1992

The Relationship of Self Esteem and Personal Problems to the Academic Success of Adult Juniors and Seniors at and Upper Division, Commuter University

Peggy G. Woodard
Loyola University Chicago

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELF ESTEEM AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS TO THE ACADEMIC SUCCESS OF ADULT JUNIORS AND SENIORS AT AN UPPER DIVISION, COMMUTER UNIVERSITY

by

Peggy G. Woodard

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

May

1992

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends her gratitude to the members of her committee, Dr. Steve Brown, Dr. Gloria Lewis, Director, and Dr. David Suddick, for their assistance throughout the project.

She would also like to thank Dr. Sarah Crawford, Director of Registration and Records, University of Illinois-Chicago for her help and support. The author would also like to thank Governors State University for their support of the project.

The author would like to extend appreciation to the study participants. Their cooperation in sharing personal information provided the opportunity to explore a previously neglected area of research with important implications for adult students.

Finally, the author extends her appreciation to her mother, Mary Ann Woodard, for her continued support throughout this process. This work is dedicated to her.

VITA

The author, Peggy G. Woodard, was born in Dongola, Illinois on February 27, 1952.

In August, 1973, Ms. Woodard received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Social Work from Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois. She received the degree of Master of Science in Education from Northern Illinois University in June, 1979. She is currently the Director of Student Development at Governors State University, University Park, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Enrollment in institutions of higher education was projected to increase from 12.5 million in 1987 to 12.6 million by 1990. Between 1987 and 1997, enrollment of older students is expected to rise by 217,000, while the enrollment of students under 25 years of age is projected to fall by nearly 600,000 (Gerald, Horn and Hussar, 1988). These projections support the facts that during the period from 1980 to 1985, enrollments of students 25 and over increased by 12 percent, while enrollments of students under 25 decreased by 5 percent (Synder, 1987). The phenomenon of an increasing older population of collegians has been reported by others (Frost, 1980; Papier, 1980; Sansing, 1983; and Scott and King, 1985; Modoono and Evans, 1987). Trends suggested that the rising educational attainment of the general population should result in an ever increasing demand for learning alternatives by older students (O'Connor and Aasheim, 1985).

The above suggests that a unique opportunity exists to study a major shift of collegians enrolled at American colleges and universities. However, there has been surprisingly little research into older students (Johnson, 1984). Thus, it was not surprising to find that many schools are unprepared to meet the needs of a population they have not defined (Templin, 1984). It is important for colleges and

universities to understand the characteristics and needs of reentry adult undergraduates for several reasons. These are: recruitment of adults, their retention, their academic success, academic support services, and collateral support services. These areas are directly related to understanding their educational motivations and goals, career aspirations, their many roles of spouse, parent, employee, employer, friend, and their life experience which they bring with them in their return to school. In addition, an understanding of their personal needs related to self-esteem and personal problems is important in helping reentry adult students to achieve academic success and reach their educational and career goals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) To describe reentry adult undergraduate (junior/senior) students in terms of self-esteem, personal problems, demographic variables, and academic variables. 2) To determine the relationship between self-esteem and personal problems and their effect on the reentry adult students' progress toward successful degree completion. This study is targeted toward student service personnel to assist them to have a better understanding of the reentry adult student and to prevent and/or correct problems that may prohibit these students from successful degree completion.

For this study, self-esteem is denoted as self worth measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. (Rosenberg, 1953). Their personal problems are denoted as the nine scales of the Mooney Problem Check List (Mooney & Gordon, 1950). Specially, the nine scales measure concerns in

the areas of: health, economic security, self improvement, personal, home-family, courtship, sex, religion and occupation.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

The purposes of the study were to investigate the five hypotheses and two research questions. Each is cited.

Hypothesis One

There was a significant relationship between subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) and student demographic variables. More specifically:

1. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and age.
2. There was a significant Relationship between subscales of the MPCL and gender.
3. There was a significant Relationship between subscales of the MPCL and ethnic group.
4. There was a significant Relationship between subscales of the MPCL and marital status.
5. There was a significant Relationship between subscales of the MPCL and number of children.
6. There was a significant Relationship between subscales of the MPCL and current employment status.

Hypothesis Two

There was a significant relationship between subscale of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) and student scholastic variation.

1. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and transfer grade point average.
2. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and the duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU.
3. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and the number of terms of enrollment after reentry to GSU.
4. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and reentry cumulative grade point average.
5. There was a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student enrollment status.

Hypothesis Three

There will be a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSES) and the student demographic variables.

1. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and age of the reentry adult student.
2. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and the gender of the reentry adult student.
3. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and ethnic group of the reentry adult students.
4. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and the marital status of the reentry adult student.

5. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and number of children of the reentry adult student.
6. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and current employment status.

Hypothesis Four

There was a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and student scholastic variables.

1. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and transfer grade point average of the reentry adult students.
2. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and the duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU.
3. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and the number of terms of enrollment after reentry to GSU.
4. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and reentry cumulative grade point average.
5. There was a significant relationship between the RSES and student enrollment status.

Hypothesis Five

There was a significant relationship between the subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale.

Questions

How do the six demographic variables (age, gender, ethnic group, marital status, number of children, and employment status) and five

scholastic variables (transfer grade point average, duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU, number of terms of enrollment after reentry, reentry cumulative grade point average, and full-part time enrollment) singularly and in combination predict subscale scores of the Mooney Problem Check List and the total Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale? Succinctly, what is the interrelationship among the five demographic variables, among the four scholastic variables, among the nine predictors, and which variables(s) serve(s) as the best predictor(s) of each psychometric measure - subscales of the MPCL and the RSES.

Limitation of the Study

The study was conducted with volunteers who are adult college students having a minimum age of 26. These students were also juniors or seniors as well as transfer students to an upper division university. Also, all subjects were students on one campus and the data was collected in one term of 1990.

Summary

The problems to be researched were introduced and the purpose of the study was presented in this chapter. Specially, the five hypotheses and two questions to be answered were set forth.

The review of the literature presented in Chapter II discusses adult students from a theoretical perspective, recruitment and program issues, problems encountered and interventions to assist adult students. In addition, Chapter II looks at cover issues of adult

students, effects of their self perceptions and psychometric instruments that describe these reentry adults. The methodology to be performed and its execution are given in Chapter III and IV, respectively. Finally, the study is summarized and related to the prevention literature in Chapter 5. Suggestions for ensuing research, based upon this analysis, are also given.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

As Templin (1984) noted, many institutions of higher education have yet to recognize that adult students are becoming a major component of their student bodies. Thus, the review of literature from the frame of reference of adult reentry students is somewhat sparse. This is not to imply that the body of knowledge is nonexistent; however, there are many areas which have not been extensively explored. The literature is presented in major sections. They are as follows: theortical basis, recruitment and program issues for adults returning to higher education, reasons adults return to college, problems adults encounter returning to college, intervention/special programming for adult students, career services of adult students, self perception of adult students, and psychometric measure of adult college student.

Theoretical Basis

It is well recognized that there is an established relationship between the various aspects of ego development, psychological stages and traditional educational objectives, and that ego development and successful completion of the various psychological stages is viewed as one of the goals of higher education for both traditional and

nontraditional students. Several different theories are helpful in understanding this relationship. Erikson (1950, 1959) viewed the individual's growth throughout life as a process of reaching and achieving a series of eight psychological tasks which are dominate at certain life stages. These tasks are listed as follows: 1) Basic Trust vs Mistrust, 2) Autonomy vs Shame, Doubt, 3) Initiative vs Guilt, 4) Industry vs Inferiority, 5) Identity vs Role Confusion, 6) Intimacy vs Isolation, 7) Generativity vs Stagnation, and 8) Ego Integrity vs Despair. These life stages ranged from infancy throughout later adulthood. Erikson believed that if each task was not successfully resolved persistent problems could result. Havighurst (1972) described developmental tasks as physiological, psychological and social demands which the individual must satisfy in order to be viewed by both others and self as a successful and happy person. These developmental tasks arise during certain periods of the adult's life and must be successfully completed to achieve success in later tasks. Piaget (in Kohlberg, 1973) also identifies various factors of the concept of developmental stages. Like many theorists he believes each stage must follow in a certain sequence with each stage depending on the previous stages.

Loevinger (1970, 1976) synthesized the conceptualizations of Alfred Adler, David Ausubel, Erik Erikson, Erich Fromm, Kenneth Isaacs, Lawrence Kohlberg, George Herbert Mead, Abraham Maslow, Jean Piaget, Carl Rogers and Harry Stack Sullivan to formulate her theory of ego development which is applicable to adolescents and adults. Loevinger considers ego development to be a major personality trait which is

important in determining an individual's responses to difficult situations. She identifies eight stages of ego development; however, unlike other theorists she is not as stringent in her belief that each stage must follow in a certain order to achieve individual happiness and success. Currently, her theory of ego development is the most inclusive of all developmental stage theories which apply to adolescents and adults (Chickering 1981). This theory of ego development which specifically addresses adult development is the theoretical basis for this study.

Loevinger considers ego development to be more than a personality trait or characteristic. She views ego development as a master trait which is second only to intelligence in the determination of an individual's responses to various situations. The eight stages or milestone sequences of ego development defined by Loevinger are: 1) Impulsive, 2) Self-Protective, 3) Conformist, 4) Conscientious-Conformist (Self-Aware), 5) Conscientious, 6) Individualistic, 7) Autonomous and 8) Integrated. These stages of development will be defined with regard to character development, interpersonal style, conscious preoccupations and cognitive style. The Impulsive and Self-Protective Stages are considered to be childhood stages where the child is rather dependent.

1) Impulsive Stage: Character development is represented by impulsiveness and fear of retaliation. The individual's interpersonal style is one of being receiving, dependent and explorative while conscious preoccupations are represented by bodily feelings, particularly sexual and aggressive.

2) Self-Protective Stage: Character development in this stage surrounds externalization of blame, opportunism and fear of being caught. The individual's interpersonal style is very manipulative and exploitative. Conscious preoccupations are characterized by self protection, trouble, wishes, things and advantage control. At this stage a cognitive style begins to emerge and is composed of stereotyping and conceptual confusion.

3) Conformist Stage: At this stage character development relates to issues such as conformity to external rules, shame and guilt for breaking rules. Interpersonal style is concerned with belonging and being superficially nice. Conscious preoccupations center around appearance, social acceptability, banal feelings and behavior. Cognitive style is represented by conceptual simplicity, stereotypes and cliches.

4) Conscientious-Conformist (Self-Aware) Stage: Character development is represented by differentiation of norms and goals. Interpersonal style is characterized by awareness of self in relation to a group and the individual's part in helping others. Conscious preoccupations are concerned with issues of adjustment, reasons and opportunity. Cognitive style at this stage is multiplicity.

5) Conscientious Stage: At this stage the focus is self-evaluated standards, guilt for consequences, self criticism, long-term goals and labels. Interpersonal style is represented by an individual who is responsible, intensive and concerned with communication. Conscious preoccupations surround differentiated feelings, motives for behavior, self respect, achievements, traits and expressions.

Cognitive style is one of conceptual complexity and development of a pattern of ideas.

6) Individualistic Stage: Character development, interpersonal style, conscious preoccupations and cognitive style at this stage are inclusive of the traits identified in the Conscientious Stage. In addition, character development adds respect for individuality while interpersonal style adds dependence as an emotional problem. The area of conscious preoccupations adds social problems and differentiation of internal life from external life. Cognitive style at this stage adds distinction of process and outcome.

7) Autonomous Stage: Character development includes factors from the Individualistic and Autonomous Stages and adds coping with conflicting inner needs and toleration at this stage of development. Interpersonal style also includes the traits from the two previous stages, but adds respect for auntonomy and interdependence. Conscious preoccupations are characterized by vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological and psychological, psychological causation of behavior, role conception, self-fulfillment and self in a social context, cognitive style is represented by increased conceptual complexity, toleration for ambiguity, a broader scope and objectivity.

8) Integrated Stage: This stage is inclusive of the characteristics identified in the Autonomous Stage and adds characteristics in the three areas of character development, interpersonal style and conscious preoccupation. Character development at this stage is represented by a reconciling of inner conflicts and renunciation of

the unattainable. Interpersonal style adds a cherishing of individuality, while conscious preoccupation adds identity of self (Loevinger, 1970). Loevinger, who compares the Integrated Stage to Maslow's (1971) Self-Actualization Stage, indicates that few individuals actually reach this stage of development.

Developmental tasks throughout adulthood focus on various aspects of the individual's life with regard to a life partner, family, friends, managing a home, educational and career issues. Reentry adult students dealing with these tasks find many demands on their time, energy and emotions which effect their time as a student (Chickering, 1981). In considering the various developmental stages and ego development, further insight is gained in regard to the reentry adult student. Erikson (1968) states that the identity of one's ego gains strength from achievement that has meaning in our culture. This premise supports Loevinger's theory that throughout each developmental stage the individual increases his/her ability for complex patterns of thought and feelings. Therefore, each stage is important to the individual's ability to learn and gain knowledge through life experiences.

These ideas are one of the basis of a liberal arts educations and represent some of the main goals of higher education. Ego development is an important factor in the way in which the adult functions in his/her many complex roles. In addition, the individual's stage of ego development has a direct effect on how much he or she can gain from an educational environment (Chickering, 1981).

Loevinger (1970) indicates that the majority of adults are at the Conformist or Conscientious Stages. The transition to the Conscientious Stage appears to be a stopping place for most adults in our society. It was noted that for traditional aged students this transition takes place between the freshman and sophomore years of college, but for the majority it is not likely to change throughout adulthood. Therefore, it is likely that the majority of adult reentry students will be at the Conscientious Stage of development. At this stage the individual is capable of setting long term goals of self evaluation, being responsible, concerned with communication, conscious of feelings and motivation and capable of complex thought patterns. An individual at the Conscientious Stage usually views education as an internal process and is likely to focus on the intellectual challenge and personal enrichment which education can bring. In this stage, education is also seen as a way to improve society.

One of the important factors with regard to ego development is that individuals at different stages of development have different capacities for setting educational goals, succeeding in a college program and for developing relationships with faculty and peers. With these factors in mind the stages of ego development provide both insight into the reentry adult student and the theoretical basis for this study.

Recruitment and Program Issues for Adults to Higher Education

Adult reentry students return to college for a variety of reasons with the major rationale being career advancement (Haponski, 1983; Augustin, 1986), and self improvement (Reehling, 1980). Recruitment of

these adult students has become a major component of most adult reentry programs (Mark and Dewees, 1984).

Weissburg (1986) indicated that at the University of Georgia more than half of the adult students were both women and married. Approximately 80 percent of the adult population were graduate and professional students and two-thirds were enrolled full time. Forty-two percent had children and three-fourths were working while taking classes. Economic benefits or career change was the reason that more than three-fourths were attending school. This study indicated that the most problematic areas for these adult students were demands on time, family responsibilities, financial concerns, little time to study and parking. Also, they indicated programs which would be of most benefit to them were financial planning, consumer rights, career development, professional writing and legal and equal rights. Flannery (1986) found the two most indentified barriers for adults returning to school were 1) balancing family and school time, and 2) balancing job demands and family. Modoono and Evans (1987) indicated that adult reentry students differed from the traditionally aged student in their motivation for education, their learning processes and experience. They indicated that faculty must adapt to the adult students' needs in order to maintain their enrollment. Darkenwald and Gavin (1987) determined that reentry adult students' expectations of classroom social ecology had a significant effect on their dropout rate, with those students expecting less social involvement than actually occurred having a higher drop out rate.

Baldwin (1980) stated that a review of adult students' job and life experience helps these students to plan their return to school. He also noted that the evaluation or assessment of the adults' background by academic standards may provide many adults with a focus for planning the continuation of their education. However, this evaluation has not always been a good measure for planning future goals. With regard to planning their return to college, there has often been a severe disjunction between students' expectations and their actual experience in higher education (Weil, 1986). Prager (1983) was more specific by stating that the educational aspirations of returning adults often do not relate to an assessment of their personal skills or expectations. Nevertheless, adults need an opportunity for a realistic self-appraisal of their potential as adult learners (Steltenpohl and Shipton, 1986) and they are often able to anticipate their impediments (Richter and Whitten, 1984). Major barriers to academic success which were identified were money, distance from campus (Meers and Gilkison, 1985), family responsibilities (Sewall, 1984; Richter and Whitten, 1984; Leppel, 1984), impatience, grade competition, and over/under confidence (Babcock, 1984). Champagne's (1987) research supported the view that self concept is an important variable with regard to the reentry adults' educational participation and achievement as well as career development. It was also noted that career counseling had a positive effect on some of the reentry students' career decisions.

Men in comparison to women tended to have more spousal support after reentering the university setting (DeGroot, 1980; Huston-Hoburg and Strange, 1986). The traditional role model conflicts continue to

exist. Women reported more emotional stress than did men (Gibert, 1980), and females tended to me more torn between their career and family roles than males (Kinner and Townley, 1986). This may explain why men tend to graduate more rapidly than women (Frost, 1980). Academic performance is not seen as the rationale given that both sexes are equally successful. In fact, adult reentry students are as academically successful as their more traditionally aged peers (Long, 1983; Smithers and Griffin, 1986). The criterion for success may well be mastery of the prerequisites (Sewall, 1984; Suddick and Collins, 1984 and 1986). Bean and Metzner (1985) indicate another factor which distinguishes traditional and nontraditional students is that the latter is more effected by external factors. This may be more pronounced when the nontraditional students are commuters (Copeland-Wood, 1985; Rawlins and Davies, 1981). Nevertheless, the older reentry students perceived themselves as valuing learning especially when it is related to career opportunities, i.e. maturity is viewed as an enabling factor as opposed to a hindrance (Epstein, 1984; Rush, 1983).

Many colleges and universities have implemented programs to assist adult reentry students. The following are examples of programming efforts: Frankel, 1982; Levin, 1986; Smith and Regan, 1983; Steltenpohl and Shipton, 1986; Uncapher, 1983. These efforts varied by campus, but the involvement of the faculty was viewed as a major factor in success for reentry adult students (Schmidt, 1983). Thus, the nature and scope of the needs of reentry adult students should be ascertained, and services should be developed and implemented to assist these students in overcoming their problems (Oski, 1980).

Problems Adults Encountered When Returning to College

For adults returning to school, there are a series of general problems such as transfer policies, residency, graduation requirements (Fisher-Thompson, 1980), financial problems (Kaplin, 1981), family support, child care, self-concept and spousal domestic conflict (Huston-Hoburg and Strange, 1986; Scott and King, 1985; and Stephenson, 1980). Also, Balkin (1987) found that women who have no contact with higher education either personally or through friends tend to have more difficulty adjusting to school and exhibit a greater fear of success than those whose friends or family had attended college.

Problems are usually encountered after admission to the university. The problems identified are as follows: time management, study skills, note taking, preparation for examinations, test taking strategies (Cramer, 1981), conflicts with family time schedules (Higgins, 1985), and job conflicts (Sands and Richardson, 1984). These problems are exasperated by other dynamics. Levy (1981) found that older women due to their maturity and life experience had difficulty relating to typically younger students. Concurrently, the student status of these returning adults precluded socialization with faculty on an equitable basis (Vause and Wiemann, 1981). The multiple role of student, worker, parent and/or spouse results in more anxiety and mental stress than that experienced by the more traditional student population (Gerson, 1985; Roehl and Okum, 1984; and Sands and Richardson, 1984).

Succinctly, the adult students, after classes began, were experiencing more role conflict than before they returned to the

university setting (Patterson and Blake, 1985). Hildreth et al (1983) cited the role change as a significant event in the life of these adults, but the researchers noted that the families of these reentry students were generally supportive of their new role. Jacobi (1987) agreed that reentry women experienced more role conflicts and time constraints than their more traditional female counterparts. However, this study indicated that reentry women reported less school related stress, fewer stress symptoms and greater satisfaction regarding their school achievements than the traditional student. In support of these findings, Pickering and Galvin-Schaefers (1988) described reentry women workers as being sure of their abilities, achievement oriented, dominant and stable with no more conflict than career women. In addition, their research found that reentry working women did not exhibit depressed scores on measures of self-esteem or the dominance measure.

Interventions/Special Programming for Adult Students:

No one intervention has been identified to help adult students adjust; however, reentry women demonstrate an interest in noncredit workshops which focus on 1) improving self-image/self-concept, 2) assertive behavior training, 3) work or educational changes, 4) job interview training and 5) leadership training for women. These courses were viewed as support interventions which assist reentry adult women to achieve academic success (Roy, 1986). Also, Mohsenin, (1980) has identified a one-to-one peer counseling program to be an alternative to assist the rematriculation of these students.

Although many institutions of higher education have not addressed the importance of adult students, some institutions have recognized the special needs of adult reentry women. To meet these needs, institutions have developed and implemented new programs based upon the unique needs of the student body (Fisher-Thompson, 1980; Holliday, 1985). Examples of these programs are those set forth by Corrado and Mangano (1982), McWilliams (1982) and Karr-Kidwell (1984). The components of these programs have been found to be at variance; however, they all have the common goal of assisting reentry adult students to access the learning environment. A delineation of the focus of these efforts include: value clarification, decision making, assertion training (Hetherington and Hudson, 1981), motivation (Murphy and Achtzinger, 1982), test taking (Chickering and Obstfeld, 1982), refresher courses in basic academic skills (Prahl, 1980), flexible course scheduling (Hall, 1980), reentry workshops (Weinstein, 1980), evening programs, weekend colleges and summer programs (Fisher-Thompson, 1980).

Career Issue of Adult Students:

One programming emphasis, that of career, has been the focus of many researchers. Martin (1980) noted that three-fourths of women returning to college in Maryland did so for career related reasons. Career indecision did not vary by age of these returnees. Sillaney (1986) found no significant difference in career indecision among three groups aged 17 to 22, 30 to 34 and 40 to 44 years of age. Weinstein (1980) presented the case that career counseling was a needed alternative to assist reentry women. With regard to career issues, the

long range effects of counseling were found to be mixed (Covitz, 1980; Caracelli, 1986). They also found that career counseling did not have a measurable effect on ensuing job satisfaction, whereas Speer and Derfman (1986) noted that the desire for a career identity was the only predictor of perceived professional development. This is not in total agreement with the research of DiNuzzo and Tolbert (1981). They reported that short term group career counseling was effective and that counselor facilitation and mutual group support promoted positive personal change.

The return to college is a significant change in the adult's life style and new coping strategies must be defined (Beutell and O'Hare, 1987). Perry (1985) reiterated three modus operandi: 1) negotiation type to reduce role conflict and stress, 2) priority setting to decide which roles to emphasize and which to diminish, and 3) superwoman which involves meeting all demands i.e. analogous to having no definite coping style.

Given the entire body of knowledge regarding reentry women, it is apparent that there are many subpopulations with varying needs both in degree and kind. Thus, it was not surprising to find a wide variety of programs instituted by colleges and universities to assist these students. For their efforts, Simkins and Ray (1983) noted that program content is more important than its structure. Irrespective of this, one fact remains. Adult reentry women tend not to avail themselves of support services (Badenhoop and Johnson, 1980; Papier, 1980). Reasons for this phenomenon require further exploration.

Self Perception of Adult Students:

The importance of self perception is also an issue. Weilert and Van Dusseldrop (1983) found that the majority of the respondees to their survey felt that the return to the classroom had a significant positive impact on their lives. Fear of success may also be tied with this, for this construct had a predictive factor of both achievement motivation and anxiety in achievement situations (Sherman, 1982; and Farmer and Fyans, 1983). This finding is in agreement with the locus of control; i.e. less external, for reentry women (Johnson, 1984). Nevertheless, external support i.e. perceived helpful attitudes of professors, is an important factor of satisfaction of reentry women (Kirk and Dorfman, 1983).

Psychometric Measures of Adult College Reentry Students:

There is sparse research of this topic. Psychometric tools have rarely been the alternative to describe and analyze adult reentry students. Clark (1984) used the Graduate Record Examination to investigate academic success of graduate students. Regarding the basic skills of undergraduate students, Sewall (1984) used the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the Metropolitan Mathematic Test and the STEP English Expression Test, whereas Suddick and Collins (1984, 1986) used the College Entrance Examinations Board's Test of Standard Written English and Descriptive Tests of Mathematics Skills.

For career assessment, Slaney and Lewis (1986) used the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory and the Vocational Card Sort. Self concept was addressed by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Caracelli, 1986) and

the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Schmidt, 1983). Schmidt (1985) investigated learning style by the Canfield Learning Style Inventory. Finally, the College Transition Inventory was used by Caracelli (1986).

Summary

As noted in the introduction, the literature regarding adult college students does not portray a complete picture of this growing segment of students in higher education. On the other hand, sufficient information is available to provide insight. Recruitment of adults is becoming a major thrust of many admissions offices, but the adult student must be viewed a multi segment group, not a general population. The reasons they return to college are varied, and the problems they encounter are wide ranging and usually encompass the competing function of a personal life with a spouse and children, a employment segment demanding up to 40 hours a week, and the academic component ranging from the pressure of a part- through full-time student.

Given the varying needs of these students as well as the uniqueness of higher education institutions, it was not surprising to find a wide divergence in the programs instituted to meet the needs of the adult college students. This may well explain the unclear record of evaluation conducted on these efforts. This generalization extends to one major area of concern for adult college students' career issues.

Given the above, there is one area where the generally mudelled picture is clear. This is an area of academic preparedness. Those who have the prerequisite to challenge the curriculum are, in the main, more successful than their peers who are less prepared.

The current study extends the precusor efforts of Caracelli (1986) who tied self-esteem to academic performance. This study expands the scope of inquiry to other scholastic variables, student demographic variables, and specific problem areas that the students often encounter. Succinctly, this study is designed to expand the knowledge base of the existing literature.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter presents the methodology utilized to examine the hypotheses and research questions of the current study. Included in this information are descriptions of the subject, description of psychometric instruments and scores, tested hypotheses, research question and statistical analyses.

Subjects

The sample for this study was drawn from the undergraduate, degree seeking adult students enrolled at Governors State University (GSU) during the 1990 Winter Trimester of academic year 1989-1990. Governors State University is an upper division, nonresidential university with a population of approximately 6,000 graduate and undergraduate full and part time students. Thus, all of the students in this study were transfer juniors and seniors. There are four academic colleges from which the subjects were chosen. They were the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Businesses and Public Administration, College of Education and College of Health Professions. A significant segment of GSU's student body was composed of adult reentry students with the average student age being approximately 34 years. The subjects were

identified by age from the university data base. A 20 percent random sample of all undergraduate, degree seeking students 26 years of age or older were asked to participate in this study.

During the Winter 1990 Trimester 1,523 undergraduate degree-seeking students, age 26 or older were enrolled at GSU. A random sample of 305 students was drawn by selecting every fifth subject on an alphabetical listing. These students were mailed a cover letter explaining the project, a demographic/scholastic data sheet, the Mooney Problem Check List and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The date of initial mailing was March 19, 1990, and by April 3, 1990, a total of 105 sets of completed materials was returned. Thus, 200 students did not respond in two weeks so they were sent a post card as a reminder on April 18, 1990. By May 1, 1990, 31 additional packets of materials were returned. Telephone calls were placed to the other 169 students from May 3 to May 13, 1990 with 147 students contacted. They were encouraged to participate in the study; a total of an additional 47 completed packages were returned by May 31, 1990.

From the initial mailing, the response rate was 34.4 percent. The sample size was enhanced by a post card reminder and telephone call, 10.2 percent and 15.7 percent respectively. In total, usable data were collected from 60.0 percent of the sample; 183 of 305.

A copy of the cover letter and demographic/scholastic data sheet forwarded to the sample is provided in APPENDIX A. Over two-thirds of the respondents were females; i.e., 67.8 percent or 124 of 183. Regarding their ethnic background, 183 subjects provided relevant background information. The frequency and percentage by group is given

in Table 1. Over one-half of the subjects almost 54 percent were Caucasian, and over one-third of the respondents, about 38 percent were Black. About five percent were Hispanic with the remainder being split between the Asian and Native American category.

The median age of the 183 respondees was 36.12 years with a range of the youngest being 26 and the oldest being 60 years of age. A distribution of the ages of the sample is given in Table 2. The mean of the sample was 36.72 years - close to the median value - and the standard deviation was 7.93 years. Almost seven eights of the sample were from 26 to 45 years of age. A review of the distribution suggested a curve which tended to be platykurtic and skewed to the right. This was confirmed by value of - 0.27 for kurtosis suggesting a flatter curve than the normal distribution and by a value of 0.47 for skewness suggesting a clustering of scores to the left of the mean.

TABLE 1

Ethnic Background of the Sample

Group	N	%
Asian	3	1.6
Black	69	37.7
Caucasian	99	54.1
Hispanic	10	5.5
Native American	2	1.1

TABLE 2

Age Distribution of the Sample

Range in Years	N	%
26-30	48	26.2
31-35	36	19.7
36-40	43	23.5
41-45	32	17.5
46-50	14	7.7
51-55	7	3.8
56-60	3	1.6

All respondees provided their marital status. Almost half were currently married, and almost 20 percent were previously married. Of the previously married group, about 16 percent were divorced, and two percent were widowed. Thus, almost one-third were single: i.e., never married. Cited in Table 3 is the distribution of marital status of the sample. On average, the sample had one child, the median, with the low frequency of 0 to a high of 6 children. They had a mean of 1.46 children with a standard deviation of 1.37. The distribution of children for the sample is given in Table 4. Over one-third of the sample reported they did not have children. Of those who had children, most had one, two or three children, over 50 percent of the total distribution. The distribution was flatter than a normal curve, kurtosis= -0.25, and skewed to the right, skewness = 0.60.

TABLE 3

Marital Status Distribution of the Sample

Category	N	%
Married	87	47.3
Single, never married	64	34.8
Divorced	29	15.8
Widowed	4	2.2

TABLE 4

Distribution of Number of Children of the Sample

Frequency	N	%
0	65	35.3
1	28	15.2
2	50	27.2
3	28	15.2
4	9	4.9
5	3	1.6
6	1	0.5

Regarding their current work status, about 30 percent were not employed. Almost half, 47 percent were employed full-time and 21 percent were working part-time. The current employment status distribution of the 183 respondees is set forth in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Employment Distribution of the Sample

Working	N	%
Full-Time	86	47.0
Part-Time	39	21.3
Not Employed	58	31.7

In addition to the cited demographic variables, the respondees were requested to provide scholastic information about themselves. Per the median, there was a 7.50 year time lag between prior enrollment in college and matriculating at Governors State University. The mean length of time for this variable was 9.25 years with a standard deviation of 6.59 years. Over 60 percent returned to college after one decade of absence and 90 percent were away for two decades. The curve tended to be flatter than a normal curve; i.e., kurtosis equaled -0.64, and skewed to the right; i.e., skewness equaled 0.70. A distribution of data for years away from the formal educational setting is given in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Duration Between Prior and Current Enrollments in College

Years	N	%
1 to 5	63	34.2
6 to 10	50	27.2
11 to 15	34	18.5
16 to 20	18	9.8
over 20	19	10.3

The grade point average (gpa) at the prior colleges they attended was gathered from official university records. The low was 2.00 on a 4.00 scale to a high of 4.00, and the median was 2.90. This was similar to the mean of 2.93. The standard deviation of the distribution was 0.71. The distribution had almost 60 percent in the B range, a gpa of less than 3.00. In comparison to the normal curve, the distribution

tended to be flatter, kurtosis = -1.35, and skewed to the right, skewness - 0.18. The gpa of the sample in their current degree program is provided in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Distribution of the Transfer Grade Point Average of the Sample

Range	N	%
2.00 to 2.50	71	38.6
2.51 to 3.00	39	21.2
3.01 to 3.50	30	16.3
3.51 to 4.00	44	23.9

A total of 183 respondees provided information on their full-time verses part-time student status. Over one-half, 52.8 percent, were enrolled as a part-time student, denoted as less than 12 hours of enrollment. On average, they had enrolled a median 3.00 times in their current degree program with the range of enrollments being a low of one to a high of 9. The mean for this variable was 3.57 enrollments with a standard deviation of 1.93. Over two thirds had prior enrollment of two, three or four times. The majority of the other 5 had more enrollments; less than 10 percent reported one enrollment. The distribution, given in Table 8, was skewed to the right, skewness - 1.11, and more peaked than the normal curve, kurtosis - 1.07.

TABLE 8

Distribution of Enrollments of the Sample

Frequency	N	%
1	17	9.3
2	44	24.0
3	43	23.5
4	34	18.6
5	21	11.5
6	9	4.9
7	4	2.2
8	3	1.6
9	8	4.4

The current grade point average of the sample at Governors State University was gathered from the student data base. Their grades ranged from a low 0.50 to a high of 4.00 on a 4.00 scale of A=4 through F=0. Their median gpa was 2.89, whereas their mean transfer gpa was 2.85 with a standard deviation of 0.78. The distribution tended to be flatter than a normal curve, kurtosis = -0.33, and skewed to the left, skewness = -0.27. Refer to Table 9 for a summary of the transfer gpa's of the sample.

Almost 40 percent of the student had a B average -- a gpa of 3.00 to 3.50; whereas almost one fourth have an A average -- a gpa over 3.50 or a C average -- a gpa of 2.00 to 2.50. Less than four percent were in academic poor standing denoted as a grade point average of less than 2.00.

TABLE 9

Grade Point Average of the Sample

Range	N	%
0.00 to 0.50	2	1.1
0.51 to 1.00	2	1.1
1.01 to 1.50	2	1.1
1.51 to 2.00	22	12.0
2.01 to 2.50	43	23.5
2.51 to 3.00	44	24.0
3.01 to 3.50	25	13.7
3.51 to 4.00	43	12.0

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1953) is a 10 item instrument designed to yield a general measure of self esteem. While the research of Goldsmith (1986), Franzio and Herzoy (1986) and Openshaw et al (1981) supports the position that the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is multidimensional, the general thesis for the scale is supported by the independent inquiry of O'Brien (1985). Irrespective of the number of factors measured in the instrument, the issue has not precluded researchers from using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for the criterion in validation of other psychometric tools: Lorr and Wunderlich (1986) for the Social Assertiveness Inventory, Orme et al (1986) for the Center

for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, Robbins (1985) for the Career Decision Making Self-Efficiency Scale, Goldsmith (1985) for the Kirton Adoption-Innovation Inventory, Diener et al (1985) for the Satisfaction With Life Scale, Kinch et al (1983) for the Self Image Inventory, Gould (1982) for the Beck Depression Inventory.

Given this information, it was not surprising to find other support for using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. It was adapted for use in Holand. The Dutch version of the instrument was found to be useful in studying self-concept (Helbing, 1982).

Mooney Problem Check List

In addition to the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Mooney Problem Check List, Adult Form (Mooney and Gordon, 1950) was used in this study. One of the most impressive studies regarding the Mooney Problem Checklist was conducted by Dreger et al (1962) who by factor analysis verified that the subscales of the instrument were retained as originally developed. For entering students, Mayes and McConatha (1982) used the college form to identify four major problem areas: 1) adjustment to college work, 2) social-psychological relations, 3) personal-psychological relations, and 4) finances, living conditions and employment. Also, problems identified at the beginning of the school year tended to abate by the end of the academic year (Maurer, 1982).

Regarding college students seeking counseling, they had significantly more problems than those not having an appointment with the counseling center (Tyron, 1984). Another indication of the value of the Mooney Problem Check List was the research efforts of DeVito et al

(1972), who validated the Test Anxiety Inventory with the Mooney Problem Check List.

The Mooney Problem Check List is an instrument that is often used in the college setting with both traditional and nontraditional students. Mayes and McConatha (1982) suggested that programs based on student needs should be developed by use of the Mooney Problem Check List and that their programs should be evaluated for effectiveness by this checklist.

The participants also completed the Mooney Problem Check List. This instrument provided scores for 9 problem areas: Health, Economic Security, Self Improvement, Personal, Home-Family, Courtship, Sex, Religion and Occupation. For each scale, a total problem score was found; i.e., marked a common or major concern by the subject. A score by problem area was found by summing the issues on each area. Thus, the value of "0," the lowest score, denoted the lowest possible score to higher value signifying a greater problem.

Refer to Table 10 for a summary of the 9 Mooney Problem Check List scores. In all cases, the distribution tended to have a mode of 0 with the frequency abating as the value increased. Thus, it was not surprising to find curves more peaked than the normal distribution; i.e. kurtosis ranging from 1.59 to 9.51, and having tails to the right, skewness ranging from 1.39 to 2.85.

For this sample, courtship, sex and religion were minor in comparison to their concerns regarding personal, self improvement, economic security and home-family issues. Two concerns were between these clusterings. They were occupational and health related issues.

In addition to completing the demographic/scholastic information sheet, each participant returned back their completed responses to two psychometric instruments. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, an instrument designed to provide a broad based measure of self-esteem with ten items. The scaling of the responses was revised to yield a total score by summating the responses to the 10 items so that "1" on the four point Likert scale was the highest value of self-esteem with "4" representing the lowest possible measure of self-esteem. Thus, the theoretical minimum to maximum score was 10 to 40. The actual extremes were 10 and 30 with a medium of 20.00. The mean of distribution provided in Table 11 was 18.64 with the standard deviation being 5.06. The distribution, in comparison to the normal curve, was flatter--kurtosis equal to -0.88 -- and tailed to the left--skewness equal to -0.27.

Those with more negative self-esteems tended to cluster nearer the median. Only 9.3 percent were five scale value from this measure of central tendency whereas over 25 percent of those with high self-esteem clustered beyond the five point range of the median.

TABLE 10

Summary of the Nine Mooney Problem Check List Subscales Distribution

Area	Extreme Scores		Central Tendency		Standard	Kurtosis	Skewness
	Low	High	Median	Mean	Deviation		
Health	0	14	2.00	2.44	2.79	2.14	1.46
Economic Security	0	20	3.00	3.97	4.44	1.59	1.39
Self Improvement	0	22	3.00	4.10	4.40	2.64	1.51
Personal	0	31	4.00	5.24	5.76	4.31	1.87
Home-Family	0	19	2.00	3.38	3.92	3.08	1.66
Courtship	0	11	0.00	0.88	1.82	9.51	2.85
Sex	0	7	0.00	0.95	1.51	2.08	1.66
Religion	0	11	0.00	1.14	1.74	8.40	2.40
Occupation	0	13	1.00	1.76	2.32	4.21	1.76

TABLE 11

Distribution of Total Score of Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for the Sample

Range	N	%
10-12	32	17.4
13-15	19	10.3
16-18	28	15.2
19-21	40	21.7
22-24	48	26.1
25-27	13	7.1
28-30	4	2.2

Hypothesis, Research Question, and Statistical Procedure

Five hypotheses were tested in this study and two research operations were addressed. Each is cited. The statistical procedure for each is also set forth.

Hypothesis One

There is a significant relationship between subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) and student demographic variables. More specifically:

1. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and age.
2. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and gender.

3. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and ethnic group.
4. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and marital status.
5. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and number of children.
6. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and current employment status.

The age analysis was conducted by use of Pearson product moment correlation (r) procedure with p set at less than 0.05. However, there were nine testings. Thus, the p-level was adjusted to 0.0056; i.e. 0.05 divided by 9.

The gender analysis was conducted by use of the t-test for independent scores. In addition, the mean and standard deviation of each sex were described. As cited above, the 0.05 p-level was adjusted to 0.0056.

The ethnic group, marital status and current employment status analysis was conducted by use of the analysis of variance procedure. The means and standard deviation of each group were generated with the hypothesis p-level adjusted to 0.0056. If an ANOVA was found to be statistically significant, the Scheffeè multiple comparison procedure was employed to ascertain which pair of means was associated with the overall rejection of the null hypothesis.

For number of children, the r was generated and tested with an adjusted p-level of 0.0056. The rationale was cited above.

Hypothesis Two

There is a significant relationship between subscale of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) and student scholastic variables. More specifically:

1. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and transfer grade point average.
2. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and the duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU.
3. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and the number of terms of enrollment after reentry to GSU.
4. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and current cumulative grade point average.
5. There is a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student enrollment status.

Each scholastic variable was correlated with the subsector of the MPCL. Since there were 9 MPCL scales, the p-level of 0.05 was adjusted to 0.0056; i.e. 0.05 divided by 9, to test the r value.

Hypothesis Three

There will be a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSES) and the student demographic variables.

1. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and age of the reentry adult student.

2. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and the gender of the reentry adult student.
3. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and ethnic group of the reentry adult student.
4. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and the marital status of the reentry adult student.
5. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and number of children of the reentry adult student.
6. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and current employment status.

Age and number of children were tested by the Pearson product moment correlation procedure. Regarding gender, the t-test was used. For ethnic status, for marital status and for current employment status analysis of variance was used. For gender, ethnic status, and marital status, mean and standard deviation of each classification were described. If an ANOVA was found to be statistically significant, the Scheffeè multiple comparison procedure was used to identify which pair of means was associated with the rejection of the overall comparison. For each testing, the p-level was set at less than 0.05, for there was only one RSES scale, not nine as with the MPCL.

Hypothesis Four

There is a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and student scholastic variables.

1. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and transfer grade point average of the reentry adult student.
2. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and the duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU.
3. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and the number of terms of enrollment after reentry to GSU.
4. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and current cumulative grade point average.
5. There is a significant relationship between the RSES and student enrollment status.

For each scholastic variable, the Pearson product moment correlation procedure was applied. The p-level was set at 0.05.

Hypothesis Five

There is a significant relationship between the subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale.

The Pearson r was the statistic of choice. Since 9 r's were generated, one for each scale of the MPCL, the p-level was set at 0.0056; i.e. 0.05 divided by 9.

Questions:

How do the six demographic variables (age, gender, ethnic group, marital status, number of children, and employment status) and five scholastic variables (transfer grade point average, duration between last attending college and reentry to GSU, number of terms of enrollment

after reentry, reentry cumulative grade point average, and full-part time enrollment) singularly and in combination predict subscale scores of the Money Problem Check List and the total Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale? Succinctly, what is the interrelationship among the five demographic variables, among the four scholastic variables, among the nine predictors, and which variable(s) serve(s) as the best predictor(s) of each psychometric measure - subscales of the MPCL and the RSES.

The correlation approach required a coding of nominal variables with three or more values to be recorded as binary variables. This conversion was as follows: Ethnic background (minority =1, majority =2), marital status (other =1, married =2) and employment (other =1, full-time = 2).

Multiple linear regression was applied. Twenty analyses were conducted. The six demographic independent variables were entered directly to generate 10 regression equations: nine for the subscales of the MPCL and one for the RSES. The five scholastic variables were then applied in a similar manner.

Since the desired p-level for one testing was 0.05, the alpha level was addended. The 0.05 divided by 20, the number of testings, yield the value of 0.0025. This was applied.

Summary

There were five hypotheses and two research questions. These were investigated per the procedure detailed in this chapter. The statistical analysis is presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter presents the findings of the testing of five hypotheses and of the answering of two questions. The seven issues were raised in the first chapter and the methodology for inquiry was obtained in the third chapter. Each hypothesis and question is presented, and each is addressed per the procedure previously specified.

Hypothesis One

There will be a significant relationship between subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) and student demographic variables.

For age, 9 r's were generated. They are reported in Table 12. The adjusted p- level was 0.0056; i.e., 0.05 divided by 9. The null hypothesis was not rejected for health, economic security, self improvement, personal, home-family, sex, religion and occupation. The correlations were sufficiently close to zero to result in the cited statistical decision. Only for courtship, with the r of -0.2150, was the null hypothesis rejected. For this variable, younger adults reported significantly more problems than their older peers. For the most part there tended to be limited difference in reported problems by age.

TABLE 12

Pearson Correlation Between Age and MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p
Health	-0.0142	.850
Economic Security	0.0292	.694
Social	0.0637	.392
Personal	-0.1129	.128
Home Family	-0.1769	.016
Courtship	-0.2150	.004
Sex	-0.2027	.006
Religion	-0.0393	.598
Occupation	0.0058	.932

df = 181

For gender, 9 *t*'s were generated and are reported in Table 13. The adjusted p-level was 0.0056; i.e., 0.05 divided by 9. In each case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, males and females had similar MPCL subscale scores.

TABLE 13

Gender Difference on MPCL Subscales

Subscale	Female		Male		t-	p-
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	value	level
Health	2.68	3.00	1.86	2.15	1.86	0.064
Economic Security	3.87	4.32	4.19	4.75	-0.45	0.656
Social	4.64	4.58	3.05	3.80	2.31	0.022
Personal	5.29	5.92	5.14	5.51	0.17	0.866
Home Family	3.19	3.79	3.66	4.16	-0.76	0.451
Courtship	0.81	1.70	1.03	2.08	-0.76	0.451
Sex	0.93	1.47	0.97	1.58	-0.16	0.871
Religion	1.19	1.75	1.07	1.73	0.46	0.649
Occupation	1.55	2.13	2.10	2.57	-1.51	0.172
df=181	10.15	5.15	19.63	4.78	-1.85	0.066

Regarding ethnic background, the mean and standard deviation by groups for the 9 MPCL scales are presented in Table 14. Per Table 1, there were only 15 students who were not Black or Caucasian. Thus, mean for Asian, Hispanic and Native American could be effected by extreme scores more than for the other groupings. ANOVA was applied nine times to ascertain if there was a significant difference in the five means, one for each ethnic group. The adjusted p-level was 0.0056. In each case, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There were no difference in the means of MPCL issues among Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic and Native American adult students.

TABLE 14

Ethnic Group Difference on the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	Asian		Black		Caucasian		Hispanic		Native Amer		F	p-level
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
Health	2.00	2.00	2.14	2.63	2.69	2.95	1.50	1.58	5.00	5.66	1.11	0.354
Economic Security	2.33	2.52	4.35	4.87	3.67	4.16	3.40	4.38	7.50	6.36	0.68	0.608
Self Improvement	3.67	2.89	3.96	3.79	4.02	4.91	5.60	4.03	5.50	0.71	0.37	0.831
Personal	6.00	5.00	4.23	4.42	5.59	6.39	6.10	5.34	16.00	9.90	2.50	0.044
Home Family	7.33	5.51	3.51	4.09	2.92	3.59	4.90	4.63	6.00	7.07	1.76	0.138
Courtship	0.00	0.00	0.91	1.96	0.94	1.82	0.10	0.32	0.50	0.71	0.69	0.623
Sex	1.33	2.31	1.04	1.67	0.92	1.44	0.60	0.97	0.50	0.71	0.30	0.878
Religion	0.67	0.58	1.00	1.64	1.26	1.87	1.10	1.66	1.00	0.00	0.29	0.885
Occupational	1.00	1.00	2.01	2.62	1.70	2.17	0.80	1.75	3.00	1.42	0.88	0.480

df- 4 and 178

Refer to Table 15 for a descriptive summary of the marital status grouping: married, single, divorced and widowed. As noted in Table 4, there were only four cases for widowed. When the ANOVA procedure was applied to each MPCL variable, the null hypothesis was not rejected each time. The adjusted p-level was 0.0056. Thus, there was no difference in the MPCL by marital status.

TABLE 15

Marital Status Difference on the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	Married		Single		Divorced		Widowed		F	p-level
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
Health	2.25	2.46	2.84	3.07	1.86	2.73	4.25	4.92	1.57	0.199
Economic Security	3.45	4.37	4.36	4.12	4.48	5.22	5.25	5.36	0.80	0.495
Self Improvement	4.30	4.62	3.81	3.77	3.24	3.72	10.75	8.30	3.73	0.012
Personal	5.98	6.35	4.89	5.54	3.34	3.89	8.50	3.87	2.06	0.107
Home-Family	3.56	4.08	3.55	4.03	2.24	3.22	4.75	2.22	1.08	0.358
Courtship	0.45	1.40	1.41	2.32	1.07	1.46	0.50	1.00	3.73	0.012
Sex	0.71	1.26	1.27	1.61	1.03	1.90	0.50	1.00	1.83	0.143
Religion	1.28	1.64	1.20	2.08	0.62	1.12	1.00	1.15	1.11	0.347
Occupation	1.71	2.35	1.88	2.04	1.72	2.88	1.25	1.89	0.13	0.942

The 9 r's between subscale of the MPCL and number of children are reported in Table 16. All r's were not statistically significant per the adjusted p-level of 0.0056. Thus, all null hypotheses were not rejected; no differences were found by the number of children the adult student had.

TABLE 16

Pearson Correlation Between Number of Children and MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p
Health	-0.0895	0.226
Economic Security	0.0943	0.204
Self Improvement	-0.0407	0.584
Personal	-0.0898	0.226
Home Family	0.0950	0.200
Courtship	-0.0787	0.288
Sex	-0.0368	0.620
Religion	-0.0908	0.220
Occupation	-0.1531	0.038

Refer to Table 17 for the descriptive summary of the employment status groupings: full-time, part-time and not employed. When the ANOVA was applied to each MPCL variable, the null hypothesis was not rejected each time. Thus, there was no difference in the MPCL by employment status.

TABLE 17

Employment Status Difference on the MPCL Subscales

	Full Time		Part Time		Not Employed		F	p-level
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
Health	2.47	2.17	2.53	2.40	2.61	2.07	0.08	0.920
Economic Security	3.71	4.19	3.39	4.01	3.64	3.96	0.28	0.759
Self Improvement	3.97	3.17	4.16	3.61	3.45	3.42	0.85	0.430
Personal	5.17	5.01	5.47	4.97	5.63	4.80	0.99	0.374
Home-Family	4.17	3.91	4.50	4.02	4.86	4.17	0.58	0.563
Courtship	0.90	1.42	1.21	1.49	1.36	1.57	3.42	0.035
Sex	0.50	1.27	0.61	1.36	0.73	1.50	3.29	0.039
Religion	1.20	1.09	1.37	1.21	1.26	1.07	0.65	0.523
Occupation	1.50	2.36	1.63	2.04	1.79	2.17	2.48	0.087

In summary, their were six analysis to investigate the relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student demographic variable. For four variables, no significant differences were found; specifically, there were no differences for gender, ethnic group, marital status, number of children, and employment status. For the nine testings for age, only one significant statistic was found. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. There was not a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student demographic variables, except for age and the MPCL subscale of courtship.

Hypothesis Two

There will be a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student scholastic variables.

Refer to Table 18 for the correlations of the MPCL subscales and transfer grade point average. Four r's were positive; health, self improvement, personal and religious. Only the self improvement correlation was significant suggesting that higher transfer grades were tied to more self improvement problems. The negative r's were found for the MPCL variables of economic security, home-family, courtship, sex and occupation. The only significant r was for sex. This suggested that more self-reported sex issues were found for those with lower transfer grade averages. Thus, in seven of the nine cases, no significant differences were found.

TABLE 18

Pearson Correlations Between Reentry Grade and the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p-level
Health	0.1375	0.064
Economic Security	-0.1439	0.054
Self Improvement	0.2496	0.001
Personal	0.0847	0.256
Home-Family	-0.0776	0.300
Courtship	-0.2048	0.006
Sex	-0.2952	0.001
Religion	0.1179	0.114
Occupation	-0.0407	0.586

The relationship between subscales of the MPCL and the variable of time between prior enrollment and reentry are given in Table 19. Four correlations - those for economic security, home-family, religion, and occupation - were positive, but negative r's were found for the health, self improvement, personal, courtship and sex MPCL scales. In all cases, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was not a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and time between enrollments.

TABLE 19

Pearson Correlations Between Time Between Enrollment and the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p-level
Health	-0.0776	0.296
Economic Security	0.1690	0.022
Self Improvement	-0.1760	0.814
Personal	-0.1219	0.100
Home-Family	0.0695	0.350
Courtship	-0.0510	0.496
Sex	-0.0720	0.338
Religion	0.0594	0.428
Occupation	0.0192	0.798

Nine r's were computed to investigate the relationship between the number of terms of enrollment and subscales of the MPCL. None of the correlations, presented in Table 20, were statistically significant.

TABLE 20

Pearson Correlations Between Terms of Enrollment and the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p-level
Health	0.0218	0.772
Economic Security	0.0401	0.594
Self Improvement	0.1755	0.018
Personal	-0.0087	0.908
Home-Family	-0.0646	0.384
Courtship	-0.0373	0.616
Sex	-0.0588	0.430
Religion	0.1044	0.160
Occupation	-0.0105	0.888

The relationships between subscale of the MPCL and transfer grade average are summarized in Table 21. Per the adjusted p-level of 0.0056, all correlations were not statistically significant.

TABLE 21

Pearson Correlations Between Transfer Grade Average and the MPCL Subscales

Subscale	r	p-level
Health	0.1619	0.028
Economic Security	-0.0249	0.738
Self Improvement	0.2031	0.006
Personal	0.0673	0.364
Home-Family	-0.0712	0.338
Courtship	-0.1466	0.048
Sex	-0.1876	0.010
Religion	0.0673	0.364
Occupation	-0.0380	0.608

In summary, there were four analyses to investigate the relationship between subscale of the MPCL and student scholastic variable. For three variables - time between enrollments, terms of enrollment and transfer grade average - no significant differences were found. For transfer grade point average, the null hypothesis was not rejected in seven cases. Only for the MPCL subscales of social and of sex, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Three

There will be a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) and the student demographic valuables.

Regarding age, the r was -0.2573. This was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Thus, older subjects had significantly higher self-esteem as measured by the RSES. The instrument was scaled so that low values had higher self-esteem.

For gender, the mean RSES scale for family was 18.15 with a standard discretion of 5.15. For males, their mean RSES score was 19.63 with a standard deviation of 4.78. The t-statistics to compare the mean was 1.85 with df=181. No difference was found ($p < 0.066$).

Regarding ethnic group, the mean RSES by classification as well as the standard deviation are given in Table 22. Refer to Table 23 for the ANOVA summary table. The null hypothesis was not rejected. There was not a significant difference in the RSES scores of the Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic, and Native American ethnic group.

TABLE 22
Ethnic Group Summary on the RSES

Group	$\bar{X}$	SD
Asian	20.33	5.51
Black	18.83	4.67
Caucasian	18.25	5.08
Hispanic	19.80	7.22
Native American	24.00	5.66

TABLE 23

ANOVA to Compare Mean RSES Scores By Ethnic Group

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Among	4	101.75	25.44	0.99
Within	178	4574.63	25.70	
Total	182	4676.38		

Presented in Table 24 is the descriptive summary of the RSES by marital status. The means of the group varied a maximum of 2.45 to a minimum of 0.45. Thus, it was not surprising to find per Table 25 that the null hypothesis was retained ($p > 0.05$).

TABLE 24

Marital Status Summary on the RSES

Group	$\bar{X}$	SD
Married	17.55	5.40
Single	20.00	3.55
Divorced	19.00	6.19
Widowed	18.00	4.97

TABLE 25

ANOVA to Compare Mean RSES Scores By Marital Status

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Among	3	92.31	30.77	1.20
Within	179	4584.07	25.61	
Total	182	4676.38		

The relationship between RSES and number of children was found to be an r of -0.0423. This was not statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Presented in Table 26 is a descriptive summary of the RSES by employment status. The means were most similar. Thus, it was not surprising to find per Table 27 that the null hypothesis was retained ($p > 0.05$).

TABLE 26

Employment Status Summary on the RSES

Group	$\bar{X}$	SD
Full-Time	18.91	5.29
Part-Time	18.22	4.47
Not Employed	17.79	4.86

TABLE 27

ANOVA to Compare Mean RSES Scores By Employment Status

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Among	2	50.47	25.34	0.99
Within	180	4625.91	25.70	
Total	182	4676.38		

There were six testings of the relationship between RSES and student demographic variables. For gender, ethnic group, marital status, employment status and number of children, the null hypothesis was not rejected. On the other hand, it was rejected for age. In 4 of the 5 testings, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, there was no difference in RSES by student demographic variables.

Hypothesis Four

There was a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and student scholastic variables. To test this hypothesis, the RSES was correlated with transfer grade point average, time lapse between prior and current enrollments, number of term of enrollment in reentry experience and current reentry grade point average. Refer to Table 28 for these statistics.

The null hypothesis was not rejected for two variables: number of terms of enrollment in the reentry experience and time between past and current college enrollment. For grades, both transfer and current, there was a significant negative correlation. Those with higher grades, in comparison to those with lower, had higher self-esteem as measured by the RSES. The scaling on the RSES with lower values were tied with higher self-esteem, and the converse was the case for high RSES scores.

TABLE 28

Pearson Correlation Between Student Variables

Variable	r	p-level
Transfer Grades	-0.4911	0.0001
Time Between Enrollment	-0.1346	0.0680
Terms of Enrollment	-0.1006	0.1800
Current Grades	-0.3652	0.0001

Thus, the null hypothesis was found to be plausible for transfer grades and for current grades but not for time between enrollment and number of enrollments. The null hypothesis was generally rejected. There was a significant correlation between student scholastic variable and RSES.

Hypothesis Five

There was a significant relationship between Mooney Problem Check List subscales and the Rosenberg Self Esteem scale. The nine r's are reported in Table 29. Eight of the correlations were positive, the exception being for the MPCL scale of social. Thus, there tended to be positive r's between the MPCL scales and the RSES. This suggested that those with higher self-esteem had few problems. The RSES is scaled with lower values denoting higher self-worth.

Four of the correlations were statistically significant per the adjusted p-level of 0.0056. These were for economic security, personal, courtship and sex. The non-significant positive r's were for health, home-family, religion and occupation. This, the null hypothesis was generally rejected in this case. There was a significant relationship between the MPCL subscale and the RSES.

TABLE 29

Pearson Correlation Between Subscales of the MPCL and the RSES

Subscale	r	p-level
Health	0.1120	0.130
Economic Security	0.2133	0.004
Self Improvement	-0.0175	0.814
Personal	0.3048	0.001
Home Family	0.2046	0.016
Courtship	0.2350	0.002
Sex	0.2864	0.001
Religion	0.0116	0.876
Occupation	0.1625	0.028

Questions

A total of twenty multiple regression analyses were evaluated. For one half of these, the six student demographic variables - age, gender, ethnic group, marital status, number of children, and employment status - were the independent variables, and the dependent variables were the nine MPCL subscales and the RSES. Since ethnic group, marital status, and employment status were nominal variables with three or more categories, these variables were recoded into binary variants. The recoding were: ethnic background (minority = 1, majority = 2), marital status (other = 1, married = 2), and employment (other = 1, full-time = 2).

The correlations between the psychometric measures and the demographic variables with the cited recodings are presented in Table 30. The 60 r's were small; only four had absolute values exceeding 0.20.

TABLE 30

Correlation between the Psychometric Variables and Student Demographic Variables

Test and/or Subtest	Demographic Variable					
	Age	Gender	Ethnic Group	Marital Status	Number of Children	Employment Status
MPCL:						
Health	-.0142	-.1373	.0994	.0638	-.0895	-.0194
Economic Security	.0292	.0332	.0620	.1109	.0943	.0232
Self Improvements	.0637	-.1690	-.0180	-.0422	-.0407	-.0654
Personal	-.1129	-.0126	.0683	-.1217	-.0898	.1039
Home Family	-.1769	.0561	-.1268	-.0456	.0950	.0794
Courtship	-.2150	.0563	.0457	.2253	-.0787	.1571
Sex	-.2027	.0121	-.0228	.1504	-.0368	-.0128
Religion	-.0303	-.0339	.0753	-.0768	-.0908	-.0712
Occupation	.0058	.1116	-.0345	.0198	-.1531	-.1266
RSES	-.2573	.1364	-.0854	.2047	-.0423	.1978

Refer to APPENDIX B for the 10 regression analyses with the student demographic variables as the independent variable and the psychometric

data as the dependent variables. The adjusted p-level was 0.0056. For all MPCL scale analyses, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This was not surprising since the correlations reported in Table 30 were not statistically significant ($p<0.0056$). For the RSES scale, the opposite was the case; the regression analysis was found to be significant ($p<0.0056$), and this was generally tied to the significant correlations reported in Table 27; i.e., that reported for age.

The correlations between the psychometric variables and student scholastic variables are presented in Table 31. The r's for the grade variable with psychometric measures exceeded them for the other student scholastic variables. Regarding the grade average variables, the RSES correlations were remarkably stronger then those with the subscales of the MPCL.

Refer to APPENDIX C for the 10 regression analysis with the student scholastic variables as the independent variables and the psychometric data as the dependent variables. The adjusted p-level was 0.0056. For all MPCL scale analysis, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This was not surprising since the correlation reported in Table 31 were not statistically significant ($p<0.0056$). For the RSCE scale, the opposite was the case; the regression analysis was found to be significant ($p<0.0056$), and this was generally tied to significant grade correlations reported in Table 31; i.e., those reported for transfer and current gpa's.

TABLE 31

Correlations Between the Psychometric Variables and Student Scholastic Variables

Test and/or Subtest	Grade Point Average		Time Between Enrollments	Enrollment After Reentry	Full Position Status
	Transfer	Current			
MPCL:					
Health	.1375	.1619	-.0776	-.0909	.0218
Economic Security	-.1439	-.0249	.1690	-.0300	.0401
Self Improvement	.2496	.2031	-.0176	-.0716	.1755
Personal	.0847	.0673	-.1219	-.0601	-.0087
Home Family	-.0776	-.0712	-.0921	.0695	-.0220
Courtship	-.2048	-.1466	-.1829	.0989	-.0510
Sex	-.2952	-.1876	-.0851	-.0883	-.0720
Religion	.1179	.0673	-.0964	-.0463	.0594
Occupation	-.0407	-.0380	.1510	-.1580	.0192
RSES	-.4911	-.3652	-.1346	.1682	-.1006

Summary

Some generalizations are drawn from the testings of the null hypothesis and the answering of the research question. These are:

1. The MPCL does not correlate with student demographic variates nor student scholastic variables.

2. The RSES does not correlate with student demographic variates nor student scholastic variables.

3. There is an overlap in self-esteem as measured by the RSES and issues confronting adult college students as measured by the MPCL.

4. When analyzed form a multivariate approach, student demographic variables were related to the RSES scale but, not the MPCL subscales.

5. When analyzed from a multivariate approach, student scholastic variables were related to the RSES scale, but not the MPCL subscales.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

In this chapter a discussion of the study's results in terms of the stated hypothesis and research questions will be presented. The findings will be discussed with regard to the related research described in Chapter II. The implications and limitations of this study will be presented. Finally, suggestions for further research will be offered.

As previously stated, the number of adult students on college campuses has increased dramatically; however, there has been little research conducted on this group of students (Johnson, 1984). Consequently, many if not most colleges are ill prepared to best meet the needs of adult college students (Templin, 1984). The purpose of this study was to add to the body of knowledge in this area. Specifically, the two fold purpose of this study was: 1) to describe reentry adult undergraduate (junior/senior) students in terms of self esteem, personal problems, demographic variables and academic variables, and 2) to determine the relationship between self esteem and personal problems and their effect on the reentry adult students' progress toward successful degree completion. In addition the results of this study are intended to provide student service personnel with a better

understanding of the reentry adult student and to assist them in the prevention or correction of problems that may prohibit these students from successful degree completion.

There are many reasons adult students return to college, with the most common reason being career advancement (Hapanski, 1983; Augustin, 1986), and self improvement (Reehling, 1980). Weissburg (1986) found that more than half of the adult students studied were both women and married. Two-thirds were enrolled full time, forty-two percent had children and three-fourths were employed while enrolled in school. The most common problems for these returning students were demands on time, family responsibilities, financial concerns, little time to study and parking. Flannery (1986) indicated the two main barriers for adults returning to school were finding a balance between time spent with family and school and a balance between family and job demands.

In preparing their return to school, adult students have often found a severe discrepancy between their expectations and actual experience in higher education (Weil, 1986). Steltenpohl and Shipton (1986) indicate adults need to have a realistic self-appraisal of their potential as adult learners and that they often anticipate problems and obstacles (Richer and Whitten, 1984). Babcock (1984) cited over/under confidence as a major barrier to reentry adult students' academic success. Also, Champagne (1987) identified the adult student's self concept as an important variable with regard to their educational participation and achievement.

Patterson and Blake (1985) indicate that once classes begin reentry adult students experienced more role conflict than before their return

to college. Hildreth et at (1983) also cited this role change as significant, but indicated the families of these students were generally supportive of their role of students. In addition it was noted that reentry women reported less school related stress, fewer stress symptoms and greater satisfaction regarding their school achievements than their more traditional counterparts (Jacobi, 1987). Pickering and Galvin-Schaefers (1988) found that reentry working women did not exhibit depressed scores on measures of self esteem.

Several types of intervention strategies have been identified to assist reentry students in their adjustment to college. These include a series of noncredit self improvement workshops (Roy, 1986), peer counseling (Mohsenih, 1980), academic skills courses (Prahl, 1980); flexible course scheduling (Hall, 1980), evening programs, weekend colleges and summer programs (Fisher-Thompson, 1980).

The findings of the current study were found to be concordant of the prior research. Our data is consistent with the review of the literature in that we have confirmed that both economic and self improvement issues do exist for reentry adult students. The current study also supports the reviews of literature in the findings that the self esteem of reentry adults is related to their academic success. Since the reentry adult student population in this study tends to have similarities to those in other studies this confirms the findings of research discussed below, as well as adding to the literature regarding specific types of problems and their relationship to academic success. This study also adds to the body of knowledge regarding self esteem and

its relationship to academic success. The following generalizations for adult reentry students were cross validated by this study:

This research indicates that economic problems and concerns were issues with which reentry students in this study were confronted. This is directly supportive of the study by Meers & Gilkison (1985) who identified money as a primary barrier to academic success for adult students. Kaplin (1981) also cited financial problems as a deterrent to adults returning to school.

Following are examples from this current study of Mooney Problem Check List items related to economic concerns: 1) Transportation or commuting problems, 2) Getting into debt, 3) Can't seem to make ends meet 4) Too little money for recreation 5) Needing money for education or training 6) Not having a systematic savings plan 7) Worried about security in my old age and 8) Unsure of future financial support. Given this adult population and the problems they encounter, it is reasonable to conclude that their concerns regarding economic issues center around both the current problems of financing their education, maintaining their current existence and their financial security after graduation.

In addition to economic concerns, this study indicates that reentry adult students have a series of self improvement issues. This is in support of the review of the literature with regard to studies by Hapanski (1983); Augustin (1986) who cite career advancement as a major reason adults return to school. Reehling (1980) refers to self improvement issues as the primary reason adults return to academics. Improvement in economic status and career related improvements were also

cited as reasons adults return to school (Martin, 1980); (Weissburg, 1986). Following are examples of Mooney Problem Check List items from this current study related to self improvement issues: 1) Not being as efficient as I would like, 2) Not using my leisure time well, 3) Wishing I had a better educational background, 4) Not having enough time for recreation, and 5) Wanting to improve my mind. Given the reentry adult population in this study and the problems they encounter, it is reasonable to conclude that their personal improvement issues center around use and availability of time and educational improvement.

This study relates to the review of the literature in looking at personal improvement issues for returning adult students. Weissburg (1986) cited that two of the most problematic areas for adult students were demands on time and too little time to study. This above study also identified programs such as consumer rights, professional writing and legal and equal rights that would benefit reentry students and help them with self improvement. Other barriers for reentry adult students were identified as balancing family and school time and balancing job demands (Flannery, 1986). Cramer (1981) identified time management as one of the problems encountered by adult students. Also in support of the current study, conflicts with family time schedules were cited as issues for reentry adult students (Higgins, 1985).

This study relates to the review of the literature in looking at self esteem issues for returning adult students. Babcock (1984) discussed over/under confidence as a barrier to academic success. Champagne (1987) states that self concept is an important factor with regard to reentry students' educational participation and achievement.

Caracelli's (1986) research indicates that a relationship does exist between self esteem and academic performance. The results of this current study add to the previous research by showing that reentry students with both high transfer GPAs and high current GPAs tend to have higher self esteem. In addition, current research indicates that older reentry students clustering near the age of 50 years, tend to have higher self esteem than those reentry adult students nearer the age of 25 years.

The above generally described the findings of this study as they relate to the prevailing literature. The following is a description of the detailed findings of this study. The results of the five hypothesis and two research questions are now cited.

There tended to be a nonsignificant relationship between subscales of the Mooney Problem Check List and the student demographic variables. Only courtship and age were significantly correlated; the correlation between age and the other eight MPCL subscales were nonsignificant. Regarding gender, all nine MPCL comparison by male versus female were nonsignificant. The same result was found for ethnic background in the Asian, Black Caucasian, Hispanic and Native American comparison.

As with the above, no meaningful differences were found by marital status per the comparison of married, single, divorced versus widowed. The same statistical decision was made when the MPCL subscales were correlated to the number of children their adult students had. That is, no significant differences were found.

Turning to the second hypothesis, the relationship of the MPCL to

student scholastic variables, four testings were undertaken. For three variables--time between enrollments, terms of current enrollment, and transfer grade point average -- no meaningful differences or trends were evident. Regarding reentry grade average and the nine MPCL subscales, two correlations were significant - those for social and for sex. Thus, the generalization was made that there was not a significant relationship between subscales of the MPCL and student scholastic variables.

The third hypothesis was that there was a significant relationship between the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scales and student demographic variables. For age, it was found that older adult students, in comparison to their younger peers, had significantly higher self-esteem as measured by the RSES. The opposite finding was noted for the other student demographic variables. More specifically, no meaningful differences were found by gender, a male vs. female comparison, by ethnic group, an Asian vs. Black vs. Caucasian vs. Hispanic vs. Native American comparison, and by marital status, a married vs. single vs. divorced vs. widowed comparison. Lastly, the correlation between number of children and RSES was not statistically significant. Thus, there was not a significant relationship between student demographic variables and the RSES.

The fourth hypothesis was that there was a significant relationship between the RSES and student scholastic variables. For time between enrollment and term of current enrollment, the correlations were nonsignificant. On the other hand, significant correlations were found between the RSES and transfer grade point average as well as re-enrollment grade average. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. For

the most part, there was a significant relationship between the RSES and student scholastic variables.

The fifth hypothesis was that there was a significant relationship between the RSES and subscales of the MPCL. For five MPCL subscales - health, social, home-family, religion and occupation - non significant correlations were found. On the other hand, significant correlations were noted between the RSES and the MPCL subscales of economic security, courtship and sex.

In addition to the five hypothesis, two questions were posed. The findings of these inquiries are now elaborated upon. For the MPCL, the demographic variables and the scholastic variables were not either singularly or in combination significant independent predictors for the nine subscales. The opposite was the case for the RSES. The student variables, both demographic as well as scholastic, were significant independent predictors as total subsets and generally as singular independent variables. Age was the significant student demographic predictor, and grade averages, both current and transfer, were the significant student scholastic predictors.

Implications

The current study is an important step in understanding and describing adult reentry students and the relationship between their personal problems, self esteem and their academic success. Caracelli (1986) represents one of the first attempts to relate self esteem to academic success. This current investigation into adult students has

added to the literature by examining other variables that affect adult students' ability to achieve academic success.

The results of this study lend support to the development of counseling intervention programs targeted at improving the self esteem of the younger reentry adult population. Previous research has not indicated the relationship between low self esteem and specific problems and their relationship to academic success (Champagne, 1987). Counseling interventions have been effective in improving individual self esteem and the individual's ability to cope with personal problems. On the basis of this study, it is believed that intervention programs could improve self esteem, ability to cope with personal problems and ultimately increase academic success and subsequent degree completion of reentry students. Some suggestions for intervention programs are mandatory orientation programs targeted toward the goals of 1) reducing anxiety by interacting with both the reentry adults and faculty within the student's academic major and 2) making students aware of university requirements they must meet in order to achieve degree completion and services available to assist them in meeting these requirements; early assessment of students personal, career and academic needs; peer support programs; early academic advising; group counseling programs designed to give support as well as information related to areas of personal growth, balancing job, school and family, coping with stress and academic related areas such as reducing test anxiety, study skills and note taking strategies. Academic Early Warning Programs and mandatory Academic Probation programs may be initiated to assist students experiencing academic difficulty. In addition, the use of

individual and group counseling is suggested as a component of these programs to help the reentry adult student to achieve personal as well as academic success.

While the programming efforts, given the variance in student population by campus, are expected to differ across the nation, the literature provides some most insightful guidance. Value clarification and decision making are obvious prerequisites for success (Hetherington and Hudson, 1981). Career issues are often a most problematic area and should be addressed if desired by the students (Martin, 1980, Speer and Derfman, 1986). Finally refresher courses including those in basic skills are a significant component for successfully challenging the curriculum (Chickering and Obstfeld, 1982).

Recommendations

Issues, concerns, students, their problems and other relevant issues vary from campus to campus. Thus, it is recommended that the unique circumstances indigenous to each environment be studied in detail so that the programming efforts best meeting the needs of the adult students can be developed and implemented. A most logical basis for inquiry is the research reviewed in this study and extended by this inquiry. These are: self esteem is correlated with problems and is in turn correlated with academic success; younger adult students tend to have proportionally more issues to resolve than their older peers, and their is a wide range of options to assist students in overcoming the issues they are encountering.

These generalizations should be validated by future research. Until empirical evidence is found to refute the above, the described interplay of age, self-esteem, problems encountered and academic success stand as the best multivariant explanation of the adult college student experience.

References

Augustin, J.W. (1986). Adult Students and Career Planning. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, September, 1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number ED262225).

Babcock, Robert J. (1984). How to Succeed in College: A Guide for the Nontraditional Student. Association of American Publishers, New York, N.Y.

Badenhoop, M. Suzanne & Johanson, M. Kelly. (1980). Do Reentry Women Have Special Needs? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4, 591-595.

Baldwin, Anne Newburg. (1980). Making Your Experiences Count Towards a College Degree. Women's Work, 6, 5-9.

Balkin, Joseph. (1987). Contributions of Friends to Women's Fear of Success in College. Psychological Reports, 61, 39-42.

Bean, John P. & Metzner, Barbara S. (1985). A Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Undergraduate Student Attrition. Review of Educational Research, 55, 485-540.

Beutell, Nicholas J. & O'Hare, Marianne M. (1987). Coping with Role Conflicts Among Returning Students; Professional Versus Nonprofessional Women. Journal of College Student Personal, 28, 141-145.

Blanshan, Sue A., Burns, Joan & Geib, Aleta. (1984, March). Re-entry Student Survey: Office of Women's Services, The Ohio State University Preliminary Report. ASHE 1984 Annual Meeting Paper. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, IL.

Caracelli, Valerie J. (1986, April). The Career Goals of Reentry Women: A Not So Hidden Agenda. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Champagnè, Delight E. (1987). Disadvantaged adult learners: Can career counseling enhance adult education program effectiveness? Adult Education Quarterly, 37, 63-77.

Chickering, Arthur W. (1981). A Collaborative Approach to Aiding a Woman Returning to College. Humanist Educator, 20, 167-172.

Copeland-Wood, Barbara A. (1985, November). Older Commuter Students and the Collegiate Experience: Involved or Detached? Paper presented at the Conference of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, Milwaukee, WI.

Corrado, Thomas J. & Mangano, Joseph A. (1982, March). The Making and Seeding of RASP: Development and Dissemination of a Model to Ease the Reentry Process of Adult Students in Two-Year Colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Covitz, Sharon Baum. (1980, April). The Effects of Career Counseling on Subsequent Job Satisfaction in Mature Women Returning to College. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Cincinnati, OH.

Cramer, Genevieve R. (1981). Study Skills Help for the Adult Woman Reentering College. Reading World, 21, 109-115.

Darkenwald, Gordon G. & Gavin, William J. (1987). Dropout as a function of discrepancies between expectations and actual experiences of the classroom social environment. Adult Education Quarterly, 37, 152-163.

DeGroot, Susan Crum. (1980). Female and Male Returnees: Glimpses of Two Distinct Populations. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 358-361.

DerKarabetian, Aghop & Best, Beverly. (1984). Motivations of Adult Women Attending College. (Report No. HE017867). California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED251006).

DeVito, Anthony J., Conetta, Mary, Tyron, Georgiana Shick, Kane, Alison & Carlson, Janet F. (1983, April). The Measurement of Test Anxiety. In Anthony J. Devito (chair), Papers presented at a Symposium of the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. Philadelphia, PA.

Diener, Ed, Emmons. Robert A. Larson, Randy J. & Griffin, Sharon. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71-75.

DiNuzzo, Theresa M. & Tolbert, E.L. (1981). Promoting the Personal Growth and Vocational Maturity of the Reentry Woman: A Group Approach. Journal of the NAWDAC, 45, 26-31.

Dreger, Ralph Mason, Cawunder, Patricia, Elder, S. Thomas, Gates, Donald, Johnson, A.B., Kemp, George P., Minder, Carolyn. (1983, March). A Standardization of the Mooney Problem Checklist-College Form. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Educational Testing Service, (1984). Older and Younger Graduate Students: A Comparison of Goals, Grades and GRE Scores. (Report No. ES-84-5; GREB-81-17R). Princeton, NJ: Clark, Mary Jo.

Epstein, Howard V. (1984, April). The Older College Student--A Changing Tradition. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Erikson, Erik H. (1963). Childhood and Society. New York: Norton. (Originally published 1950).

Erikson, Erik H. (1959). Identity and the Life Cycle. Psychological Issues Monograph 1. New York: International Universities Press.

Erikson, Erik H. (1968). Identity: Youth & Crisis. New York: Norton.

Farmer, Helen S. & Fyans, Leslie J., Jr. (1983). Married Women's Achievement and Career Motivation: The Influence of Some Environmental and Psychological Variables. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1, 358-372.

Fisher-Thompson, Jeanne. (1980). Obtaining a Degree: Alternative Options for Re-entry Women. Field Evaluation Report. (Grant No. G0679-01076). Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Fisher-Thompson, Jeanne. (1980). Barriers to Re-entry Women: College Transfer Policies, Residency and Graduation Requirements. Field Evaluation Draft. (Grant No. G006901070). Washington, DC: Office of Education

Fisher-Thompson, Jeanne. (1980). Re-entry Women and Graduate School. Field Evaluation Draft. (Grant No. G0079-01070) Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Fisher-Thompson, Jeanne & Kuhn, Julie A. (1981). Re-entry Women: Relevant Statistics. Field Evaluation Draft. (Grant No. G007901070) Washington, DC: Women's Educational Equity Act Program.

Flannery, Daniele D. (1986, April). The Relationship Between Multiple Adult Roles, Barriers to Learning, and Persistence/Withdrawal for Returning Adult Students. Paper read at American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Frankel, Alan D. (1982, April). Structuring an Adult Learning Environment, Part III: The Team Approach. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Western College Reading Association, San Diego, CA.

Franzoi, Stephan L. & Horzog, Mary E. (1986). The Body Esteem Scale: A Convergent and Discriminant Validity Study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 50, 24-31.

Frost, Martha E. (1980, September). Towards Understanding the Needs of College Students Who Delay Entrance. Paper presented of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Gerald, Debra E., Horn, Paul J., and Hussar, William J. (1988). Projections of Education Statistics to 1997-98. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Gerson, Judith M. (1985). Women Returning to School: The Consequences of Multiple Roles. Sex Roles, 13, 77-92.

Gilbert, Lucia A., Manning, Linda & Ponder, Marguerite. (1980). Conflicts with the Student Role: A Comparison of Female and Male Reentry Students. Journal of the NAWDAC, 44, 26-32.

Goldsmith, Ronald E. (1985). The Factorial Composition of the Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 45, 245-250.

Goldsmith, Ronald E. (1986). Dimensionality of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13, 253-264.

Gould, Jonathon, (1982). A Psychometric Investigation of the Standard and Short Form Beck Depression Inventory. Psychological Reports, 51, 1167-1170.

Graduate Record Examinations Board. (1984). Older and Younger Graduate Students: A Comparison of Goals, Grades and GRE Scores. (Report No. ETS-84-5; GREB-81-17R). Princeton, NJ.

Hall, Roberta M. (1980). Re-entry Women: Part-time Enrollment, Full-time Commitment. Field Evaluation Draft. (Grant No. G0079-01070). Washington DC: Department of Education.

Haponski, William C. (1983). Recruit and Retain Adult Students. The Challenge of the 80's--and Beyond: To Create New Faces in Your Classrooms and Keep Them There. (Report No. HE015798). Oneida, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED226637).

Havighurst, R. J. (1972). Developmental Tasks and Education. (3rd ed.) New York: McKay.

Heatherington, Cheryl & Hudson, George R. (1981). Returning Women Students: Independence, Personal Identity Confidence and Goal Orientation. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 31-36.

Higgins, Martha N. (1985). Crisis Intervention for the "Second Time Around" College Female. Emotional First Aid: A Journal of Crisis Intervention, 2, 5-8.

Hildreth, Gladys J. & Dilworth-Anderson, Peggye & Rabe, Sabrina M. (1983). Family and Social Life of Women Over Age Fifty Who are in College. Educational Gerontology, 9, 339-359.

Holliday, Gay. (1985). Addressing the Concerns of Returning Women Students. New Directions for Student Services, 29, 61-73.

Huston-Hoburg, Laura & Strange, Carney. (1986). Spouse Support Among Male and Famale Returning Adult Students. Journal of College Student Program. 27, 388-394.

Jacobi, Maryann. (1987, February). Stress Among Re-entry Women Students: A Contextual Approach. Paper read at Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego.

Johnson, Carolyn H. (1984, March). Effects of Personality Correlates on Achievement in Traditional and Re-entry College Women. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kaplin, Susan Romer. (1981, March). A Feminist Cinderella Tale: Why Women Over Age 30 Want to Attend Graduate and Professional School and What Happens to Them. Paper presented at the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Karr-Kidwell, P.J. (1984, May). Re-entry Women Students in Higher Education: A Model for Nontraditional Support Programs in Counseling and Career Advisement. Paper presented at the women and Work Symposium, Arlington, TX.

Kinch, John, Falk, R. Frank, & Anderson, Donna. (1983). A Self-Image Inventory: Its Theoretical Background, Reliability and Validity. Symbolic Interaction, 6, 229-242.

Kinner, Richard & Townley, Julie. (1986). Major Values Conflicts of Young, Re-entry Graduate Students. Guidance and Counseling, 1, 16-21.

Kirk, Cynthia Formanek & Dorfman, Larraine T. (1983). Satisfaction and Role Strain Among Middle Age and Older Reentry Women Students. Educational Gerontology, 9, 15-29.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). "Continuities in Childhood and Adult Moral Developmental Revisited." In P.B. Baltes and K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Personality and Socialization. New York: Academic Press.

Kominski, Robert. (1987). School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1983 (Report No. EA019264) Suitland, MD: Bureau of the Census. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED280155).

Leppel, Karen. (1984). The Academic Performance of Returning and Continuing College Students: An Economic Analysis. Journal of Economic Education, 15, 46-54.

Levin, Elaine L. (1986). A Support & Group for Midlife Students Reentering College. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 371-372.

Levy, Judith A. (1981). Friendship Dilemmas and the Intersection of Social Worlds: Reentry Women on the College Campus. Research in the Interweave of Social Roles, 2, 143-170.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Loevinger, J., Wessler, R., and Redmore, C. (1970). Measuring Ego Development. 2 vols. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Long, Huey B. (1983). Academic Performance, Attitudes, and Social Relations in Intergenerational College Classes. Educational Gerontology, 9, 471-481.

Lorr, Maurice & Wunderlich, Richard A. (1986). Two Objectives Measures of Self-Esteem. Journal of Personality Assessment, 50, 18-23.

Mark, Michael & DeWees, Patricia. (1984). Recruitment, Retention and Alumni: Development of Adult Learners Through Assessment of Prior Learning. Lifelong Learning, 8, 18-20.

Martin, Mary K., Richmond, Lee J. & Tucker, Norma S. (1980). Statewide Assessment of Career Aspiration and Job Attainment Among Women Returning to College in Maryland. (Report No. CE027145). Maryland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED194786).

Maslow, A.H. (1971). The Father Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Viking.

Maurer, Janet F. (1982, April). Reported Stress of College Seniors as a Function of Gender and Sex Role Orientation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Baltimore, MD.

Mayes, Alice M. & McConatha, Jesmin. (1982). Surveying Students ;Needs: A Means of Evaluating Students Services. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 473-476.

McWilliams, Katie. (1982). Barrier Reduction Program for Women: Final Report. (Grant No. TEA-22426632). Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Meers, Betty W. & Gilkison, Betty. (1985). Older Students on Campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 369-370.

Modoono, S., & Evans, W. (1987). Faculty Training and Adult Development. Journal of Higher Education Management, 3, 39-46.

Mohsenin, Iran C. (1980). Peer-Sponsored Conference: College Reentry Strategy for Adult Women. Educational Horizons, 58, 193-196.

Murphy, Dennis T. & Achtzinger, Mary Ann. (1982). Recruiting the Older, Adult, Female Student. College and University, 57, 314-322.

O'Brien, Edward J. (1985). Global Self-Esteem Scales: Unidimensional or Multidimensional? Psychological Reports, 57, 383-389.

O'Connor, Kathleen & Aasheim, L.J. (1985, January). Working with Nontraditional Students: Women in Transition. Paper presented at the Regional Conference on University Teaching, Las Cruces, NM.

Openshaw, D. Kim, Thomas, Darwin L. & Rollins, Boyd D. (1981). Adolescent Self-Esteem: A Multidimensional Perspective. Journal of Early Adolescence, 1, 273-282.

Orme, John G., Reis, Janet & Herz, Elicia J. (1986). Factorial and Discriminant Validity of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CES-D) Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42, 28-33.

Oski, Katharine. (1980). Problems and Issues Raised by Returning Adults. Alternative Higher Education: The Journal of Nontraditional Studies, 5, 100-105.

Papier, Sarah N. (1980). Counseling for the Re-Entry Women (Report No. CG018846). New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED266366).

Patterson, Carey D. & Blank, Thomas O. (1985, March). Doubt, Struggle and Growth: A Profile of the Mature Woman in the Student Role. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Perry, Gloria R. (1985). Coping Styles of Nurses Returning to School. (Report No. CG019628) Illinois. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED277946).

Pickering, G.S. and Galvin-Schaefer, K. (1988). An Empirical Study of Reentry Women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 298-303.

Prager, Karen J. (1983). Educational Aspirations and Self-Esteem in Returning and Traditional Community College Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 144-147.

Prahl, Ellen (1980). Confidence and Competence: Basic Skills Programs and Refresher Courses for Re-Entry Women Field Report. (Grant No. G0079-01070) Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Rawlins, Melanie & Davies, Kathy. (1981). Today's Challenge: Adults in College. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 4, 12-13,27.

Reehling, Jean E. (1980). They Are Returning: But, Are They Staying? Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 491-497.

Richter, Donna L. & Whitten, Charles H. (1984). Barriers to Adult Learning: Does Anticipation Match Reality? Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 465-467.

Robbins, Steven B. (1985). Validity Estimates for the Career Decision-Making Self Efficacy Scale. Measurement and Evaluation-in-Counseling and Development, 18, 64-71.

Roehl, Janet E. & Okun, Morris A. (1984). Depression Symptoms Among Women Reentering College: The Role of Negative Life Events and Family Social Support. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 251-254.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the Adolescent Self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Roy, Susan W. (1986). Programming for returning women students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 75-76.

Rush, Isabel E. (1983, March). Comparative Study of Learning Styles and Related Factors Between Traditional and Nontraditional Students at the University of Akron. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Aging, Detroit, MI.

Sands, Roberta G. & Richardson, Virginia. (1984). Educational and Mental Health Factors Associated with the Return of Mid-Life Women to School. Educational Gerontology, 10, 155-170.

Sansing, Lucille Howell. (1983, March). Marital and Mothering Roles Among Reentry Women in Higher Education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Alexandria, Virginia.

Schmidt, Steven D. (1983). Understanding the Culture of Adults Returning to Higher Education: Barriers to Learning and Preferred Learning Styles. (Grant No. USDA-2667) Washington, DC: Department of Agriculture.

Scott, Shirley A. & King, Jeanne C. (1985, August). Perceived Spousal Support for Women Who Return to College. Revision of a paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Sewall, Timothy J. (1984). Academic Skills of the Returning Adult Student. Report of a Pilot Study (Report No. CE039722) Green Bay, Wisconsin: Wisconsin University, Green Bay. Assessment Center. (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED248390).

Sherman, Pamela & Zibrin, Mara. (1982, March). Fear of Success and Achievement Anxiety in Reentry versus Non-Reentry Women. Papers presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Simpkins, Thelma C. & Ray, Jacqueline W. (1983). What Makes the Difference with Reentry Women--Program Content or Program Structure. Journal of General Education, 35, 99-109.

Slaney, Fiona M. (1986). Career Indecision in Reentry and Undergraduate Women. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 114-119.

Slaney, Robert B. & Lewis, Ellen T. (1986). Effects of Career Exploration on Career Undeaded Reentry Women: An Intervention and Follow-up Study. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28, 97-109.

Smith, Jeanne Wielage & Regan, Mary C. (1983). A Longitudinal Evaluation of Life Reassessment Courses. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 231-235.

Smithers, Alan & Griffin, Alice. (1986). Mature Students at University: Entry, Experience and Outcomes. Studies in Higher Education, 11, 257-268.

Snyder, Thomas D. (1987). Digest of Education Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Speer, Lenora J. & Dorfman, Lorraine T. (1986). The Outcomes of Reentry Education: Personal and Professional Development in Middle-Aged and Older Women Graduates. Educational Gerontology, 12, 233-265.

Steltenpohl, Elizabeth & Shipton, Jane. (1986). Facilitating a Successful Transition to College for Adults. Journal of Higher Education, 57, 637-658.

Stephenson, Mary J. (1980, February). The Integration of School and Family Needs by Women Returning to College. Paper presented at the Lifelong Learning Research Conference, College Park, M.D.

Suddick, David E. & Collins, Burton A. (1984, April). A Longitudinal Study of the English Usage and Algebra Basic Skills Testing Remediation Paradigm for Older, Reentry College Juniors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Suddick, David E. & Collins, Burton A. (1986, April). A Longitudinal Cross Validation of a Basic Skills Testing Remediation Paradigm for Older, Reentry College Juniors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, LA.

Templin, Jean P. (1984). Institutional Response to Problems of Returning Adult Students in Western Pennsylvania (Report No. HE017432) Pennsylvania. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED246749).

Tyron, Georgiana S. (1984). Validity of a 42-item Money Problem Checklist Scale for Counseling. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 281-282.

Uncapher, Barbara, Carnahan, Robert E., Altenburger, Janice, Regner, Judy & Quinlan, Kathy. Meeting Needs of Adult University Students: A Model Designed by Adult Students (Report No. HE016715) New Kensington, PA: Pennsylvania State University, New Kensington. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED235735).

Vause, Corinne J. & Wiemann, John M. (1981). Communication Strategies for Role Invention. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45, 241-251.

Walert, Margaret & Van Dusseldorp, Ralph. (1983). Attitudinal and Social Changes on Re-Emerging Academic Women (Report No. HE017045) Alaska. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED240936).

Weil, S.W. (1986). Nontraditional Learners within Traditional Higher Education Institutions: Discovery and Disappointment. Studies In Higher Education, 11, 219-235.

Weinstein, Loribeth. (1980). The Counseling Needs of Reentry Women: Field Evaluation Draft) Grant No. G0079-01070) Washington, DC: Office of Education.

Weinstein, Loribeth. (1980). Recruitment and Admissions: Opening the Door for Reentry Women. Field Evaluation Draft. (Grant No. G0079-01070) Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC. Project on Status and Education of Women.

Weissberg, Michael, (1986). An Analysis of Adult Student Needs by Sex and Undergraduate/Graduate Status. College Student Affairs Journal, 6, 24-36.

Wheaton, Janilee B. & Robinson, Daniel C. (1983). Responding to the Needs of Reentry Women: A Comprehensive Campus Model. NASPA Journal, 21, 44-51.

Wintersteen, Betty A. (1982). Evaluation of the Social and Academic Problems of the Returning Women Student 35+ (Report No. JC820529) Massachusetts: Independent study Research Paper, North Shore Community College (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED226767).

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

To: Governors State University Students

From: Peggy G. Woodard, M.S.Ed.
University Professor Counseling in Student Development/
Outreach Counselor

Re: Request for Participation in a Research Project

Date: March 19, 1990

I am writing to invite you to participate in a study of the academic success of adult students who are returning to college. The main purpose of the study is to ascertain the effect of self esteem and personal problems on the success of reentry adult students. Enclosed are three questionnaires, The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, Mooney Problem Check List and a Demographic Data Sheet which I am requesting that you complete and return in the enclosed, self addressed, stamped envelope. It should only take you about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Participation in this project will give you the opportunity to learn something about yourself, as you will be provided feedback regarding the results if you request it. The questionnaires have been numbered to match with information we have retrieved from GSU's data base; however, they cannot be identified with any specific individual. If you are interested in receiving your individual results, I am requesting that you put your social security number on the completed questionnaires.

We hope that the results from this study will enable us to improve services available to future reentry adult students. I am looking forward to your participation. Should you have any questions regarding this project, please contact me at 708-534-5000 extension 2142. Thank you for considering this project.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Identification number: _____

2. Age: _____

3. Sex: _____F _____M

4. Ethnic Background (please check one):

   ____Asian ____Black ____Caucasian ____Hispanic

   ____Native American ____Other (please specify) _____

5. Marital Status (please check one):

   ____Married ____Single (never married) ____Divorced

   ____Separated ____Widowed

6. Children:

   ____No children

   ____Number of children (under 18 years of age) living with me

   ____Number of children (under 18 years of age) living outside my home

   ____Number of adult children (18 years of age or older) living independently

   ____Number of adult children (18 years of age or older) living with me

7. Enrollment status:

   ____Full time ____Part time

8. Current term of enrollment:

   ____First ____Second ____Third ____Fourth ____Fifth

   ____Sixth ____Seventh ____Eighth ____Ninth ____Ten-Eleventh

   ____Twelfth ____More than twelve

9. Current employment status:

   ____Full time (37 or more hours per week)

   ____Part time (less than 36 hours per week)

   ____Not employed

10. Time between the last school attended and your current return to school for degree completion:

    ____1-5 years ____6-10 years ____11-15 years

    ____16-20 years ____more than 20 years

APPENDIX B

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES WITH THE PSYCHOMETRIC DATA AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND THE STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Health

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	64.337	1.391	.221
Residual	173	1333.413		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.263
Age	.005
Ethnic Group	.417
Marital Status	.439
Gender	-.828
Number of Children	-.192
Constant	2.663

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Economic Security

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	89.374	.742	.617
Residual	173	3473.58		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.347
Age	.022
Ethnic Group	-.436
Marital Status	.598
Gender	.232
Number of Children	.285
Constant	2.693

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Self Improvement

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	210.146	1.898	.084
Residual	173	3191.604		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.877
Age	.045
Ethnic Group	-.473
Marital Status	.857
Gender	-1.695
Number of Children	-.169
Constant	5.628

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Personal

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	194.631	.960	.454
Residual	173	5845.613		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	1.212
Age	-.077
Ethnic Group	.747
Marital Status	-.433
Gender	-.017
Number of Children	-.217
Constant	6.120

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Home and Family

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	203.845	2.284	.038
Residual	173	2573.340		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	.786
Age	-.098
Ethnic Group	-.870
Marital Status	-.265
Gender	.353
Number of Children	.391
Constant	6.476

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Courtship

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	49.371	2.607	.019
Residual	173	545.941		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	.540
Age	-.043
Ethnic Group	.246
Marital Status	.268
Gender	.274
Number of Children	-.037
Constant	.509

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Sex

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	16.742	1.232	.292
Residual	173	391.808		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.043
Age	-.036
Ethnic Group	-.059
Marital Status	.103
Gender	-.050
Number of Children	.004
Constant	2.344

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Religion

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	9.711	.532	.783
Residual	173	526.350		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.237
Age	-.008
Ethnic Group	.208
Marital Status	-.108
Gender	-.118
Number of Children	-.081
Constant	1.910

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Occupation

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	46.448	1.489	.185
Residual	173	899.797		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	-.446
Age	.019
Ethnic Group	-.280
Marital Status	.025
Gender	.437
Number of Children	-.280
Constant	1.952

Dependent Variable: MPCL Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	6	624.243	4.520	.000
Residual	173	3982.334		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Employment	2.209
Age	-.149
Ethnic Group	-.668
Marital Status	.553
Gender	1.429
Number of Children	.048
Constant	18.952

APPENDIX C

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES WITH THE PSYCHOMETRIC DATA AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND THE STUDENT SCHOLASTIC BACKGROUND AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Health

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	61.17	1.60	0.16
Residual	171	1307.15		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	0.006
Term of Current Employment	-0.108
Part-Full Enrollment Status	-0.048
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-0.262
Transfer Grade Average	0.002
Constant	10.379

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Economic Security

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	317.59	3.52	.005
Residual	171	3082.97		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	0.006
Term of Current Employment	-0.225
Part-Full Enrollment Status	0.818
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	0.765
Transfer Grade Average	-0.017
Constant	4.767

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Self Improvement

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	283.363	3.17	.009
Residual	171	3057.496		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	.007
Term of Current Employment	-.116
Part-Full Enrollment Status	.988
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.148
Transfer Grade Average	.009
Constant	-1.170

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Personal

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	167.582	.99	.420
Residual	171	5739.988		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	.004
Term of Current Employment	-.145
Part-Full Enrollment Status	-.414
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.583
Transfer Grade Average	.006
Constant	4.901

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Home and Family

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	52.410	0.660	.654
Residual	171	2716.167		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	-.002
Term of Current Employment	.156
Part-Full Enrollment Status	-.098
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.285
Transfer Grade Average	-.002
Constant	4.580

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Courtship

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	38.240	2.360	.042
Residual	171	554.269		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	-1.958
Term of Current Employment	-.003
Part-Full Enrollment Status	.005
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.185
Transfer Grade Average	-.004
Constant	2.640

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Sex

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	34.634	3.237	.008
Residual	171	365.908		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	3.047
Term of Current Employment	.020
Part-Full Enrollment Status	-.051
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.050
Transfer Grade Average	-.006
Constant	2.546

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Religion

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	20.325	1.349	.217
Residual	171	515.736		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	2.976
Term of Current Employment	0.031
Part-Full Enrollment Status	-0.047
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-0.053
Transfer Grade Average	-.001
Constant	3.479

Dependent Variable: MPCL Subscale of Occupation

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	27.803	1.019	.409
Residual	171	934.039		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	-.001
Term of Current Employment	-.028
Part-Full Enrollment Status	.133
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	.304
Transfer Grade Average	-.001
Constant	1.715

Dependent Variable: MPCL Rosenberg Self Esteem

Analysis of Regression Summary Table

Source	df	SS	F	p-level
Regression	5	1143.736	11.636	.000
Residual	171	3361.597		

Regression Equation

Variable	Raw Weight
Current Grade Average	-.006
Term of Current Employment	.102
Part-Full Enrollment Status	.048
Time Between Prior and Current Reenrollment	-.107
Transfer Grade Average	-.028
Constant	28.284