

379
N81d
No. 1706

AN IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE
PROBLEMS OF FRESHMAN STUDENTS
ACCORDING TO THE MOONEY
PROBLEM CHECK LIST

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Joe W. Rode, A.A., B.A., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

May, 1981

Rode, Joe W., An Identification and Analysis of the Problems of Freshman Students According to the Mooney Problem Check List. Doctor of Education (College Teaching), May, 1981, 147 pp., 15 tables, bibliography, 63 titles.

The purpose of this study was to identify the major problem areas of freshmen community college students and to determine if significant differences in problems of freshmen students existed as a variable of age, sex, or marital status. The population consisted of 674 community college students enrolled in an Orientation to College program during the fall or spring semester of 1976, 1977, 1978 or 1979. Each student was administered the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL), College Form (1950) during the first week of enrollment at the community college.

The data were analyzed in order to determine if a significant difference existed in the problem areas reported by students according to a Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks. A significant difference produced by the Friedman ANOVA indicated a need to apply a Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test in order to determine which problem areas differed significantly from one another. A Mann Whitney U Test was employed to statistically compare the problem areas of male students and female students as well as married students and single students. A Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks for k independent samples was

employed to test differences in the responses of four student age groups: 18 and under, 19 and 20, 20 through 29 and 30 years of age and over.

The results indicated that there was a significant difference in the problem areas of the MPCL as selected by students participating in this study. Most noticeably, students selected Adjustment to College Work, Personal and Psychological Relations, and Social Recreational Activities as problem areas of most concern to them. Female students also reported significantly more problems than male students in the areas of Health and Physical Development, Social-Psychological Relations, and Personal-Psychological Relations. Significant differences were also found to exist according to age in the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, Social and Recreational Activities, and Social-Psychological Relations. Likewise, single students reported significantly more problems than married students in the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, Social-Recreational Activities, and Social-Psychological Relations.

Findings of this study support further use of the MPCL with community college students of the late 1970's. The success of this instrument in reflecting the problems of specific groups points toward its usefulness in helping college personnel understand the expressed problems of their student body. It also provides significant data on those target groups for whom specific programs could be developed in order to meet their expressed needs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations of the Study	
Basic Assumptions	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	13
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.	49
Selection of Subjects	
Campus Population	
Study Population	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
The Instrument	
IV. TREATMENT AND PRESENTATION OF DATA.	69
Introduction	
Treatment of Data	
Statistical Implications	
Introduction to Model	
A Proposed Model	
Adjustment to College Emphasis	
Personal-Psychological Relations Emphasis	
Social-Recreational Activities Emphasis	
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS	121
Summary	
Findings	

	Page
Conclusions	
Recommendations for Further Study	
Implications	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	146

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Enrollment Data	50
II. Racial Composition of Enrollment.	51
III. Day and Evening Enrollments	51
IV. Ages of Campus Population	52
V. Age of Subjects	53
VI. Sex of Students Included in the Study	55
VII. Marital Status of Students Included in the Study.	55
VIII. A Ranking of the Seven Most Frequently Selected Problem Areas of the Mooney Problem Check List Accompanied by Mean Number of Problems Checked, Number of Students Completing Checklists and Problem Area Abbreviations	71
IX. A Comparison of Each Problem Area of the Mooney Problem Check List Ranked One Through Seven Accompanied by the Number of Student Checklists Analyzed and Resulting Levels of Statistical Difference Found in Student Rankings Between Problem Areas According to the Wilcoxon Matched- Pairs Signed Ranks Test.	75
X. An Analysis of Each Problem Area of the Mooney Problem Check List Ranked One Through Seven and Levels of Significance Produced by Area Comparisons, One to Another, According to the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test	80
XI. A Comparison of the Average Rank Assigned by Males and Females on the Seven Problem Areas of the Mooney Problem Check List Accompanied by the Average Rank Assigned to Each Problem Area and the Level of	

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
Difference Between Males and Females Produced by an Application of the Mann Whitney U Test.	84
XII. A Comparison of Age Groups on Each Problem Area of the Mooney Problem Check List According to the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance with Accompanying Mean Rank Scores, Numbers of Students and Level of Significance Between Mean Ranks of Each Area	88
XIII. A Comparison of Age Groups to Significant Problem Areas of the Mooney Problem Check List According to the Mann Whitney U Test Including Levels of Significance Found by Comparison of Mean Rank Scores for All Age Groups in All Possible Combinations. . .	90
XIV. A Comparison of Married and Single Students on Each Problem Area of the Mooney Problem Check List According to the Mann Whitney U Test with Accompanying Numbers of Stu- dents Compared, Mean Rank Scores and Level of Significance in Difference of Mean Rank Scores	95
XV. A Comparison of the Mean Grade Point Average of the Upper and Lower Ten Percent of Students Based upon Frequency of Problem Selection with Number of Students and Standard Deviation Produced by t Test. . . .	98

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history higher education has been called upon to meet the often changing and frequently divergent needs of students. Current reviews of the literature reflect a plethora of roles played by higher education in an attempt to maintain sensitivity to the needs of students and society. More recently, institutions of higher education have expanded their influence to include concern for the personal, social and emotional needs of students as well as the intellectual. Such an expansion of influence, often referred to as the development of concern for the "total student," has been viewed by some to be the ultimate role of higher education in a democratic society.

Such concern for developing the "total student" has directly led to the growth of student service programs now prevalent in today's junior and community colleges. In few areas do highly trained professionals attend to the personal, emotional and social development of students so directly as do student service personnel. Indeed, the underlying philosophical commitment of these professionals is that they have a vital role to play in the creation of a more humane person through global support and enhancement of the instructional process. To this end, problems or concerns

encountered by a student which directly or indirectly effect his academic success are, and ought to be, considered an integral part of the student's educational experience. Consequently, those professionals offering student services are confronted with the enormous task of meeting a diverse number of student needs reflective of the institution's overall population.

The most voluminous listing of potential student problems would surely fail to include all problems and concerns encountered by a typical junior or community college population. This fact was evidenced by a review of the literature through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) which identified 824 references dealing with the problems of students in their freshman year of college. Walsh (9) and Magill et al. (5) reflect the diversity of concerns facing today's student by detailing problems of students so dissimilar as the needs of women reentering higher education to the articulation problems of vocational-technical students. While such diversity may significantly add to the variety of problems dealt with by student service personnel, this diversity detracts from the institution's ability to respond with the coordination often necessary to assist students in overcoming such problems. Accordingly, it is imperative to conduct research to identify the most fundamental of problems confronting students. As institutional research is collected and analyzed, then, and

only then, can empirically valid programs be developed to adequately address the problems of students. This study makes use of a basic research tool designed to identify the problems of students enrolled in a college environment. Furthermore, the study provides a sound theoretical research base for student assessment which, according to Morris (7), is recommended prior to initiating any treatment designed to meet the assumed needs of students.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify and analyze the problems of selected freshman students enrolled in a Texas community college as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List--College Form.

Purposes of the Study

In addition to identifying and analyzing the major problem areas of freshman students enrolled at a Texas community college, the purposes of this study were (1) to determine if significant differences existed in these problem areas between male and female students, (2) to determine if significant differences existed in these problem areas between various age groups, (3) to determine if significant differences existed in these problem areas between married and single students, (4) to determine if significant differences existed in the mean grade point averages of the upper ten per cent of students checking the

most problems compared to the lower ten per cent of students checking the fewest problems as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List, and (5) to suggest a proposed model program designed to address the major problems of students as reflected by the data.

Null Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no significant difference in student problems as reflected by selected problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List.
2. There will be no significant difference between the problems of male and female students as reflected by selected problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List.
3. There will be no significant difference between the problems of various age groups as reflected by selected areas of the Mooney Problem Check List.
4. There will be no significant difference in the problems of married and single students as reflected by selected problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List.
5. There will be no significant difference in the mean grade point averages of the upper and lower ten per cent of students as a function of the number of problems checked on the Mooney Problem Check List.

Background and Significance of the Study

This Texas community college counseling staff has collected a large body of data regarding the problems of students. The Mooney Problem Check List has been administered to over 600 freshman students since 1975. The check lists were used to directly establish individual counseling contacts with counselors for those students indicating a desire to talk over their problems with someone on the college staff. Previous to this study, no attempt had been undertaken to analyze the data or generate problem profiles for freshman students at this institution.

A review of the literature concerning the problems of entering freshman college students revealed a multitude of studies concerning the topic. These studies span the history of institutions of higher education and many studies have selected the Mooney Problem Check List as the basic instrument for use in analyzing the problems of students. However, while such studies involving university settings are numerous, few studies have employed the Mooney Problem Check List to research the problems confronting the community college student. Indeed, Brewster (1), Hartman (4), Greene (3) and Tolle (8) are representative of the extent to which research has been conducted concerning the problems of community college freshmen as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. It should also be noted that the most recent of these studies, Brewster, was conducted in 1971.

The existence of such limited research on the problems of students in community colleges as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List is contrary to the large body of similar studies conducted in university settings. Indeed, the literature is replete with original research and verification studies concerning the problems of university populations. There exist no such parallels regarding research and the community college student. The need for a sound data base regarding the problems of students is equally important for community college and university populations.

It should also be noted that Cross (2) recently addressed, at considerable length, the New Student in higher education. Cross identified a need to constantly evaluate what institutions are doing while being keenly aware of the new breed of student that emerged upon the college scene as of the 1970s. According to Cross,

Young people who have not considered college in the past but who are entering college in the 1970's are distinguished by lower test scores than by any other single measure available, including race, sex and socioeconomic status (2, p. 14).

Cross insists that it is imperative to conduct research at two year colleges as well as at four year institutions if this New Student is to be understood. When commenting on the profile of the New Student, Cross stated,

. . . most of their parents have never attended college, the expectation of college is new to the family, lack of high school success, mostly C's compared to B's and A's for traditional

students, Traditional students are primarily attracted to four year colleges and universities, whereas New Students plan to enter public community colleges or vocational schools (2, p. 15).

The latter point made by Cross is especially reflective of the New Student attending the community college campus under investigation. Data submitted to this researcher by the Office of Research for the institution identified only 30%, 980/3,268, of the Spring 1980 enrollment as university transfer oriented. This is contrasted to 65%, 2,124/3,268, of the same enrollment, indicating a primary interest in occupational preparation or vocational training. The remaining 5%, 164/3,268, of the enrollment listed hobby or avocational interest as their primary orientation. Such educational intent is a further reflection of the differences which potentially exist between university and community college freshman students. Such potential population differences were considered an essential justification for conducting this study.

This study was significant in that it (1) yielded a problem profile representing the community college freshman; (2) examined the relationship between age and the problem areas of freshman students; (3) examined the relationship between marital status and the problem areas of freshman students; (4) examined the differences in the problem areas of male and female students; (4) furnished data regarding the relationship between the number of problems encountered

by freshman students and their mean grade point average; (6) identified the nature and extent to which community college programs should be developed to address the needs of freshman students; and (7) resulted in the development of a proposed model specifically designed to reduce the problems of freshman students as a result of data analysis.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were utilized:

Full-time Student--A student enrolled in a minimum of twelve semester hours during the fall or spring semester was considered full time.

Married Students--Students who were married at the time they completed the Mooney Problem Check List constituted this group.

Mooney Problem Check List--The College Form of the check list, developed by Ross L. Mooney in the 1940s and revised in 1950, constituted the check list used in this study.

Orientation to College--Psy. 1611, a one hour course required of all full-time day students during their first regular semester, but recommended to all Freshmen.

Problems or Concerns--These are problems selected by students as they complete the Mooney Problem Check List. Ross L. Mooney specifies the following directions to assist students in selecting such problems or concerns.

Read the list slowly, pause at each item, and if it suggests something which is troubling you, underline it, thus "34. Sickness in the family." Go through the whole list, underlining the items which suggest troubles (difficulties, worries) of concern to you. After completing the first step, look back over the items you have underlined and circle the numbers in front of the items which are of most concern to you, thus, "37. Sickness in the family," (6, p. 1).

Single Students--Single students were students not married at the time of completing the Mooney Problem Check List. This group included divorced students, widowed students and those students who had never married.

Students of the 1970s--This population was comprised of students enrolled in Orientation to College, Psy. 1611, at a Texas community college, during the fall or spring semesters of 1976, 1977, 1978 or 1979.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were imposed on this study:

1. The study was limited to a North Texas community college campus.

2. Subjects were limited to those students enrolled in Orientation to College sections during the fall or spring semesters of 1976, 1977, 1978 or 1979.

3. Problems of students were limited to the general problem areas contained within the Mooney Problem Check List--College Form.

4. Analysis of data was limited to the problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List ranked one through seven by the population under investigation. All rankings were

determined by a simple frequency of checked items within problem areas.

5. No distinction was made between those problems which were checked by students and those problems which were circled by students.

6. No attempt was made to perform item analysis on the 330 separate items contained in the Mooney Problem Check List.

7. The study was limited in statistical inference to students enrolled in Orientation to College sections at this Texas community college.

8. Comparisons of student grade point averages to the number of problems checked on the Mooney Problem Check List were limited to the upper and lower ten per cent of students as determined by frequency of problem selection. Furthermore, such comparisons were limited to the semester in which the checklist was completed.

9. Groups compared in this study were limited to male subjects versus female subjects and married subjects versus single subjects.

10. Comparisons of age groups were limited to students eighteen years of age and younger, students nineteen through twenty years of age, students twenty-one through twenty-nine years of age and students thirty years of age or older.

Basic Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered essential for this study:

1. It was assumed that the counselors and orientation instructor responsible for administering the Mooney Problem Check List followed specific directions provided in the Mooney Problem Check List Manual.

2. It was assumed that all subjects completed the Mooney Problem Check List in an honest fashion.

3. It was assumed that college students were able to recognize problems or concerns that were troubling them individually.

4. It was assumed that all demographic data including: age, sex, and marital status was recorded honestly by those subjects completing the check list.

5. It was assumed that students enrolled in an Orientation to College course represented "entering freshman students" upon which conclusions could be drawn.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brewster, Hoyt W., "The Problems of Jr. College Freshmen and the Development of the Jr. College Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1971.
2. Cross, Patricia K., Beyond the Open Door, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.
3. Greene, Carolyn and Donald L. Kester, "Black Community College Students Have Special Problems. What Are These Special Problems? A Research Project at One Community College Finds Some Answers," A Research Project, Los Angeles, California, 1970, ERIC: ED 047 690.
4. Hartman, Bernard J., "Survey of College Student's Problems Identified by the Mooney Problem Check List," Psychological Reports, XXII (March, 1968), 715-716.
5. Magill, Kathleen and Kathryn Cirksena, "Problems and Information Needs of Women Reentering Higher Education," A Research Paper, Bethesda, Maryland, 1977, ERIC: ED 155 349.
6. Mooney, Ross L., and Leonard Gordon, The Mooney Problem Check List Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
7. Morris, Glyn, "How 5 Schools Made Plans Based on Pupil Needs," The Clearing House, XXIX (November, 1954), 131-134.
8. Tolle, Donald J., "Identification of Troublesome Problems Affecting St. Petersburg Junior College Students, with Implications for Guidance Program Improvement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1957.
9. Walsh, Michael E., "Articulation Problems of Vocational-Technical Students," Community College Review, V (Winter, 1978), 50-54.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The major purpose of this study was to identify the major problem areas of freshman students as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. A great deal of research has been conducted in this area and much of that research has employed the Mooney Problem Check List as a basic research tool.

This study makes no claim to be unique in its effort to measure the problems of students enrolled in a community college. The study does attempt to add to the body of knowledge currently existing regarding student problems which seem to be influenced by social and environmental changes. Furthermore, the study attempts to add significantly to the research involving community college students and their problems. The studies contained in this section will be illustrative of the wide variety of research on the problems of students involving the Mooney Problem Check List.

One of the first uses of the Mooney Problem Check List was reported by Marsh (24) in 1940. Marsh reported that the Mooney Problem Check List was used with freshman and sophomore women attending Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri. The Check List was used with 370 women in an effort to

determine worries of the modern college woman. Marsh stated that,

Mooney's check list has been found to be a very useful tool in attempting to locate the areas of student problems. It affords a quick and convenient way to get an overall view of a student's felt difficulties, and provides an excellent basis for an opening conference with the student who asks for psychological help (24, p. 339).

Marsh concluded the study by identifying personality, academic, and social areas as the main problem areas facing the women at Stephens College. The smallest frequencies of indicated worries were in the areas of home, physical and financial concerns.

Ross L. Mooney (29), March 1942, discussed some of the uses of data coming from the Mooney Problem Check List when used in a school setting. Mooney emphasized the individual nature of each student's response on the check list noting that this permitted individual differences to surface. He further stated that his primary goal was to develop a simple means by which students could identify their problems.

Mooney stated regarding test development,

Simple phrases, familiar to the students, are used in the List. These phrases were gleaned primarily from the free writing of four thousand students who were asked to describe briefly the problems which were worrying them most. The phrases were sifted through successive screenings, checked against other surveys, tried out in experimental editions and finally constituted into the present Problem Check List (29, p. 68).

Mooney also stated, regarding interpreting the Mooney Problem Check List,

Methods of interpretations are as simple and direct as the method of marking. The interpreter directly analyzes the items which an individual marks or the items which are most prevalently marked by a group of students. The content of the items provides the basic data. There are no "scores" and hence no need for complicated scoring schemes. The 11 areas are a simple grouping of the items under general headings which tend to organize the data . . . (29, pp. 68-69).

Congdon's (8) 1942 study used the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C in Freshman Orientation classes at Colorado State College of Education. Congdon administered the check list, reviewed student problems, offered personal interviews to students based on check list responses and finally, administered the check list a second time. Results indicated a decrease in problems in all areas except Curriculum and Teaching Procedures. Congdon further reported an overall decline of 24 per cent in the number of problems chosen by students on the second check list administration as a result of the consultation program. Congdon concluded that several benefits seen by those involved in this study warranted continued use of the Mooney Problem Check List. Those benefits included,

1. It is not a test; students are not ranked or graded in any way.

2. Psychological terms for describing personality, such as introversion, maladjustment, dominance, etc., which are not well understood by many faculty advisors and most students, do not appear in this check list.

3. The results of this list furnish basic information which can be used in strengthening an orientation course. Those areas in which many and vital problems occur, may well be considered in organizing an orientation program.

4. A student's check list furnishes a point of contact valuable in individual conferences.

5. The results of the Check List are considered as temporary remedial problems and are not part of the student's permanent record (8, p. 374).

Finally, Congdon reported definite relationships between the Mooney Problem Check List and the Bell Adjustment Inventory and added, ". . . the Problem Check List has proved to be a valuable tool in the freshman counseling program at Colorado State College of Education" (8, p. 375). Congdon concluded by encouraging further use of the instrument as a counseling tool.

One of the earlier uses of the Mooney Problem Check List occurred in 1943 when Mooney (28) utilized the check list with freshman woman enrolled at Ohio State University. One hundred seventy-one women participated in the study and all were dormitory residents living in on-campus quarters. The average number of problems marked by students was 29.8. The range was reported to be from 3 to 106 with a median of 24. The average number of problems marked in the eleven possible problem areas was

Problem Areas	Average
Adjustment to College Work	5.4
Personal-Psychological Relations	4.2
Social-Recreational Activities	3.3
Health and Physical Development	3.1
The Future: Vocational and Educational Curriculum and Teaching Procedures	2.8
Social-Psychological Relations	2.1
Courtship, Sex and Marriage	1.9
Finances, Living Conditions and Employment	1.5
Morals and Religion	1.5
Home and Family	1.3

(28, p. 85).

Mooney summarized three general uses of the check list as a result of this study,

1. It shows the most common problems among a group of students as directives to the kind of personnel services most in demand,
2. it picks out particular students who are the most likely candidates for particular services,
3. and it implements individual interviews (28, p. 90).

Mooney finalized the article by stating that Ohio State University had decided to administer the check list again in 1944 to all freshman girls enrolling at the University.

Gordon (15) attempted to ascertain the validity of the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, in a study conducted at Ohio State University using students enrolled in beginning psychology classes. Gordon not only used the first summary question on page five of the Check List in which the individual indicates whether he feels that the items marked give a well-rounded picture of his problems, but he introduced yet another variable to the design of his study. Based on another administration, Gordon successfully demonstrated the ability of the check list to reflect new problems as

they arise or solutions to old problems based on two separate administrations of the check list. Gordon further indicated that problem changes occurring between administrations were remarkably accurate. The second administration of the check list identified new problems 97.8 per cent of the time while indicating the direction of change (increased or decreased problems) 82.6 per cent of the time.

Marzolf and Larsen (26) used the Mooney Problem Check List with upper classmen enrolled at Illinois State Normal University. In this study, the check list was found to support clinical observations regarding the frequency of certain behavior patterns in students.

Similarly, Hibler and Larsen (19) employed the Mooney Problem Check List in 1943 at Illinois State Normal University in order to identify the problems of upper classmen. Again, the authors reported great success with the instrument and recommended special attention be devoted to those problems circled by students. Such student responses, according to the authors, represented major problem areas for upper classmen at the particular institution participating in this study.

The authors further reported that the organization of activities is the most widespread problem facing the average upper-class college student at Illinois State Normal University. Lack of self-confidence was the item most often circled by students.

Marjorie Prieur (31) employed the Mooney Problem Check List in an effort to determine needs of high school girls enrolled in a home economics program in Webster Groves, Missouri. The check list identified two problem areas of students not currently being addressed by the home economics program. Students most frequently underlined problem items regarding selecting a career, Area X: The Future-Vocational and Educational and personal hygiene, Area I: Health and Physical Development. The check list was later used by professionals in personal guidance with students:

. . . the group guidance program proved to be stimulating and produced satisfactory results. A few of the girls were more reticent in checking their problems. In the long run, however, most of their difficulties came to light, and something definite was attempted for each (31, p. 142).

Stone (36) administered the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, to five hundred seventy-eight students at the River Falls State Teachers College in 1947. The group participating in this study included forty-two seniors, fifty-eight juniors, one hundred and twenty-six sophomores and three hundred fifty-two freshmen.

Stone reported the following rankings for the eleven categories of concerns as determined by the sample,

Categories

ACW	Adjustment to College Work	1
SRA	Social and Recreational Activities	2
CTP	Curriculum and Teaching Procedures	3
PPR	Personal-Psychological Relations	4

FVE	Future: Vocational Educational	5
FLE	Finances, Living Conditions and Employment	6
HPD	Health and Physical Development	7
SPR	Social-Psychological Relations	8
CSM	Courtship, Sex and Marriage	9
MR	Morals and Religion	10
HF	Home and Family	11

(36, p. 405).

Stone also reported slight differences in rankings among certain individual underlined problems and certain individual circled problems. Additionally, women marked a far greater number of problems than did men with the only exception being the category of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment. Other differences among married and non-married students were noted and faculty reaction to the check list was judged to create a positive environment at the college.

In a 1951 study conducted by Carr (6), the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C was used to ascertain the problems of both inferior and superior students at Florida State University. Carr's study clearly indicated the usefulness of the check list in differentiating the groups along two lines: (1) the tendency for superior students to concentrate on long range goals as opposed to the more immediate concerns of inferior students, and (2) the increased ability of inferior over superior students to cope in areas involving social and psychological relationships.

In 1952, Charles J. McIntyre (27) verified the prima facie validity of the Mooney Problem Check List by designing

a study to predict the number of problems identified by selected groups of high school students. McIntyre formulated the following seven hypotheses,

. . . less intelligent students would have more problems than the more intelligent in the area of Adjustment to School Work; (2) Seniors would have more problems than those in lower grades in the area of the Future: Vocational and Educational; (3) Students from broken homes would have more problems than those from intact homes in the areas of Home and Family; (4) Boys would have more problems than girls in the area of Adjustment to School Work; (5) Boys would have more problems than girls in the area of the Future: Vocational and Educational; (6) Negroes would have more problems than Whites in the area of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment; and (7) Girls would have more problems than boys in the area of Courtship, Sex and Marriage (27, p. 270).

McIntyre reported confirmation of hypotheses one, two, three, four, five, and six. Hypothesis seven was not confirmed, as no statistical significance between the concerns of males and females could be found on the category of Courtship, Sex, and Marriage.

Jones (21) administered the Mooney Problem Check List to students enrolled at Indiana University in 1954-1955. The group studied consisted of 75 married and 75 unmarried students who were administered the check list, the Inventory of Affective Tolerance and the Personal Audit. "Comparisons produced significant differences between married and unmarried students concerning three areas: (1) affective tolerance, (2) problems in the area of courtship, sex and marriage, and (3) total problems" (21, p. 127).

Jones further stated that items investigated relative to the Personal Audit proved insignificant above the 35 per cent level, while nine of eleven categories on the Mooney Problem Check List were significant at the 10 per cent level or lower. Conclusions reached by Jones included,

(1) Unmarried students express a significantly higher number of problems than do married students, (2) there appears to be a definite relationship between the degree of affective tolerance and the typical problems of students, (3) married students express more concern over present problems, while unmarried students appear to be thinking more seriously about future problems (21, p. 128).

Slinger (33) employed the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, with a group of freshman students enrolled at the University of Florida in 1955. The check list was reported effective in identifying problems of freshman students as well as establishing a substantial inverse relationship between the student's grade point average and his selection of problems in the Adjustment to College Work category. It was also noted that female students had more problems than males, that students were more concerned over Adjustment to College Work than over any other problem area and that there was a lack of close student-teacher relationships among the freshman students at the University of Florida.

Singer and Stefflre (32) combined forces to examine the concurrent validity of the Mooney Problem Check List--Adult Form, in a 1957 study which examined its relationship to other variables found important in counseling with the

veteran. Their findings suggested that the check list was valuable in directing the counselor and veteran to areas of real concern, worked equally well with married or unmarried clients, and should become increasingly more popular in school settings. The authors further suggested the need to develop local normative data. Singer and Stefflre concluded that, "apart from the data presented, . . . open check lists such as this type, such as the SRA Youth Inventory and SRA Junior Inventory, will play an increasing role in counseling situations particularly in school settings" (32, p. 301).

Tolle (38) was one of the first to use the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, in dealing with junior college students. In 1957, Tolle reported (1) that problems in Adjustment to College Work were of the greatest concern to students at St. Petersburg, (2) that females and students under twenty years of age reported a significantly lower mean number of problems than did males and those students over twenty years of age, (3) many students desired to discuss their problems with members of the college, yet did not know to whom to go for help, and (4) faculty tend to evaluate the guidance program at St. Petersburg Junior College higher than the students. Tolle concluded his study by recommending that the Mooney Problem Check List become a basic tool for use in the guidance program at St. Petersburg Junior College.

Williams (40) used the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, to evaluate the effectiveness of an orientation course at North Texas State University in 1956. Williams administered pre- and post-check lists to 150 randomly selected college women from the School of Education in an effort to determine the effectiveness of an orientation class in reducing the number of problems reported by students. Williams concluded that the check list provided good data regarding students enrolled in orientation classes at North Texas State University. Williams administered the check list to orientation students in October and again at semesters end. Reported results included a decrease in problems checked in all eleven areas of the second administration of the Mooney Problem Check List for students enrolled in the North Texas State University orientation program.

A further expansion of the above study by Williams included the random selection of 150 students at East Texas State Teachers College. This control group consisted of students not enrolled in orientation classes. Again, two separate administrations of the check list were given, one in October and one at semesters end. This control group experienced increases in four of the eleven problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List, second administration. These increases included the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, Courtship, Sex and Marriage, Adjustment to College Work, and the Future: Vocational and Educational.

Amos and Washington (1) reported in 1960 still another application of the Mooney Problem Check List. Their findings indicated that teachers' perceptions of students' problems don't necessarily agree with students' perceptions. They additionally remarked,

Teachers identified fewer problems as characteristic of the students than did the students themselves, and appeared especially unaware of the extent of student problems in the areas of Money, Work, the Future, and Health and Physical Development. Teacher's judgements were more similar to boys than to those of girls . . . (1, p. 257).

Amos and Washington further reported that teachers often failed to "sense" many adolescent problems and perceived students as having fewer problems than they actually had. Amos and Washington recommended the check list as an excellent tool for altering teacher perceptions and creating an environment where teachers and students could share common concerns.

Yarrow (41) investigated the problems of entering freshmen at the University of Southern Mississippi in 1963-1964. Yarrow administered the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, to 236 entering freshmen, generating the following conclusions: (1) the problems of University of Mississippi students are predominantly in the "Adjustment to College Work" area, (2) American College Testing composite scores are of little use in predicting problem frequency, (3) the Mooney Problem Check List correlates well with the Otis Test of Mental Ability, (4) numbers of problems checked cannot

be used to predict a student's grade point average, (5) dropouts are more concerned about the "Future: Vocational and Educational" than are students who do not drop out, (6) problem areas of women differ slightly when compared to men, (7) problems of dormitory students differ from those of non-dormitory students, and (8) problems can be identified according to college major.

Clements and Oelke (7) published a study in 1967 attempting to identify the common types of problems that concerned adolescents in the public schools of Georgia during 1964 and 1965. The Mooney Problem Check List was employed for this purpose. A second reported goal of the study was an examination of the relationship which existed between problems reported on the Mooney Problem Check List and each of the following variables:

1. Population mobility trends of the school community,
2. Sex of the students,
3. Age of the students,
4. Grade level of the students,
5. Occupation level of the heads of the students' households,
6. Educational level of the heads of the students' households,
7. Social position of the student's family,
8. Teacher-pupil ratio in the student's school,
9. Counselor-pupil ratio in the student's school,

10. Student's perception of the Mooney Problem Check List, 1950 Revision, as presenting a "well-rounded picture" of their problems,

11. Student's desire for further exploration into personal and interpersonal areas of concern,

12. Student's desire to discuss their problems with another person,

13. Size of student's school,

14. Type of school community (7, pp. 697-698).

Forty-one Georgia counties participated in this study. A table of random numbers was used to select eighteen participating schools. A comparison of means for the eleven problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List produced statistically significant differences for seven of the fourteen independent variables. Those variables found to significantly correlate with the Mooney Problem Check List included variables one, two, four, six, eight, nine and ten.

In each area of reported significance a general hypothesis regarding expected findings was found. For example, for all problem areas except Health and Physical Development, students from schools without counselors reported the largest mean number of problems. Other significant findings included a lower incidence of problems in schools with a low teacher-pupil ratio; students where the head of household had at least a high school education reported fewer problems in school than did students of parents who dropped out of

school prior to high school graduation; and students in communities where unstable (increasing or decreasing) populations were reported experienced more problems in the area of Social-Psychological Relations.

Marshall's (25) 1967 study to determine the types of problems differentiating high-achievers, average-achievers and low-achievers employed the Mooney Problem Check List to aid in identifying significant differences in these groups. The check list produced fifty-one response items deemed to significantly differentiate students of the three achievement groups. Marshall further stated that the check list also isolated twenty-nine separate problem items which distinguished the low-achievers from the other two groups used in this study. Again, Marshall was enthusiastic about the results produced by the check list.

Hartman (17) conducted one of the few studies involving community college students when he administered the Mooney Problem Check List to freshmen and sophomores at a community college in an industrial setting. The study, conducted in 1968, involved 79 males and 62 females between the ages of 18 and 20 years of age. All students were single and enrolled as full time students.

Hartman reported that results of his study demonstrated clearly that most problems indicated by students fall into the categories of Adjustment to College Work, Personal-Psychological Relations and Social-Psychological Relations.

He further stated that the results of community college students participating in this study were consistent with the literature. Hartman reported some differences in problem ranking according to sex, most noticeably area five, The Future: Vocational and Educational,

The Future-Vocational and Educational ranked second highest in terms of serious problems but last for females. Social-Psychological Relations ranked third (tie) highest as a serious problem for females but only eighth highest for males. Males indicated that the least number of serious problems were in the areas of Social and Recreational Activities and Curriculum and Teaching Procedures. Females indicated their least serious problems were in the areas concerning the Future-Vocational and Educational, and Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (17, pp. 715-716).

Hartman also noted that males admitted to having more problems than females as well as a greater willingness to discuss their problems with a trained person (17).

Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi (2) used the Mooney Problem Check List at Michigan State University in 1967 and 1968 in an attempt to determine the extent to which underclassmen were troubled by religious concerns. Again, the check list was selected by Beit-Hallahmi owing to the fact that, ". . . it is one of the most widely used instruments with college students, especially in counseling settings" (2, p. 334). Results of this study indicated that Adjustment to College Work was the major concern of Michigan State University freshmen.

Cutsumbis (9) studied two Midwestern undergraduate university samples in a 1968 study designed to investigate the relationship of some sociological factors, specifically, sex, social class, religious affiliation, parental ethnicity, and grandparental ethnicity to self-reported anxiety. Using the Mooney Problem Check List, Cutsumbis was unable to reveal any patterns between self-reported anxiety and religious affiliation, parental ethnicity or grandparental ethnicity. Cutsumbis did report the emergence of significant patterns between social class and self-reported anxiety for males and females.

Goldman (14) conducted a study in 1968 of freshman and junior students enrolled in a northeastern state university using the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C. In this study, 301 students were administered the Mooney Problem Check List and the California Test of Personality. Correlations were obtained accordingly between the scores of the tests.

Goldman reported that of the 360 coefficients, " . . . 318 were significant, i. e. 30 were significant at the .05 level and 288 were significant at the .01 level" (14, p. 390). He further reported that the relationships were primarily negative; that is,

Those who demonstrated a high degree of adjustment (high score on the C. T. P.) check fewer problems on the M. P. C. L. than those who demonstrated poor adjustment (low score on the C. T. P.). On the basis of this study which is in agreement with a similar work by an earlier researcher, the present writer asserts that the M. P. C. L. may permit an assessment of the person's adjustment status (14, p. 310).

Purdue University conducted extensive research on student problems employing the Mooney Problem Check List as reviewed in 1969 by Dye and Akers (12). Undergraduate students at Purdue University were administered the check list in an effort to determine their concerns and worries, to determine to what extent they thought they experienced problems serious enough to warrant professional help and where would such help be sought?

The study involved single full-time undergraduates at Purdue's Lafayette campus. Two thousand students were randomly sampled according to the Mooney Problem Check List. A total of 1,114 returned questionnaires was scored. Results indicated that females experienced more problems than males, the greatest problem areas for males were in the areas of Adjustment to College Work and Social and Psychological Relations while females most frequently were bothered by Social and Recreational Activities and Adjustment to College Work.

Stetter (34) used the Mooney Problem Check List in 1969 to lower the anxiety level of students. Stetter tested the premise that anxiety levels of students would be lowered when students learned that others their own age had problems similar to theirs. Procedures included administration of the check list to two samples of junior high school students. All check lists were collected and scored, and the results of student problem selection were shared with each sample.

Pre- and post-test scores of the IPAT-8 Parallel-Form Anxiety Battery revealed a definite decrease in the anxiety level of students after each student was allowed to review his check list with the accompanying information regarding how other classmates had responded to the same problem statements. In view of these findings, Stetter remarked,

. . . it can be concluded that the hypothesis is correct. The anxiety level of students will be lowered when they learn that others their age have personal-social problems similar to their own. The technique for using a problem checklist to allow students to reveal their personal problems to each other while remaining anonymous is a technique worth being added to a teacher's or guidance worker's repertoire (34, p. 184).

In 1970, Carolyn Greene (16) published results of research conducted at Chabot Community College in Hayward, California. The Mooney Problem Check List was used along with the Personal Integration and Omnibus Personality Inventory in an effort to sample the problems of students in a college environment. The research design called for the measurement of black students, Chicano students, and "others." It should be noted, however, that Chicano students declined to participate in the study.

Statistical analysis of comparisons made between the "other" group and the black group showed no significant difference on the Personal Integration instrument or the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Statistically significant differences were found with the Mooney Problem Check List on the FLE Area, Finances, Living Conditions and Employment.

Greene concluded that black students did have problems that were different than those problems of other students. Greene added that this study, "is an example of how institutional research can serve the needs of all groups within the college community" (16, pp. 4-5).

In 1971, Brewster (3) completed his dissertation using the Mooney Problem Check List in an attempt to discern the problems of junior college students enrolled in the Los Angeles and Orange county area of California. He used 1,944 students and eliminated 112 of the 330 items of the Mooney Problem Check List in an effort to modernize the check list. Brewster then added additional items bringing the total number of problems mentioned to 579. This instrument was administered to 311 freshman students enrolled at three community colleges. Results demonstrated that pollution was most often named by students as a problem troubling them. Not spending enough time studying was ranked second.

Additional conclusions reached by Brewster included: (1) certain type problems are cited more by one sex or the other, (2) age variables do affect problems checked, (3) the Mooney Problem Check List is in need of revision, (4) check lists should allow for social concerns to be reflected, and (5) this newly designed check list seems to represent the concerns of junior college students in the Los Angeles area.

In a paper presented at the meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association in Denver, 1971, Held and Snow (18) reviewed results of their study which employed the Mooney Problem Check List with obese patients in an outpatient medical setting. The study was conducted at the University of Colorado Medical Center and involved randomly selected obese adolescents being treated for weight reduction.

It was predicted that the obese patients would have more personality disturbances and a significantly greater number of personal problems as manifested by higher MMPI and Mooney Problem Check List scores when they were compared to a control group of normal weight individuals. The MMPI scales used in this study included the three validity scales, the ten basic scales, the ego strength scale (es), Welsh's anxiety (A) scale and the repression scales. Mooney Problem Check List scores were determined by the total number of problems underlined by subjects.

The general hypothesis that obese girls would have elevated MMPI scores, indicative of psychological difficulty, and that these higher MMPI scores would be reflected in significantly higher Mooney Problem Check List scores was supported. The obese group had significantly higher scores on five of the ten basic clinical scales of the MMPI when compared to the normal weight control group. These differences were further supported by consistent differences

across all eleven subcategories of the Mooney Problem Check List. An independent measure, the Rotter I-E Scale, produced no significant difference between the two groups.

Held and Snow determined that the MMPI and Mooney Problem Check List do differentiate between clinical outpatients being treated for obesity and normal-weight control groups. They record obese patients scoring significantly higher on the D, P_D, P_A, P_T and S_C scales of the MMPI, while recording a significantly greater number of items on the Mooney Problem Check List.

Karr and Mahrer (22) reported successful use of the Mooney Problem Check List in assessing personal adjustment problems of senior and junior students at Miami University, 1972. Using Erickson's (13) developmental sequence, which asserts that specific problem types accompany each developmental stage, Karr and Mahrer hypothesized that leaving college to enter independent life as an adult represented an important transition point. As such, it was further hypothesized that (1) seniors would report significantly more problems than juniors, and problems would tend to cluster into recognizable adjustment areas.

Personal adjustment was measured by means of the Mooney Problem Check List. Interspersed with the check list were thirty items from the K scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) included as a technique to identify response bias.

Results supported all hypotheses. College seniors reported a greater number of personal problems on the Mooney Problem Check List than college juniors. The problems of seniors did tend to cluster in three general areas: (1) Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, (2) Personal-Psychological Relations, and (3) Adjustment to College Work. Finally, seniors with defined vocational choices reported more problems than juniors with defined vocational choices.

Domino and DeGroot (11) conducted research from 1969 through 1973 at the Counseling Center of Fordham University using the Mooney Problem Check List. Results of their study, published in 1976, found significant differences between 200 counseling seekers and 200 counseling nonseekers on 9 of the 11 Mooney Problem Check List problem areas. The study also provided forty-two individual items that were useful in predicting potential clients. The researchers concluded that students who eventually become clients differ substantially from nonclient peers. They further supported continued use of the instrument strongly supporting the usefulness of the Mooney Problem Check List at both a theoretical and at an applied level.

In a 1973 study, Deiker and Pryer (10) reported finding significant differences in clinical patients and normal students as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. Deiker and Pryer attempted to better define characteristics of reported problems in emotionally disturbed adolescents.

The study detailed problem differences of "normal" students with clinical population groups which included: adolescent adjustment reaction, functional psychosis, neurosis and character disorder.

Findings included clinical patients selecting an average of 26 percent of all Mooney items as compared to the 14 percent selected by the student control group. While this fact was highly predictable, it was noted that the Mooney Problem Check List apparently identified qualitative differences as well as quantitative differences among the two populations. Students in the control group ranked problems in school adjustment first while clinical cases most often selected the area of Personal and Psychological Relations. A review of the statements in this area clearly indicated that this subscale contains clinical references to mood, affect and cognition.

More recently, Hood (20) used the Mooney Problem Check List--Form C in 1974 to examine personal problems of a selected group of freshman students at North Texas State University. Hood compared the findings of this group with students enrolled in Education 161 at North Texas State University during the 1950s and 1960s. Significant results produced by this study included

1. Students of the 1970's have a significant higher mean number of problems . . . than did students of the 1960's and 1950's.
2. . . . the 1970 populations indicated significantly more problems of concern in each of the

- eleven MPCL categories, with the exception of Adjustment to Work category . . .
3. The 1970's student indicated significantly more problems of concern than the 1960's student in the following categories: Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, Home and Family, Morals and Religion, The Future: Vocational and Educational and Curriculum and Teaching Procedure.
 4. The 1960's and 1970's analysis of variance indicated significant differences beyond the .05 level in all categories other than the Social-Psychological Relations, Personal-Psychological Relations, Courtship, Sex and Marriage, and Adjustment to College Work.
 5. Females of the 1970's accounted for the majority of the variance between the other two decades.
 6. Males of the 1970's revealed a relatively stable problem frequency count for total number of problems indicated and between the eleven categories of the MPCL (20, pp. 98-99).

Hood further recommended that additional research be conducted, especially with female students, in order to "examine the effect of societal pressures upon the female . . ." (20, p. 101). Hood also suggested that additional research was needed regarding the differences in problem areas identified by males and females.

In 1975 Palladino and Domino (30) reported use of the Mooney Problem Check List at a private Eastern urban university. Freshman students from 1969 through 1973 participated on a voluntary basis in a testing program sponsored by the Counseling Center. Instruments included in the study were the California Psychological Inventory and the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes in addition to the Mooney Problem Check List.

"The data were analyzed by a 2x3 analysis of variance (sex groups--nonclients, short-term, and long-term clients)" (30, p. 499). It was found that five of the California Psychological Inventory's eighteen scales yielded significant differences regarding those who did not seek counseling services, did so for a short time or for those who became long-term clients. All seven Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes yielded significant sex differences as did nine of eleven of the Mooney Problem Check List scales.

Palladino and Domino stressed the fact that this study administered the previously described instruments in 1969, prior to any student seeking counseling services. Thus, unlike many studies, the label of client or non-client was based on a four year period.

Palladino and Domino concluded their findings by reporting,

the MPCL is the only instrument in this study that yielded consistently significant differences between groups, a finding consistent with the literature. Not only do 8 of the 11 problem areas show significant group differences, but a ranking of means between groups shows that the long-term group has the highest mean of all 11 problem areas for males, while for females the long-term group has the highest mean for 9 of the 11 areas. These results support the usefulness of the Mooney in a counseling setting and underscore the notion that when dealing with relatively normal problems the best assessment approach is a direct one (30, p. 500).

Wen-Shih-Sung and Rose (39) correlated grade point averages for black students in a study involving the Mooney Problem Check List. The study, published in 1975, found

the Mooney Problem Check List to correlate significantly to both black males and females while the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale correlated significantly to G. P. A. for males only.

Leon (23) published results using the Mooney Problem Check List with international students. In his article, published in 1976, Leon discussed his attempt to determine the problems of international students attending Howard University subsequent to the 1974-1975 academic year. Leon attempted to further break down problem selection according to the variables of sex, college major, place of birth, marital status and class. The sample employed consisted of 112 students from twenty-eight countries and four geographic regions: Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and the Near East. The findings indicated,

. . . that the major problems of international students of Howard University are, in descending order of importance, Social and Recreational Activities; Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment; Home and Family; Personal Psychological Relations; and Courtship, Sex and Marriage. 2. Single international students, as a group, face more problems than married, separated or divorced students, and their problems are significantly different. Male international students experience significantly more problems than their female counterparts the number of problems was not significantly different among international students in various majors. Caribbean students indicated significantly fewer problems than students from Africa, Asia or the Near East (23, p. 4859).

Stewart and Deiker (35) reported in 1976 results of an item factor analysis conducted on the high school and junior

high school version of the Mooney Problem Check List. The study, conducted owing to the, ". . . continued popularity in counseling of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL)," was designed to explore the factorial structure of the MPCL (35, p. 509).

Stewart and Deiker concluded that, although the Mooney Problem Check List was conspicuously remiss in including clinically relevant problems, it did however, provide an "index of general adjustment" (35, p. 509). Results of the factor analysis provided a single general factor overlapping whose emergence could not be explained from the present evidence provided by this study. It was hypothesized however, that Mooney's 1942 item generation process, which included only the most frequent of problems mentioned by students, might act to include the most common problems of adolescents.

Caine and Wijesinghe (5) included the Mooney Problem Check List in a study conducted at Claybury Hospital, located in Essex, Great Britain, 1976. The study dealt with pre-treatment expectations. By using the Mooney Problem Check List, Hysteroid/Obessoid Questionnaire, the Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire and the Symptom Sign Inventory the authors concluded that,

. . . subjects who are internally directed in interest and who have a liberal attitude to a variety of social issues and a "psychological" set to treatment are more responsive to group

psychotherapy as seen by their therapist as well as by themselves (5, p. 384).

In 1977, Burdt (4) published results of a study involving the Mooney Problem Check List and the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes. The results of Burdt's study supported the relationship between student identification of personal concerns and study habits and attitudes. The data produced by this study dealt primarily with the frequency that a student reported a personal area of concern and his study habits and attitudes. Students who reported a high number of personal concerns also reported study habits and attitudes which were predictive of academic failure.

Swearingen and Thompson (37) published results in 1978 using the Mooney Problem Check List to evaluate the effectiveness of a treatment program on a general psychiatric ward at the Veterans Administration Hospital, located in Los Angeles, California. The study was a result of an attempt by the authors to place more emphasis on patient opinions regarding necessary clinical treatment. Results of the study produced data indicating that patients found psychiatric care highly satisfactory. Other results included,

Also, ward staff found the Mooney Problem Check List to be so useful in treatment planning and counseling that they have continued to use it. Use of the list enables staff to identify problems soon after the patient is admitted and to

incorporate work on those areas into a treatment plan. Patients have also found the list to be an easy way for them to summarize all of their problems (37, p. 184).

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Amos, Robert T. and Reginald M. Washington, "A Comparison of Pupil and Teacher Perceptions of Pupil Problems," Journal of Educational Psychology, LI (May, 1960), 255-258.
2. Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin, "A Problem Profile of University Underclassmen," College Student Journal, VI (Fall, 1974), 332-337.
3. Brewster, Hoyt W., "The Problems of Jr. College Freshmen and the Development of the Jr. College Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1971.
4. Burdt, Eric, "Relationships Between Adolescents Personal Concerns and Their Study Habits," Education, LXXXVII (Spring, 1977), 302-304.
5. Caine, T. M. and Wijesinghe, B., "Personality, Expectations and Group Psychotherapy," British Journal of Psychiatry, CXXIX (October, 1976), 384-387.
6. Carr, James F., "The Problem Areas of a Selected Group of Students at Florida State University as Indicated by the Mooney Problem Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1955.
7. Clements, Hubert M. and Merritt Oelke, "Factors Related to Reported Problems of Adolescents," Personnel and Guidance Journal, VL (March, 1967), 697-702.
8. Congdon, Nora A., "The Perplexities of College Freshmen," Educational and Psychological Measurement, CXI (Spring, 1943), 367-375.
9. Cutsumbis, Michael N., "The Relationship of Certain Sociological Factors to Self-Reported Anxiety as Revealed by the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXVIII (Fall, 1968), 577-581.

10. Deiker, Thomas and Margaret Pryer, "Reported Problems in Emotionally Disturbed and Normal Adolescents," Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, VI (October, 1973), 146-150.
11. Domino, George and Maryanne DeGroot, "A Comparison of Counseling Seekers and Nonseekers on the Mooney Problem Check List," Journal of College Student Personnel, XIX (January, 1978), 33-36.
12. Dye, Allen H. and Stephen Akers, "An Analysis of Student Academic and Personal Concerns and Awareness of Counseling Services," A research project report, Lafayette, Indiana, 1969, ERIC: ED 039 592.
13. Erickson, E. H., "Identity and the Life Cycle," Psychological Issues, I, Monograph No. 1, 1959.
14. Goldman, Bert A., "Relationships Between Scores on the Mooney Problem Check List and the California Test of Personality," Journal of Educational Research, VXi (March, 1968), 307-310.
15. Gordon, Leonard V., "The Reflection of Problem Changes by the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, IX (Spring, 1949), 749-752.
16. Greene, Carolyn, and Donald L. Kester, "Black Community College Students Have Special Problems. What Are These Special Problems? A Research Project at One Community College Finds Some Answers," A research project, Los Angeles, California, 1970, ERIC: ED 047 690.
17. Hartman, Bernard J., "Survey of College Students' Problems Identified by the Mooney Problem Check List," Psychological Reports, XXII (Summer, 1968), 715-716.
18. Held, Mark and David Snow, "MMPI, Internal-External Control, and Problem Check List Scores of Obese Adolescent Females," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXVIII (October, 1972), 523-525.
19. Hibler, Francis W., and Arthur Larsen, "Problems of Upperclass Students in a Teachers College," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXVIII (June, 1943), 253-260.

20. Hood, Gary K., "An Analysis of College Student Problems as Indicated on the Mooney Problem Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1974.
21. Jones, Worth R., "Affective Tolerance and Typical Problems of Married and Unmarried College Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (October, 1958), 126-128.
22. Karr, Stephen D. and Alvin Mahrer, "Transitional Problems Accompanying Vocational Development and College Graduation," Journal of Vocational Behavior, II (July, 1972), 283-289.
23. Leon, Paul, "Self-Perceived Problems of International Students Attending Howard University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
24. Marsh, Charles J., "The Worries of College Women," The Journal of Social Psychology, XV (September, 1942), 335-339.
25. Marshal, Jon Clark, "Problems of High School Students in Relation to Grade Achievement," School and Society, LXXXV (April, 1967), 237-238.
26. Marzolf, Stanley S. and Arthur Larsen, "Statistical Interpretation of Symptoms Illustrated with a Factor Analysis of Problem Check List Items," Educational and Psychological Measurement, V (Fall, 1945), 285-294.
27. McIntyre, Charles J., "The Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVII (September, 1953), 270-272.
28. Mooney, Ross L., "Personal Problems of Freshman Girls," Journal of Higher Education, XIV (February, 1943), 84-89.
29. Mooney, Ross L., "Surveying High-School Students' Problems by Means of a Problem Check List," Educational Research Bulletin, XXI (March, 1942), 57-69.

30. Palladino, Joseph J. and George Domino, "Differences Between Counseling Center Clients and Nonclients on Three Measures," Journal of College Student Personnel, XIX (November, 1978), 497-501.
31. Prieur, Marjorie, "Personal Guidance in Home Economics," Educational Research Bulletin, XXII (September, 1943), 118-142.
32. Singer, Stanley L. and Buford Stefflre, "The Concurrent Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (January, 1957), 298-301.
33. Slinger, George E., "Freshman Problems and Academic Achievement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1955.
34. Stetter, Richard, "A Group Guidance Technique for the Classroom Teacher," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 179-184.
35. Stewart, David W. and Thomas Deiker, "An Item Factor Analysis of the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXVI (Summer, 1976), 509-513.
36. Stone, Gordon L., "Student Problems in a Teachers College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (June, 1948), 404-416.
37. Swearingen, Dolores J. and Julian M. Thompson, "What Does the Patient Think, An Evaluation of a General Psychiatric Ward," Hospital and Community Journal, XXIX (March, 1978), 182-184.
38. Tolle, Donald J., "Identification of Troublesome Problems Affecting St. Petersburg Junior College Students, with Implications for Guidance Program Improvement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1957.
39. Wen-Shih-Sung, and Rose E. McCoy, "Relationships of Selected Nonacademic and Academic Variables to the Grade Point Average of Black Students," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXV (January, 1976), 935-939.

40. Williams, Charles C., "An Experimental Study to Determine the Effectiveness of the Freshman Orientation Course at North Texas State University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1958.
41. Yarrow, Walter H., "An Investigation of the Problems of Entering Freshmen at the University of Southern Mississippi," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1964.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In this chapter a review of methods and procedures is presented. Subjects of the study are described and a general review of the assessment instrument is included.

Selection of Subjects

Subjects for this study consisted of freshman students enrolled in Orientation to College sections at a Texas community college during the fall or spring semesters of 1976, 1977, 1978 or 1979. As was described earlier, Orientation to College is a freshman requirement for all full-time day students. The course is included in all occupational program degree plans leading to the Associate in Applied Science degree and is required for the Associate in Arts degree at the institution.

Campus Population

Several features of the campus population from which the sample for this study was drawn were considered noteworthy and warrant further discussion. The following demographics of the general student population are intended to provide information characteristic of the students of this institution while assisting in providing further data

regarding the extent to which the results of this study may be generalized by the reader to other institutions and to other populations.

The community college campus participating in this study opened in the fall of 1975. Enrollment during that first semester totaled 975 students. Table I identifies that the campus, placed in a suburb of a large metroplex, is a growing one with a relatively even mixture of male and female students. A review of college enrollments for the years covered by this study are included below. Data regarding the breakdown of male and female students has also been incorporated into this table.

TABLE I
ENROLLMENT DATA

SEMESTER	YEAR	ENROLLMENT	MALES	FEMALES
Fall	1976	2,324	1,344	980
Fall	1977	2,948	1,661	1,287
Fall	1978	3,090	1,684	1,406
Fall	1979	3,296	1,761	1,535

Table II summarizes the racial composition of the campus for the years studied. The table clearly shows the predominance of caucasian students in the populations. Spanish and black students accounted for eight per cent and

TABLE II
RACIAL COMPOSITION OF ENROLLMENT

RACE	ENROLLMENT			
	1976	1977	1978	1979
Caucasion	1,925	2,454	2,635	2,849
American Indian	1	12	10	20
Black	121	175	157	142
Oriental	10	18	14	24
Spanish	210	274	266	253
Other	44	15	8	8

five per cent respectively, of the 1979 fall semester enrollment. All other minorities combined accounted for two per cent of that same 1979 enrollment.

Data in Table III demonstrate that the campus has an increasing evening student population. A review of the data in Table III also reveals a steady increase in students enrolling in both day and evening classes during the same semester.

TABLE III
DAY AND EVENING ENROLLMENTS

YEAR	DAY	EVENING	ENROLLED BOTH DAY AND EVENING
1976	1,010	977	337
1977	1,270	1,255	423
1978	1,265	1,395	430
1979	1,296	1,521	479

Finally, Table IV provides data regarding the ages of students for this particular campus. Again these data were reported only for those years included within the study.

TABLE IV
AGES OF CAMPUS POPULATION

YEAR	Under 21	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46+
1976	774	560	392	204	131	119	144
1977	875	746	516	297	156	167	191
1978	986	776	481	279	199	169	200
1979	1,083	828	473	327	217	173	195

It can clearly be seen in Table IV that all age categories have experienced growth since 1976. Students under 21 years of age represented the heaviest concentration of enrollees: approximately 33 per cent of the fall, 1979 enrollment was under 21 years of age. It should be further noted that the 21-25 age category accounted for 25 per cent of the fall 1979 enrollment. Students 26-30 represented 14 per cent of that same enrollment with all other students, students 30 years of age and older, accounting for the final 28 per cent of the enrollment.

Study Population

All subjects participating in the study were students enrolled in Orientation classes as described in the preceding section. The following information regarding these subjects

has been included to supply the reader with additional background useful in interpreting and generalizing the data results.

Table V provides a breakdown of the ages for all subjects participating in this study. Students 18 years of age represent the largest group studied, 48 per cent of all participants. Students 19 years of age represent 11 per cent of the total population for the study followed by 17 year olds who represent 7 per cent of that population. The range

TABLE V
AGE OF SUBJECTS

AGE	FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY %
17	48	7.1
18	326	48.4
19	75	11.1
20	38	5.6
21	28	4.2
22	21	3.1
23	13	1.9
24	16	2.4
25	11	1.6
26	10	1.5
27	10	1.5
28	6	0.9
29	11	1.6
30	3	0.4
31	6	0.9
32	3	0.4
33	4	0.6
34	4	0.6
35	2	0.3
37	4	0.6
38	2	0.3
39	3	0.4
40	1	0.1

TABLE V--Continued

AGE	FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY %
41	5	0.7
42	1	0.1
43	6	0.9
44	3	0.4
45	1	0.1
47	3	0.4
48	2	0.3
49	1	0.1
50	2	0.3
51	2	0.3
52	2	0.3
72	1	0.1
TOTAL 674	100.0	100.0

of ages included in the data was from age 17 to 72, with a mean age of 21.26 years. The median age of all participants was calculated at 18.38 with a mode of 18 years of age.

Table V also summarizes the relative frequencies regarding the total population of each age category. Again it was evident that the 18 year old represents the most frequent subject in the study while students 30 years of age and younger represent 91.4 per cent of the total students participating in this study.

Table VI includes data regarding the sex ratio of students included in the data. The data clearly reflects an even mixture of both male and female students.

TABLE VI
SEX OF STUDENTS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

	SEX	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
	Male	325	48.2
	Female	349	51.8
Total	Male and Female	674	100.0

Table VII indicates the number of married and single students included in the data analysis. The data clearly reflects the predominance of single students included in the study. It is noted, however, that 121 students, 18% of the total sample, were married when they completed the Mooney Problem Check List.

TABLE VII
MARITAL STATUS OF STUDENTS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

	STATUS	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
	Married	121	18.0
	Single	553	82.0
Total	Married and Single	674	100.0

In summary, data provided clearly demonstrates that the population investigated was generally under thirty

years of age and single. The group also was remarkably evenly divided between males and females. A significant number of married students and students over thirty years of age existed in order to justify further data generation regarding the problem areas of students in those categories.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Data for this study were collected through the counseling center of a Texas community college. Data gleaned for this study was originally obtained by counselors and orientation instructors from students enrolled in PSY. 1611, Orientation to College. This is a required course for all full time day students enrolling in the college for the first time. This group constitutes subjects selected for this study.

The Mooney Problem Check List--Form C, was given to all students during the first week of each fall and spring semester, 1976 through 1979. The check list was administered as part of a test packet including other instruments . . . i.e. Acquaintance Volume Scales and How Good a Student Are You surveys. Each orientation instructor explained the confidentiality that would be afforded each student's responses on the check list and instructed students to omit their name and identification number if desired. For the purposes of this study, students electing to omit their name and identification number were not included as subjects in the study. Additionally, orientation instructors

informed students that if, as a result of completing the check list, they wished to speak to a counselor, arrangements to that effect would be made as part of their orientation experience. Finally, anyone who did not want to complete the check list was free not to do so without penalty.

Additional specific instructions given by orientation instructors responsible for instrument administration included the following directions:

1. Tell students this is not a test.
2. Tell students that it is, instead, a list of problems which often bother college students.
3. Ask students to complete the check list by reading each item and selecting those problems which are of concern to them.
4. Encourage each student to then complete the summary interpretation in their own words.
5. Read the directions as they are printed on the cover of the Mooney Problem Check List.
6. Ask students if they have any questions.
7. Inform students that they have one week to complete the check list.
8. Collect the completed check list in one week.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

In order to test hypothesis number one, a Friedman Two-way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was applied to the data produced by administering the Mooney Problem Check List

for all subjects. This procedure was followed by a Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed Ranks Test in order to identify those problem areas which differed significantly from one another.

In order to test hypotheses two and four, a Mann-Whitney U Test was employed to statistically compare male subjects to female subjects and married subjects to single subjects. Hypothesis number three was tested by applying a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks for k independent samples followed by a Mann-Whitney U Test. Finally, hypothesis number five was tested by application of a test of significance in mean differences. In all data analysis, the null hypothesis was rejected at or above the .05 level of significance.

The Instrument

The instrument used in this study was the Mooney Problem Check List--College Form. The instrument, developed by Ross L. Mooney in the early 1940s and revised in 1950, contains 330 problem statements. These 330 items were selected by Mooney from a master list of approximately 5,000 common problems of college students. Mooney (9) states in paragraph two of the manual for the Mooney Problem Check List that:

Mooney's Problem Check Lists were developed during the early 1940's to help students express their personal problems. The procedure is simple. Students read through the appropriate Problem Check List--Junior High School, High School or College

form--underline the problems which are of concern to them, circle the ones of most concern, and write a summary in their own words (9, p. 3).

The instrument groups the 330 items into eleven areas with each area containing 30 problem statements. These problem areas are designed horizontally across three pages. Students completing the form proceed in a vertical direction virtually assuring lack of test awareness by students to specific problem areas.

Individual items selected by Mooney for inclusion in this instrument were required to meet certain criteria.

According to Mooney, the items were to be:

1. In the language of the students;
2. Short enough for rapid reading;
3. Self-sufficient as individual phrases;
4. Common enough to be checked frequently in large groups of students, or serious enough to be important in an individual case;
5. Graduated in seriousness from relatively minor difficulties to major concerns;
6. Vague enough in "touchy" spots to enable the student to check the item and still feel that he can hide his specific problems in later conferences if he chooses to do so;
7. Centered within the student's own personal orientation rather than in general social orientation (9, pp. 11-12).

The eleven problem areas contained in the Mooney Problem Check List are as follows:

- | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Area I | Health and Physical Development (HPD) |
| Area II | Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) |
| Area III | Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) |
| Area IV | Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) |
| Area V | Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) |
| Area VI | Courtship, Sex, and Marriage (CSM) |
| Area VII | Home and Family (HF) |
| Area VIII | Morals and Religion (MR) |

Area IX Adjustment to College Work (ACW)
Area X The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE)
Area XI Curriculum and Teaching Procedure (CTP)
(9, p. 4).

As was discussed in Chapter I, a basic limitation of this study was to analyze only those problem areas ranked one through seven by the population under investigation. Those areas of the check list omitted from further data analysis were Area VI: Courtship, Sex and Marriage, Area VII: Home and Family, Area VIII: Morals and Religion, and Area XI: Curriculum and Teaching Procedures.

When employing the check list, Mooney cautions the interpreter to

. . . always keep in mind that the Problem Check List is not a test. It does not yield scores on traits or permit any direct statements about the adjustment status of the person who made the responses . . . it is simply a count of the problems which the student has identified as matters of concern to him (9, pp. 5-9).

This caution should not however, diminish the validity or reliability of results produced by the instrument. McIntyre (8) verified the prima facie validity of the instrument by use of identified problem groups. Through his design, he found that students with specific problems could be identified via inspection of their check list responses. This study was in agreement with earlier research conducted by Stogdill and Denton (10).

The question of reliability was also addressed in the 1950 revision manual written by Mooney. Quoting an unpublished study by Gordon (7),

. . . the Problem Check List was administered twice to 116 college students. The frequency with which each of the items was marked on the first administration was correlated with which each of the same items was marked on the second administration. A correlation coefficient of .93 was found (7, p. 9).

Mooney further cites in his 1950 revision manual,

. . . a study of four educational groups in which the Problem Check List was repeated one to ten weeks after first administration. The rank order of the eleven problem areas, arranged by size of mean number of problems checked in the area, remained virtually the same from one administration to the other for each of the groups. The rank order correlation coefficients varied from .90 to .98 (9, p. 9).

Based on these reported findings, it appears clear that the check list is designed to provide the basic stability required to implement program changes subsequent to data analysis. Indeed, the wide and varied successful use of this instrument over the years not only warrants its continued use, but has led to its wide acceptance in professional circles as a valid and reliable instrument.

One final discussion is in order regarding selection of the Mooney Problem Check List for this study. Brewster (5), in completing his doctoral dissertation in 1971, remarked that the Mooney Problem Check List was in need of revision. As a result, a serious effort was undertaken to verify the reliability and validity of the instrument for use in the 1970s. To that end, the following procedures were undertaken with the accompanying results.

1. An extensive review of the literature involving the Mooney Problem Check List was undertaken. Results of

this review indicated that, not only was use of the Mooney Problem Check List widespread throughout the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, but the instrument was widely used in the 1970s as well. Over seventy studies were found to have been conducted since 1970 employing the instrument in a wide variety of settings including clinics, hospitals and major universities. These studies were not limited to the United States or studies with American subjects. The Mooney Problem Check List has been used in England and with students from the Near East, Africa, Asia and the Caribbean as well as in this country.

2. An attempt was made to verify sales of the Mooney Problem Check List in an effort to determine the current level of its usage. The Psychological Corporation was contacted as test supplier and the following information was obtained.

The corporation does not release sales figures on test instruments as a matter of company policy. However, the company was able to verify wide usage of the instrument in the United States at this time. According to the Psychological Corporation, the instrument sells sufficiently to warrant its continued listing in current sales catalogs. Further assurance was given that if sales were not sufficient, the marketing department would either request a revision of the instrument or recommend discontinuing its

use. Neither of these options was currently being considered according to the company.

3. A review was conducted of student responses to the first essay question contained in the Mooney Problem Check List, which asks students if the items they have marked on the list give a well-rounded picture of their problems? An excess of 95 percent of all students completing the Mooney Problem Check List answered this question yes. This student reaction to the check list has been verified by personal experience with orientation classes.

4. An attempt was made to locate studies in which the Mooney Problem Check List was correlated to other existing instruments. A review of the literature produced numerous studies in which significant correlations were found to exist between the Mooney Problem Check List and other well known instruments. Some of these instruments include

Bell Adjustment Inventory

California Test of Personality (CTP)

California Psychological Inventory

Inventory of Affective Tolerance

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

Otis Test of Mental Ability

SRA Youth Inventory

SRA Junior Inventory

Scholastic Testing Service Youth Inventory (STS)

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes

5. An extensive review of existing instruments was conducted in an effort to locate similar type self-report or survey instruments that would assess student problems. The following procedures were followed in an attempt to locate a more recently written or revised instrument as just described,

a. A review was conducted of Psychological Testing by Anastasi (1). Not only was there a void of such instruments, but according to Anastasi,

. . . one of the clearest examples of content validation in a current personality inventory is provided by the MPCL. Evidence has accumulated indicating its effectiveness . . . data on concurrent validity are available from comparisons on contrasted groups whose reported problem frequencies in relevant areas differ in the expected direction (1, p. 495).

b. Tests in Print by Buros (3) was reviewed. Again a similar void of problem assessment instruments appropriate for college populations was found.

c. Mental Measurement Yearbook by Buros (2) was reviewed. Once again, this researcher found a lack of problem assessment instruments suitable for college populations. The 4th edition of Buro's yearbook says regarding the Mooney Problem Check List,

No check list can present definitively all problems, and users of this as well as other check lists should bear this in mind. The principal contribution of the check list is to be found in the extent to which they increase the understanding of problems marked by the students . . . the evidence indicates

that students can and do express the problems included in the M. P. C. L. (2, p. 67).

d. The following major test suppliers for the United States were contacted. Such suppliers reported that, either they had no instrument that identified the problems of students at the college level, or that, in their opinion, the Mooney Problem Check List was the best available on the market.

1. American Guidance Services
2. Educational Testing Services (ETS)
3. Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.
4. Houghton-Mifflin Testing Service
5. McGraw-Hill Testing Services
6. Psychological Corporation Inc.
7. Scholastic Testing Services Inc.
8. Science Research Associates (SRA)

e. The following instruments were reviewed owing to the fact that they had been used in other studies or were recommended as potential assessment tools.

Bell Adjustment Inventory

California Psychological Inventory (CPT)

California Test of Personality

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)

Gordon Personal Inventory

Gordon Personal Profile

Minnesota Counseling Inventory

Personal Data Blank

SRA Youth Inventory

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes

Youth Inventory

The list contains few instruments appropriate for college populations and no instruments which generally assess student problems.

f. The Educational Research department of North Texas State University was contacted for additional referrals in an effort to locate similar assessment instruments. As a result, the university Counseling and Testing department was visited. There, information was gathered regarding assessment instruments suitable for college populations. That department had also used the Mooney Problem Check List. Recent efforts by the university to modernize its problem statements were reviewed by the researcher and described below.

Through the National Directors of Counseling Conference, a directory of counseling center directors was secured. Over one hundred universities were subsequently sampled regarding the current reporting of problems by students. There were approximately thirty respondents. This led to the development of the Counseling Client Check List.

It should be noted that the Counseling Client Check List has not been validated nor used with any populations as of this date. A review of the instrument identified 86 of the 100 items as either directly or indirectly included in the Mooney Problem Check List-- College Form. The instrument has not been utilized for several years and remains stored in the Counseling office. There exists no current plans for its use in the immediate future.

In summary, while the Mooney Problem Check List fails to cover all potential student problems, it does cover a wide range of problems. The problem statements are written in general terms which avoid becoming dated and subjects felt that the check list presented a well rounded picture of their problems.

It should also be noted that recent nationwide research conducted by North Texas State University in the late 1970s has produced items representative of the problems of today's student not unlike those contained within the Mooney Problem Check List. This lends still further credence to the current applicability of Mooney's original items.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anastasi, Anne, Psychological Testing, 4th ed., New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1976.
2. Buros, Oscar K., Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1953.
3. _____, Tests in Print, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1961.
4. _____, The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1972.
5. Brewster, Hoyt W., "The Problems of Jr. College Freshmen and the Development of the Jr. College Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1971.
6. Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw Hill and Company, 1971.
7. Gordon, Leonard U., "The Reflection of Problem Changes by the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, IX (Spring, 1949), 749-752.
8. McIntyre, Charles J., "The Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVII, (September, 1953), 270-272.
9. Mooney, Ross L., and Leonard U. Gordon, The Mooney Problem Check List Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
10. Stogdill, Emily L., and Jack Denton, "Differences in Responses of Selected College Groups to Items on the Mooney Problem Check List," An unpublished study, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1947.

CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the procedures for treatment of data and the results of the statistical treatment of data are presented. Data treatments described were related to the purposes and research hypotheses contained within this study. All data presented reflect those responses of students completing the Mooney Problem Check List.

Treatment of Data

After completion of data collection, the data were tabulated and statistical procedures were applied in order to test research hypotheses. The data were tabulated for statistical treatment by hand scoring only those Mooney Problem Check Lists containing the complete demographic data required.

Scoring the Mooney Problem Check List included counting each of the potential 330 separate problem items identified by students. These problem items were totaled according to the eleven broad problem areas contained within the Mooney Problem Check List. This procedure was repeated on each of the 674 check lists. The sum of problem items identified by students in each of the eleven problem areas was then

recorded on coding sheets for all students. Data entered on coding sheets were transformed to I.B.M. punchcards by the Computer Center at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas for the purposes of applying various statistical treatments to the data. These statistical treatments are discussed in detail later in Chapter IV.

A basic limitation imposed on this study was to confine problem analysis to seven of the eleven problem areas contained in the Mooney Problem Check List. In order to accomplish this limitation, the computer was programmed to consider the total number of problem items selected by students in each of the eleven problem areas and retain only those areas ranking one through seven according to a frequency distribution of expressed problems by students. Table VIII represents those seven problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List retained by the computer for inclusion in this study.

The ranking of problem areas was accomplished via a simple frequency count of all problem items identified by students in each of the eleven problem areas contained in the Mooney Problem Check List. Data in Table VIII illustrates those problem areas ranked one through seven from the most frequently checked problem area by students to the least frequently checked problem area by students. For the purposes of this study, the problem areas of Courtship, Sex and

TABLE VIII

A RANKING OF THE SEVEN MOST FREQUENTLY SELECTED
 PROBLEM AREAS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST
 ACCOMPANIED BY MEAN NUMBER OF PROBLEMS
 CHECKED, NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING
 CHECKLISTS AND PROBLEM AREA
 ABBREVIATIONS*

Problem Areas of the Mooney Problem Check List Retained for Further Data Analysis	Problem Areas Ranked from Most Frequently Checked to Least Frequently Checked	Problem Areas Abbreviated	Average Number of Problems Checked in Each Problem Area
Adjustment to College Work	1	ACW	5.169
Personal- Psychological Relations	2	PPR	3.672
Social- Recreational Activities	3	SRA	3.358
Social- Psychological Relations	4	SPR	3.224
Health and Physical Development	5	HPD	2.866
Finances, Living Conditions and Employment	6	FLE	2.668
The Future: Vocational and Educational	7	FVE	2.611

*N = 674

Marriage; Curriculum and Teaching Procedures; Home and Family and Morals and Religion were ranked eight through eleven and therefore, were not retained for further data analysis according to a basic limitation of this study.

In addition to illustrating the ranking of problem areas by students as a reflection of the number of problems they reported, Table VIII also clearly shows that the area of Adjustment to College Work (ACW) was the most frequently reported problem area troubling students.

A review of the average number of items checked in this problem area revealed that the 674 students identified problem items in the Adjustment to College Work area an average of 5.169 times. The problem area ranked as the second greatest problem for students was the area of Personal-Psychological Relations. That problem area had problem items checked an average of 3.672 times, indicating that students selected an average of three or four problem statements in this area. Table VIII ended with the seventh ranked problem area of students, The Future: Vocational and Educational. Items in this problem area were checked by the 674 students an average of 2.611 times, indicating that students selected on the average between two and three items in this problem area.

Finally, Table VIII contains abbreviations for the seven retained problem areas treated further in this study. These abbreviations will be utilized in all subsequent tables.

The procedure of ranking the problem areas of Mooney Problem Check List one through seven, from the area containing the most number of checked problems to the area containing the least, determined those problem areas to be treated further. The questions asked in this further treatment of the data comprise the remainder of this chapter. All statistical procedures employed in this treatment were selected in order to meet basic assumptions required when treating non-parametric data and to satisfactorily answer the five hypotheses contained in Chapter I.

Testing of Hypotheses

The tenability of each stated hypothesis was determined by statistical analysis. Each hypothesis was either rejected or retained according to the .05 level of significance. Results of such statistical testing are presented in the remainder of this chapter.

Hypothesis I

Stated in the null form, it was predicted that no significant difference would be found in the problem areas ranked one through seven by students. In order to statistically test this hypothesis, a Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was applied to the data presented in Table VIII. The F ratio obtained for significance of difference between each mean of the seven retained problem areas of this study was significant beyond the .01 level. This allowed the

rejection of hypothesis number one. More simply, when the average numbers of items checked by students on the seven problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List were statistically compared, it was found that students selected problem items on the Mooney Problem Check List in a statistically significant fashion. That is, the rankings of problem areas one through seven could have occurred by chance in less than one out of one hundred cases. Further research was indicated in order to account for this significance.

The rejection of hypothesis number one required further statistical analysis in order to isolate and identify the problem areas which differed significantly. That is, further analysis was required in order to confidently say which problem areas were selected significantly more than others by students. A Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test was applied to the problem areas ranked one through seven in order to determine which problem areas accounted for that significant difference.

Table IX.--Table IX represents the results produced by application of Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Again, this statistical procedure was applied in order to compare each problem area of the Mooney Problem Check List ranked one through seven, one to the other, in all possible combinations. These comparisons were accomplished by a complex statistical procedure unique to the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test. Basically, the procedure is designed to statistically compare the difference in the

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF EACH PROBLEM AREA OF THE MOONEY
 PROBLEM CHECK LIST RANKED ONE THROUGH SEVEN
 ACCOMPANIED BY THE NUMBER OF STUDENT
 CHECKLISTS ANALYZED AND RESULTING
 LEVELS OF STATISTICAL DIFFERENCE
 FOUND IN STUDENT RANKINGS BETWEEN
 PROBLEM AREAS ACCORDING TO THE
 WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS
 SIGNED RANKS TEST*

Abbreviated Problem Areas Compared One to Another	Level of Significance in Differences Found Between the Average Ranking of Compared Problem Areas
HPD to FLE.	0.018
HPD to SRA.	0.004
HPD to SPR.	0.286
HPD to PPR.	0.000
HPD to ACW.	0.000
HPD to FVE.	0.004
FLE to SRA.	0.000
FLE to SPR.	0.002
FLE to PPR.	0.000
FLE to ACW.	0.000
FLE to FVE.	0.407
SRA to SPR.	0.028
SRA to PPR.	0.020
SRA to ACW.	0.000
SRA to FVE.	0.000
SPR to PPR.	0.000
SPR to ACW.	0.000
SPR to FVE.	0.000
PPR to FVE.	0.000
ACW to FVE.	0.000

*N = 674

Essentially, this is done by ranking all students from 1 to 674, from the student who checked the fewest problems to the student checking the most. Once this was achieved, the program found an average rank between 1 and 674 reflective of the average importance placed by the 674 students in this problem area. These averages, named mean ranks, were then compared repeatedly from one problem area to another until all possible problem area comparisons were completed.

Table IX illustrates that a total of twenty-one possible comparisons were required to compare each problem area, one to another. This process was necessary in order to identify which problem area(s) was being selected by students in a statistically significant manner that could not be explained by mere chance alone. The data provided by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test produced statistically significant differences below the .05 level when one problem area was compared to another. A review of Table IX reveals that the area of Adjustment to College Work (ACW) produced levels of significance below .05 in all six comparisons to other problem areas. Likewise, the problem areas of Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) also produced levels of significant differences when their mean rank was compared to all other problem areas. This finding may be interpreted as accounting for the significant difference in the way students checked problem items when the original Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by

Ranks was applied to the average number of problems checked by students in each problem area. The levels of significance below .05 also indicated that these differences produced by comparing one problem area to another could have occurred by chance in less than 5 out of 100 cases.

A review of the average number of problems checked by students in each problem area as presented in Table VIII clearly ranked Adjustment to College Work (ACW) as the number one problem area troubling students. Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) was ranked as the second greatest problem area for students, while the problem area of Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) was ranked third. These data produced by the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test allow for the construction of a hierarchy of student problems in these problem areas. Stated more simply, since more students checked problems in these three areas than any other problem areas, and did so in a significant manner when compared to other problem areas, these areas may be ranked one, two, three as the three greatest problem areas confronting students.

Table IX also shows that comparisons in the problem areas of Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Health and Physical Development (HPD), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) produced statistically significant differences in the way students identified problems in all comparisons made

except two. A comparison of the average rank of problems checked in the Health and Physical Development (HPD) area to the Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) area did not prove to be significantly different, level of significance = 0.286. Similarly, a comparison of the problem rank given by students checking items in the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) area was not significantly different from the student responses to problem items contained in the problem area, The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE), level of significance = 0.407. This finding simply means that when the original ranking of problem areas, one through seven, was conducted by finding the average number of problem items checked on each problem area (see Table VIII), no significant difference was found to exist between the fourth and fifth ranked problem areas or the sixth and seventh ranked problem areas.

Further interpretation of these data indicate that students did not differ enough in their selection of problem items in the areas of Health and Physical Development (HPD) and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) to clearly rank one over the other in terms of which troubles students the most. Stated another way, mere chance alone could explain why one problem area ranked above the other. Likewise, the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) did not differ enough to clearly rank one problem area over the other

as being a more serious problem for students. These findings indicate that what actually exists is a tie for the problem areas ranked as the fourth and fifth greatest concern to students and a tie for the problem areas ranked as the sixth and seventh greatest concern of students.

Further interpretation of these findings supports the conclusion that the original limitation of treating only the problem areas ranked one through seven by students was justified. The data indicates that, as one proceeds beyond the top three ranked problem areas, it becomes increasingly more difficult to definitively say what troubles students most. Based on these findings it could be predicted that inclusion of all eleven problem areas contained within the Mooney Problem Check List would not substantially add to the data produced by this study. In fact, these findings indicate that little difference in student responses would be found in the ranking of the lower problem areas, eight through eleven (not part of this study).

Table X.--Table X was constructed to assist visually in the conceptualization of the twenty-one problem area comparisons, one to the other. The table also shows the level of significance produced when one problem area was compared to another. This statistical level indicates to what degree the total number of problem items checked by students in each problem area could have occurred by mere chance alone.

TABLE X

AN ANALYSIS OF EACH PROBLEM AREA OF THE MOONEY
 PROBLEM CHECK LIST RANKED ONE THROUGH SEVEN
 AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE PRODUCED BY
 AREA COMPARISONS, ONE TO ANOTHER,
 ACCORDING TO THE WILCOXON
 MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED
 RANKS TEST

Abbreviated Problem Areas Ranked One Through Seven	Levels of Significance in the Difference Between Problem Areas Compared One to Another						
*ACW (1) PPR (2) SRA (3) SPR (4) HPD (5) FLE (6) FVE (7)	0.000	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.028	0.004	0.286
Problem Areas Compared to Original Ranking One Through Seven	**ACW	PPR	SRA	SPR	HPD	FLE	

*This table reads from left to right, in a horizontal and vertical fashion. For example, the ACW problem area produced a 0.000 level of significance when compared to each of the remaining six problem areas listed in a vertical column (left).

**The .05 level of significance was used for testing each comparison made.

As already discussed, the levels of significance produced by the application of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test and shown in Table X, provide a detailed view of problem area comparisons, one to another, and the extent to which they were statistically different from one another as

a result of student problem selection. The table shows that the problem areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) were each found to be significantly different beyond the .05 level of significance when contrasted to each of the other retained problem areas (one through seven). Table X also illustrates that the comparisons of the Health and Physical Development (HPD) area and the Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) area produced a level of significance = 0.286. A similar finding of no significant difference between problem area selection was illustrated by the comparison of The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) to the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) problem area, level of significance = 0.407.

In summary, hypothesis number one was rejected. A ranking of the average number of problems selected by students in each problem area (ranked one through seven) revealed that students reported problem areas in a statistically significant manner as reflected by the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks. Further data analysis was conducted in order to identify those problem area(s) which were selected by students in a statistically significant fashion that could not be explained by chance alone. In order to accomplish this accounting for difference in problem area selection, a Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test was applied to statistically compare the mean

rank, 1 to 674, given by students to each problem area. Twenty-one multiple comparisons were required in order to compare the difference in the ranking of each problem area, one to another. Results of this multiple comparison indicated that problems in the areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) were each selected by students in a manner which could not be explained by mere chance. Thus a one-two-three hierarchy of problem areas was indicated. Results of the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test also produced significant differences in the way students ranked the areas of Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Health and Physical Development (HPD), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE). The differences in student rankings between these four problem areas were not as dramatic as the differences between the areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA). These areas could, at best, be ranked as tied for the fourth and fifth rank and tied for the sixth and seventh rank. The data produced confidently allowed for the ranking of problem areas in a significant manner reflective of student problem identification. Therefore, null hypothesis one, which predicted no significant difference would be found in the problem selection of students, was rejected.

Hypothesis II

Stated in the null form, hypothesis two predicted that no significant difference in the seven problem areas would be found between male and female students. A Mann Whitney U Test was employed to the data in order to test this hypothesis. Table XI presents the data produced by the application of this procedure.

Table XI.--A review of Table XI reveals that female students assigned a higher average ranking or mean rank to each of the seven problem areas. This means that when all males were ranked from 1 to 674, in order from the student having the least problems in an area to the student having the most problems in an area, the average student could be assigned a rank reflective of the group. Carried a step further, the lower the rank assigned this average student, called mean rank, the less this problem area troubled students. Conversely, the higher the mean rank assigned this average student, the more this problem area troubled students.

A review of Table XI reveals that females, as a group, had higher mean ranks than males in all problem areas. This simply means that the average female student, ranked 1 to 674, rated each problem area as more troubling than did the average male student. A review of the level of significance column indicates that, of these seven comparisons between male and female mean ranks, three were reported significant at or below the .05 level. These problem areas included

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE RANK ASSIGNED BY MALES AND FEMALES ON THE SEVEN PROBLEM AREAS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST ACCOMPANIED BY THE AVERAGE RANK ASSIGNED TO EACH PROBLEM AREA AND THE LEVEL OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES PRODUCED BY AN APPLICATION OF THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST

Abbreviated Problem Areas	Mean Rank Assigned by Males to Problem Area	Mean Rank Assigned by Females to Problem Area	Level of Significance Found Between the Average Rank of Males and Females on Each Problem Area
HPD	289.07	382.60	0.000
FLE	332.51	342.14	0.5134
SRA	323.34	350.68	0.0652
SPR	299.65	372.74	0.000
PPR	295.31	376.79	0.000
ACW	324.10	349.98	0.0832
FVE	327.93	346.41	0.2089

Health and Physical Development (HPD), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), and Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR). Each of these problem areas was reported significant beyond the 0.0001 level. This means that females, on the average, reported having more problems than males in these three problem areas in a manner which could not be explained by mere chance. In fact, the 0.0001 level of significance indicates that males and females would differ on these three problem areas 9,999 out of 10,000 times. Stated more simply,

the likelihood of these findings having occurred by mere chance is 1 in 10,000.

It should also be noted that, while females had higher mean ranks in all other problem areas, the differences between the average male mean rank and average female mean rank were beyond the .05 level. This means that the fact that females reported having more problems than males on the remaining problem areas could have occurred in more than 5 out of 100 cases by chance. The level of significance is therefore, said to be greater than .05.

In summary, the data showed that females had higher mean ranks, more problems, than males on all seven problem areas. Further analysis indicated that these differences could not be explained by chance in the problem areas of Health and Physical Development (HPD), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) and Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR). Additionally, the higher mean ranks assigned females in the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE), Adjustment to College Work (ACW) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA), while not significantly different than males, were in agreement with earlier research conducted by Stone (14), Slinger (11) and Hood (5). In each of these studies, females reported having more problems than did their male counterparts.

The data confidently allowed for the identification of problem areas selected more frequently by female students than by male students. Therefore, null hypothesis two, which predicted that no significant difference would be found between problem areas of male and female students, was rejected. The application of a Mann Whitney U Test produced significant differences in the responses of male and female students, which could not be accounted for by mere chance alone.

Hypothesis III

Stated in the null form, hypothesis three predicted that no significant difference would be found in the problems of selected age groups as reflected by problem areas (ranked one through seven) of the Mooney Problem Check List. For the purposes of this study, four age groups were analyzed. These groups consisted of students eighteen years of age and under (Group I), students nineteen through twenty years of age (Group II), students twenty-one through twenty-nine years of age (Group III), and students thirty years of age and older (Group IV).

A Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was applied to each of the seven problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List in order to determine whether or not significant differences were present in problem selection by students representing different age groups. Table XII illustrates that significant differences were found when

an analysis of variance by age groups was applied to selected problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List.

Table XII.--Table XII shows that the level of significance found between mean ranks of each age group produced problem areas where significant differences could not be explained by chance alone. The levels of significance produced by the application of the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance were significant beyond the .05 level for the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR). This means that, in each of these problem areas, one or more of the four age groups responding to the check list identified problem items in a statistically significant manner. That is to say, one or more groups reported a significantly greater number of problems than the others and, did so in a way that could not be explained by coincidence.

It should also be mentioned that, as in earlier statistical treatments, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance used a complex method for conducting an analysis of the variance between age groups. Basically, this analysis of variance, or measure taken of the difference in problem items checked by each age group, was computed by use of mean ranks. Again, mean ranks simply reflect the average score for that age group if all scores were ranked from 1 to 674 representing the total number of students in this study.

This average score was then compared to see if differences were found which could not be explained by chance, thus statistically significant. This was the finding produced by the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance. Therefore hypothesis number three was rejected.

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF AGE GROUPS ON EACH PROBLEM AREA OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST ACCORDING TO THE KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH ACCOMPANYING MEAN RANK SCORES, NUMBERS OF STUDENTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RANKS OF EACH AREA

Problem Category	Problem Area Mean Rank Group I, 374 Total Students 18 years of age and under	Problem Area Mean Rank Group II, 162 Total Students 19-20 years old	Problem Area Mean Rank Group III, 77 Total Students 21-29 years old	Problem Area Mean Rank Group IV, 61 Total Students 30 years of age and older	Level of Significance Between Mean Ranks of Each Age Group
HPD	338.62	334.35	330.20	348.22	0.949
FLE	328.47	385.78	340.77	260.48	0.000
SRA	346.87	344.10	332.89	268.37	0.029
SPR	351.69	347.85	310.28	257.39	0.002
PPR	339.49	353.50	344.16	274.40	0.051
ACW	330.13	338.61	366.59	343.01	0.507
FVE	342.31	339.66	320.80	323.34	0.757

The rejection of hypothesis number three still left the unanswered question of which age group accounted for the significant difference in problem selection in the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social and

Recreational Activities (SRA) and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR). Further treatment of the data was required in order to account for this significant difference between the four age groups.

In order to determine which age group(s) accounted for the significant difference in problem item selection produced by the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance, a Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to each mean rank produced by each age group in those problem areas where significant differences were found. This procedure resembled that followed in the treatment of data in hypothesis number one. Like the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks Test which compared each group, one to the other, the Mann Whitney U Test was applied to compare the mean rank of each age group, one to another. This was done in all possible age group combinations in order to say definitively which age group(s) differed significantly in identifying problem areas on the Mooney Problem Check List.

Table XIII represents the levels of difference produced when the mean ranks, average rank assigned from 1 to 674 representing the average importance of the problem to students, for each age group were compared, one to another, in all possible combinations. Table XII should be consulted for a review of the original mean rank scores compared.

Table XIII.--Table XIII illustrates that the level of significance produced by the comparison of the mean ranks of groups 1-2 was 0.0012 on the FLE problem area. This simply

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF AGE GROUPS TO SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM
AREAS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST
ACCORDING TO THE MANN WHITNEY U TEST
INCLUDING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE
FOUND BY COMPARISON OF MEAN RANK
SCORES FOR ALL AGE GROUPS IN
ALL POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS

Problem Areas Selected by Age Groups Which are Sig- nificant	Levels of Significant Difference Found for Each Age Group by Problem Area When Mean Ranks Were Compared in All Possible Combinations					
	Groups 1-2 Students 18 years old and under compared to students 19 and 20 years old	Groups 1-3 Students 18 years old and under compared to students 21 through 29 years of age	Groups 1-4 Students 18 years old and under compared to students 30 years old and older	Groups 2-3 Students 19 and 20 years old compared to students 21 through 29 years of age	Groups 2-4 Students 19 and 20 years old compared to students 30 years old and older	Groups 3-4 Students 21 through 29 years of age compared to students 30 years old and older
FLE	0.0012	0.6205	0.0077	0.1094	0.0000	0.0178
SRA	0.8673	0.5719	0.0032	0.6779	0.0073	0.0593
SPR	0.8427	0.0855	0.0003	0.1632	0.0017	0.1187

means that the difference in items checked on the FLE area by students eighteen years old and under when compared to students nineteen and twenty years of age could not be explained by mere chance. Likewise, the comparisons between groups 1-4, 2-4 and 3-4 produced a level of significant difference beyond the .05 level. That is, their levels of significance, 0.0077, 0.0000 and 0.0178 respectively could

not be explained by mere chance alone. Again, this simply means that students eighteen years old and under differed significantly on the FLE problem area when compared to students thirty years of age and older, that students nineteen and twenty years of age differed greatly from those thirty years of age or older and that students twenty-one through twenty-nine differed significantly from those students thirty years of age and older. This finding may be interpreted as indicating that problems in the area of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment were most severe for group 2, the nineteen and twenty year olds. The findings also indicated that group 4 had the fewest concerns in this problem area, while groups 1 and 3 shared an equal concern, less than group 2, yet greater than group 4.

An analysis of the SRA problem area contained in Table XIII shows that levels of significant difference were also found between groups 1 and 4, students eighteen and younger and those students thirty years of age and older, and groups 2 and 4, students nineteen and twenty years of age, compared to those thirty years of age and older. Again, the difference produced by comparing each mean rank, average level of assigned seriousness for the group on a problem area from 1 to 674, produced differences which could not be explained by chance alone. Comparisons of groups 1 and 4 produced a difference in their problem selection at the 0.0032 level. Stated more simply, these two groups could not be expected

to repeat this difference in problem selection as a result of chance except in 32 of 10,000 cases. Likewise, groups 2 and 4 produced a level of significant difference of 0.0073. This difference could be expected to occur by chance in only 73 of 10,000 cases.

An explanation of the findings produced by analysis of the Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) area indicated that groups 1 and 2, students under twenty-one, found this area most troubling. This area presented few problems for the student thirty years of age or older or to the students twenty-one through twenty-nine years of age. However, the eighteen year old or under, Group 1, and the nineteen and twenty year old, Group 2, considered this to be a serious problem for them.

Finally, Table XIII contains analysis of the SPR problem area. Again, the average rank or indication of seriousness, 1 to 674, was compared for each age group, one to another, in all possible combinations. A significant difference in students responses was found between group 1 and 4 and between group 2 and 4. Again, the level of comparison was well below what could be expected to occur by chance, set at 0.0003 and 0.0017. This data may be interpreted as again showing that the SPR area was a large concern for students eighteen years of age and under as well as for students who were nineteen or twenty years of age. The data also indicated that Social-Psychological problems were not

significantly checked by students twenty-one through twenty-nine years of age (Group 3) or by students thirty years of age or older (Group 4).

In summary, the data produced by the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance indicated that selected age groups reported significantly more problems in problem areas (one through seven) of the Mooney Problem Check List. The Mann Whitney U Test identified the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) as being selected in a statistically significant manner by the various age groups employed. Finally, data were presented to identify those age groups which selected problem items in a given problem area in a manner that could not be explained by chance alone. As a result of the findings produced by these procedures, null hypothesis three, which predicted that no significant difference would be found in the problems of selected age groups, was rejected.

Hypothesis IV

Stated in the null form, hypothesis four predicted that no significant difference would be found in the problem areas selected by married and single students as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. A Mann Whitney U Test was applied to the data in order to test this hypothesis. In Table XIV, a summary of findings produced by the Mann-Whitney U Test is presented.

A review of Table XIV indicates that a significant difference was found between the problem areas reported by single and married students. A significant difference was found in the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) and Social-Psychological Relations. All other comparisons were not found to be statistically significant, indicating that students did not differ in problem selection in a manner which could not be explained by chance.

Table XIV.--A review of Table XIV illustrates the comparison made between the responses of married students and single students on the seven problem areas. As in the comparison between males and females, the Mann Whitney U Test was employed. Again, this procedure was designed to compare the average mean rank of married and single students, from 1 to 674, with 1 indicating the student with the lowest concern in this area and 674 indicating the student with the greatest concern. The level of significance found in the difference of mean ranks between problem areas compared indicates whether one could expect this difference in student responses to occur by chance alone.

The data produced by the Mann Whitney U Test indicated that the single student reported a higher mean rank than the married student on each of the seven problem areas with one exception. That exception was the problem area of ACW or Adjustment to College Work. Further analysis indicated that,

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF MARRIED AND SINGLE STUDENTS ON EACH PROBLEM AREA OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST ACCORDING TO THE MANN WHITNEY U TEST WITH ACCOMPANYING NUMBERS OF STUDENTS COMPARED, MEAN RANK SCORES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE IN DIFFERENCE OF MEAN RANK SCORES

Problem Category	Problem Area Mean Rank for Single Students 533--Total Students Counted	Problem Area Mean Rank for Married Students 121--Total Students Counted	Level of Significance Produced by Comparison of Mean Rank Scores of Married and Single Students
HPD	340.22	325.08	0.4331
FLE	348.90	285.39	0.009
SRA	347.08	293.74	0.0057
SPR	348.92	285.32	0.0009
PPR	343.47	310.20	0.0856
ACW	336.62	341.52	0.8013
FVE	341.57	318.90	0.2365

in the areas of FLE (Finances, Living Conditions and Employment), SRA (Social and Recreational Activities), and SPR (Social-Psychological Relations) the level of significant difference between mean ranks was beyond the .05 level. Stated more simply, the 0.009 level of significant difference found on the FLE problem area, the 0.0057 level of significant difference found on the SRA problem area and the 0.0009 level of significant difference found on the SPR problem area, each fell below the minimal 5 in 100 (.05) chance probability established for significance in this study.

In short, these findings indicated that single students reported having more problems than married students in each of these three problem areas and, did so, in a statistically significant manner which could not be explained by chance problem markings. No other comparisons between married and single students proved to be statistically significant.

In summary, the application of a Mann Whitney U Test produced findings that indicated that married and single students differed in a significant manner in selecting problem items as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. The Mann Whitney U Test indicated that single students reported having significantly more problems in the areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social and Recreational Activities (SRA) and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR). As a result of these findings, null hypothesis four, which predicted that no significant difference would be found in the problem areas of married and single students, was rejected.

Hypothesis V

Stated in the null form, hypothesis five predicted that no significant difference would be found between the mean grade point averages of students based upon frequency of expressed problem selection as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List. A t test for independent samples was employed to test this hypothesis on the upper ten percent (those

expressing the most problems) and the lower ten percent (those expressing the fewest problems) of all students in this study. Table XV represents findings produced by the application of a t test.

Table XV.--Table XV indicates that the mean grade point average, or average grade point average for the group in question on a four-point scale, for all students comprising the lower ten percent group, was 2.78. This group represented those students checking the fewest items on the Mooney Problem Check List. Conversely, the mean grade point average for the students representing the upper ten percent, those students checking the most items on the Mooney Problem Check List, was 2.89. It should be mentioned that these grade point averages were compiled during that semester when the Mooney Problem Check List was completed.

A t test for independent samples applied to the mean grade point averages resulted in a t score of .762755. According to Ferguson (3), the resulting t value was less than the critical value; therefore null hypothesis five was retained. This simply means that when the average grade point (mean grade point) for each of the two groups was compared to each other (t test), no significant difference was found to exist between the grade point averages of the two groups. In other words, the t score of .76275 which resulted from a complex statistical procedure designed to

TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE UPPER AND LOWER TEN PERCENT OF STUDENTS BASED UPON FREQUENCY OF PROBLEM SELECTION WITH NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND STANDARD DEVIATION PRODUCED BY T TEST

Groups Compared	Mean Grade Point Average of Each Group	Number of Students Compared	Standard Deviation or Amount Grade Point May Fluctuate Due to Group Variance
Lower Ten Percent of Students	2.78	56	.76
Upper Ten Percent of Students	2.89	53	.74

compare one group to another, did not produce differences in the groups which could not be explained by mere chance.

Table XV also includes the standard deviation of each of the two groups. This score indicates the relative variability or diversity of the group with regard to the mean grade point average. This score also represents the degree one could expect the grade point average to change for plus or minus thirty-four percent of the population. As can be seen in Table XV, both the average grade point and the standard deviations for both groups were very similar. This finding was expected, as no significant statistical difference was found between the grade point average of the two groups.

The total number of students included in the data analysis and reflected in Table XV was 109. This represented

twenty-five missing cases from the original upper and lower ten percent of the total population. These twenty-five missing students were accounted for by reviewing the original Mooney Problem Check Lists completed by those students. In fourteen cases it was impossible to attain the student's permanent record from the Registrar's office owing to an inability of the computer to locate such a student. It was hypothesized that students may have inaccurately recorded their social security numbers or withdrawn from the college prior to the official date of record; in which case, the college would not have a record for the student. In an additional eleven cases, the student was located. However, a review of records indicated that they withdrew from all classes prior to completion of the semester in which the Mooney Problem Check List was completed. These eleven students were also dropped from the study. It should also be noted that the total number of students dropped from the study was evenly divided between the two groups, leaving the total number of students in each group sufficient to conduct the statistical treatment required.

In summary, the application of a t test to the mean grade point average of those students representing the upper and lower ten percent of those students checking the most and least problem items on the Mooney Problem Check List failed to produce a significant difference in the mean grade point average of the two groups. As a result of these

findings, null hypothesis five, which predicted that no significant difference would be found in the mean grade point average of the upper and lower ten percent of students based upon a frequency of problems selected, was retained. This finding is consistent with earlier research conducted by Hartman (1).

Statistical Implications

The statistical treatments conducted in Chapter IV provided a great deal of data from which to plan a model program designed to meet the needs of the community college students investigated. A full-blown model of such a program is contained in Chapter V. However, it appears justifiable at this time to propose elements of that model based on an interpretation of the data reviewed.

First, it was clearly demonstrated that students reported the main problems troubling them to be associated with the areas of adjusting to college work, personal and psychological relationships, and social and recreational activities. Any model must stress assisting students in these areas if it truly intends to meet the needs of students.

Further analysis of the data indicated that younger students reported significantly more problems than did older students. Similarly, single students reported having more problems than did their married counterparts, as did females when compared to males. These findings indicate that younger single students have the most problems and

therefore should be targets of specialized services. The finding that females reported having more problems than males was consistent with the literature and will receive further attention in Chapter V.

These findings suggest the freshmen students enrolled in Orientation to College as the ideal group in which to implement a new model of services aimed at meeting the needs of students. Not only were they the group initially investigated, but they are the logical group to receive assistance early in their academic career, where gains may still be realized.

The model proposed as a result of data analysis includes expanding the current Orientation to College program. Data indicates that the program should be broadened to include specific concentration on helping students to adjust to college work, getting to know fellow students and involving students in social and recreational activities while on campus. The development of an expanded Orientation to College program designed to meet these three goals would be the minimally acceptable program based on the data produced by this study. Additional focus may be required on the unique needs of male and female students as well as the single and married student. Finally, the data indicate that, in all cases investigated, focus should be on the younger student between the ages of eighteen and twenty.

The model proposed includes the development of three cells. These cells contain structured exercises in (1) adjusting to college, (2) social-psychological relations, and (3) social and recreational activities. Each of these cells is recommended to be covered on a weekly basis owing to the fact that students reported encountering each of these areas as major problems during the first week of college classes. Finally, the problems reported by students appeared sufficient to warrant conducting Orientation to College classes throughout the entire semester (sixteen weeks) instead of the first five weeks of classes as is the current practice. A more detailed development of the model is contained in the remainder of this chapter. However, prior to the recommendation of any model designed to address the primary problem areas of community college freshmen, a review of the existing program is in order.

The Orientation to College Program, originally devised and developed by the Dean of Student Development Services at the college, is a five-week course designed to assist students in their overall adjustment to college. The program is divided into a weekly format covering such topics as introducing students to campus life, learning to study, student development services, use of library facilities and graduation requirements and career opportunities. Figure 1 aids in the conceptualization of the topical emphasis in a week by week fashion.

week one	week two	week three	week four	week five
Introduction to Campus	Learning to Study	Tour of Student Development Offices	Walsh Library Emphasis	Career Opportunities and Graduation Information

Fig. 1--Orientation to College Program curriculum

Week one consists primarily of campus tours, a general introduction of facilities and speeches by campus administrators. Week two involves teaching students how to figure grade point averages, how to take tests wisely and study skills training. Week three involves visiting all student service areas including counseling, career placement, financial aids, student activities, student publications and intramurals. Week four consists of a tour of campus library facilities and an opportunity to do some limited research and general browsing. Finally, week five is dedicated to reviewing graduation requirements with students and generally discussing the nature of programs available at the college. An attempt is also made at this juncture to review the current trends of employment within the labor market. The final class session is strictly maintained as a social event with refreshments served by the college.

Introduction to Model

Any model proposed to meet the basic needs of students is limited by two factors: basic research findings and the

ability of resources to implement a program to address such findings. For these reasons, the design of any program should address certain limited problems of students based on sound research findings. As a function of limited personnel, and the inability to address all problems of students, while still doing an excellent job, it is suggested that this model concentrate on three primary problem areas. Those areas of concentration should include the areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA). It is further suggested that continual evaluation be conducted regarding the needs of students to review if any of the lower ranked problem areas of this study surface as a major focus of concern for students. This evaluation should be conducted by continuing to administer the Mooney Problem Check List to each group of new students on an annual basis.

A Proposed Model

Initially, it is suggested that an orientation and introduction session be held with each group of students. At this point counselors could explain the goals and purposes of the program as well as conduct future research by administering the Mooney Problem Check List. After an initial introductory week of class sessions primarily aimed at orienting the students to their new environments, conducting

further research, and answering student questions, it is suggested that phase two of the proposed model be introduced.

Phase two of the model being proposed calls for expanding the Orientation to College Program from a five-week course to a sixteen-week program. It is also suggested that the number of semester hours credit awarded for completion of this program likewise be expanded from one semester hour to three semester hours. It is further suggested that the program adopt a three-part emphasis reflecting those major problem areas of students such as: Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA). Additionally, it is proposed that the Director of Student Activities for the campus be assigned a more vital and direct role in the Orientation to College Program. Figure 2 illustrates the newly proposed model as it would appear on a topical basis to students participating in the program on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday schedule. This schedule is proposed in order to maximize the frequency with which students associate and socialize. However, while such a schedule is thought to be more desirable, it is not thought that such a program, similarly conducted on a Tuesday and Thursday schedule, would be dramatically less successful.

week one	weeks two through sixteen		
M-W-F	Monday	Wednesday	Friday
Introduction	Adjustment to College	Personal-Psychological Relations	Social-Recreational Activities

Fig. 2--Proposed schedule

As can be seen in Figure 2, each of the three highest ranked problem areas of students is dealt with on a weekly basis. This is crucial, since research indicates that each of these problem areas is equally troubling new students during their first week of classes.

Adjustment to College Emphasis

The proposed model suggests that counselors devote one day per week to assisting students in adjusting to college. As previously mentioned, the problem statements of this area primarily deal with possession of good study habits and being prepared to succeed in college. It is therefore advised that the weekly emphasis entitled Learning to Study in the current orientation program be expanded to a more extensive study skills training unit. This emphasis is suggested as a means of providing students the skills needed to succeed in college, while at the same time offering them the encouragement they need during the first semester in a new and challenging environment.

Materials to be included in a study skills unit should not be predetermined. Time should be provided to cover those topics deemed to be troubling orientation students. However, it is suggested by problem statements contained in the Adjustment to College Work (ACW) problem area that general study skills training should suffice. Brown (1), Pauk (9), Yarrington (16), Carman and Adams (2), Walter and Siebert (15), and Deese and Deese (3) recommend certain basic topics inherent to any study skills unit. Accordingly, the unit should provide the flexibility over the semester to include such basic topics as (a) managing time, (b) improving memory, (c) improving note-taking skills, (d) reading textbooks, (e) taking tests successfully, (f) writing papers, (g) setting goals, (h) developing good listening skills, (i) researching term papers, (j) motivating one's self to study, and (k) making speeches and talking in class.

The unit should also remain flexible enough to allow students to eliminate items which do not concern them as a group, add or create topics which do trouble them, and re-order or prioritize the existing list. This important step of allowing students input in deciding the topics most important to them is imperative if the unit is to succeed in decreasing students' fears about succeeding or adjusting in college.

Personal-Psychological Relations Emphasis

The proposed model suggests that once a week for fifteen weeks, structured time be provided for students to get to know one another. Stetter (13) found that anxiety and worries of students decreased under structured conditions designed to demonstrate to students that their problems were not unique. As an extension of this principle, it is suggested that counselors create a living laboratory situation whereby students are encouraged to get to know one another, share problems and relate to each other on a weekly basis. Such a procedure should directly alleviate students' concerns over being accepted by others while providing them an ideal format in which to share their worries, concerns, successes, and failures with one another.

Specific exercises designed to accomplish the goals outlined in the preceding paragraph need not be extensive. Counselors are thought to have excellent human relations skills and should be quite adept at facilitating group discussion. However, many helpful exercises could be programmed into such a unit, if desired. Exercises such as the "Life Line" developed as an outgrowth of the Human Potential Movement, as well as "Strengths I See/Strengths Others See," are typical activities which should provide a good interpersonal format for students to get to know each other. One final suggestion is made, owing to the nature of

the exercises which are thought to be effective in promoting interpersonal interaction. It is suggested that class size be limited to groups where participation by all students is both possible and reasonable.

Social-Recreational Activities Emphasis

The final component of the proposed model is perhaps the most difficult to develop. Research identifies the need students have for more social and recreational activities. Since these activities are routinely offered by the college, it must be assumed that students either do not know of their existence or need identified time provided for them to attend. It would be much easier to assume position one, that is, students are not aware of what activities are available for them. If this were the case, a publicity campaign should provide the needed remedy. However, it is apparent that school activities do not attract great participation despite all efforts to publicize events at this institution. Attendance is minimal throughout the semester and some school functions struggle to succeed. This fact demands further attention and adoption of position two; that is, students need identified time provided for them to attend school activities.

The adoption of the latter position requires wholesale changes in the current operation of the orientation program

as it now exists. An expanded role is also urged for the Director of Student Activities; and, finally, the creation of a special orientation budget will be suggested to underwrite costs involved in providing certain recreational experiences for students.

First, it is suggested that extensive planning take place prior to the fall semester in an effort to coordinate the offerings of the Student Activities Department and the Orientation to College Program where possible. More specifically, it is highly desirable to plan campus activities for Fridays in an effort to provide access to activities to as many Orientation to College students as possible.

Second, it is suggested that the campus activity period be changed from the existing Tuesday-Thursday morning schedule to a combination of days which would include Friday mornings. Again, this would allow maximum Friday participation in campus events by orientation students, thus benefiting both the activities and orientation programs.

Third, Friday activities should be designed, where possible, to allow for extended activities in which flexible entry and exit would be possible. This is suggested owing to the fact that orientation students may have limited time to attend activities without missing other classes. Such activities that would provide easy access and exit may

include dances, band concerts, cookouts, workshop presentations, speakers bureaus, western days, play days, movies, handy craft demonstrations, intramurals, and others.

Fourth, a special orientation budget should be created to provide financial support for activities developed within classes for their own enjoyment. It is assumed that, even under the best of conditions, there will be times when class sections will not be able to participate in pre-arranged campus activities. Indeed, it would be presumptuous to assume that any activities program could provide fifteen weekly programs for each orientation section. For this reason, it is suggested that sufficient funds be provided to support a minimum of five class activities for each orientation section. Planned activities need not be expensive, but minimal funding is required by the institution in order to meet this need of students.

Finally, planning time should be provided for students to determine those activities they wish to engage in during the semester. It is also suggested that a schedule of all previously planned activities be made available to students at this time. This planning might best be accomplished during the introductory week or during the first few Friday class meetings.

In conclusion, the proposed model is not overly sophisticated. Instead, it closely resembles the problems of students as reflected by the Mooney Problem Check List.

Indeed, elaborate programs may be counter-productive to meeting the basic needs that students have. This is never so apparent as it is in the problem area of Social-Recreational Activities (SRA). What activities students participate in do not appear to be nearly as important as the fact that they do participate. Similarly, extravagant orientation programs would only be effective in so far as they could meet the basic needs of students as reflected in this study.

The proposed model as described closely outlines the most significant problem areas encountered by students of this study. Indeed, an orientation program designed to help students to adjust to college and to develop closer relationships, while providing social and recreational activities as part of a weekly program, offers unique challenges to those who attempt to implement programs based on research findings. However, such a program needs still further modification if it truly is to address the needs of all students as reflected by this study.

While the basic research findings of this study clearly outlined the Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR), and the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) areas as the dominant problem areas of students, many students had serious difficulties in other areas. In order to design an adequate program to meet the needs of all students, certain modifications in the

previously proposed schedule (Figure 2) would be required. Those modifications require additional treatment in the problem areas of Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Health and Physical Development (HPD), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE). It is suggested that a modified program continue to focus on the areas of Adjustment To College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA). However, additional time should be devoted to meeting the needs of students represented by those problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List ranked four through seven. A modified proposed schedule which allocates such additional time is detailed in Figure 3.

Week One	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Two	Social-Psychological Relations Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Three	Adjustment to College Health and Physical Development Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Four	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Finances, Living Conditions and Employment	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Five	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday

Fig. 3---Continued

Week Six	Future: Vocational and Educational Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Seven	Adjustment to College Social-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Eight	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Health and Physical Development	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Nine	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Ten	Finances, Living Conditions and Employment Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Eleven	Adjustment to College Future: Vocational and Educational Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Twelve	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Psychological Relations	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Thirteen	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Fourteen	Health and Physical Development Personal-Psychological Relations Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday
Week Fifteen	Adjustment to College Finances, Living Conditions and Employment Social-Recreational Activities	Monday Wednesday Friday

Fig. 3---Continued

Week Sixteen	Adjustment to College Personal-Psychological Relations Future: Vocational and Educational	Monday Wednesday Friday
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Fig. 3---Modified proposed schedule

The proposed schedule as modified in Figure 3 allows coverage of all seven problem areas retained in this study. The schedule also provides for a maximum of coverage of those problem areas ranked one, two, and three by devoting twelve sessions to each of these areas. The schedule allocates a minimum of three sessions to each of the remaining problem areas, those areas ranked four through seven. Finally, the schedule maintains, where possible, the weekly focus on those problem areas ranked one, two, and three by rotating a lower-ranked problem area into the schedule every fourth session.

A review of problem statements in those problem areas ranked four through seven identifies the focus these sessions should take in each area. This chapter concludes with a brief suggested outline of that focus for each of the remaining four problem areas.

First, the Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) problem area is dominated by problem statements reflecting feelings of shyness, inferiority, and a general concern over lack of leadership ability. Activities designed to assist students with needs in this area might include (a) relaxation training,

(b) basic leadership training in setting and reaching goals, (c) teaching problem solving, (d) assertiveness training, (e) basic communications training, and others. Again, the list of activities is endless and could be expanded as needed. However, caution should be taken so as to allow each orientation group to formulate "their" topics of concern in order to adequately cover those problems or concerns which trouble them directly. Therefore, as with each previously discussed problem area, student input and planning is highly recommended.

Second, the Health and Physical Development (HPD) problem area generally reflects concerns over diet, exercise, and overall general health. Activities which might be designed to assist students with problems in this area include (a) providing students with access to the office of Health Services located on campus, (b) introducing students to Health and Physical Education facilities located on campus, (c) providing opportunities for students to initiate structured exercise programs monitored by physical education faculty, (d) providing students with opportunities to join weight control and exercise groups outside of class, and, (e) basic classroom discussions about the nature of good nutrition, diet and longevity. Again, it is further recommended that adequate opportunity be given for student input and discussion of student initiated topics.

Third, the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) problem area generally reflects concern over managing finances, needing part-time or full-time work and not having

enough time for school work or leisure activities, due to work. Activities which might be designed to assist students with problems in these areas include (a) teaching students how to develop a budget, (b) assisting students in developing time schedules, (c) exposing students to career information systems and, (d) assisting students in locating work. The latter activity might require additional involvement of the Career Placement office on campus. It is also suggested that the Financial Aids Office be directly involved in the orientation process, especially if personnel in that area are skilled in developing budgets. Finally, it is suggested that time be given to students to suggest alternative activities which reflect areas of concern not covered by these suggested activities.

Fourth, the Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) problem area is dominated by problem statements concerning making career decisions, choosing a college major, entering a vocation and not being able to get a job. These statements suggest that activities in this area should be designed to: (a) assist students in analyzing their vocational interests, (b) provide students with an opportunity for aptitude testing, (c) give students an opportunity to enter into academic advisement with advisors and counselors, (d) allow students to develop degree plans or tentative road maps for course selection, (e) give students skills in resume writing and job interviewing and, (f) provide students with an opportunity to generally express uncertainty about what the future holds.

Again, the nature of problems contained within this problem area indicates that vocational counseling is required.

Therefore, substantial involvement of vocational counselors and placement personnel is highly recommended. Finally, as in all other emphases, student input and involvement in problem solving is highly desirable.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brown, William F., Student's Guides to Effective Study, San Marcus, Effective Study Materials, Inc., 1970.
2. Carman, Robert A. and Royce Adams, Study Skills: A Student's Guide for Survival, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
3. Deese, James and Ellin K. Deese, How to Study, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.
4. Hartman, Bernard J., "Survey of College Student's Problems Identified by the Mooney Problem Check List," Psychological Reports, XXII (March, 1968), 715-716.
5. Hood, Gary K., "An Analysis of College Student Problems as Indicated on the Mooney Problem Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1974.
6. Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw Hill and Company, 1971.
7. Myers, Jerome L., Fundamentals of Experimental Design, 2nd ed., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
8. Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed., New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
9. Pauk, Walter, How to Study in College, New York, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1962.
10. Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
11. Slinger, George E., "Freshman Problems and Academic Achievement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1955.

12. Spence, Janet T., John W. Cotton, Benton J. Underwood, and Carl P. Duncan, Elementary Statistics, 3rd ed., Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
13. Stetter, Richard, "A Group Guidance Technique for the Classroom Teacher," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 179-184.
14. Stone, Gordon L., "Student Problems in a Teachers College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (June, 1948), 404-416.
15. Walter, Tim and Al Siebert, Student Success, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
16. Yarrington, David J., Surviving in College, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing Co., 1977.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The emphasis of this study was placed on the identification and analysis of problem areas expressed by the community college freshman student. The basic instrument used in this study to reflect those problem areas of students was the Mooney Problem Check List--College Form.

Research on the problems expressed by students in educational settings within the United States is ample. Original research and validation studies reflecting the problems of community college students are, at best, limited in number. This study was designed to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning the problems of the community college student.

The first phase of this study consisted of administering the instrument to students enrolled in Orientation to College classes during the fall and spring semesters of 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979. A second phase consisted of developing testable hypotheses regarding identification and analysis of the problem areas expressed by community

college freshman students. All research hypotheses were treated by analysis of variance, multiple comparisons and t test techniques. Stage three consisted of data collection and analysis via computer programming. Each hypothesis was subsequently rejected or retained based on the findings produced by data analysis. Stage four consisted of conclusions drawn from data analysis. The study concluded with a suggested model program designed to address the expressed problem areas of those students who participated in this study.

The results of this study led to the rejection of hypotheses one, two, three, and four. Hypothesis five was retained. The data revealed that problems of freshman students could be identified and analyzed. Results also identified differences in student problem selection in groups analyzed according to age, marital status, and sex differences.

Findings

Based upon the analysis of data presented in Chapter IV, the following findings appear warranted:

1. Freshman students participating in this study clearly reported problems when completing the Mooney Problem Check List in a statistically significant manner.

2. The problem areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR), and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) were clearly selected by freshman students in a way which could not be accounted for by chance.

3. Significant differences in the problem selection of male and female students were found in the problem areas of Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Health and Physical Development (HPD), and Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR).

4. Significant differences in problem selection were found among some age groups within the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social-Recreational Activities (SRA), and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR).

5. Significant differences were found in the problem selection of married and single students in the problem areas of Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social-Recreational Activities (SRA), and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR).

6. No relationship was found between the number of problems reported by students and students' grade point averages.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings, the following conclusions appear warranted:

1. The students participating in this study not only had problems which significantly concerned them, but they

were able to articulate those problems when afforded an opportunity to do so.

2. Attending college for the first time causes great concern for many freshman students about their ability and preparedness to adjust to a college environment.

3. Entering a college for the first time creates significant problems for students regarding their need for acceptance, as reflected by the Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) area, and their need to become involved in social and recreational activities. The latter is reflected by the predominance of problems selected in the problem area of Social-Recreational Activities (SRA).

4. Females may not actually have more problems than males, but they tend to report more problems than do their male counterparts.

5. Younger students, most noticeably those students in the eighteen and younger age group and those in the nineteen and twenty year age group, have significantly more problems than do older students.

6. Marriage may contribute to a reduction in the number of problems of students. In fact, married life may be less stressful than single life, as was evidenced by single students' reporting significantly more problems than married students.

7. Student grade point average is significantly affected by variables other than the number of problems

reported by students. These variables make it extremely difficult to predict academic success based solely upon the number of problems students report.

In view of the findings of this study, the following recommendations appear to be warranted:

1. A model program, as presented in Chapter IV, designed to address in a systematic manner the major problems of freshman students should be implemented.

2. A model program designed to address the problems of freshman students should include an emphasis on Adjustment to College Work, Personal-Psychological Relations and Social-Recreational Activities.

3. An emphasis on assisting students in their adjustment to college work should include

- a. an opportunity for students to determine, as a group, those topics to be included in a study skills unit,

- b. structured exercises for students to improve basic study skills and study habits, and

- c. a sufficient number of class meetings to adequately cover those topics covered in a study skills unit.

4. An emphasis on personal-psychological relations should include

- a. an extended opportunity for social exchange among students in a classroom setting and
 - b. an ongoing opportunity for students to express worries, concerns, successes and failures with one another.
5. An emphasis on social-recreational activities should include
- a. offering structured opportunities for students to engage in social and recreational activities outside of the classroom;
 - b. coordinated involvement of the Student Activities area in developing such activities on a campus-wide basis;
 - c. designing social-recreational activities to allow for flexible student entry and exit, where possible;
 - d. the creation of an orientation budget to provide financial support for the creation of group social-recreational activities, and
 - e. sufficient opportunity for students to plan "their own" social events unique to each freshman orientation section.
6. New students in their first semester of college should be required to participate in an orientation program. This is especially crucial for students under twenty-one years of age.

7. Any orientation program which is developed to meet adequately the needs of freshman students should be conducted throughout the entire semester. It is further recommended that full college credit be awarded to any student participating in such a program.

8. Continual research into the problems of freshman students is required in order to assure that any orientation program is addressing the current problems of students.

9. Orientation programs which contain large groups of students unlike the population used as subjects of this study may need to alter orientation components in order to reflect the needs of such populations.

10. Voluntary counseling groups should be formed for students who feel they need additional services. At least one group should be developed to focus on each of the following problem areas: Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Health and Physical Development (HPD), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE).

Recommendations for Further Study

In view of the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further study appear to be warranted:

1. Further research should be undertaken to determine if female students have more problems than male students or simply report having more problems than male students.

2. Similar studies should be conducted with other community college populations in an effort to validate the findings of this study. Subsequent to such validation, community colleges should develop programs designed to meet the basic problems of freshmen, i.e., adjusting to college, personal and psychological relations and social and recreational activities in a direct and positive fashion.

3. Additional research should be undertaken to investigate the potential inverse relationship between the number of problems reported by students and the students' grade point average.

4. Further research should be conducted on the problem areas of Health and Physical Development (HPD), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FLE), accompanied by recommendations for program implementation designed to reduce problems in those areas.

5. The proposed model should be implemented as soon as is feasible at the college participating in this study. Furthermore, it is recommended that the success of the proposed model be measured by requiring each student to complete a Mooney Problem Check List at the beginning and end of the semester.

6. Additional research of this nature should be conducted with more heterogeneous populations, including significant numbers of minority students, evening and part-time students.

7. Additional research should be conducted to investigate the major problem areas reflective of additional age categories.

8. The proposed model should be tested by grouping students in homogeneous groups according to major problems troubling them. The results of such homogeneity should be measured against groups of randomly selected students exposed to the model as originally recommended.

9. The proposed model should also be offered in more concentrated five-week blocks according to problem areas. The results of such concentrated problem emphasis should be measured against randomly selected students exposed to the model as originally recommended.

Implications

A review of the problem areas significantly selected by freshman students when completing the Mooney Problem Check List revealed three areas as significant problems to students. It was clear that Adjustment to College Work (ACW), Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR), and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) were problem areas troubling the students of this study in a way that could not be explained by mere chance.

A review of the items contained in the Adjustment to College Work (ACW) problem area reveals that statements tend to cluster around problems involving proper high school preparation for college, possession of good study skills

and habits, and a general concern about doing well in college. Completion of the Mooney Problem Check List coincided with the first week of classes, a time when many of these concerns might be judged to be paramount in the minds of the first time freshman student. However, caution must be recommended in attempting to explain the predominance of concern over college adjustment as an imaginary problem of "timing" alone. The problem may be perceived as real when one reflects that the institution participating in this study has an "open door" policy to admit any student eighteen years of age or older whose high school class has graduated. This admission is probationary, yet does not discriminate against those who lack a high school diploma, G.E.D. certification or perhaps, adequate preparation to adjust and succeed in college.

One should also note that some students attend the community college because they are unable to meet more rigid admission criteria at four-year universities. It is a fact of educational life that community colleges attract those students who may be unable to enter the four-year university of their choice for scholastic reasons. These factors, combined with the fact that this community college enrolls many non-traditional students pursuing technical or career related fields, combine to produce a student less comfortable with academic preparation and more concerned with ability to adjust to the college environment. These concerns, added to

what might be thought of as a normal amount of worry for students during those first few "exciting" days of college, may be thought to interact, thus explaining why adjustment to college was the major problem of freshmen at this community college.

The identification of the Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) problem area as the second most significant problem area of students who participated in this study was also consistent with findings reported by others. Morris (13), Congdon (5), Mooney (12), Palladino and Domino (14), and Hibler and Larsen (9) each confirmed the Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) problem area as the second most frequently identified area of concern of students who participated in their studies respectively. Similarly, Dye and Aker (6) reported the Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) problem area ranking third in the concerns of students, ranking only behind the areas of Adjustment to College Work (ACW) and Social-Recreational Activities (SRA).

A closer inspection of the individual problem statements which comprise the Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) area reveals that the area reflects many interpersonal concerns such as being accepted by others, overcoming feelings of inferiority, and concern over being able to relate successfully to peers in a mature fashion. Again, it should be remembered that completion of the check list coincided with the student's first week in a college environment. It is

reasonable for students to express concern over making new friends and being accepted during this time. It is also noteworthy to mention that the typical college freshman may find himself in a class with older, more mature adults for the first time in his educational experience. Such adults are commonplace in classes at the community college and may prompt students to question their ability to relate on any equal basis and in a mature fashion. All of these factors may have influenced students as they completed the checklist, and may have contributed to their ranking the area of Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) as a high concern.

The area of Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) was ranked as the third greatest concern of students in this study. Again Mooney (12), Congdon (5), and Morris (13) reported similar findings. Hibler and Larsen (9) and Dye and Akers (6) also reported finding the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) area a significant problem for students who participated in their studies.

An examination of the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) area reveals concerns centering around lacking involvement in activities, wanting more interpersonal exchanges, not having enough free time, and lacking adequate opportunity to participate in sports or recreation. Again, it should be kept in mind that opportunities for socializing were minimal prior to completion of the Mooney Problem Check List.

A concern over lack of opportunity to get involved in sports should be considered warranted, as this community college has no intercollegiate sports program and limited intramural programs. It should be noted that research indicates that approximately 80 per cent of all students attending this community college work. It is therefore reasonable to assume that they have limited free time for involvement in student activities. Additionally, it is thought that commuting students, living at home, may spend less time on campus, and therefore have limited opportunities to participate in student-centered recreational activities. These factors, may explain why students consider their needs unmet in this area.

Another factor might also be mentioned when attempting to explain the importance placed by students on the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) area. Most students who participated in this study were single. Attending school functions and getting involved in campus activities appear to be more popular with single students. Several explanations for this phenomenon might be offered. Attending school activities might be viewed as an excellent way to meet members of the opposite sex. If so, and if single students are primarily interested in making friends with members of the opposite sex, then one would expect this problem area to be rated very high by single students during the first week of classes.

The areas of Health and Physical Development (HPD), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR), Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), and The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) completed the rankings of the seven retained problem areas of this study. A review of the literature demonstrates wide variance in rankings for these problem areas. Taken as a group, any one of these problem areas could be ranked fourth, at best. It was interesting to note the relatively low importance given to The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE) problem area. Such a low ranking may reflect the student learner who attends college purely for enjoyment, rather than to prepare for a career. It may also reflect the high number of adults attending classes in order to upgrade skills or retrain. These adults may already possess good jobs and be less concerned about their future. The relatively lower priority given this problem area causes one to question the current emphasis being placed in community colleges on job training and career specialization. The findings reflect that this is not a dominant problem area for students. However, further research would be needed to validate this assumption. The data could also be interpreted as documenting the effective job this community college is doing in alleviating the concerns of students regarding their vocational and educational future. In short, one could argue that students enrolled in vocational training programs, as are approximately one half

of all students attending this community college, simply are not worried about what the future, vocational or educational, holds for them.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the results produced by the Mooney Problem Check List tend to support its continued use in the early 1980's. The data produced by this study verifies earlier results reported by many authors conducting research in a variety of settings. It should also be noted that the similarity of findings between this study and those of other studies conducted in university settings tends to support the idea that students' problems are more similar than different when the problems of community college and university populations are compared.

Hypothesis two was stated in the null form, owing to the discrepant findings reported in the literature. The most prevalent finding, that females tend to report more problems than males, is supported by Stone (18), Slinger (16), Tolle (19), Dye and Akers (6), Beit Hallahmi (1), Clements and Oelke (4), and Bunnett (3). Conversely, using similar populations, Hartman (8) and Leon (11) reported that males reported more problems than females when completing the Mooney Problem Check List. Finally, Yarrow (20) reported no significant difference in the number of problems reported by either sex. Instead, Yarrow identified a significant difference in problem areas, rather than in the quantity of problems reported.

The finding that females reported significantly more problems than males in the areas of Health and Physical Development (HPD), Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) and Personal-Psychological Relations (PPR) can be explained by taking one of two positions. First, it is possible that females do have more problems than their male counterparts. If this position was adopted, a detailed discussion of each problem area where significant differences were found would be required. However, a second position regarding the findings produced by this study is also defensible. That position would be that females do not have more problems than males: they only tend to report more problems than males. This latter position is the stance most often adopted by the literature. An explanation of this phenomenon is also required.

Females may tend to report more problems than males simply because they are more aware of their problems and, perhaps, more honest in seeking help with problems. Palladino and Domino (14) and others have documented the fact that females tend to seek counseling services and assistance more than do males. It might be the reflection of cultural mores that males report having fewer problems than females. Looked upon in another light, this could be the reflection of the "macho" image or more traditional strong-male role in our society. Indeed, it may reflect the psychological view that men do not have problems, can handle their own

concerns, are not weak, and do not need help from strangers. Should this be the case, a certain urgency of research is suggested; for it has been often suggested that admitting that one has a problem is often the first step required in solving it.

Finally, it should be noted that neither position can be defended by the research results produced by this study. This lack of conclusiveness represents an inherent weakness of all checklists or self-report instruments. It is simply impossible to distinguish between that which actually exists and that which is only reported to actually exist.

Hypothesis three was stated in null fashion owing to a lack of available research on problem area identification by age. A review of the literature did not produce studies which reflected an analysis of the various age categories investigated by this study. The findings produced by analysis of the various age groups in this study may represent a unique contribution to the literature.

The four age groups selected for investigation by this study reflected an intent to analyze students who had entered the institution directly from high school (Group I), students who had entered college after a one or two year lapse in formal education (Group II), and more mature adults. The latter group, mature adults, was divided between those adults under thirty years of age (Group III), and those adults

thirty years of age and older (Group IV). The age of thirty was selected based on a desire to maintain an equal number of subjects in each group while attempting not to lump the concerns of all mature adults into one age category.

The data produced by hypothesis three indicate that significant differences do exist in problem areas as reflected by age groups. The differences were significant on the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE), Social-Recreational Activities (SRA), and Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) problem areas. It should be kept in mind that only one of these areas, Social-Recreational Activities (SRA), was considered one of the top three problem areas by all students who participated in the study.

A closer inspection of the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) problem area reveals that problem statements in this category reflect concerns over having enough money, a good job, and proper living conditions. Students thirty years of age and older did not express the same concerns over finances, living conditions and employment that all other groups expressed. It appears that the FLE area of concern was greatest for those 19-20 years old. This might be explained by the fact that the 18-year-old group is still largely living at home or receiving financial assistance from parents, or a combination of both. The 19-20 year age group may be perceived to be closer to breaking away from home and cutting family ties, thus increasing their concern

over finances and living conditions. Finally, the 21-29-year-olds are apparently in a situation somewhat similar to the 18-year-olds, but for different reasons. One conclusion that might be drawn from the data is that the 21-29-year-old group is rapidly approaching the 30-and-over age group, where students may have found employment and established permanent living quarters outside the home, and are beginning, at least, to find financial independence.

A review of the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) problem area reveals that, once again, adults 30 years of age or older are significantly less troubled than are their younger counterparts. Higher scores seem to cluster within the age groups 18 years and under and the group 19-20 years old. Concerns of this type seem less important to the group 21-29 years old, and are of very little importance to those over thirty years of age.

One explanation of the decline in concern over social and recreational activities with age is that, as young people grow older and marry, they have less and less time for individual social recreation. Instead, such concerns are replaced by family commitments and involvements. In fact, it is suspected that one reason young people place such importance on socializing and engaging in social and recreational activities may be to meet members of the opposite sex. This idea is supported by the high proportion of single students who attend school functions, as mentioned earlier. In

comparison, there appears to be a nearly total absence of participation by married students or family in such events. It is almost as if the latter group is expected to meet such needs in the community at large. Since older students do not regularly participate in school functions and since older students report fewer problems in this area, it may be assumed that older students meet this need within a marriage, outside the school, or both. An additional explanation for this gradual decline of concern with age is simply that, as one grows older, he is better able to afford to engage in those activities that meet his needs in this area. The economy being what it is, it may be quite costly to entertain, attend cultural events, participate in sports, travel, or pursue a hobby. If money is a key factor, then one might also predict the age groups to resemble each other on both the Finances, Living Conditions and Employment (FLE) problem area and the Social-Recreational Activities (SRA) problem area. A review of group means produced for all groups on these two problem areas shows a strikingly similar curvilinear relationship decreasing with age.

Finally, the area of Social-Psychological Relations (SPR) showed a similar decline in importance with age. The concerns of this area center around getting along with others, being popular, and generally acting in a mature fashion. Again, the data show that this is of primary importance for those 18 years of age and under, as it is with 19-20 year olds.

As one matures in years, acquires long-term relationships, and generally experiences successful relations with peers, a decline in the concern for this area would be anticipated. Indeed, 19-20-year-olds do not see this as a major problem area. Adults 30 years old or older rank this area significantly less troubling to them than do any other group, including the 21-29-year-olds.

In summary, it could be said that any program planned to address the needs of students, according to age groups, should target the delivery of services to those students 21 years of age or younger. This is indicated by the reporting of more problems in all areas by those students who were under the age of 21. In all areas investigated, the student 30 years old or over experienced the least concern or worry.

Hypothesis four was stated in the null form owing to the great emphasis being placed in community colleges on the unique needs of the adult learner returning to school after a prolonged absence from formal education. Most frequently, these adults are married, and an examination of their problems, contrasted with those of single students, could provide further data regarding the different needs of married and single community college students.

Leon (11), Stone (18), and Jones (10) each documented the fact that single students reported having more problems

than married students when completing the checklist. Singer and Steffle (15) reported no significant difference between married and single veterans when conducting research with a non-student population.

The literature supports the stand that single students have more problems than married students. The findings produced by this study support that stand. Single students reported significantly more problems in the area of Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment (FLE), an area that may be directly related to the maturity and stability often accompanying marriage. It could also be predicted that needs for social and recreational activity would decline as one found a mate with whom to socialize and share activities. As was expected, single students reported significantly more problems in this area than did married students. Likewise, single students were more troubled by social-psychological needs which marriage may often meet.

In conclusion, these results suggest that perhaps marriage is simply less stressful. It has been reported in many fields that, as a group, married people lead more satisfying lives than do singles. Indeed, it has even been reported that married men live longer than single men. The finding that married students reported fewer problems than single students gives added reason for establishing the

single students as a target group for delivery of additional services.

Hypothesis five was stated in null form as a result of research conducted by Slinger (16), in which a substantial inverse relationship was reported between grade point average and problems reported on the Mooney Problem Check List. Yarrow (20) also correlated grade point average with problems reported on the checklist. Yarrow reported no significant relationship between the two variables. Few additional studies have scientifically investigated the relationship of problems and grade point average. Many studies have speculated that higher numbers of problems reported by students would negatively affect grade point average. However, these have largely been speculations, untested by research.

The findings produced by this study showed no significant difference in mean grade point average between two groups thought to represent the extremes of problem expression. Evidently, having a great number of problems will not prohibit one from doing well in college. Likewise, having few problems does not give one an apparent edge on making the Dean's List. The findings produced by this study, if anything, tended to support an earlier finding of inverse relationship reported by Hartman (8).

Caution must be urged when making statements regarding the interpretation of any data where no statistically significant difference was found. However, it would be interesting to hypothesize that admitting more problems reflect an open willingness to work harder, face life's difficulties head-on, and succeed in school. In retrospect, an analysis of the Adjustment to College Work (ACW) area might be a better predictor of college grades. In any event, the Mooney Problem Check List did not act as a good predictor of grades for the students in this study. It must be assumed that the motivation to do well in school lies beyond the questions contained in the checklist. Apparently, some students with many problems do well in school, while others with few problems do poorly.

In concluding, it should be mentioned that the results produced by use of the Mooney Problem Check List in this study were not uniquely different from those previously reported in the literature. The validation of many earlier findings builds a convincing case for continued use of this instrument. It must also be noted that the findings produced by this study were similar to many produced by other studies employing university populations. This has profound implications. While the new student of the community college may be unique, the problems of community college freshmen and university students appear to be more alike than they are dissimilar. It appears the needs and problems facing students

are needs and problems of a "human kind" rather than that of an "educational setting."

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin, "A Problem Profile of University Underclassmen," College Student Journal, VI (Fall, 1974), 332-337.
2. Brewster, Hoyt W., "The Problems of Jr. College Freshmen and the Development of the Jr. College Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1971.
3. Bunnett, Nancy H., "Parental Financial Support and Family Problems of College Freshmen," Journal of College Student Personnel, XVI (March, 1975), 145-148.
4. Clements, Hubert M. and Merritt Oelke, "Factors Related to Reported Problems of Adolescents," Personnel and Guidance Journal, VI (March, 1967), 697-702.
5. Congdon, Nora A., "The Perplexities of College Freshmen," Educational and Psychological Measurement, CXI (Spring, 1943), 367-375.
6. Dye, Allen H. and Stephen Akers, "An Analysis of Student Academic and Personal Concerns and Awareness of Counseling Services," A research project report, Lafayette, Indiana, 1969, ERIC: ED 039 592.
7. Greene, Carolyn and Donald L. Kester, "Black Community College Students Have Special Problems. What are These Special Problems? A Research Project at One Community College Finds Some Answers," A research project, Los Angeles, California, 1970, ERIC: ED 047 690.
8. Hartman, Bernard J., "Survey of College Student's Problems Identified by the Mooney Problem Check List," Psychological Reports, XXII (March, 1968), 715-716.
9. Hibler, Francis W., and Arthur Larsen, "Problems of Upperclass Students in a Teachers College," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXVIII (June, 1943), 253-260.
10. Jones, Worth R., "Affective Tolerance and Typical Problems of Married and Unmarried College Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (October, 1958), 126-128.

11. Leon, Paul, "Self-Perceived Problems of International Students Attending Howard University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
12. Mooney, Ross L., "Surveying High-School Students' Problems by Means of a Problem Check List," Educational Research Bulletin, XXI (March, 1942), 57-69.
13. Morris, Glyn, "How 5 Schools Made Plans Based on Pupil Needs," The Clearing House, XXIX (November, 1954), 131-134.
14. Palladino, Joseph J. and George Domino, "Differences Between Counseling Center Clients and Nonclients on Three Measures," Journal of College Student Personnel, XIX (November, 1978), 497-501.
15. Singer, Stanley L. and Buford Stefflre, "The Concurrent Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (January, 1957), 298-301.
16. Slinger, George E., "Freshman Problems and Academic Achievement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Florida, 1955.
17. Stetter, Richard, "A Group Guidance Technique for the Classroom Teacher," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 179-184.
18. Stone, Gordon L., "Student Problems in a Teachers College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (Fall, 1948), 404-416.
19. Tolle, Donald J., "Identification of Troublesome Problems Affecting St. Petersburg Junior College Students, With Implications for Guidance Program Improvement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1957.
20. Yarrow, Walter H., "An Investigation of the Problems of Entering Freshmen at the University of Southern Mississippi," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anastasi, Anne, Psychological Testing, 4th ed., New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1976.
- Buros, Oscar K., Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1953.
- _____, The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- _____, Tests in Print, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1961.
- Brown, William F., Student's Guides to Effective Study, San Marcos, Effective Study Material Inc., 1970.
- Carman, Robert A. and Royce Adams, Study Skills: A Student's Guide for Survival, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Cross, Patricia K., Beyond the Open Door, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Deese, James and Ellin K. Deese, How to Study, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.
- Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw Hill and Company, 1971.
- Mooney, Ross L., and Leonard V. Gordon, The Mooney Problem Check List Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
- Myers, Jerome L., Fundamentals of Experimental Design, 2nd ed., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed., New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Pauk, Walter, How to Study in College, New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962.
- Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

- Spence, Janet T., John W. Cotton, Benton J. Underwood, and Carl P. Duncan, Elementary Statistics, 3rd ed., Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
- Walter, Tim and Al Siebert, Student Success, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Yarrington, David J., Surviving in College, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing Co., 1977.

Articles

- Amos, Robert T. and Reginald M. Washington, "A Comparison of Pupil and Teacher Perceptions of Pupil Problems," Journal of Educational Psychology, LI (May, 1960), 255-258.
- Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin, "A Problem Profile of University Underclassmen," College Student Journal, VI (Fall, 1974), 332-337.
- Bunnett, Nancy H., "Parental Financial Support and the Financial and Family Problems of College Freshmen," Journal of College Student Personnel, XVI (March, 1975), 145-148.
- Burdt, Eric, "Relationships Between Adolescents' Personal Concerns and Their Study Habits," Education, LXXXVII (Spring, 1977), 302-304.
- Caine, T. M. and B. Wijesinghe, "Personality, Expectations and Group Psychotherapy," British Journal of Psychiatry, CXXIX (October, 1976), 384-387.
- Clements, Hubert M. and Merritt Oelke, "Factors Related to Reported Problems of Adolescents," Personnel and Guidance Journal, VL (March, 1967), 697-702.
- Congdon, Nora A., "The Perplexities of College Freshmen," Educational and Psychological Measurement, CXI (Spring, 1943), 367-375.
- Cutsumbis, Michael N., "The Relationship of Certain Sociological Factors to Self-Reported Anxiety as Revealed by the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXVIII (Fall, 1968), 577-581.
- Deiker, Thomas and Margaret Pryer, "Reported Problems in Emotionally Disturbed and Normal Adolescents," Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, VI (October, 1973), 146-150.

- Domino, George and Maryanne DeGroot, "A Comparison of Counseling Seekers and Nonseekers on the Mooney Problem Check List," Journal of College Student Personnel, XIX (January, 1978), 33-36.
- Erickson, E. H., "Identity and the Life Cycles," Psychological Issues, I, Monograph No. 1, 1959.
- Goldman, Bert A., "Relationships Between Scores on the Mooney Problem Check List and the California Test of Personality," Journal of Educational Research, VXI (March, 1968), 307-310.
- Gordon, Leonard V., "The Reflection of Problem Changes by the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, IX (Spring, 1949), 747-752.
- Hartman, Bernard J., "Survey of College Students' Problems Identified by the Mooney Problem Check List," Psychological Reports, XXII (Summer, 1968), 715-716.
- Held, Mark and David Snow, "MMPI, Internal-External Control, and Problem Check List Scores of Obese Adolescent Females," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXVIII (October, 1972), 523-525.
- Hibler, Francis W., and Arthur Larsen, "Problems of Upper-class Students in a Teachers College," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXVIII (June, 1943), 253-260.
- Jones, Worth R., "Affective Tolerance and Typical Problems of Married and Unmarried College Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (October, 1958), 126-128.
- Karr, Stephen D. and Alvin Mahrer, "Transitional Problems Accompanying Vocational Development and College Graduation," Journal of Vocational Behavior, II (July, 1972), 283-289.
- McIntyre, Charles J., "The Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVII (September, 1953), 270-272.
- Marsh, Charles J., "The Worries of College Women," The Journal of Social Psychology, XV (September, 1942), 335-339.
- Marshal, Jon Clark, "Problems of High School Students in Relation to Grade Achievement," School and Society, LXXXV (April, 1967), 237-238.

- Marzolf, Stanley S. and Arthur Larsen, "Statistical Interpretation of Symptoms Illustrated with a Factor Analysis of Problem Check List Items," Educational and Psychological Measurement, V (Fall, 1945), 285-294.
- Mooney, Ross L., "Personal Problems of Freshman Girls," Journal of Higher Education, XIV (February, 1943), 84-89.
- _____, "Surveying High-School Students' Problems by Means of a Problem Check List," Educational Research Bulletin, XXI (March, 1942), 57-69.
- Morris, Glyn, "How 5 Schools Made Plans Based on Pupil Needs," The Clearing House, XXIX (November, 1954), 131-134.
- Palladino, Joseph J. and George Domino, "Differences Between Counseling Center Clients and Nonclients on Three Measures," Journal of College Student Personnel, XIX (November, 1978), 497-501.
- Prieur, Marjorie, "Personal Guidance in Home Economics," Educational Research Bulletin, XXII (September, 1943), 118-142.
- Singer, Stanley L. and Buford Stefflre, "The Concurrent Validity of the Mooney Problem Check List," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXV (January, 1957), 298-301.
- Stetter, Richard, "A Group Guidance Technique for the Classroom Teacher," The School Counselor, XVI (January, 1969), 179-184.
- Stewart, David W. and Thomas Deiker, "An Item Factor Analysis of the Mooney Problem Check List," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXVI (Summer, 1976), 509-513.
- Stone, Gordon L., "Student Problems in a Teachers College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIX (Fall, 1948), 404-416.
- Swearingen, Dolores J. and Julian M. Thompson, "What Does the Patient Think, An Evaluation of a General Psychiatric Ward," Hospital and Community Journal, XXIX (March, 1978), 182-184.
- Walsh, Michael E., "Articulation Problems of Vocational-Technical Students," Community College Review, V (Winter, 1978), 50-54.

Wen-Shih-Sung, and Rose E. McCay, "Relationships of Selected Nonacademic and Academic Variables to the Grade Point Average of Black Students," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXV (January, 1976), 935-939.

Unpublished Materials

- Brewster, Hoyt W., "The Problems of Jr. College Freshmen and the Development of the Jr. College Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1971.
- Carr, James F., "The Problem Areas of a Selected Group of Students at Florida State University as Indicated by the Mooney Problem Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1955.
- Dye, Allen H. and Stephen Akers, "An Analysis of Student Academic and Personal Concerns and Awareness of Counseling Services," A research project report, Lafayette, Indiana, 1969, ERIC: ED 039 592.
- Greene, Carolyn and Donald L. Kester, "Black Community College Students Have Special Problems. What are These Special Problems? A Research Project at One Community College Finds Some Answers," A research project, Los Angeles, California, 1970, ERIC: ED 047 690.
- Hood, Gary K., "An Analysis of College Student Problems as Indicated on the Mooney Problem Check List," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1974.
- Leon, Paul, "Self-Perceived Problems of International Students Attending Howard University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1976.
- Magill, Kathleen and Kathryn Cirksena, "Problems and Information Needs of Women Reentering Higher Education," A research paper, Bethesda, Maryland, 1977, ERIC: ED 155 349.
- Slinger, George E., "Freshman Problems and Academic Achievement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Florida, 1955.

- Stogdill, Emily L., and Jack Denton, "Differences in Responses of Selected College Groups to Items on the Mooney Problem Check List," An unpublished study, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1947.
- Tolle, Donald J., "Identification of Troublesome Problems Affecting St. Petersburg Junior College Students, with Implications for Guidance Program Improvement," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1957.
- Williams, Charles C., "An Experimental Study to Determine the Effectiveness of the Freshman Orientation Course at North Texas State University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1958.
- Yarrow, Walter H., "An Investigation of the Problems of Entering Freshmen of the University of Southern Mississippi," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, 1964.