

7-1-1960

A study of the validity of secondary school school recommendations for students entering Richmond College in September, 1955

James Garland Hanes

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>

Recommended Citation

Hanes, James Garland, "A study of the validity of secondary school school recommendations for students entering Richmond College in September, 1955" (1960). *Master's Theses*. Paper 164.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

**A STUDY OF THE VALIDITY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR STUDENTS ENTERING RICHMOND COLLEGE IN SEPTEMBER, 1955**

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
The University of Richmond

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

by
James Garland Hanes

August 1960

APPROVAL SHEET

The undersigned, appointed by the Chairman of the Department of Education, have examined this thesis by

James Garland Hanes, B.A.

Candidate for the degree of Master of Science in Education, and hereby certify their approval of its acceptance.

Thomas N. Pollard, Jr.

Thomas N. Pollard, Jr., M.A.
Director of Admissions,
Richmond College,
The University of Richmond

Miss Manie Spangler

Miss Manie Spangler, A.M.
Assistant Professor of Education,
The University of Richmond

Nathaniel H. Henry

Nathaniel H. Henry, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English,
The University of Richmond

Calvin H. Phippkins

Calvin H. Phippkins, Ph.D.
Professor of Education,
Limestone College, and
Visiting Lecturer in Education

Franklin R. Jones

Franklin R. Jones, Ed.D.
Professor of Education,
Randolph Macon College, and
Visiting Lecturer in Education

Edward F. Overton

Edward F. Overton, Ph.D.
Professor of Education and
Dean of the Summer School,
The University of Richmond

Date: Aug. 3 1960

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Doctor Edward F. Overton, Professor of Education and Dean of Summer School. The author wished to express his sincere gratitude to Doctor Overton for his aid and encouragement, and to Doctor Robert F. Smart, Dean of Richmond College, and Miss Helen A. Monsell, Registrar, for making available the necessary data. The author is also grateful to Doctor Franklin R. Jones, Professor of Education, Randolph Macon College, and to Doctor Calvin H. Phippins, Professor of Education, Limestone College, for their aid and interest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Value of the study	1
Purpose.	2
Procedures	2
Selection of the cases	2
Conversion of grades	3
Definitions of Terms	4
Categories of recommendations	4
Persons making the recommendations	4
Kinds of secondary schools	4
Size of secondary schools	5
Disposition of cases	5
The academic deficiency list	6
II. AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL RECOMMENDATIONS	7
Interpretation of Tables I-II	7
Interpretation of Table III.	11
Interpretation of Table IV	13
Reliability of a Refusal to Recommend	16
Reliability of Highly Recommended	16

CHAPTER	PAGE
Reliability of Unqualified Recommendations	17
Reliability of Recommendation with Qualification	18
Reliability of Not Indicated Recommendation	18
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS	
MADE BY THE SECONDARY SCHOOL OFFICIALS	20
Interpretation of Table V	20
Interpretation of Tables VI-VII	22
Interpretation of Tables VIII-XI	25
Interpretation of Table XII.	30
Reliability of Recommendations by Guidance Officers	30
Reliability of Recommendations by Principals	32
Reliability of Recommendations by Assistant Principals	32
IV. AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	
RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE SIZE AND KIND OF SCHOOL	34
Interpretation of Tables XIII-XIV.	34
Interpretation of Table XV	37
Interpretation of Table XVI	37
Interpretation of Table XVII	40
Interpretation of Tables XVIII-XIX	42
Interpretation of Table XX	45
Reliability of Recommendations of Urban Schools	45
Reliability of Recommendations of Rural Schools	45

CHAPTER	PAGE
Reliability of Recommendations of Private Military Schools	47
Reliability of Recommendations of Non-military Private Schools	47
Reliability of Different Sized Schools	47
V. SUMMARY	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Results of Follow Up Study of Cases Distributed	
According to Their Secondary School Recommendation . . .	8
II. Disposition of Cases as Per Cent of Cases in Each	
Category of Recommendations	9
III. The Per Cent of Cases with Each Type of Recommendation	
in Each Classification of the Results of the	
Follow Up Study	12
IV. Number Enrolled and Mean Grade Rating for Cases in	
Each Category of Recommendations at the End of Each	
Semester for Four Years	14
V. Distribution of Recommendations Made by Secondary	
School Officials	21
VI. Disposition of cases Recommended by Each Type of	
Recommending Person	23
VII. Disposition of Cases Recommended with all Cases Not	
Recommended Excluded	24
VIII. Disposition of Cases Recommended Highly by Each Type	
of Recommending Person.	26
IX. Disposition of Recommended Cases by Each Type of	
Recommending Person	27
X. Disposition of Cases Recommended with Qualifications	
by Each Type of Recommending Person	28

TABLE	PAGE
XI. Disposition of Cases Not Recommended	29
XII. Disposition of Cases for Which No Recommendation Was Indicated	31
XIII. Distribution of Cases by Size and Kind of Secondary School.	35
XIV. Distribution of Recommendations by Size and Kind of School.	36
XV. Disposition of Cases Recommended by Size and Kind of Secondary School.	38
XVI. Disposition of Cases Recommended Highly by Size and Kind of Secondary School.	39
XVII. Disposition of Recommended Cases by Size and Kind of Secondary School.	41
XVIII. Disposition of Cases Recommended with Qualifications by Size and Kind of Secondary School.	43
XIX. Disposition of Not Recommended Cases by Size and Kind of Secondary School	44
XX. Disposition of Cases by Size and Kind of School When No Recommendation Was Indicated	46
XXI. Number of Academic Drop-outs from Each Category of Recommendations During or at the End of Each Semester	55
XXII. Number of Cases on the Deficiency List from Each Category of Recommendations at the End of Each Semester	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A college admissions committee must examine and weigh carefully the qualifications of those applying for enrollment in the college. In general, such a committee must accept or reject the applicant on the basis of data of widely varying degrees of reliability--i.e., the secondary school recommendation, secondary school grades, rank in graduating class, standardized test scores, and the recommendations of alumni, ministers, teachers, and friends of the family.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. In theory, the recommendation of the secondary school should be one of the most important items of information concerning an applicant's qualifications for admission to the college. The principal or guidance officer is a professional educator experienced and, in some instances, trained in the techniques of appraising the qualifications of the applicant to enter a specific college. In practice, how much weight can an admissions committee assign to the secondary school recommendation? Specifically, how valid are the secondary school recommendations for students applying for admission to Richmond College?

Value of the study. The 1960's are expected to bring increasingly large numbers of applications to the colleges of the nation. With so many applicants for the presently limited number of places, admission

committees will be faced with the increasingly difficult task of deciding whom to admit and to whom admission will be denied. It is hoped that the findings of this study will, to some degree, be helpful to the Admissions Committee of Richmond College in their future determinations of qualifications for admission to the college.

II. PURPOSE

Purpose of the study. In making this study, answers were sought to four main questions, (1) How reliable was each of the five categories of secondary school recommendations? (2) Does this reliability vary with the classifications of persons making the recommendations? (3) Does this reliability vary with the size and kind of school? (4) Under what circumstances are the secondary school recommendations most, or least, valid? The answer to each of these questions, it is hoped, will reveal the validity of secondary school recommendations as criteria for admission to Richmond College.

III. PROCEDURES

Selection of the cases. One class of freshmen entering Richmond College was selected for a detailed study of their college records to determine to what extent these records validate, or invalidate, the secondary school recommendations. It was decided that the class should be followed for a five year period to include those who, for a variety of reasons, might need more than the normal four years to graduate.

Consequently, the Freshman Class of 1955-56 was selected as the latest class to have the requisite lapsed time of five years.

For the purpose of this study, it was decided to select from the official roster of Freshman 1955-56 only those cases with the following qualifications: (1) The student must not have been enrolled in Richmond College prior to the summer session of 1955. (2) He must not previously have attended any other college. (3) He must not have left the secondary school prior to 1955. On these bases 212 cases were selected from the official roster of 405 in the Freshman Class of 1955-56.

A study of the permanent record cards and personnel folders of these 212 cases necessitated the elimination of three additional cases from the study. One of these three was eliminated because he died in October, 1957. Another was eliminated because his records at Richmond College did not include a transcript or a recommendation from the secondary school he had last attended. The permanent record card of the third case was not available. Thus, there are 209 cases in this study.

Conversion of grades. In analysing the academic achievement of the cases, it was decided to convert the customary letter grade to some numerical value to facilitate efforts to obtain accurate averages for large numbers of cases. The grade A was given the value of three points per semester hour; B, two points; C, one point; D, zero points; E, minus one point; and F, minus two points. The grade rating used in this study was determined by dividing the total number of points by the

sum of the semester hours taken. Thus, the minimum grade rating was -2.000, and the maximum was 3,000.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Categories of recommendations. The secondary school recommendations were divided into five categories: (1) highly recommended, (2) recommended, (3) recommended with qualifications, (4) not recommended, and (5) not indicated. The last category was set up to include all cases for which there was no indication in their records that they were, or were not, recommended to Richmond College.

Persons making the recommendation. The persons making the recommendation at the secondary level were divided into five classifications. (1) principal, including headmaster, and acting headmaster; (2) assistant principal, including vice principal and assistant headmaster; (3) guidance officer, including counselor; (4) other, for secretary and registrar; and (5) none, for all cases in which no name or title appeared on the transcript or recommendation.

Kinds of secondary schools. The secondary schools were classified as (1) private, (2) urban, and (3) rural. A school was considered private if it was not financially supported by tax funds levied by any political body. Urban denotes any public school located in a non-farm area, or in a town with a population of 2,500 or more persons according to the United States Census Bureau figures for 1950. The classification rural refers to a public school in a non-urban area in which the economy is primarily agrarian.

Size of secondary school. Each school was classified by the size of its 1955 graduating class. A school was classified as small if there were fewer than fifty members in its graduating class. A school with as many as fifty, but fewer than one hundred, members in its graduating class was designated as medium. A school was considered large if it had as many as one hundred in its graduating class.

Disposition of cases. In following the 209 cases through their stay in Richmond College, five classifications were made of the final disposition of the cases. (1) Graduate means any one of the cases who graduated from Richmond College through June, 1960. (2) Withdrawal without prejudice refers to all cases that transferred to the Business School of the University of Richmond or to another college, and to all that withdrew for any other reason while they were not on the academic deficiency list. (3) Academic drop-out designates all cases that have not returned to Richmond College following a semester in which they: (a) were on the academic deficiency list, (b) were suspended for academic deficiency, (c) withdrew for failure to meet the terms of their academic probation. (4) Disciplinary drop-out refers to all cases that have not been readmitted to Richmond College after they were suspended or dismissed from the college for disciplinary reasons. (5) Still enrolled includes those cases that were enrolled in Richmond College in the second semester of the session 1959-60 but did not graduate in June, 1960, and all who are candidates for degrees in August, 1960.

The academic deficiency list. The academic deficiency list is composed of all students who fail to meet the academic minimums set forth in the following regulations of Richmond College.

DEFICIENT STUDENTS

To remain in college, a student must pass at least nine semester hours each semester. In addition, to be eligible to return to college for the succeeding session, the following requirements must be met:

A first-year student must earn at least eighteen semester hours and twelve quality credits during the full session.

A second-year student must earn twenty-one semester hours and twenty-one quality credits during the full session.

A third-year, fourth-year, or any other student must earn at least twenty-four semester hours and twenty-four quality credits during the full session.

Any student who at the end of the first semester has failed to meet the minimum requirements above may appear before a faculty committee by whom his request to matriculate for the second semester will be considered. No application from an upper classman will be considered unless it has been endorsed by his parent or guardian.

All reinstated students will be on probation for the succeeding semester, but in classes where the mid-semester reports show good grades, the Dean of the College may remove the probation.¹

¹University of Richmond Bulletin, Richmond College Catalogue Number for 1956, p. 37.

CHAPTER II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL RECOMMENDATIONS

The data presented in this study were compiled from the permanent record cards and personnel folders in the files of Pichmond College. The secondary school recommendation for each case was weighed against his record of academic achievement in college. From this comparison a determination was made as to what extent the recommendation could be justified.

Table I shows the number of cases that (1) graduated, (2) withdrew without prejudice, (3) became academic drop-outs, (4) were still enrolled, and (5) were disciplinary drop-outs from each of the five categories of secondary school recommendations. The same information is presented in percentages in Table II. The two tables should be read together.

From these tables it was noted that of the 32 cases that were highly recommended, 17 graduated, 12 withdrew without prejudice, and 3 were academic drop-outs. Fewer than one-tenth (9.37 per cent) of the cases were academic drop-outs, while more than half (53.13 per cent) had graduated. The 12 withdrawals without prejudice were 37.50 per cent of the cases.

The 139 cases in the recommended category were distributed as follows: 44 graduates, 44 withdrawals without prejudice, 30 academic drop-outs, 11 still enrolled, and 1 disciplinary drop-out. Graduates

TABLE I

RESULTS OF FOLLOW UP STUDY OF CASES DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO
THEIR SECONDARY SCHOOL RECOMMENDATION

Categories of Recommendations	Total Cases	Graduated	Withdrew with- out prejudice	Academic Drop-out	Still Enrolled	Disciplinary Drop-out
(1) Highly recommended	32	17	12	3	0	0
(2) Recommended	130	44	44	30	11	1
(3) Recommended with qualifications	12	3	3	6	0	0
(4) Not recommended	14	0	6	6	1	1
(5) Not indicated	21	4	8	8	1	0
TOTALS	209	68	73	53	13	2

TABLE II

DISPOSITION OF CASES AS PER CENT OF CASES
 IN EACH CATEGORY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Categories of recommendations	Total cases	Graduated	Withdrew with- out prejudice	Academic drop-out	Still enrolled	Disciplinary drop-out
	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent
(1) Highly recommended	15.31	53.13	37.50	9.37	0.00	0.00
(2) Recommended	62.20	33.84	33.84	23.08	8.46	0.77
(3) Recommended with qualifications	5.74	25.00	25.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
(4) Not recommended	6.70	0.00	42.86	42.86	7.14	7.14
(5) Not indicated	10.05	19.05	38.09	38.09	4.76	0.00
TOTALS	100.00	32.53	34.93	25.36	6.22	0.96

and withdrawals each accounted for about one-third (33.84 per cent) of the cases; academic drop-outs, nearly one-fourth (23.08 per cent); and those still enrolled, less than one-tenth (8.46 per cent).

Of the 12 cases in the third category, recommended with qualifications, there were 3 graduates, 3 withdrawals without prejudice, and 6 academic drop-outs. The 50 per cent rate of academic drop-outs in this group is double the per cent who graduated. It is also more than twice the academic drop-out rate for cases in the second category, and over five times that for cases in the first category.

Since all of the cases in the fourth category were not recommended for admission to Richmond College, they might be expected to have a poor record of achievement. This expectation is supported by the data in Table I. The 14 cases were distributed as follows: 0 graduates, 6 (42.86 per cent) withdrawals, 6 academic drop-outs, 1 (7.14 per cent) still enrolled, and 1 disciplinary drop-out.

Of the 21 cases that were neither recommended nor not recommended, there were 4 graduates, 8 withdrawals, 8 academic drop-outs, and 1 still enrolled. As in the third category, the number of academic drop-outs is twice the number of graduates. The academic drop-out rate (38.09 per cent) is higher and the graduate rate (19.05 per cent) lower than the rates for any of the three recommended categories.

Of the 209 cases in the study 68 (32.53 per cent) graduated, 73 (34.93 per cent) withdrew without prejudice, 53 (25.36 per cent) were academic drop-outs, 13 (6.22 per cent) were still enrolled, and 2 (0.96 per cent) were disciplinary drop-outs.

Table III reveals that although the cases in the first category comprised only 15.31 per cent of the total cases, they produced 25 per cent of the graduates and only 5.66 per cent of the academic drop-outs. This group also furnished 16.44 per cent of the total withdrawals without prejudice.

The cases in the second category represented 62.20 per cent of all cases. This group supplied 64.71 per cent of the graduates, 60.27 per cent of the withdrawals, 56.60 per cent of the academic drop-outs, 84.62 per cent of those still enrolled, and 50 per cent of the disciplinary drop-outs.

The third category represented 5.74 per cent of all cases, but furnished 11.32 per cent of the academic drop-outs, about twice the proportionate share for this group. Although the number of graduates was equal to the number of withdrawals in this category, the 4.41 per cent of total graduates was slightly higher than the 4.11 per cent of total withdrawals.

The fourth category had 6.70 per cent of the cases, but furnished no graduates. This group had 11.32 per cent of the academic drop-outs, 50 per cent of the disciplinary drop-outs, 7.69 per cent of the still enrolled, and 8.22 per cent of the withdrawals.

The 21 cases in the fifth category represented 10.05 per cent of all cases, yet this group furnished only 5.88 per cent of the graduates and 15.10 per cent of the academic drop-outs. This group also had 7.69 per cent of those still enrolled and 10.96 per cent of the withdrawals.

TABLE III

THE PER CENT OF CASES WITH EACH TYPE OF RECOMMENDATION IN EACH CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE FOLLOW UP STUDY

Categories of Recommendations	Total cases	Graduated	Withdrew without prejudice	Academic drop-out	Still enrolled	Disciplinary drop-out
	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent
(1) Highly recommended	15.31	25.00	16.44	5.66	0.00	0.00
(2) Recommended	62.20	64.71	60.27	56.60	84.62	50.00
(3) Recommended with qualifications	5.74	4.41	4.11	11.32	0.00	0.00
(4) Not recommended	6.70	0.00	8.22	11.32	7.69	50.00
(5) Not indicated	10.05	5.88	10.96	15.10	7.69	0.00
TOTALS	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

It is interesting to note that this group furnished about 50 per cent more academic drop-outs and 40 per cent fewer graduates than its proportionate share.

Table IV presents the number of cases enrolled and the grade ratings each semester for the cases in each of the five categories of recommendations. The last line presents the total enrollment each semester and the mean grade rating for all cases. The nine cases that withdrew without prejudice and the one case that was temporarily suspended for disciplinary reasons have been excluded from the first semester figures because they had no grades.

An analysis of Table IV shows that the cases in the first category maintained a mean grade rating considerably above the mean rating of all cases throughout the eight semesters. Those in the second category maintained a mean grade rating above the mean semester rating for all cases in every semester except the fifth. For this group, the greatest decrease in enrollment from one semester to the next (22 cases, 24.72 per cent of enrollment the preceding semester) coincides with the one significant decrease in mean grade ratings between successive semesters. The cases in the third category had the lowest mean grade ratings of all groups in the first, second, and fourth semesters. Their rating increased from .093 the fourth semester to 1.035 the fifth semester, after a decrease in enrollment of 43 per cent from the fourth semester. The cases in the fourth category had the lowest mean ratings of all cases in all semesters except the first, second, and fourth. At no time was their rating above

TABLE IV

NUMBER ENROLLED AND MEAN GRADE RATING FOR CASES IN EACH CATEGORY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE END OF EACH SEMESTER FOR FOUR YEARS

CATEGORIES of recommendations	Semester 1		Semester 2		Semester 3		Semester 4		Semester 5	
	no.	rating	no.	rating	no.	rating	no.	rating	no.	rating
(1) Highly recommended	30	1.425	28	1.505	23	1.550	23	1.465	18	1.559
(2) Recommended	126	.592	106	.811	91	.809	89	.893	67	.770
(3) Recommended with qualifications	11	-.353	10	-.239	7	.394	7	.093	4	1.035
(4) Not recommended	12	.161	10	.050	10	-.131	8	.537	4	-.060
(5) Not indicated	20	.285	14	.509	13	.703	12	.816	10	.831
Semester Mean	199	.589	170	.799	144	.832	138	.926	103	.892

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Categories of recommendations	Semester 6		Semester 7		Semester 8		All semester
	No.	rating	no.	rating	no.	rating	mean rating
(1) Highly recommended	17	1.716	15	1.825	15	1.677	1.523
(2) Recommended	63	1.089	55	1.158	49	1.291	.882
(3) Recommended with qualifications	3	1.480	3	1.430	3	1.523	.330
(4) Not recommended	1	.310	3	.980	5	1.000	.151
(5) Not indicated	9	1.002	4	1.485	5	1.320	.704
Semester Mean		1.188		1.304		1.368	.908

the mean for all cases in the respective semesters. The mean rating for cases in the fifth category rose steadily as the number of cases enrolled decreased, until their mean was above the mean for all cases in the seventh semester.

From an analysis of the data that have been presented in this chapter, it appears that the most reliable secondary school recommendation is that of the fourth category, not recommended. Of the 14 cases, not one graduated, and only one was still enrolled in 1960. Academic drop-outs and disciplinary action accounted for one-half of the group. Although none of the group was an academic drop-out the first semester,² 4 (28.57 per cent) were on the academic deficiency list.³ Only one case remained in college after the fifth semester. Finally, the very low grade rating for this group substantiates the conclusion that the secondary school appraisal for the group was justified.

The next most reliable recommendation appears to be that of the first category, recommended highly. This group, from which only 15.31 per cent of the cases in the study were drawn, produced 25 per cent of the graduates and only 5.66 per cent of the academic drop-outs. The 17:3 ratio of graduates to academic drop-outs is extremely high. Of the 156 deficiencies, this group was responsible for only 8 (5.13 per cent). The grade rating for the group was in all semesters higher than the highest semester mean for all cases, which was that of the eighth

² cf Table XXI in Appendix.

³ cf Table XXII in Appendix.

semester. The academic success of the group demonstrates the high degree of accuracy for this recommendation.

The second category of recommendations appears to be much less reliable than category one or four. This group furnished 62.20 per cent of the cases, 64.71 per cent of the graduates, and 60.27 per cent of the withdrawals. The group also furnished 91 per cent of its proportionate share of academic drop-outs. The ratio of graduates to academic drop-outs is only about 3 to 2. The mean grade rating for this group is .882, slightly below the .908 rating for all cases. In only the first and second semesters was the semester mean for the group above that for all cases. At the end of the first year there had been 38 on the deficiency list, and 46.67 per cent of the academic drop-outs from this group had occurred. However, 68.46 per cent of the group stayed in college through the fourth semester. This is slightly higher than the 66.03 per cent of all cases that were enrolled through the fourth semester. It is also 16 per cent greater than the 58.89 per cent of the Freshman Class of 1948-49 that remained for a similar period.⁴ It appears that the only conclusion that can be made at this time is that the recommendation in the second category is reliable in a majority of cases. It is hoped that the study of related factors, as set forth in the succeeding chapters, may determine more definitely the reliability of this recommendation.

⁴William McLean Trausneck, "Some Factors Relating the Success of Richmond College Students to Their High School Preparation" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Richmond, Richmond, 1950), p. 18.

The group recommended with qualifications had only 12 cases, 25 per cent of whom graduated and 50 per cent of whom were academic drop-outs. The ratio of graduates to withdrawals without prejudice was the same as that for category two. However, the ratio of graduates to academic drop-outs was only 1:2 as compared with the 3:2 ratio for category two. This group supplied twice its proportionate share of academic drop-outs and almost twice its share of the academically deficient students. The grade rating of this group the first semester was -.353, the lowest of any group in any semester. After the fifth semester, when two-thirds of the group were no longer in college, the grade rating rose above the mean for all cases.

A recommendation with qualifications indicates some doubts on the part of the recommender. That these doubts were justified in some cases is supported by the college records. However, it is to be expected that the number of academic drop-outs from this category should not be twice the number of graduates. Therefore, it is concluded that the recommendation with qualifications is not a reliable indicator of success in college in a majority of cases. The degrees of unreliability may be established more definitely after a study of related factors.

No indication of any recommendation is by negation a recommendation. A comparison of the achievement of cases in this category with that of cases in the third category shows that the ratio of graduates to academic drop-outs is 1:2 for both categories, but the percentage of withdrawals without prejudice from the fifth category (Table II, page 9)

is larger than that from the third. Therefore, it appears that no recommendation at all is almost the equivalent of a recommendation with qualifications.

In general, the secondary school recommendation will enable an admissions committee to distinguish between those applicants who will most probably pass and those who will most probably fail. However, to determine more accurately the degree of success or failure, it seems more sensitive instruments are needed.

CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE SECONDARY SCHOOL OFFICIALS

The person responsible for making the secondary school recommendation for a student seeking college admission is aware that he must maintain the integrity of the school if admissions committees are to accept the recommendations of the school in the future. He makes the recommendation with the knowledge that his judgement of the student may be in error. Further, he knows that his recommendation cannot accurately measure the influence on the student of the environmental change that is in store for the successful college applicant. The recommending person is under some pressure from parents and the community to obtain college admission for those students who desire it; for he knows that, to some degree, the college preparatory program of his school will be judged by the measure of acceptance his students attain with the college of their choice.

Table V shows that of the 209 cases in the study, principals signed the transcripts or made the recommendation in 152 cases. Assistant principals made recommendations for 29 cases, guidance personnel for 17 cases, and the secretary or registrar for 6 cases. In 5 cases no one signed the transcript or made a recommendation.

The recommendation most often made was that of category two, recommended, which occurred in 130 cases. There were 32 cases which were

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY
SECONDARY SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Recommending official	Total cases		Highly recommended		Recommended		Recommended with qualifications		Not recommended		Not indicated	
	no.		no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	152		24	15.79	98	64.47	8	5.26	9	5.92	13	8.56
Assistant Principal	29		4	13.79	19	65.52	2	6.90	3	10.34	1	3.45
Guidance Officer	17		4	23.53	9	52.95	2	11.76	2	11.76	0	0.00
Other	6		0	0.00	4	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	33.33
None	5		0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	100.00
TOTALS	209		32	15.31	130	62.20	12	5.74	14	6.70	21	10.05

highly recommended; 12 cases were recommended with qualifications; and there were 14 cases not recommended. In 21 cases the student was neither recommended nor not recommended, the recommending person, either deliberately or by oversight, failing to make any kind of recommendation. It was noted that thirty-five cases (13.75 per cent) were admitted to Richmond College without the endorsement of the secondary school, or contrary to its recommendation.

An analysis of Table VI reveals that 58.82 per cent of the cases for whom the guidance officer made a recommendation had graduated, whereas only 32.89 per cent of those recommended by the principal and only 20.69 per cent of the cases recommended by the assistant principal had graduated. The rate of academic drop-out from the group recommended by the guidance officer was only 17.65 per cent, but from the principal's group the rate was 26.32 per cent, and from the assistant principal's group, 27.59 per cent. The rate of withdrawal without prejudice from the group recommended by the assistant principal was 37.93 per cent; that from the principal's group, 34.87 per cent; and from the guidance officer's group, only 17.65 per cent.

A comparison of Table VI and Table VII reveals the same pattern exists when all cases not recommended are excluded. Table VII probably gives a more accurate overall appraisal of the recommendations of the three main recommending persons, because of the exclusion of the cases they definitely did not recommend for admission.

TABLE VI

DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED BY EACH
TYPE OF RECOMMENDING PERSON

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew without prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	152	50	32.89	53	34.87	40	26.32	8	5.26	1	0.66
Assistant Principal	29	6	20.69	11	37.93	8	27.59	4	13.79	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	17	10	58.82	3	17.65	3	17.65	0	0.00	1	5.88
Other	6	0	0.00	4	66.66	1	16.67	1	16.67	0	0.00
None	5	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTALS	209	68	32.53	73	34.93	53	25.36	13	6.22	2	0.96

TABLE VII
DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED WITH
ALL CASES NOT RECOMMENDED EXCLUDED

Recommending person	Total cases		Graduated		Withdrew without prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.		no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	143		50	34.96	48	33.50	38	26.56	7	4.85	0	0.00
Assistant Principal	26		6	23.08	10	38.46	6	23.08	4	15.38	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	15		10	66.66	3	20.00	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	6.67
Other	6		0	0.00	4	66.66	1	16.67	1	16.67	0	0.00
None	5		2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTALS	195		68	34.88	67	34.36	47	24.10	12	6.15	1	0.51

Table VIII is an analysis of the follow-up study of the cases that were recommended highly by each of the classifications of recommending persons. This table shows the guidance officer's recommendation to be most accurate, for all four of the cases he recommended highly graduated. Of those recommended highly by the assistant principal, half graduated and half withdrew without prejudice. Of the twenty-four recommended highly by the principal, 45.83 per cent graduated, 41.67 per cent withdrew, and 12.50 per cent were academic drop-outs.

Table IX is an analysis of the follow-up study of cases appraised as recommended. The table again shows that the guidance officer made the most reliable recommendation, for over half (55.56 per cent) of his students graduated, and not one was an academic drop-out. More than one-third (36.73 per cent) of the principal's group graduated, and nearly one-fourth (24.50 per cent) were academic drop-outs. The recommendation of the assistant principal appears unreliable. Although the academic drop-outs were only 26.32 per cent of the cases in this group, only 15.79 per cent graduated. However, 21.05 per cent were still enrolled.

It is noted in Table X that the assistant principal and the guidance officer each recommended with qualifications only two cases, too small a number of cases from which to draw valid conclusions. However, one case from each group graduated. Of the eight cases recommended with qualifications by the principal, only one (12.50 per cent) graduated, and five (62.50 per cent) were academic drop-outs.

Table XI shows that of the fourteen cases that were not recommended, the principal was responsible for nine; the assistant principal, three;

TABLE VIII

DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED HIGHLY BY EACH
EACH TYPE OF RECOMMENDING PERSON

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	24	11	45.83	10	41.67	3	12.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Assistant Principal	4	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	4	4	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	0	0		0		0		0		0	
None	0	0		0		0		0		0	
TOTALS	32	17	53.13	12	37.50	3	9.37	0	0.00	0	0.00

TABLE IX

DISPOSITION OF RECOMMENDED CASES BY EACH

TYPE OF RECOMMENDING PERSON

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	96	36	36.73	32	32.65	24	24.50	6	6.12	0	0.00
Assistant Principal	19	3	15.79	7	36.84	5	26.52	4	21.05	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	9	5	55.56	3	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	11.11
Other	2	0	0.00	2	50.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	0	0.00
None	0	0		0		0		0		0	
TOTALS	126	44	33.84	44	33.84	30	23.08	11	8.46	1	0.77

TABLE X

DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED WITH QUALIFICATIONS

BY EACH TYPE OF RECOMMENDING PERSON

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	8	1	12.50	2	25.00	5	62.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Assistant Principal	2	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	2	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	0	0		0		0		0		0	
None	0	0		0		0		0		0	
TOTALS	12	3	25.00	3	25.00	6	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

TABLE XI

DISPOSITION OF CASES NOT RECOMMENDED

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	9	0	0.00	5	55.56	2	22.22	1	11.11	1	11.11
Assistant Principal	3	0	0.00	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00
Guidance Officer	2	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	0	0		0		0		0		0	
None	0	0		0		0		0		0	
TOTALS	14	0	0.00	6	42.86	6	42.86	1	7.14	1	7.14

and the guidance officer, two. None of this group graduated, but one from the principal's group was still enrolled. Of the other eight cases from the principal's group, only two (22.22 per cent) were academic drop-outs, one was a disciplinary drop-out, and five withdrew without prejudice. Since all of the guidance officer's group and two-thirds of the assistant principal's group were academic drop-outs, it would appear that the principal's recommendation was not as reliable as that of the other two. However, the number of cases is perhaps too small to substantiate this conclusion. Altogether, it appears that a student who is not recommended by his school is an exceedingly poor prospect for admission to Richmond College.

From an analysis of the data in Table XII, it was noted that in five cases no one signed the transcript nor made any kind of recommendation for the applicant. Of these five unclassified cases, two graduated, two withdrew, and one was an academic drop-out. Of the sixteen other cases for which there was no indication of any recommendation, the principal signed thirteen of the transcripts; the secretary or registrar, two; and the assistant principal, one. Since no recommendation was made, there is no way to judge its validity. However, it appears that an unsigned transcript may be an oversight, but a signed one with no recommendation tends to have the force of a qualified recommendation.

From the data presented in this chapter, it is indicated that the recommendation of the guidance officer is highly reliable in all categories.

TABLE XII

DISPOSITION OF CASES FOR WHICH NO
RECOMMENDATION WAS INDICATED

Recommending person	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Principal	13	2	15.38	4	30.78	6	46.15	1	7.69	0	0.00
Assistant Principal	1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Guidance Officer		0		0		0		0		0	
Other	2	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
None	5	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTALS	21	4	19.05	8	38.09	8	38.09	1	4.76	0	0.00

Of the cases for which he was responsible, only three were academic drop-outs. Of these three cases, two were not recommended, and the other was recommended with qualifications. The percentage of graduates from cases recommended by the guidance officer was the highest of all recommending persons. Table VII, page 24, shows that exactly two-thirds of the cases recommended by the guidance officer graduated.

The reliability of a recommendation by the principal appears more difficult to establish. Of the principal's recommendations in the first and second categories, the number of cases graduated was greater than the combined number of academic drop-outs and those still enrolled. The number of graduates from each of these categories was also larger than the number of withdrawals. However, only 12.5 per cent of the eight cases recommended with qualifications graduated, and only 22.22 per cent of those not recommended were academic drop-outs. It would appear, then, that the principal's recommendation is reliable in a large number of cases in the first category and in the majority of cases in the second category of recommendations. However, his recommendations in categories three and four appear less reliable.

It seems that the recommendations of the assistant principal are highly reliable in categories three and four, but the number of cases is too small to justify a valid conclusion. The 3:5 ratio of graduates to academic drop-outs for the cases recommended by the assistant principal in category two seems to indicate that his recommendation is somewhat unreliable in this category.

In summary, it is indicated that the validity of the secondary school recommendation does vary among the groups of recommending persons in the following manner:

(1) The recommendations of the guidance officer appear to be highly valid. (2) The recommendations of the principal seem to be valid in a majority of the cases, except in category three (recommended with qualifications). (3) The recommendations of the assistant principal tend to be reliable in all categories except the second (recommended).

CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

RECOMMENDATION BY THE SIZE AND KIND OF SCHOOL

The schools in the study varied in size from one small rural school with a graduating class of 4 to a large urban school with a graduating class of 950. No private or urban school was as small as the smallest rural school, but no rural school was as large as the largest private school. To what extent are such differences among the secondary schools reflected in differences in the reliability of their recommendations for admission to Richmond College?

Table XIII shows the distribution of cases by size and kind of secondary school. Arranged by size, there were 126 large schools, 40 medium schools, and 43 small ones. Of the 126 urban schools, 109 were large, 11 medium, and 6 small. There were no large rural schools, 12 medium, and 27 small. Of the 44 private schools, 17 were large, 17 medium, and 10 small.

Table XIV shows the distribution of the recommendations by size and kind of school from which the recommendation came. Among the classifications of schools, urban schools made 60.29 per cent of the recommendations; rural, 18.66 per cent; and private, 21.05 per cent. When the schools were classified by size, it was found that large schools made 60.29 per cent of the recommendations; small schools, 20.57 per cent; and medium schools, 19.14 per cent. It would seem that Richmond College obtains a majority of its students from large urban schools.

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF CASES BY SIZE AND
KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

Kind	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Urban	6	11	109	126
Rural	27	12	0	39
Private	10	17	17	44
TOTALS	43	40	126	209

TABLE XIV

DISTRIBUTIONS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

BY SIZE AND KIND OF SCHOOL

School	Total cases		Highly recommended		Recommended		Recommended with qualifications		Not recommended		Not indicated	
	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban	126	60.29	17	13.49	77	61.11	8	6.35	9	7.14	15	11.91
Rural	39	18.66	9	23.08	24	61.54	4	10.25	0	0.00	2	5.13
Private	44	21.05	6	13.64	29	65.91	0	0.00	5	11.36	4	9.09
Total ₁	209	100.00	32	15.31	130	62.20	12	5.74	14	6.70	21	10.05
Small	43	20.57	5	11.63	28	65.12	4	9.30	4	9.30	2	4.65
Medium	40	19.14	8	20.00	24	60.00	2	5.00	2	5.00	4	10.00
Large	126	60.29	19	15.08	78	61.90	6	4.76	8	6.35	15	11.91
Total ₂	209	100.00	32	15.31	130	62.20	12	5.74	14	6.70	21	10.05

Further analysis of Table XIV shows that rural and medium schools tend to recommend highly a greater percentage of their students than do schools in any other classification. Rural schools and small schools seem to make a recommendation with qualifications for a larger percentage of their students than do other schools. None of the rural schools found it necessary to refuse to recommend any of their students. On the other hand, the percentage of students not recommended was highest among small schools and private schools. Private schools did not make a single recommendation with qualifications, but they had the highest percentage of cases recommended.

Table XV shows that 38.49 per cent of the cases from urban schools and 37.30 per cent of cases from large schools graduated from Richmond College. Only 20.45 per cent of the cases from private schools, 22.50 per cent from medium schools, 25.64 per cent from rural, and 27.91 per cent of cases from small schools graduated.

The percentage of withdrawals without prejudice was highest among cases from medium schools (55.00 per cent) and lowest among those from small schools (25.58 per cent). However, the percentage of academic drop-outs was highest among cases from small schools (34.88 per cent) and lowest among medium schools (22.50 per cent). The small schools also had the highest percentage of cases (11.63 per cent) still enrolled, and the medium schools had the lowest (0.00 per cent).

Table XVI is an analysis of the disposition of all cases recommended highly by each classification of secondary schools. This table shows

TABLE XV

DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED BY SIZE

AND KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban	126	49	38.49	39	30.95	30	23.81	6	4.76	2	1.59
Rural	39	10	25.64	16	41.03	10	25.64	3	7.69	0	0.00
Private	44	9	20.45	18	40.91	13	29.55	4	9.09	0	0.00
Total ₁	209	68	32.53	73	34.93	53	25.36	13	6.22	2	0.96
Small	43	12	27.91	11	25.58	15	34.88	5	11.63	0	0.00
Medium	40	9	22.50	22	55.00	9	22.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	126	47	37.30	40	31.75	29	23.01	8	6.35	2	1.59
Total ₂	209	68	32.53	73	34.93	53	25.36	13	6.22	2	0.96

TABLE XVI
DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED HIGHLY BY
SIZE AND KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	2	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	16	11	68.75	3	18.75	2	12.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	18	13	72.22	3	16.67	2	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00
Rural:											
Small	5	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	3	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	8	2	25.00	6	75.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Private:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	3	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	3	1	33.33	1	33.33	1	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	6	2	33.33	3	50.00	1	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00
Totals:	32	17	53.13	12	37.50	3	9.37	0	0.00	0	0.00
Small	5	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	8	4	50.00	4	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	19	12	63.16	4	21.05	3	15.79	0	0.00	0	0.00

that 72.22 per cent of the cases recommended highly by urban schools graduated, whereas only 33.33 per cent of those recommended highly by private schools graduated, and only 25.00 per cent of those from rural schools graduated. The large school also had a higher percentage of cases to graduate than did medium and small schools, which had 50.00 per cent and 20.00 per cent respectively.

The per cent of cases withdrawn without prejudice was as follows: urban, 16.67 per cent; rural 75.00 per cent; private, 50.00 per cent; small, 80.00 per cent; medium, 50.00 per cent; and large, 21.05 per cent. The academic drop-outs were all from large schools, where the percentage was 15.79.

It appears that the least reliable schools, when they recommend a student highly, are the rural and small schools, especially the small rural schools whose recommendation appears most unreliable. The group with the most reliable recommendation seems to be the urban school, especially the medium urban school, although large schools in general appear to make a reliable recommendation. The private schools are also unreliable when they recommend highly, but not as unreliable as the rural or small schools.

Table XVII shows that, of the groups of schools from which 130 cases were recommended, urban schools had the largest percentage of graduates (38.96 per cent), closely followed by the large schools (36.71 per cent). The urban and the large schools also had the smallest percentage of academic drop-outs (19.48 per cent and 18.99 per cent, respectively).

TABLE XVII

DISPOSITION OF RECOMMENDED CASES BY
SIZE AND KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban:											
Small	4	2	50.00	0	0.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	8	2	25.00	5	62.50	1	12.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	65	26	40.00	22	33.85	12	18.46	4	6.15	1	1.54
Total	77	30	38.96	27	35.07	15	19.48	4	5.19	1	1.30
Rural:											
Small	17	6	35.29	3	17.65	5	29.41	3	17.65	0	0.00
Medium	7	1	14.29	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	0										
Total	24	7	29.17	7	29.17	7	29.17	3	12.50	0	0.00
Private:											
Small	7	2	28.57	2	28.57	2	28.57	1	14.29	0	0.00
Medium	8	2	25.00	3	37.50	3	37.50	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	14	3	21.43	5	35.71	3	21.43	3	21.43	0	0.00
Total	29	7	24.14	10	34.48	8	27.59	4	13.79	0	0.00
Totals:	130	44	33.84	44	33.84	30	23.08	11	8.46	1	0.77
Small	28	10	35.72	5	17.86	9	32.14	4	14.28	0	0.00
Medium	23	5	21.74	12	52.17	6	26.09	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	79	29	36.71	27	34.18	15	18.99	7	8.86	1	1.26

While the small school has the lowest rate of withdrawal without prejudice (17.86 per cent), it also has the highest rate of academic drop-outs (32.14 per cent).

In general, the urban and the large schools, again seem to have the most reliable recommendations and the private and medium schools the least reliable recommendations. Specifically, the recommendation of the large urban school is the most reliable, while that of the medium rural and medium private school is the most unreliable.

Table XVIII is an analysis of the 12 cases recommended with qualifications. Because of the small number of cases from all classifications except urban and large, it is perhaps impossible to make many valid conclusions. However, there appears to be a tendency for this recommendation to be highly reliable when made by a large school and a little less reliable when made by an urban school. None of the cases recommended with qualifications from rural, or small, or medium schools graduated, while 50.00 per cent of the cases from large schools and 37.50 per cent from urban schools graduated.

Table XIX shows that when a school of any classification states that an applicant is not recommended by the school, the recommendation is most reliable. Since no case not recommended graduated, the general reliability of this recommendation is measured by the percentage of academic drop-outs compared with the percentage of withdrawals and those still enrolled. On this basis, the recommendation of the private school, appears valid to a greater degree than the recommendation from other schools.

TABLE XVIII

DISPOSITION OF CASES RECOMMENDED WITH QUALIFICATIONS

BY SIZE AND KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban:											
Small	1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	6	3	50.00	1	16.67	2	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	8	3	37.50	1	12.50	4	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Rural:											
Small	3	0	0.00	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	1	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	4	0	0.00	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Private:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Totals:	12	3	25.00	3	25.00	6	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Small	4	0	0.00	1	25.00	3	75.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	2	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	6	3	50.00	1	16.67	2	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00

TABLE XIX

DISPOSITION OF NOT RECOMMENDED CASES BY
SIZE AND KIND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban:											
Small	1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00
Medium	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Large	8	0	0.00	4	50.00	3	37.50	0	0.00	1	12.50
Total	9	0	0.00	4	44.44	3	33.33	1	11.11	1	11.11
Rural:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Private:											
Small	3	0	0.00	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	2	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Totals:	14	0	0.00	6	42.86	6	42.86	1	7.14	1	7.14
Small	4	0	0.00	1	25.00	2	50.00	1	25.00	0	0.00
Medium	2	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	8	0	0.00	4	50.00	3	37.50	0	0.00	1	12.50

From an analysis of Table XX, it appears that no recommendation of any kind from a private school is almost the equivalent of not recommended. Of the four cases from private schools, none graduated, three withdrew, and one was an academic drop-out. No recommendation from a large urban school appears to be equivalent to a recommendation with qualifications half the time and not recommended the other half, for three of the fifteen cases graduated, one was still enrolled, and six were academic drop-outs.

In summary, it appears that any recommendation from a large urban school is generally reliable and is the most reliable of all schools. The recommendations of small urban and medium urban schools appear reliable in only half the cases.

The recommendations of small rural schools are reliable in a majority of cases, but that of the medium rural school is unreliable in a majority of cases. For all rural schools, the reliability of a recommendation is much lower than that from the urban schools.

In general, private school recommendations are usually unreliable for all recommendations except that of not recommended, which is highly reliable. However, the small private school is reliable in its recommendations in a majority of cases. Of the 44 cases from private schools, 24 were from military schools and 20 from non-military schools. If the cases not recommended are eliminated, 23 were recommended from military schools and 16 from non-military schools. Of the 23 cases from military schools, 3 (13.05 per cent) graduated, 4 (17.39 per cent) were still

TABLE XX

DISPOSITION OF CASES BY SIZE AND KIND OF SCHOOL

WHEN NO RECOMMENDATION WAS INDICATED

School	Total cases	Graduated		Withdrew with- out prejudice		Academic drop-out		Still enrolled		Disciplinary drop-out	
	no.	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent	no.	per cent
Urban:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Large	15	3	20.00	5	33.33	6	40.00	1	16.67	0	0.00
Total	15	3	20.00	5	33.33	6	40.00	1	16.67	0	0.00
Rural:											
Small	2	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	2	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Private:											
Small	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Medium	4	0	0.00	3	75.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	0	0		0		0		0		0	
Total	4	0	0.00	3	75.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Totals:	21	4	19.04	8	38.10	8	38.10	1	4.76	0	0.00
Small	2	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Medium	4	0	0.00	3	75.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Large	15	3	20.00	5	33.33	6	40.00	1	16.67	0	0.00

enrolled, and 6 (26.10 per cent) were academic drop-outs. Of the 16 cases recommended by non-military schools, 6 (37.50 per cent) graduated, and only 2 (12.50 per cent) were academic drop-outs. Thus, it appears that recommendations from non-military private schools are quite reliable, but those from private military schools are most unreliable.

In general, the recommendations of large schools are reliable in a majority of cases; those of medium schools in about half the cases; and those of small schools are unreliable in a majority of the cases.

Therefore, it was concluded that the reliability of the recommendations does vary greatly with the size and kind of secondary school making the recommendation. It is possible for an admissions committee to estimate, in a general way, by the size and kind of school how much, or how little, acceptance to give a recommendation from a secondary school.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study has revealed that the validity of secondary school recommendations of applicants for admission to Richmond College does vary with the kind of recommendations, the school official making the recommendation, and the size and classification of the secondary school. If one, or a combination, of these factors is considered, an admissions committee may be able to distinguish between those applicants who will most probably pass and those who will most probably fail.

From the first phase of this study, it was indicated that the most valid recommendations are those at either end of the range of recommendations--i.e., recommended highly and not recommended for admission. This high degree of validity was maintained for these two recommendations throughout the study and, in general, was not influenced by such factors as who made the recommendation or from what size or kind of school the recommendation was made.

From the study of the applicants who were in the second category (recommended), it was concluded that this recommendation was reliable in a majority of cases. However, the validity of this recommendation varies greatly with the different classifications of recommending persons and with the size and kind of school. It was found that such a recommendation made by a guidance officer was highly reliable, but one made by an assistant principal was often unreliable. Further, it was found that

this recommendation was reliable when made by a large urban school or a non-military private school, but was unreliable when made by a medium school or a private military school.

This study indicated that an applicant recommended with qualifications is a relatively poor risk for college. It was found that only one-fourth of such students graduated, while one-half were academic failures. Such a recommendation is apparently valid when made by a guidance officer or by a large school. In general, however, this recommendation is an indication that the applicant is more likely to fail than to pass his work at Richmond College.

The study showed that when there was no recommendation of any kind made for an applicant, he was likely to be less successful than an applicant recommended with qualifications, but more successful than one who was not recommended. However, no indicated recommendation from a private school is very nearly the equivalent of a refusal to recommend.

From the second phase of this study, it was revealed that the recommendations of the guidance officer were highly reliable and the most valid for all categories of recommendations. Of those whom he recommended or recommended highly, not one was an academic drop-out. Of those whom he recommended with qualifications, one-half graduated and one-half were academic drop-outs. All of those who were admitted contrary to the recommendation of the guidance officer became academic drop-outs.

The recommendation of the principal was found to be reliable in a majority of cases, except when he made a recommendation with qualifications. Although the degree of reliability varies with the type of recommendation and is never as reliable as a recommendation made by a guidance officer, the recommendation of the principal was found to be more reliable than that of an assistant principal.

When the factors of size and kind of school were incorporated into the study, it was found that the recommendations from large urban schools were the most reliable, and the least reliable were from private military schools.

In general, the recommendations of rural schools, private schools, and medium schools were found to be unreliable in a majority of cases. However, those from non-military private schools and small rural schools were reliable in a majority of cases.

In conclusion, it appears that, on the basis of this study, an admissions committee may be able to accept with assurance the recommendations of the guidance officer and, with a little less assurance, recommendations from large urban schools. It further appears that the committee may find it prudent in some cases to place little reliance on the recommendations of small schools, rural schools, private military schools, or the recommendations of assistant principals.

It is recommended to the Admissions Committee of Richmond College that those applicants who are recommended highly by their secondary schools will most probably be successful in their college work; for of

those admitted with this recommendation, more than half will graduate, and only about one-tenth will be academic drop-outs.

Over a five year period, about one-third of those admitted with a recommendation of recommended will graduate, and almost one-fourth will be academic drop-outs. Nearly one-tenth will still be enrolled, and about one-third will have withdrawn.

Of the applicants accepted with a recommendation with qualifications, about one-fourth will graduate, but one-half will become academic drop-outs.

When an applicant has not been recommended for admission to Richmond College by his secondary school, the Admissions Committee has a very reliable indicator that the applicant will not be successful in his work. Of the fourteen cases not recommended, only one has been successful to any appreciable degree, and he had been unable to graduate in the five years covered by this study.

It appears that the Admissions Committee should insist on receiving some kind of recommendation from the applicant's secondary school. Of the twenty-one cases admitted without any kind of recommendation, only four graduated and eight were academic drop-outs.

It is also recommended that the findings in this study should be followed up at regular intervals that the Admissions Committee may have additional information which may serve to help them in the difficult task of student selection.

The findings of this study suggest several questions which might be answered in other studies. (1) Why are the recommendations of

guidance officers so much more reliable than those of principals or assistant principals? (2) Are the reliability of the recommendations of large urban schools and the unreliability of small and rural schools a reflection of better preparation of students in large urban schools? (3) Do students from large schools adjust more readily to the demands of a college environment than do students from small schools and rural schools? (4) How effective is the system of academic probation at Richmond College?

Further study of topics suggested by these questions may give admissions committees additional information to aid in student selection, and thereby decrease the number of failures and withdrawals from Richmond College.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- American Council on Education, Predicting Success in Professional Schools, A Report Prepared by the Committee on Student Personnel Work of the American Council on Education (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1949), 187 pp.
- Fine, Benjamin. Admission to American Colleges. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946, 217 pp.
- MacIntosh, Archibald. Behind the Academic Curtain. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948, 149 pp.
- Whitney, Frederick L. The Elements of Research. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950. 435 pp.

B. Periodicals

- Baker, Elizabeth C. and George A. "Factor Analysis of High School Variables and Success in University Subjects for the First Semester in the University," Journal of Experimental Education, 24: 315-18, June, 1955.
- Berdie, Ralph F. "Improving Evaluation in Student Recruitment and Selection," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 34: 481-6, April, 1956.
- "College Admissions in Ohio," School and Society, 85: 258, September 28, 1957.
- "Commencement," Reporter, June 9, 1960, p. 4.
- Daniel, Walter G. "Testing High School Students for College," School Life, 33: 143-4, June, 1953.
- "Flunked Out," Time, September 20, 1948. pp. 76-77.
- Lewis, William A. "Scholarship and College Entrance Testing," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 38: 759-60, May 1960.
- Pierson, Leroy R. "High School Teacher Prediction of College Success," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37: 142-5, October, 1958.
- "Poor Selection or Inadequate Preparation?" School and Society, 74: 139, September 1, 1951.

"Relieving College Enrollment Pressure," School and Society, 85: 315-16, October 26, 1957.

Salley, Ruth C. and Weintraub, Ruth G. "Student Records of Entrance and Graduation," School and Society, 69: 404-6, June 4, 1949.

"Something Has to Give," Time, June 6, 1960, p. 42.

"To Rank or Not to Rank," National Education Association Journal, May, 1960, pp. 26-27.

Wald, Richard C. "The Impending Campus Crisis," Saturday Review, September 14, 1957, pp. 22-24.

Warren, Roy E. "A Study of Applicants for Readmission to College," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 34: 553-8, May, 1956.

Weeks, James S. "The Predictive Validity of A.C.E. and S.C.A.T.," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 38: 52-4, September, 1959.

C. Unpublished Materials

Trausneck, William McL. "Some Factors Relating the Success of Richmond College Students to Their High School Preparation." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Richmond, Richmond, August, 1950.

D. Miscellaneous

University of Richmond Bulletin, Richmond College Catalogue for 1956.

APPENDIX

TABLE XXI

NUMBER OF ACADEMIC DROP-OUTS FROM EACH CATEGORY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
DURING OR AT THE END OF EACH SEMESTER

Categories of recommendations	Semesters										Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
(1) Highly recommended	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
(2) Recommended	8	6	2	4	1	2	5	1	1	0	30
(3) Recommended with qualifications	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
(4) Not recommended	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
(5) Not indicated	2	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
TOTALS	10	14	3	10	5	3	5	2	1	0	53

TABLE XXII

NUMBER OF CASES ON THE DEFICIENCY LIST FROM EACH CATEGORY
OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE END OF EACH SEMESTER

Categories of recommendations	Semesters										Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
(1) Highly recommended	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	8
(2) Recommended	23	15	3	22	6	7	6	7	2	4	95
(3) Recommended with qualifications	4	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
(4) Not recommended	4	6	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	18
(5) Not indicated	4	5	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	19
TOTALS	35	34	8	36	11	11	6	9	2	4	156

VITA

James Garland Hanes. Born Mount Hope, West Virginia, September 16, 1923. Educated Virginia Public Schools. Graduate, Farmville High School, Farmville, Virginia, June, 1939. B. A. Degree, Hampden Sydney College, May, 1943, major in English. United States Army, February 22, 1943--March 23, 1946. Faculty of St. Christopher's School, Richmond, Virginia, September, 1946. Appointed Principal, St. Christopher's Middle School, June, 1952.

CERTIFICATE FOR ADMISSION

to

RICHMOND COLLEGE
University of Richmond, Virginia

To Principal: Mail blank, typed if possible, directly to the Office of Admissions at this institution.

Give key to grading system.

This is to certify that
First name
Middle name
Last name

of
Number and Street
City
State

was } graduated from the of
 expects to be } Name of school Address of school

on 19....., and has completed the work shown below.

Student's birth date Name of parent or guardian

Student attended this school from to

Other schools attended

Applicant ranks approximately number from the top in a class numbering students. (If class rank is not available, check appropriate quartile): Upper..... Second..... Third..... Lowest.....

Class periods minutes times a week weeks a year. Passing mark..... College recommending mark

This school is accredited by (check) Regional Assn....., State....., Other (specify)

Under "Remarks" give name of other school(s) in which specific credit was earned. Specify if credits allowed for service in Armed Forces. Indicate by "T" subjects now being studied, and by "SS" subjects taken in summer school. Specify by "PG" any subjects taken after graduation.

COURSES	Year Studied 1, 2, 3, 4	Grade of Work Done	Unit Credit	REMARKS	COURSES	Year Studied 1, 2, 3, 4	Grade of Work Done	Unit Credit	REMARKS
ENGLISH—First Year					SOCIAL STUDIES				
Second Year					Civics				
Third Year					American History				
Fourth Year					U. S. Government				
					World History				
					Economics				
LATIN—First Year					AGRICULTURE				
Second Year									
Third Year									
Fourth Year									
FRENCH—First Year					BUSINESS EDUCATION				
Second Year									
Third Year									
Fourth Year									
SPANISH—First Year					DRAMATICS				
Second Year									
Third Year					HOME ECONOMICS				
Fourth Year									
MATHEMATICS									
General Math.									
Algebra, 1st Year					INDUSTRIAL ARTS				
Algebra, 2nd Year									
Geometry, Plane					JOURNALISM				
Geometry, Solid									
Trigonometry					MECH. DRAWING				
SCIENCES									
General Science					SPEECH				
Biology									
Chemistry					VOCATIONAL SHOP				
Physics									
Music					OTHER				
ART									

Date..... Signature..... Title.....

TEST DATA

Please record below the requested information regarding any standardized tests administered to the applicant. Be sure to give the full name of each test. Show under "norm group" that group with which the applicant was compared in order to determine the percentiles, I.Q., etc.

Date administered	Full name of test	Raw score	I.Q.	Per-centile	Norm group
	American Council on Educ. Psych. Exam.,	Q.			
 Form, 19..... Edition	L.			
		Total.....			

APPRAISAL

Important: Please record frankly under the headings below any information which would help us understand and guide this student at this institution.

1. Preparation—Check the statement expressing your opinion of this applicant with respect to preparation for college.

- () Superior () Good () Average () Doubtful () Inadequate.

2. Character, basic integrity —

3. Steadfastness, seriousness of purpose —

4. Exceptional capacities or talents —

5. Extracurricular activities —

6. Health —

7. Emotional balance, relationship with others —

OTHER DATA

List high school subjects this student has failed

.....

Has this student been registered at any other college or institution?

If so, in what institution?

This certificate is forwarded with without recommendation for admission to college.

Other comments —

Signed..... Position

**RICHMOND COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND, VIRGINIA**

SUPPLEMENTAL CERTIFICATE FOR ADMISSION

To the Principal or Headmaster:

Please complete this form and return it to the Director of Admissions, Richmond College, University of Richmond, Virginia.

=====

This is to certify that has completed the work shown
Name of Student

in detail below, and ^{was} graduated from the
(Name of School)

of on
Address of School Date

This certificate is forwarded ^{with} recommendation for admission to college.
without

Date Signed:
Principal or Headmaster

Record for Final.....of Preparation
(Semester, year)

Courses	Grade of Work Done	Unit Credit	Remarks

Passing Grade College Certifying Grade

This student ranked number in a class of students. (Please indicate approximate rank, if exact rank can not be given.)

Comments, including Final Honors earned; plans for graduation in Summer Session, etc.:

.....

.....

.....

.....