The method of study includes a discussion of how the research was conducted, what materials were used to obtain the data, and how the data were analyzed. The chapter is divided into various parts: the means of sample selection, the questionnaire and semantic differential, the procedure for obtaining the data, the hypotheses tested and how the data were statistically analyzed.

Sample

The sample was selected by a three step process:

1. Records of the university were examined to determine the percentage of freshmen and sophomores enrolled in each of the colleges.

2. Students enrolled in the general psychology courses at Utah State University during the Spring Quarter, 1969, were then administered the questionnaire and the semantic differential.

3. A sample of 150 freshmen and sophomore students representing the proportions enrolled in each college of the university were then randomly selected. Thus, 107 freshmen and 43 sophomores constituted the sample. The numerical representation from each college is indicated in Table 2.
Table 2. Representation of freshmen and sophomores in each college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Percent Enrolled</th>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Registration</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to obtain the following information:

1. Sex, marital status, year in college and the college in which enrolled,
2. Pre-college counseling experiences,
3. The significance of peers, teachers, counselors, parents, reading and other sources in forming impressions of counseling,
4. Awareness of the USU Counseling Center,
5. The media most effective in making students aware of the USU Counseling Center, and
6. Use of the USU Counseling Center services.

The semantic differential

Every individual behaves according to what the environment means
to him. Therefore, if one could measure the meaning of any environmental situation, i.e., a person, an object, a thought, or services (such as counseling) one would have a means of predicting individual behavior toward that measured concept. The semantic differential as reported by Gulo (1966) was significant in measuring differences in student attitudes toward professors and college environments. The instrument for measuring students' impressions of counseling in this study was constructed from the various scales presented by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957). These scales (Appendix B) were selected on the basis of those which were considered to best represent characteristics that were indices of three broad aspects of counseling:

1. Counseling as a profession,
2. Counselors, and
3. The counseling process.

The students were presented with these three aspects of counseling and asked to rate them on a seven-point bi-polar scale, one indicating the most negative impression with seven indicating the most positive impression. The ratings were varied in polarity to avoid the possibility of persistence of set, so that one side was not all negative or positive. The ratings (Appendix C) indicate the direction as well as the intensity of each student's impression.

Procedure

The questionnaire, semantic differential and instructions were administered to a general psychology lab of 35 students who were not part of the final sampling. The students were asked for their criticisms and comments. The problems and questions they indicated were used in developing the final form. The questionnaire and the semantic differential were then administered to all the freshman and sophomore
students in the general psychology courses. Instructions were read to inform the students that they were part of a graduate study and that answering all the questions as honestly as possible would be most beneficial. The experimenter made it known that he was available for answering any questions. The instructions were read as follows:

Instructions

Part I. Questionnaire

You are part of a psychological experiment. The purpose of the questionnaire is to accumulate information on college students' counseling experiences and related information. For this study to be meaningful your honest and accurate answers are needed. If you have any questions please raise your hand. Now please turn the page to part II.

Part II. Semantic Differential

The following pages represent a means of evaluating your impressions of various facets of counseling. Your personal opinion is desired so please read each heading and mark with an "X" the position you feel best indicates your impression of the characteristic being measured. You may consider the middle blank as being neutral. Please mark every scale as honestly as possible.

The questionnaires were collected and grouped according to class and college and then a random sampling was selected to provide the data for the study.

Hypotheses to be tested

1. When grouped as listed below, there is no significant difference
between students' total mean ratings on three rating scales:

a. Freshmen and sophomores: this hypothesis was used to help determine if being in college one year longer, or being one year older would have an effect on students' impressions of counseling.

b. Those who had received counseling and those who had not: it was anticipated that those who used counseling services would have more positive impressions of counseling.

c. Those who received pre-college counseling only and those who received college counseling only: it was believed that those receiving college counseling only would be using the service because of personal desire as opposed to the variety of reasons for which a person might see a secondary school counselor.

d. Those who received pre-college counseling for 1-2 sessions and 3 or greater, and those who received college counseling for 1-2 sessions and 3 or greater: this hypothesis was used to determine the duration of counseling and its effect on mean impressions of counseling.

2. There is no difference between the frequencies each source of impressions of counseling was rated as "most important" in forming the students' impressions of counseling.

3. There is no difference between the frequency each media was indicated as being the means of awareness of the USU Counseling Center. The various sources of making students aware of the USU Counseling Center were studied to determine which one was reaching the greatest number of students and to especially see the effect of the bulletin board.
4. There is no difference in the frequency of student use of the USU Counseling Center for those with above or below the sample's mean impression of counseling.

5. There is no difference in freshman and sophomore use of the USU Counseling Center. Freshman and sophomore students' use of the counseling center was studied to determine which class most frequently used the services. Freshmen were anticipated to use the services more because of their newness to college life.

6. There is no difference in the frequency of those who use the USU Counseling Center for each of the different sources of impressions of counseling.

7. There is no difference in the frequency of those who use the USU Counseling Center for each of the different sources of awareness.

Analysis of data

The impressions of counseling were scored by weighting the intervals between the poles of the semantic differential scales from one to seven. The rating of seven indicated the most extreme positive score on the scale and one indicated the most negative score. The poles were randomly varied to reduce the possibility of response sets. The direction of polarity for each scale was determined by various factor loading reported by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) (Appendix C).

The t-test was used to determine the significance of difference between the mean ratings of impressions of counseling for:
1. Freshmen and sophomores,
2. Those who had received counseling and those who had not,
3. Those who received pre-college counseling only and those who received college counseling only.

An analysis of variance was used to determine the difference between pre-college counseling for 1-2 and 3 or greater number of sessions, and college counseling for the same number of sessions.

The chi-square (Ferguson, 1966) was used to test the difference between the frequencies of the following:
1. Each source of impressions of counseling rated as "most important" in forming students' impressions of counseling,
2. Each media indicated as being the means of awareness of the USU Counseling Center,
3. Use of the USU Counseling Center for freshmen and sophomores, those with above and below the samples' mean impression of counseling, each of the various sources of awareness, and each of the different sources of impressions of counseling.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this research are reported in four sections: impressions of counseling, sources of these impressions, student awareness of the USU Counseling Center, and students' use of the USU Counseling Center.

Students' impressions of counseling

The first hypothesis stated that there was no difference between the mean ratings of impressions of counseling for freshman and sophomore students. The data (Table 3) were gathered via the semantic differential, treated by t-test and indicated no difference.

Table 3. Impressions of Counseling: Freshmen vs. Sophomores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Rating of Impressions</th>
<th>T-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.30 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total representation of the sample's impressions of counseling may be found in Appendix E.

The second hypothesis compared the impressions of counseling for those who had used counseling facilities and those who had not.
The data, analyzed by t-test, showed no significant difference (see Table 4).

Table 4. Impressions of Counseling: Users vs. Nonusers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>T-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.02 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonusers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean impression of counseling for those who received exclusively pre-college counseling compared to those receiving college counseling only was examined in the third hypothesis. The data, analyzed by t-test (Table 5) showed no significant difference between the means.

Table 5. Impressions of Counseling: Pre-college vs. College use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>T-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-college only</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.65 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth hypothesis examined the data for those receiving pre-college counseling for 1-2 sessions and for 3 or more sessions; likewise, college counseling was categorized identically. The treatment of data in this case was by analysis of variance. No
significant difference was found (Table 6).

**Table 6. Impressions of Counseling: Number of Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5731</td>
<td>.91 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.00 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions; counseling interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2360</td>
<td>.36 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.6297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of impressions**

The hypothesis was that there was no difference in the frequency each source of impressions of counseling was indicated as being "most important" to each student. The data gathered were by questionnaire and treated by using a chi-square Goodness of Fit test (Ferguson, 1966).

**Table 7. Most Important Sources of Impressions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Impressions</th>
<th>Frequency Indicated</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>approx. 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 4

* = significant difference (.001)
The sources most frequently indicated as being "most important" were: counselors (32%), parents (26%), teachers (19%), peers (13%), and reading (9%). The chi-square values (Table 7) indicated significant difference at .001 level between an equal distribution of frequency for each source as being most important in forming students' impressions of counseling. It appeared that the two most important sources were counselors and parents and the two least important sources were peers and reading.

Source of awareness

The entire sample was examined by questionnaire to determine what percent were aware of the USU Counseling Center; 50% indicated being aware. The hypothesis for the sources of awareness stated that there was no difference between the frequency each source of awareness was indicated. Chi-square was used to evaluate the data (Table 8).

Table 8. Source of Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Awareness</th>
<th>Frequency Indicated</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>52.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass by</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>approx. 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 8 * = significant difference (.001)
The results indicated significant difference at .001 level between an equal distribution of frequency for each source being indicated as the responsible factor for awareness. The two most frequently indicated were the bulletin board and friends; the two least frequently indicated were student newspaper and dorm parents.

Use of the USU Counseling Center

Use of the counseling center was determined by questionnaire and treated by chi-square. The total sample indicated that 16% used the USU Counseling Center facilities. The hypothesis stated that there was no difference between the use of the center for each class. The chi-square value showed no significant difference (Table 9).

Table 9. Use of Counseling Center: Freshmen vs. Sophomores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number who use</th>
<th>Number who do not use</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.187 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also investigated was the frequency of use for those with greater versus less than average mean impressions of counseling. The chi-square value was not significant (Table 10).

The impact on student use of the USU Counseling Center by the various sources of impressions of counseling was gathered by questionnaire and analyzed by chi-square. The data (Table 11)
Table 10. Use of Counseling Center: Impressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number who use</th>
<th>Number who do not use</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than average mean</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.02 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than average mean</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

showed significant difference at .05 level between the expected equal distribution of frequency of use for each of the sources of impressions of counseling and the observed. Surprisingly, 36.5% of the students who used the counseling center indicated parents as being the factor most responsible for their impressions of counseling.

Table 11. Use of Counseling Center: Sources of Impressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Impression</th>
<th>Frequency Indicated</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>approx. 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 4  *= significant difference (.05)
The last hypothesis examined which source of awareness had the most impact on use of the USU Counseling Center. The chi-square results (Table 12) indicated no difference between the number of students who visited the center for each source of awareness, but four sources; friends (20.8%), catalog (20.8%), bulletin board (16.5%), and pass by regularly (16.5%) were the most frequently mentioned sources of awareness for those who used the counseling center.

Table 12. Use of Counseling Center: Source of Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Awareness</th>
<th>Frequency Indicated</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.40 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass by</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>approx. 100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this chapter the results have been presented. The next chapter includes the conclusions and implications based upon these results.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to determine: (1) Utah State University students' impressions of counseling, (2) the sources of these impressions, (3) students' awareness of the counseling center, and (4) the effect of the foregoing factors on student use of the counseling facilities.

The subjects were randomly selected from freshmen and sophomores enrolled in general psychology courses at Utah State University during the Spring Quarter, 1969. The random selection was stratified to represent the percentages of freshmen and sophomores enrolled in each college. The total sample consisted of 107 freshmen and 43 sophomores.

Student information was obtained from a questionnaire designed to help determine:
1. The "most important" source of impressions of counseling,
2. The sources of awareness of the USU Counseling Center,
3. Use of pre-college counseling and counseling provided through the USU Counseling Center, and
4. Data referring to college, sex and class of the students.

Impressions of counseling were assessed by using a seven point bi-polar semantic differential scale.

The data derived from the above were used to test seven hypotheses which compared mean impressions of counseling for:
1. Freshmen and sophomores,
2. Pre-college counseling 1-2 or 3 or more sessions, college counseling for like number of sessions, and

3. Various aspects of pre-college counseling and college counseling.

Conclusions

The results related to impressions of counseling indicated that:

1. The impressions of counseling for the total sample were positive. This may infer agreement with the study by Kiell (1957) which indicated that the overall student impression of the counselor was positive and that he was considered a "great comfort."

2. Freshman and sophomore students had about the same impressions of counseling. The slight, insignificant difference, may be related to being in college longer or being one year older than the freshmen. Another reason may be drawn from a study by Barahal and Brammer (1950) which indicated that freshmen were not happy with their previous high school counseling, inferring a residual impact on freshmen impressions of counseling from their high school experiences.

3. Those having received any kind of counseling were more than twice the number of those who had not (102 to 48). However, their impressions of counseling were almost identical. One would like to have thought that those who received counseling would have had higher impressions of counseling, especially when this study indicated that two out of three students had seen counselors. It may however, in future studies, be worthwhile to determine the reasons why students saw counselors, which in this study, might have shown low impressions of counseling when counselors were disciplinarians, etc., and high impressions of counseling for personal self-initiated
4. There was no significant difference between impressions of counseling based on frequency of pre-college or college counseling experiences. However, those who received pre-college counseling for 1-2 sessions had the lowest mean rating and those with college counseling for 1-2 sessions had the highest mean rating. This tended to confirm the results of a study by Form (1953b), which indicated no significant difference between student appraisal of their counseling facilities according to frequency of use.

Concerning the sources of students' impressions of counseling: A significant difference, as shown by chi-square, occurred between the frequency each source was rated as "most important." The two most frequently indicated were counselors and parents and the two least indicated were peers and reading. Counselors were indicated by 32% as being the "most important" source of impression. These results were almost identical to those found by Brough (1965) which indicated that: (1) student perceptions of counselors developed from diverse sources, and (2) the single most influential source of perception was the counselor himself.

The analysis of student awareness of the counseling center showed 50% being aware. It seemed important to indicate that the sample was taken from general psychology courses and, therefore, might have been a sample which was more aware of the counseling center than a random sampling of student body. This indicated the need to expand the methods of making students aware of the counseling facilities.
The sources of awareness, analyzed by chi-square, showed significant difference between the frequency each media was indicated as the source of awareness of the USU Counseling Center. The most frequently indicated sources were the bulletin board and friends. Although no study was found to indicate the source of awareness of the counseling centers at other universities, the study by Clark (1966) showed 54% of the major universities used the student newspaper, 40% word of mouth, 40% faculty contact and 38% freshman orientation as means of establishing student awareness of the counseling facilities. Displays were listed as used by only 10% of the institutions. A comparison of these data tended to indicate the USU Counseling Center Bulletin Board had been most effectively used to alert students to the facilities, and should be continued. The student newspaper, used by more than half of the universities studied by Clark (1966) indicated, as implied by Harrington (1962), that it could be a greater contribution to awareness of the USU Counseling Center especially if human interest topics were discussed.

This study found no relation between source of awareness and use of the USU Counseling Center.

Conclusions from student use of the USU Counseling Center were that:

1. Sixteen percent of the total sample used the USU Counseling Center. This represented a higher percentage of students who saw the counselors than the mean percentage of students seen per year in 36 of the major universities in the United States (Clark, 1966). One would like to think that the sample was representative enough to generalize to the entire student population. Nevertheless, consideration of sample selection
from general psychology must be taken into account.

2. There was no difference between freshmen and sophomore use of the USU Counseling Center.

3. There was no difference in the use of counseling services for those with greater compared to those with less than the sample's mean impression of counseling. These findings were comparable to the results reported by Form (1953b) which found no relation between student appraisal of the center and their use of the facilities.

4. There was no relation between students' impressions of counseling and their use of the USU Counseling Center.

5. Significant difference existed between the sources of impressions and use of the USU Counseling Center. Those who used the facilities indicated parents as being mainly responsible for their impressions of counseling. It appeared that the impressions conveyed by parents had the most impact on encouraging student use of counseling facilities. One reason may be that students asked questions or had problems beyond what the parents felt they could adequately handle and, therefore, referred them to counselors.

6. Those who used the USU Counseling Center indicated no significant difference between their sources of awareness. Results reported by Form (1953b) indicated that those who were "more" aware of the counseling center and its functions used them more often, but that the reason 40% of his sample of Michigan State College students did not use the counseling facilities was not due to their ignorance of the center's purposes, functions or location. This tended to indicate a greater
importance on individual need for determining use of counseling. Summary of the reviewed literature indicated the greatest variable factor was related to whether or not students felt a counselor was best qualified to meet particular needs.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study were:

1. The size of the sample being limited to a stratified representation of freshmen and sophomores in general psychology courses instead of a more inclusive random sampling of the entire student body.

2. The selection of the sample from a possible biased sample of general psychology students, which may have limited the ability to generalize the data to the whole student body.

3. The semantic differential may have been insensitive to certain aspects of differences between impressions of counseling.

**Suggestions**

If the research were to be conducted again, the author would recommend: (1) use of a larger random sample of student body, and (2) adding a question dealing with the reason students saw a counselor.

**Implications**

It appeared to the writer that with the aforementioned limitations of the study, the results represented some basis for forwarding the following implications and recommendations to the USU Counseling Center:

1. The single "most important" source of impression was the counselor, which indicated that high school counselors could be effective in orienting students to professional facilities
available at the university level. This infers that college personnel should increase their communication with high school counselors.

2. The USU Counseling Center needed to develop other means of making students aware of the counseling facilities. Since so few students indicated the newspaper as being their source of awareness, perhaps this indicates an effective instrument for creating awareness. The bulletin board, however, appeared to have been effective in alerting students to the counseling center and should be continued.

3. Parents seemed to convey an impression of counseling to students which encouraged their use of the facilities more than the other sources of impressions studied in this investigation. Parents were also indicated as the second "most important" source of students' impressions of counseling. These support the need for increased counselor-parent communication.


APPENDIXES
Appendix A

Questionnaire
I. General Information (Circle appropriate number)
   A. Sex:  Male     Female
   B. Marital Status:  Married     Single
   D. College __________

II. Counseling History (Circle appropriate answer)
   A. Counseling prior to college: (Circle number of sessions)
      0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  10  15
   B. How significant were the following sources in forming your impressions of counseling? (Rank in order, 1-6, one being the most significant, 6 being the least significant.)

      Rank  Sources
      1. ___  A. peers
      2. ___  B. teachers
      3. ___  C. counselors
      4. ___  D. parents
      5. ___  E. reading
      6. ___  F. other (please specify) __________________

III. College Counseling (Circle appropriate answer)
   A. Where is the USU Counseling Center
      1. Education building--Counseling Center?
      2. Old Main
      3. Union Building
      4. Don't know
   B. How did you find out about the USU Counseling Center?
      1. USU Catalog        6. dorm parents
      2. faculty            7. pass the Center regularly
      3. friends           8. other (please specify)
      4. campus newspaper   __________________
      5. Counseling Center 9. don't know
         Bulletin Board
   C. Have you used the Counseling Center Services? (Circle number of sessions)
      0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  10  15
Appendix B

Semantic Differentials
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIALS

Counseling as a Profession

only for disturbed people _______ anyone can profit

easy job _______ difficult job

important profession _______ unimportant profession

progressive _______ retarded

reputable _______ disreputable

complex _______ simple

sophisticated _______ not sophisticated

Impressions of Counselors

well adjusted _______ not well adjusted

kind _______ cruel

happy _______ sad

unfair _______ fair

shallow _______ deep

active _______ passive

dull _______ exciting

warm _______ cold

relaxed _______ tense

sincere _______ insincere

wise _______ foolish

aloof _______ down to earth

humble _______ proud

Counseling Process

valuable _______ worthless
pleasant
voluntary
unnecessary
distressful
someone else could do as well
helps one understand oneself
meaningful
sensitive
prohibitive

unpleasant
forced
necessary
comforting
only the counselor could help
mixes one up
meaningless
insensitive
permissive
Appendix C

Semantic Differential Weighting Scale
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIALS

Counseling as a Profession

only for disturbed people 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 anyone can profit
easy job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 difficult job
important profession 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 profession
progressive 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 retarded
reputable 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 disreputable
complex 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 simple
sophisticated 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 not sophisticated

Impressions of Counselors

well adjusted 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 not well adjusted
kind 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 cruel
happy 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 sad
unfair 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 fair
shallow 1 1 3 4 5 6 7 deep
active 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 passive
dull 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 exciting
warm 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 cold
relaxed 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 tense
sincere 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 insincere
wise 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 foolish
alouf 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 down to earth
humble 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 proud

Counseling Process

valuable 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 worthless
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>7:6:5:4:3:2:1</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>7:6:5:4:3:2:1</td>
<td>Forced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>1:2:3:4:5:6:7</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressful</td>
<td>1:2:3:4:5:6:7</td>
<td>Comforting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else could do as well</td>
<td>1:2:3:4:5:6:7</td>
<td>Only the counselor could help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps one understand oneself</td>
<td>7:6:5:4:3:2:1</td>
<td>Mixes one up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>7:6:5:4:3:2:1</td>
<td>Meaningless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>7:6:5:4:3:2:1</td>
<td>Insensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
<td>1:2:3:4:5:6:7</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Mean Rating Profile of Students' Impressions of Counseling
### SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIALS

#### Counseling as a Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Semantic Differential</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only for disturbed people</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>anyone can profit 5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy job</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>___</td>
<td>difficult job 5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important profession</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>unimportant profession 6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>retarded 5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputable</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>disreputable 5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>simple 5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophisticated</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>not sophisticated 4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impressions of Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Semantic Differential</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well adjusted</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>not well adjusted 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>cruel 5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>sad 5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>fair 5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>deep 4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>passive 4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>exciting 4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>cold 4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>tense 5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincere</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>insincere 5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>foolish 5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloof</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>down to earth 5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong>:*:</strong></strong>:</strong>__:</em>_<strong>:</strong>__</td>
<td>proud 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Counseling Process

valuable
pleasant
voluntary
unnecessary
distressful
someone else could do as well
helps one understand oneself
meaningful
sensitive
prohibitive

worthless 5.42
unpleasant 4.91
forced 5.42
necessary 5.19
comforting 4.88
only the counselor could help 4.44
mixes one up 4.62
meaningless 5.08
insensitive 4.85
permissive 4.28
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