A COMPARISON OF DROPOUTS TO GRADUATES
IN A MEDIUM SIZE HIGH SCHOOL IN KANSAS, 1963-1969

by ✕ᛃ8ᵍ

Philip James Wegman

B.A., St. Benedict's College, 1967

_____

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Administration and Foundations

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:

Herbert E. Kaiser
Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The value of education for American Youth is considered to be of paramount importance. It has become an almost universally accepted goal for Americans to complete high school and receive a diploma. Since an ever increasing proportion of our youth do enter and complete high school each year this goal has been realized to a large extent.

Although our educational successes are many our educational failures still exist. Each year many dropouts are added to the evergrowing ranks of the unemployed and the educationally disadvantaged.

Many studies have been conducted in an effort to determine factors that influence early school leavers. Some studies have attempted to identify selected characteristics or factors that would enable the school to adjust its curriculum in an effort to prevent early withdrawal. Some emphasis has also been given on what community agencies should do after a student drops out of school.

Other studies have sought to compare early school leavers with graduates. Through a comparison of social, personal, family, and educational factors it was hoped that a differentiation of traits could be established between the two groups.

Some inadequacies and contradictions exist in the various studies to be found on school dropouts and some recent studies completely nullify previously implied correlations.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

A study of dropouts is difficult due to the complexity and uniqueness of the individuals being studied. The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to review the literature concerning the dropout problem, and (2) to compare dropouts with graduates, at a medium size high school in Kansas, in order to determine the differentiation in traits that existed between the two groups.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms below were used in this report with the following meanings:

A Dropout was a pupil who left a school before graduation from grade 12 or completion of a program of studies. Death or transfer to another school constituted exceptions.

A Senior High School was a school which included grades ten, eleven, and twelve as a unit.

A Medium Size High School had an enrollment which ranged from 800 to 1,200 students.

The Grade Point Average was a measure of scholastic success in the total subjects taken. The average was obtained by dividing total grade points earned by the total number of credits of course work. Values assigned were: A = 4 points, B = 3 points, C = 2 points, D = 1 point and F = 0 points.

The Reasons For Dropping Out included in this study were: lack of interest, non-attendance, suspension, pregnancy, marriage, and employment.

MEASURING INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

The <u>California Test of Mental Maturity</u> was used in the study. The test requires about 40 minutes of actual testing time and can be given within a single school period.

Standardization of the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity was based upon 25,000 students in forty-eight states and the District of Columbia. For all the students involved, control data from other standardized tests, including several hundred Stanford-Binet testings, were available. Reliability r's were reported on the basis of the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 and show correlation coefficients ranging from .68 to .88. Reliability is given for each age level from fourteen to nineteen. It is claimed that the CTMM, short form, has a high validity coefficient as evidenced by its .81 correlation with I.Q.'s obtained from the Wechsler-Bellevue and the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). Apparently very little sex or racial bias can be found in the tests.

The <u>Differential Aptitude Test</u> is a series of tests which measures in eight areas -- Verbal Reasoning (VR), Numerical Ability (NA), Abstract Reasoning (AR), Space Relations (SR), Mechanical Reasoning (MR), Clerical Speed and Accuracy (CSA), Language Usage-Spelling (LU-Spelling), and Language Usage-Sentences (LU-Sentences). The CSA test is timed, but all other subtests are intended to be power tests. The battery is suitable for administration in grades eight through twelve, and the reliabilities were all determined by the split-half method except for CSA which

was established by administration of both forms within an hour. Reliability r's are presented in tabular form for each grade level and for each sex separately.

Validity for the DAT was established in two ways. Content validity was established by using the type of items already proven useful in mental testing or by drawing upon material with obvious relationship to the area being tested. Studies on thousands of high school students were also made resulting in criteria for prediction of school grades, achievement test scores, college grades and educational and vocational placement.

The norm tables provided for the DAT help a teacher or counselor to convert raw scores into percentile rankings which may be plotted on a profile sheet for interpretive purposes. The norms are presented for each grade and sex.

In validation studies, it has been found that the various subtests frequently predict well in multiple areas. For example, the VR test predicts well for academic work in almost all subjects, while NA predicts performance in English and social studies as accurately as in mathematics and science. AR, on the other hand, is as well related to office practice and industrial arts as to science.

Super (34, p.17) remarked that "The DAT may be characterized as currently the best battery for use in educational guidance in the high school."

For the purpose of the study, all of the scores were utilized, mainly because of the important relationship between these scores and school achievement.

Chapter 2

THE DROPOUT PROBLEM, THE BACKGROUND, AND
THE OVERALL PICTURE

Greene (18) and Woolatt (45) pointed out that at the
beginning of the 20th Century a mere six percent of our youth
graduated from high school. However, from 1932 to 1965, with the
exception of the war years, there was a tremendous increase in
the percentage of students who remained in school until graduation.
In 1928-1929 one out of every 1000 students in the ninth grade
graduated from high school. Of every 1000 who entered ninth grade
in 1952-1953, 673 survived to graduate in 1956.

Schreiber (29) showed that during the decade of 1960-1970
an all time record of 26 million youth, with varying degrees of
training would pass out of the school and into the labor market.
Of this number at least 7.5 million would be high school dropouts,
and an estimated 2.5 million of these would have less than eight
years of formal education. Mitchell(22) reported that unemploy-
ment was approximately twice as high for people who did not have
high school education as for high school graduates.

Schreiber (29) pointed out that the national high school
dropout rate at the present time is about 35 percent. In 1950
for the first time in American Educational History more students
graduated from high school than dropped out.

In the following review of the literature an examination
of past findings concerning the characteristics of dropouts was
made with particular emphasis upon the recurring characteristics
of dropouts.

Causes of dropouts are both complex and numerous. Dropouts themselves are unique individuals and do not form a homogenous group. The review of causes for dropping out of school centered around four main areas: social, personal, family and school. The following characteristics reviewed may not describe any one particular dropout but a combination of these characteristics are generally true for most dropouts.

Social

Many studies today show dropouts to be socially and poorly adjusted persons having negative self-concepts. Schreiber (30) stated that all personality disorders centered around (a) a faulty self-concept; (b) an inability to handle problems; (c) an immediate need for gratification due to strong dependency needs; (d) and the inability to control impulsive behavior. Dropouts also displayed a delay in social development, inability to set goals, ego weakness, and anxiety and guilt feelings.

Cervantes (11) showed that dropouts were not well liked by their peers and had few friends and associations. Four out of five dropouts had feelings of not belonging whereas four out of five graduates felt accepted.

Terseneer and Terseneer (36) stated that dropouts had feelings of not belonging as indicated by reactions from teachers, parents, and classmates.

Personal

In this category three main characteristics were reviewed:

personality and temperament, intelligence, and reasons given by dropouts for leaving school.

Personality and temperament. Cassell and Coleman (10) found that dropouts lacked personal goals for achievement. However, Nelson (24) pointed out that dropouts combined their low levels of aspirations with fantastic and unrealistic expectations concerning their future life roles.

Lichter (21, pp. 72-73) studied 105 intellectually capable, potential dropouts. He reported that 64 percent of the girls and 89 percent of the boys in his study were having problems because of their character formation. The remaining subjects were diagnosed as neurotic.

Chilman (12) reported that potential dropouts had significantly lower need scores in the areas of achievement, order, and cautious-controlled behavior than did a group of potential persisters matched on I.Q., sex, grade placement, and school attended.

Intellectual. An enduring and popular assumption is that school dropouts have lower mental ability than school persisters; however, some studies tend to minimize intelligence as a significant factor.

Blough, (5) after compiling the results of fourteen studies, found dropouts to have a median I.Q. score of 94 while graduates had a median I.Q. score of 105. A study of seven communities by the U. S. Department of Labor (39) showed that 21 percent of the graduates as compared to 46 percent of the dropouts had I.Q. scores of 90 or less.

Of the 174 dropouts Snepp (31) reported 34 percent scored an I.Q. of 96 or above, while 66 percent were below 96, and 23 percent were below 81.

A summarization of nine surveys (41, pp. 21-22) covering 21,000 dropouts compared the percent of dropouts with the percent of the total population at certain I.Q. levels. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of 21,000 Dropouts with the Percent of
the Total Population at Certain IQ Levels

IQ Level	Percent of Population	Percent of Dropouts
110 and above	30.7%	11%
90 - 109	46.5	50
80 - 89	14.5	20
Below 80	8.2	19

From the above table it can be concluded that dropouts tended to come from the lower intelligence groups more frequently than the general population. Although most studies revealed that the I.Q. of the dropout was considerably lower than that of the average student, one study (7) found little difference in the mental ability of dropouts as compared to graduates.

Reasons given by dropouts. In one study (26) of nearly 5,000 dropouts who were questioned, over one-third (34 percent)

gave as their main reason for dropping out that they were more interested in work than in school, 23 percent were needed at home, and 13 percent needed to earn some money. Other reasons given, in order of descending frequency were: too many poor grades, urged to quit by parents, trouble with teachers, and could get better training on-the-job.

Other authorities (11), (15), and (36) also found that dropouts gave similar reasons for leaving school early.

Family

Almost all studies concerning the dropout have stressed the importance of family background, and the impact that home life had on a son or daughter who was attending school. When other sources were investigated the factors reviewed in this category included: type of home, socioeconomic status, parents attitude toward education, and the amount of education received by the parents.

Type of home. Pollack (25) and Cassell(10) found that dropouts usually came from weak or broken homes in which parents were inconsistent in affection and discipline, communication and pleasurable experience were lacking, and the father figure was either weak or absent.

Williams (43) also stated that children often drop out of school as a result of the failure of the home to provide love, affection, understanding and economic and emotional security which are necessities to the normal development of all young people.

Socioeconomic status. Nearly all studies agreed that the majority of dropouts came from the lower socioeconomic class. Cassell and Coleman (10) found in their study that from 72 to 84 percent of all dropouts came from low income families.

In addition to the low income factor most dropouts came from a low social class and usually lived in a low social area. Bowman and Mathews (8) confirmed that in most cases there appeared to be a consistent trend for fewer dropouts to come from higher social areas and more from lower social areas More graduates than dropouts in the same social class lived in better neighborhoods among neighbors of superior social status.

Parent's attitude toward education. Most studies showed that parents of graduates were more positive toward the importance of education for their children than were parents of dropouts.

Williams (43) considered family attitude to be directly connected to school dropouts. Through extensive interviewing of parents of school dropouts in Louisiana and New York he reported about two-thirds of the parents interviewed held negative and indifferent attitudes toward education. They considered the lack of a high school diploma to be no obstacle to their children's later development and success; however, the parents of in-school pupils almost all considered the lack of a diploma to be a serious obstacle.

Education of parents. The relationship between dropping out and the education of mother, father, and both parents was studied by Van Dyke and Hoyt (40, p. 88) and the findings revealed

that in all cases, the lower the educational attainment of the parents, the greater the tendency for a child to drop out. Results are given below:

Table 2

Relationship Between Dropping Out and the Education of
Mother, Father, and Both Parents

Educational Attainment of Parents	Percentage	
	Dropouts	Graduates
Neither parents had graduated	67%	38%
One parent had graduated one had not	17	15
Both parents had graduated	13	28
Both parents had post high school work	1	7

Williams (43) as a result of a survey in Maryland found 79% of the mothers and 80% of the fathers of dropouts had themselves not graduated from high school. From 57 to 63 percent of the mothers and fathers of dropouts had 10 years of education or less and from 24 to 31 percent of the mothers and fathers of dropouts had sixth grade education or less.

School

The last category for consideration in which character-istics of dropouts become manifest centered around the school. The following review included a presentation of factors related to the school dropouts.

Grade level attained. National Center for Educational Statistics (23) showed there was a fairly constant exodus from grades 10 through 12; however, the majority of dropouts were boys who left steadily throughout high school as opposed to girls who were found to drop out most frequently during the twelfth grade. In a study of 220 students in a sample of which 72 dropped for various reasons, it was found that in the majority of dropouts, 56 percent were boys. The overall dropout rate was 29 percent in the tenth grade; 36 percent in the eleventh grade with 31 percent in the twelfth grade. Boys were found to drop out at a fairly even rate from tenth grade through the eleventh grade. However, by the twelfth grade few boys were found to drop out. In contrast, the girl drop out rate showed a low of 3 percent during the eleventh grade and a high of 20 percent during the twelfth grade school year.

Snepp (31) found that the highest dropout rate occurred during the junior year followed by high school sophomores, freshmen, and finally seniors.

Reading achievement. Many studies indicated that the reading achievement of dropouts was significantly lower than that of graduates. Blesdoe (4) found that the mean reading comprehension score for pupils dropping out of the ninth or tenth grade was a grade equivalent of 7.9 while that of the remaining ninth graders was 8.9.

Snepp (31) in a study of 154 dropouts found one-fourth of the dropouts were reading normally; 28 percent were retarded one

grade, 19 percent two grades, and 28 percent three grades.

Subject failure. There appears to be a definite relation-
ship between failure in school subjects and dropping out of
school. Dillon (15) in a study of 881 dropouts found that 74
percent had failed at least two subjects, 13 percent had failed
three and 30 percent four or more.

A study conducted by the National Center for Educational
Statistics (23) found that English was the subject most frequently
failed by students followed by mathematics and social science
studies with science and languages falling last. It was found
that English accounted for almost 30 percent of the total failures,
while mathematics and social studies each accounted for 18 percent
of the failures. Language and science accounted for 15 percent
of the total failures.

Grade point average. Stevens (32) found that most drop-
outs have low grade point averages due to the fact that they fail
many subjects and earn low grades in the ones they do pass.

Allen (1) in a study of 847 dropouts reported that only
two percent had grade point averages of A and B, while 74 percent
had averages of D and F. Based on these findings he placed 78
percent in the lowest quarter of class rank as opposed to placing
two percent in the upper quarter.

In another study conducted by Van Dyke and Hoyt (40) a
mean grade point average of 1.5 was found for dropouts as opposed
to a mean average of 2.5 for all persisters.

Bowman and Mathews (8) matched dropouts with persisters on I.Q., sex, and socioeconomic status and found that dropouts made much lower grades. No dropouts, on the basis of grade point averages were placed in the highest quarter of their class, while 69 percent were placed in the lowest quarter.

Non-promotion. Retention or failure of a grade in school appears to have a great deal to do with a student dropping out of school.

Dillon (15) found that 52 percent of dropouts had failed one or more grades. Nelson (24) found if a pupil was retarded two years by the time he reached seventh grade, he was unlikely to finish either tenth grade or high school. However, if he was retarded three years, he was unlikely to even enter ninth grade.

Bowman and Mathews (8) found retardation rate for dropouts was over four times that of the control group, and over three times that of the staying group.

Thomas and Knudsen (37, pp. 92-94) studied the consequences of non-promotion and found the following:

1. Non-promotion often becomes a source of anxiety for the child due to the family pressure and emphasis on academic achievement.

2. The student is often removed from his peer group and has to associate with younger, less socially advanced groups of students.

3. A negative self-concept is often developed since non-promotion often makes the student feel like a failure.

4. Non-promotion tended to brand the student as a failure. In many cases teachers and counselors were found to reinforce the student's image of himself as a dropout and consequently expected very little of him.

Age of leaving school. Young (46) found the average age of 54 ninth grade dropouts was 16 years 7 months. Dropouts were found to be approximately two years older than the average age of junior high graduates. Wolfbein (44) found the percentages for the different ages for dropouts to be as follows: 10 percent left before the age of 16; 27 percent left before the age of 17; 17 percent left before the age of 18; and 12 percent left before the age of 19.

Allen (1) found 4 percent of boy and 7 percent of girl dropouts were underage, while 53 percent of boy and 41 percent of girl dropouts were average when entering the ninth grade.

Absenteeism. Cassell and Coleman (10), Snepp (31) and Pollack (25) found frequent absences tended to be characteristic of the school dropout.

Snepp (31) found 80 percent of the dropouts in his study had chronic attendance problems.

Van Dyke and Hoyt (40) reported that dropouts were absent an average of 15 out of every 100 days as opposed to 6 out of every 180 days for persisters.

Extracurricular activities. In a study of 208 dropouts, Snepp (31) found that 79 percent had never participated in extra-curricular activities. In another study of 798 dropouts, Dillon (15) found that 73 percent had never participated in an extra-curricular school activity.

Bell (3) studied student participation in extracurricular activities for both graduates and dropouts. He found that 68

percent of the dropouts were non-participators whereas only four
percent of the graduates were non-participators.

Greene (18) stated that dropouts failed to participate in
extracurricular school activities due to a lack of identification
with the school. Potential dropouts lacked a feeling of belonging
and to them school often represented unpleasantness.

In summarizing the recurring characteristics of dropouts,
Cassell and Coleman (10) found the following:

<u>Social</u>:

> Very few friends and associates, and is not well
> liked by peers
> Poor general and personal adjustment
> Distrustful and resentful towards adults
> Has feelings of "not belonging"
> Girls tend to go steady with older boys
> Boys tend to own a car
> Often in difficulty with community agencies and
> the law

<u>Personal</u>:

> Usually purposeless and has no personal goals
> for achievement
> Low schlastic aptitude
> Sixteen years of age or older
> Physically is either quite small or quite large
> for age group
> Frequently ill and usually easily fatigued

<u>Family</u>:

> Usually from weak or broken home
> From low-income group, and usually from trade
> or labor occupations
> Education of parents usually below eighth-grade
> level
> Often there are five or more children in the
> family
> Attitude of parents graduation negative or
> vascillating

School:

> Failure of one or more school years
> A year or more behind in reading or arithmetic at
>   seventh grade level
> Poor school attendance and numerous truancies
> Little or no participation in extracurricular school
>   activities
> Attendance at numerous elemental schools
> School marks are predominantly below "C"
> Expresses little interest in school or learning
> Evidences strong resentment towards school control

The preceding review of the characteristics of school dropouts summarized the overall factors associated with each of the four main categories which influenced a person to leave school early. In the following chapters, selected dropout characteristics were chosen and a correlational study was conducted on dropouts involved in the study.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND MATERIALS

A study of 219 Junction City Senior High School students
was conducted covering the years 1963 through 1969. Of these 219
students, 102 were dropouts as opposed to 117 graduates. The
dropouts chosen for this study were those students who had taken
the California Short Form Intelligence Test and who had a complete
set of Differential Aptitude Test scores covering the nine sepa-
rate areas. An equal proportion of graduates were chosen for each
year of the six year period covered in the study. All of the
graduates chosen also had a complete set of scores for the
California Short Form Intelligence Test and the Differential
Aptitude Test.

Variables Used in Study

In the study twenty-two different variables were used on
each of the 219 participating students. The purpose of the
following paragraphs is to thoroughly acquaint the reader with the
variables which have been used and a rationale for their inclusion
in the study.

Intelligence quotient. In studies on dropouts, scores
earned on group tests of intelligence have appeared consistently.
This variable has been found to be relatively stable as related to
early school leaving. In almost all cases the correlation between
low I.Q. and leaving school early has been found to have been
extremely significant.

Grade point average. As cited in Chapter 2, many studies have found that a correlation exists between a student's grade point average and his decision to drop out of school. For this reason, GPA was included as a variable in the study.

The GPA of each student was computed for each year the person attended high school. For the graduate, the GPA represented an average computed for a four-year period. On the other hand, the GPA of the dropout was computed only for the length of time the student was in high school.

Army or other. Approximately 40 percent of the students who attended the high school in the study were from a military background. Due to the particular situation, the Army variable was used to determine what effect the father's occupation had on a student's education attainment.

Housewife or other. Many studies reviewed hinted toward the fact that the socioeconomic status of the parents, and whether or not both parents worked, had a great influence on the child's educational attainment. This variable was included to determine whether being a housewife or working had any influence on the educational attainment of the youngster.

Differential aptitude test. Many studies showed the DAT to be an extremely reliable and valid aptitude test having an important relationship to school achievement. For this reason, all the scores on the DAT were used in the study.

Sex. The sex variable was added in order to serve as a further discriminator between dropout and graduate. In reviewing the literature many references pointed to the higher achievement levels of females. The lesser frequency of grade repetition among females, and the greater percentage of girls in the graduating classes.

The sex variable was used to compare these national findings to a local situation. It served as a constant control throughout the study and the statistical processing.

Reasons for dropping. The review of the literature showed some of the main reasons for leaving school to be: lack of interest, work, marriage, and pregnancy. These reasons for leaving school along with the local problem of non-attendance and suspension were included in order to determine the correlation between the reasons for leaving school and all the other variables.

Chapter 4

DROPOUT PROBLEM IN A MEDIUM SIZE HIGH
SCHOOL IN KANSAS

During the six school years, 1963-1969, the total dropout
rate at the Senior High School, Junction City, Kansas, was 5.5
percent for grades 10-12. During the six years the total accumu-
lative enrollment at the Senior High School was 6362 students.
Of this number, 204 boys and 161 girls, or a total of 365 students
were determined to be dropouts from grades 10-12. Boys were 56
percent of the total and girls accounted for 44 percent.

Table 3

Percent of Dropouts According to Grade Level and Sex of Student
At the Junction City Senior High School, 1963-1969

Grade Level	Total Dropout Rate	Dropout by Sex	
		Boys	Girls
Sophomore	35.0%	21.9%	13.1%
Junior	32.4	17.6	14.8
Senior	32.6	16.4	16.2
Total	100.0%	55.9%	44.1%

The dropout rate was found to be greatest for sophomores--
the year during which most students reach 16, the legal age for
dropping out of school. When separated by sex of student and
grade level, a higher percentage of boys dropped out during the
tenth grade, but a higher percentage of girls dropped out during

their twelfth grade.

The three reasons most frequently found for senior high school dropouts included: (1) Lack of Interest, 26.3 percent; (2) Non-Attendance, 21.1 percent; and (3) Marriage, 9.3 percent. Other reasons given for leaving school were related to work, illness, and pregnancy.

Correlation Matrix

A correlational study was conducted to determine the degree of correspondence or relationship between the selected variables in the study. The findings then established the degree of correspondence of each of the twenty-two variables to itself and to each of the other variables and thereby produced useful results concerning the characteristics of dropouts.

In order to determine the level of significance in the study, Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used. It was determined that a .01 level of significance be used for this behavioral research since a substantial sample size was involved. Since an overall positive correlation was anticipated, a one tailed test was used.

The degrees of freedom used was 100 since the sample size was 219. Therefore any statistic at .230 or over indicated a significant correlational finding.

Roscoe (28, p. 84) found that when one of the variables was Dichotomous as with variables including Army, housewife, sex, and the reasons for dropping out of school, the point biserial and the Pearson product moment were mathematically equivalent.

In the interpretation of the correlational studies, only the significant findings were mentioned and discussed.

All students. The I.Q. variable for all students was found to have a significant positive correlation with Grade Point Average at .60. The I.Q. variable was also found to correlate highly with all the scores on the Differential Aptitude Test with correlations ranging from .48 to .72. A significant negative correlation was found between I.Q. and whether a student graduated or dropped out. Basically one may infer from the I.Q. variable that the grades a student earned in high school were a function of his mental ability. It also indicated that the person with a lower I.Q. was more likely to drop out than a person with an average to high I.Q.

The average I.Q. for all the students in the study was 100 with a standard deviation of 12.

The Grade Point Average variable also produced useful results. The negative correlation of -.36 with absences showed that the more days a person missed school the poorer his grades became. GPA showed a significant positive correlation with all areas of the DAT. The moderately high correlation of -.65 with whether a student dropped out or graduated simply showed that students with poorer grades became high school dropouts. The mean grade point average of all the students in the study was 1.96.

The absences variable produced only two significant positive correlations. Dropouts were absent more and missed more school than graduates. In view of the fact that a reported 26.3 percent of all dropouts resulted due to a lack of interest in

school, perhaps absences were related to an overall lack of interest.

The 219 students in this study were absent an average of 32 days while attending high school.

The Army variable showed that there was a significant correlation between a student's father being in the Army and the student being dropped from school for non-attendance.

The verbal and numerical scores on the DAT yielded very high correlation in all areas. The highest correlation, as was expected, was attained by the verbal score with the combined Verbal-Numerical score at .88. The verbal score showed that a graduate earned a higher verbal and numerical score than a drop-out.

The dropout variable that served as a discriminator between dropouts and graduates proved to be a very revealing variable. Its negative correlation of -.37 with I.Q. again showed that students with higher I.Q.s' were more likely to graduate than students with lower I.Q.s'. Another revealing correlation was a negative correlation of -.65 with Grade Point Average. This indicated that graduating students earned higher grades than did students who dropped out of school.

The six reasons for dropping out failed to attain any real degree of practical significance in very many areas. One interesting finding revealed that there was a significant correlation between a person dropping school due to lack of interest and the actual grades that such a person received, as well as the number of days he was absent from school.

Dropouts only. The correlation matrix on the dropouts only proved to be quite revealing and was useful for determining some specific identifying variables.

The I.Q. variable showed a significant yet much lower correlation with Grade Point Average for the dropouts as compared to graduates. In view of the fact that the mean I.Q. for dropouts was 95.5 and the mean GPA was 1.4, the .36 correlation of I.Q. with GPA indicated that dropouts failed to fully attain their potential. The actual grades earned by dropouts did not reflect their true ability. However, the I.Q. variable correlated significantly with the DAT, but it attained a much lower level of practical significance for dropouts than for graduates.

The Absences variable proved to be an important characteristic of dropouts. They missed an average of 42 days while attending high school, which is particularly important when one considers that approximately 70 percent of all high school dropouts occurred before the senior year in high school. In view of this fact, the absentee rate for dropouts was three to four times higher than for graduates. The standard deviation of the Absences variable indicated that dropouts missed a minimum of 8 days to a maximum of 74 days while attending high school.

The Army variable produced only limited significant results. The negative correlation of -.28 with dropping school to work indicated that if a student's father was in the Army the less likely would that student be to drop school in order to find a job and work. On the other hand, as it has already been

indicated, the Army variable showed a positive correlation of .36 with dropping school due to non-attendance. This indicated that if a student's father was in the Army, the student was more likely to miss school and to be dropped for non-attendance than a student whose father was a civilian. This finding perhaps indicated the fact that the Army Post was located farther from the high school for Army students, while most of the students whose parents were civilian lived in the city and were relatively close to the high school.

The scores on the DAT attained significant correlations for dropouts in most areas as they had done for the other samples. It should be noted, however, that the correlations were higher for the other sample than they were for dropouts. This again would tend to indicate that the dropouts did not maximize their full potential.

The variables for dropping out of school failed to achieve any practical level of significance. However, they did correlate significantly with some of the other dropout variables, thus indicating that the reasons for leaving school were related to each other.

Graduates only. Graduates were found to attain a higher I.Q., 104; Achieve a higher GPA, 2.4; and miss fewer days of school, 23, than the other samples in the study. In addition practically all the scores on the DAT were found to correlate much higher for graduates than all the other samples.

Comparison of the Samples

In order to bring together the most significant and re-
vealing data, tables illustrating the three samples under study
were prepared. In the following discussion, generalizations and
interpretations have been made.

Intelligence, grade point average, absenteeism. The
following chart suggests that a relationship exists between
intelligence, grade point average, and absenteeism. From the
individual correlations covering all three samples it can be seen
that dropouts tend to have a lower intelligence quotient (I.Q.)
earn lower grades, and miss more school than graduates or all
students. The overall conclusion that can be obtained by using
these three variables suggests that a person's intelligence quo-
tient and/or the number of days a person was absent from school
has a direct bearing upon the grade point average he earns in
school.

Table 4

Mean Intelligence Quotient, Grade Point Average,
and Absenteeism Scores for Graduates,
All Students, and Dropouts

Variable	Graduates	All Students	Dropouts
Intelligence Quotient	104.0	100.0	95.5
Grade Point Average	2.4	1.9	1.4
Absenteeism in Days	23	32	42

Intelligence Only

A comparison showing the percentage of dropouts and graduates in the various I.Q. ranges was made to point out some additional significant findings. The general trend indicated that for every one graduate with an I.Q. below 90 there were approximately three dropouts, while for every one dropout with an I.Q. of 110 or above, there were approximately three graduates.

Table 5

A Comparison of the Percentage of Intelligence Quotients for all Dropouts and Graduates as Shown in Various I.Q. Ranges

	Sample Size	Intelligence Quotient			
		Below 90	90-100	101-109	110 and above
Dropouts	102	32.3	36.3	21.5	9.7
Graduates	117	12	25	32	31

The individual male and female samples indicated that a noticeable higher percentage of males had I.Q.'s of 101 and above than did females.

Table 6

A Comparison of the Percentage of Intelligence
Quotients for Male Dropouts and Graduates
as Shown in Various I.Q. Ranges

Males Only	Sample Size	Intelligence Quotient			
		Below 90	90-100	101-109	110 and above
Dropouts	58	15.7	20.6	14.7	5.8
Graduates	65	7	15	16.5	17

Table 7

A Comparison of the Percentage of Intelligence
Quotients for Female Dropouts and Graduates
as Shown in Various I.Q. Ranges

Females Only	Sample Size	Intelligence Quotient			
		Below 90	90-100	101-109	110 and above
Dropouts	44	16.6	15.7	6.8	3.9
Graduates	52	5	10	15.5	14

DAT comparison between samples. The following chart gives
the mean percentile score comparison between the three samples in
the study. The sample sizes were as follows: Graduates, 117;
All Students, 219; Dropouts, 102. The overall score comparison
showed dropouts to be much lower than the other two samples.

Table 8

Mean DAT Percentile Scores for Three
Categories of Students

Percentile

	Verbal Reason	Numer'l Ability	VR+NA	Abst. Reas.	Cler'l Sp. & Acc.	Mech. Reas.	Space Rela.	Lang. Spell.	Usage Grammar
Graduates	54.5	60.3	58.0	56.5	65.8	52.8	54.6	47.9	51.5
All Students	44.3	48.7	47.3	44.6	57.3	44.0	45.8	44.3	44.3
Dropouts	32.7	35.0	35.1	31.0	47.6	34.0	35.7	40.2	36.1

The four main areas of the DAT that showed the greatest degree of difference between dropouts and graduates were: Verbal Reasoning, Numerical Ability, VR + NA and Abstract Reasoning. As was already pointed out in the review of the literature, most dropouts tended to perform much lower in reading ability and comprehension than did graduates. The verbal reasoning and the VR + NA scores would tend to verify this fact.

The numerical ability score showed dropouts to be much lower than graduates in their all-around ability to master academic work.

The abstract reasoning score indicated that dropouts had a much harder time understanding ideas that were not presented in words or numbers than did graduates.

The differences between the performance of dropouts and graduates on the other areas of the DAT were not as significant as the four areas which were mentioned. The one area of the DAT which showed the least amount of difference in the mean score earned was spelling.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The first two chapters of this report were devoted to the introduction and review of the current literature concerning the dropout problem on a nation-wide basis. The subsequent chapters reviewed the problem in a medium size high school in Kansas during the years from 1963 through 1969. A correlational study was conducted in order to determine the degree of correspondence which existed between a determined number of variables for both dropouts and graduates. A direct comparison was then made possible and a differentiation of traits was established.

Data from one hundred and two dropouts and one hundred and seventeen graduates was collected in an attempt to find the relationship that existed for each of the twenty-two variables involved.

The results indicated that dropouts had a lower mental ability level, earned lower grades, performed much lower on most areas of the DAT, and missed more days at school than did graduates.

The most frequent reasons for dropping out included: lack of interest in school, non-attendance, and marriage.

All available data suggested that these categories were not mutually exclusive. Inadequacies in reporting the reasons for dropping out prevented making any finer distinctions. However, the obtained information indicated that perhaps retention might be improved by appropriate counseling and the development of the school program and curriculum.

Recognition of the objective characteristics and identification of the problem does not take into account identification of individual causes for dropping out of school. Nor does it touch on individual feelings such as the sense of failure, lack of purpose, and frustration that leads to dropping out as soon as the student reaches the legal age for leaving school.

The individuality of youth must be considered in every phase of a school program and curriculum. In order to provide for the individual needs of students and increase the possibility of success of each student, appropriate counseling must be started at an early age. Provisions in the school curriculum must be made so as to enable the student to fulfill his needs and achieve a success that will make possible a satisfactory adjustment to both the school and the community.

In our land of opportunity one of the many privileges we are entitled to is education for all. We as Americans should be aware of the anguish and frustration experienced by these school leavers. Our concern may mean the difference between a happy well-adjusted skilled laborer and an unhappy, poorly adjusted unskilled worker who goes from job to job.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, Charles M. "What Have Our Dropouts Learned." _Educational Leadership_, X (March, 1953), pp. 347-59.

2. Beair, Roberta E. S. _Self-Concept as Related to Adolescent School Dropouts_. Doctor's Thesis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1964.

3. Bell, James W. "A Comparison of Dropouts and Non-Dropouts on Participation in School Activities." _The Journal of Educational Research_, XL (February, 1967), pp. 248-51.

4. Blesdoe, Joseph C. "An Investigation of Six Correlates of Students Withdrawal from High School." _Journal of Educational Research_, LIII (September, 1959).

5. Blough, Telford B. _A Critical Analysis of Selected Research Literature on the Problem of School Dropouts_. Doctor's Thesis. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1956, p. 376.

6. Brown, Stanley B. and Peterson, Ted T. "Failure--The Rebellious School Dropout." _School and Society_, LXXXXVII (November, 1969).

7. Boggan, Earl J. "What Are the Major Causes of Student Dropouts and What Should the School Do About the Present Condition?" _Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals_, XXXVIIII (April, 1955), pp. 84-85.

8. Bowman, Paul H. and Mathews, Charles V. _Motivations of Youth for Leaving School_. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 200, Quincy, Illinois. University of Chicago and Quincy Youth Development Project, September, 1960, p. 137.

9. Carmical, Laverne. "Characteristics of Achievers and Under-Achievers of a Large Senior High School." _Personnel and Guidance Journal_, LXIII (December, 1964).

10. Cassell, Russell N. and Coleman, Jack C. "A Critical Examination of the School Dropout, Reluctant Learner, and Abler, Non-College Student Problem." _The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals_, XXXXVI (November, 1962), pp. 60-65.

11. Cervantes, Lucius F. _The Dropout: Causes and Cures_. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965, pp. 140-145.

12. Chilman, Catherine S. A Comparative Study of Measured Personality Needs and Self-Perceived Problems of Ninth and Tenth Grade Students: Half of the Group Possessing Characteristics Associated with Early School Leaving and the Other Half Not Possessing Such Characteristics. Doctor's Thesis. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University, 1959, p. 305.

13. Davis, Donald A. "An Experimental Study of Potential Dropouts." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXX (May, 1962).

14. Dentler, Robert A., and Warshaver, Mary E. Big City Drop-outs and Illiterates. New York: Center for Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

15. Dillon, Harold J. Early School Leavers: A Major Educational Problem. National Child Labor Committee Publication No. 401. New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1949, p. 94.

16. Fink, Donald D. The Efficiency of Certain Criteria in Predicting School Dropouts. Doctor's Thesis. Pullman: Washington State University, 1963.

17. Gowan, John Curtis and Demos, George D. (Editors). The Disadvantaged and Potential Dropout. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966.

18. Greene, Bert I. Preventing Student Dropouts. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 29, 42-43.

19. Hoyt, Harold L. "Whose Responsibility Is the Public School Dropout?" Education Colorado, V (November, 1969).

20. Huus, Helen. Freedom and Education, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963.

21. Litcher, Solomon C., and others. The Dropouts. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962, p. 302.

22. Mitchell, James P. Manpower Challenge of 1960's. U. S. Department of Labor. No. 0-54227 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 17.

23. National Center for Educational Statistics. A Study of Longitudinal Patterns of Failure Among High School Dropouts and Poorly Performing Graduates. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Abstracts, Inc., ED-012-486, pp. 16-23.

24. Nelson, Lester W. "The Dropout Problem--A Growing Educational Concern Today." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXV (April, 1961), pp. 275-277.

25. Pollack, Jack Harrison. "The Astounding Truth About Drop-
         outs." Parents' Magazine, XXXXI (September, 1966),
         pp. 66-67.

26. Pond, Fredrick L. "Pennsylvania Study of Dropouts and the
         Curriculum." The Bulletin of the National Association
         of Secondary School Principals, XXXVII (March, 1953),
         pp. 81-87.

27. Ritchie, Robert R. "The High School Dropout--An Educational
         Dilemma." The Bulletin of the National Association of
         Secondary School Principals, XXXXVI (November, 1962).

28. Roscoe, John T. Fundamental Research Statistics. New York:
         Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

29. Schreiber, Daniel. "The Low Ability Group and the World of
         Automation." The Bulletin of the National Association
         of Secondary School Principals, XXXXVIII (November,
         1964), pp. 73-76.

30. Schreiber, Daniel L. The School Dropout. Washington, D. C.
         National Education Association, Project on School
         Dropouts, 1964, p. 214.

31. Snepp, Daniel W. "Can We Salvage the Dropout?" The Clearing
         House, XXXI (September, 1956), pp. 49-54.

32. Stevens, J. Joseph. The Development and Testing of a Model
         for the Identification of Potential Dropouts. Doctor's
         Thesis. Greeley: Colorado State College, 1965, p. 140.

33. Strom, Robert D. "A Realistic Curriculum for the Predictive
         Dropout." Clearing House, XXXVIIII (October, 1964).

34. Super, Donald E. "The Multi-factor Tests: Summing Up."
         Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (September, 1957),
         p. 17.

35. Swan, Leonard. "Early Recognizing of Potential Drop-out Helps
         Canton." School Management, V (November, 1961).

36. Terseneer, L. M. and Terseneer, R. A. "Review of the
         Literature on School Dropouts." The Bulletin of the
         National Association of Secondary School Principals,
         XXXXVIII (May, 1958), pp. 141-153.

37. Thomas, Shailer and Knudsen, Dean D. "The Relationship Between
         Non-Promotion and the Dropout Problem." Theories Into
         Practice, V (November, 1961), pp. 74-84.

38. Thompson, Michael L. and Nelson, Robert H. "Twelve Approaches to Remedy the Dropout Problem." _Clearing House_, XXXVIII (December, 1963).

39. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. _School and Early Employment Experience of Youth: A Report on Seven Communities_, 1952-1957. Bulletin No. 1277. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, August, 1960, p. 89.

40. Van Dyke, L. A. and Hoyt, K. B. _The Dropout Problem In Iowa High Schools_. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 160. Iowa City: State University of Iowa and Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, p. 88.

41. Warner, O. Ray. "The Scholastic Ability of School Dropouts." _School Life_ 47: 21-22, October, 1964, also cited in: _School Dropouts_: Research Summary 1967 - S1. Prepared by Shenell E. Varner. Washington: Research Division, National Education Association, 1967, and Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Report No. Research Summary, 1967 - S1.

42. Williams, Percy V. "School Dropouts." _NEA Journal_, LII (February, 1963).

43. Williams, Robert F. "Social Dynamite." _Virginia Journal of Education_, II (April, 1962), pp. 11-12.

44. Wolfbein, Seymour L. "Transition from School to Work: A Study of the School Leaver." _Personnel and Guidance Journal_, XXXVIII (October, 1959), pp. 98-105.

45. Woolatt, Lorne H. "Why Capable Students Dropout of High School." _National Association of Secondary School Principals_, XXXXV (November, 1961).

46. Young, Joe M. "Lost, Strayed, or Stolen." _Clearing House_, XXVIIII (October, 1954), pp. 89-92.

APPENDIX

TITLE: PHIL WEGMAN REPORT   ALL STUDENTS   N= 219

Variable No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1-I Q	1.0000	0.5986*	-0.1228	-0.0628	-0.0036	0.7276*	0.7128*	0.7098*	0.6132*	0.4788
2-GPA	0.5986*	1.0000	-0.3623*	-0.1107	-0.0768	0.6503*	0.6791*	0.6127*	0.5001*	0.4918
3-ABSS	-0.1228	-0.3623*	1.0000	0.0971	-0.0466	-0.1529	-0.1409	-0.1048	-0.1611	-0.1740
4-ARMY	-0.0628	-0.1107	0.0971	1.0000	0.1281	-0.0172	-0.0956	-0.0522	-0.0652	-0.0742
5-HSWF	-0.0036	-0.0768	-0.1281	0.1281	1.0000	-0.0782	-0.1276	-0.0851	-0.0637	-0.0354
6-VERB	0.7276*	0.6503*	-0.1529	-0.0172	-0.0782	1.0000	0.7412*	0.7837*	0.6151*	0.4547*
7-NUM	0.7128*	0.6791*	-0.1409	-0.0956	-0.1276	0.7412*	1.0000	0.7358*	0.5879*	0.5346*
8-ABST	0.7098*	0.6127*	-0.1048	-0.0522	-0.0851	0.7837*	0.7358*	1.0000	0.6803*	0.5477*
9-MECH	0.6132*	0.5001*	-0.1611	-0.0652	-0.0637	0.6151*	0.5879*	0.6803*	1.0000	0.5661*
10-SPAT	0.4788*	0.4919*	-0.1740	-0.0742	-0.0354	0.4547*	0.5346*	0.5477*	0.5661*	1.0000
11-CLER	0.2641*	0.3718*	-0.1170	-0.0277	-0.0306	0.3003*	0.3507*	0.3380*	0.2658*	0.2373
12-SPLL	0.4352*	0.4530*	-0.0595	0.0591	-0.0786	0.5907*	0.4897*	0.3840*	0.3094*	0.2296
13-SENT	0.6258*	0.5887*	-0.1313	0.0197	-0.0535	0.7057*	0.6634*	0.6347*	0.4980*	0.4368
14-V-N	0.7130*	0.6801*	-0.1713	-0.0602	-0.1002	0.8842*	0.8525*	0.7599*	0.5552*	0.4953
15-DROP	-0.3656*	-0.6542*	0.3331*	0.2136	0.0552	-0.3634*	-0.4036*	-0.4101*	-0.3273*	-0.3189
16-WHY Lack of Interest	-0.1773	-0.3258*	0.2326*	0.0004	0.0580	-0.2033	-0.1994	-0.2658*	-0.2155	-0.1833
17-Non-Attendance	-0.1849	-0.3068*	0.2253	0.3148*	-0.0328	-0.1057	-0.2209	-0.1327	-0.1370	-0.1578
18-Suspended	-0.1614	-0.1794	-0.0050	0.1545	0.0412	-0.1053	-0.0480	-0.1130	-0.0944	0.0078
19-Sex	0.0083	-0.1683	-0.0179	0.0121	0.0613	-0.0285	-0.0165	-0.0665	-0.0802	-0.1361
20-Pregnant	0.0741	-0.0090	0.0929	0.0257	-0.0145	0.0041	-0.0306	0.0186	0.0423	-0.0067
21-Married	-0.1165	-0.1318	-0.0399	-0.0284	-0.0145	-0.1854	-0.1638	-0.1569	-0.1441	-0.1164
22-Work	-0.0416	-0.1682	0.0068	-0.1391	0.0469	-0.0598	-0.0516	-0.0476	0.0083	-0.0975
MEAN	100.3425	1.9518	31.8036	0.3607	0.7489	44.3288	48.7306	44.6941	44.0091	45.8082
STD. DEV.	12.1163	0.7901	27.7550	0.4802	0.4337	29.8658	30.6067	30.9106	28.8294	29.5800

Variable No.	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1-I Q	0.2641*	0.4352*	0.6258*	0.7130*	-0.3656*	-0.1773	-0.1849	-0.1614	0.0083	0.074
2-GPA	0.3718*	0.4530*	0.5887*	0.6801*	-0.6542*	-0.3258*	-0.3068*	-0.1794	-0.1683	-0.009
3-ABSS	-0.1170	-0.0595	-0.1313	-0.1713	0.3331*	0.2326*	0.2253	-0.0050	-0.0179	0.092
4-ARMY	-0.0277	0.0591	0.0197	-0.0502	0.2136	0.0004	0.3148*	0.1545	0.0121	0.025
5-HSWF	-0.0306	-0.0786	-0.0535	-0.1002*	0.0552	0.0580	-0.0328	0.0412	0.0613	-0.014
6-VERB	0.3003*	0.5907*	0.7057*	0.8842*	-0.3634*	-0.2033	-0.1057	-0.1053	-0.0285	0.004
7-NUM	0.3507*	0.4897*	0.6634*	0.8525*	-0.4036*	-0.1994	-0.2209	-0.0480	-0.0165	-0.030
8-ABST	0.3380*	0.3840*	0.6347*	0.7599*	-0.4101*	-0.2658*	-0.1327	-0.1130	-0.0665	0.018
9-MECH	0.2658*	0.3094*	0.4980*	0.5652*	-0.3273*	-0.2155	-0.1370	-0.0944	-0.0802	0.042
10-SPAT	0.2373*	0.2296*	0.4368*	0.4953*	-0.3189*	-0.1833	-0.1578	0.0078	0.1361	-0.006
11-CLER	1.0000	0.2885*	0.2276	0.3213*	-0.3172*	-0.1399	-0.1631	-0.1307	0.0521	-0.037
12-SPLL	0.2885*	1.0000	0.5866*	0.5526*	-0.1330	-0.1014	-0.0380	-0.0547	-0.0306	0.118
13-SENT	0.2276*	0.5866*	1.0000	0.7560*	-0.2576*	-0.1928	-0.1405	0.0038	0.0190	0.032
14-V-N	0.3213*	0.5526*	0.7560*	1.0000	-0.3731*	-0.2183	-0.1934	-0.0210	-0.0216	-0.039
15-DROP	-0.3172*	-0.1330	-0.2576*	-0.3731*	1.0000	0.4750*	0.3757*	0.3007*	0.0131	0.194
16-WHY Lack of Interest	-0.1399	-0.1014	-0.1928	-0.2183	0.4750*	1.0000	-0.1556	-0.1245	0.1187	-0.080
17-Nc	-0.1631	-0.0380	-0.1405	-0.1934	0.3757*	-0.1556	1.0000	-0.0985	-0.1025	-0.063
18-Suspended	-0.1307	-0.0547	0.0038	-0.0210	0.3007*	-0.1245	-0.0985	1.0000	0.1419	-0.051
19-Sex	0.0521	-0.0306	0.0190	-0.0216	0.0131	0.1187	-0.1025	0.1419	1.0000	-0.153
20-Pregnant	-0.0379	0.1182	0.0320	-0.0394	0.1946	-0.0806	-0.0637	-0.0510	-0.1534	1.000
21-Married	-0.0216	-0.1310	-0.1175	-0.1864	0.1946	-0.0806	-0.0637	-0.0510	-0.2057	-0.033
22-Work	-0.0482	-0.0017	0.0039	0.0019	0.2579*	-0.1068	-0.0845	-0.0676	0.0914	-0.043
MEAN	57.3972	44.3744	44.3470	47.3470	0.4658	0.1644	0.1096	0.0731	0.5616	0.032
STD. DEV.	28.6420	28.8519	29.6897	30.5573	0.4988	0.3706	0.3124	0.2602	0.4962	0.175

Variable No.	21	22
1–I Q	-0.1165	-0.0416
2–GPA	-0.1318	-0.1682
3–ABSS	-0.0399	0.0068
4–ARMY	-0.0284	-0.1391
5–HSWF	-0.0145	0.0469
6–VERB	-0.1854	-0.0598
7–NUM	-0.1638	-0.0516
8–ABST	-0.1569	-0.0476
9–MECH	-0.1441	0.0083
10–SPAT	-0.1164	-0.0975
11–CLER	-0.0216	-0.0482
12–SPLL	-0.1310	-0.0017
13–SENT	-0.1175	0.0039
14–V–N	-0.1864	0.0019
15–DROP	0.1946	0.2579*
16–WHY Lack of Interest	-0.0806	-0.1068
17– Non–Attendance	-0.0637	-0.0845
18–Suspended	-0.0510	-0.0676
19–Sex	-0.2057	0.0914
20–Pregnant	-0.0330	-0.0438
21–Married	1.0000	-0.0438
22–Work	-0.0438	1.0000
MEAN	0.0320	0.0548
STD. DEV.	0.1759	0.2276

TITLE: PHIL WEGMAN REPORT   DROPOUTS ONLY   N = 102

Variable No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1-I Q	1.0000	0.3607*	0.0642	0.0296	0.0322	0.7106*	0.6179*	0.7041*	0.5398*	0.3073
2-GPA	0.3607*	1.0000	-0.1579	0.0450	-0.0909	0.3932	0.4482*	0.3369*	0.1885	0.2956
3-ABSS	0.0642	-0.1579	1.0000	0.0060	-0.0790	-0.0135	0.0575	0.0693	-0.0345	-0.1191
4-ARMY	0.0295	0.0450	0.0060	1.0000	0.1327	0.1583	0.0481	0.0703	0.1236	0.1152
5-USWF	0.0322	-0.0909	-0.0790	0.1327	1.0000	-0.0361	-0.1366	-0.1307	-0.0348	-0.0377
6-VERB	0.7106*	0.3932*	-0.0135	0.1583	-0.0361	1.0000	0.6513*	0.7763*	0.5968*	0.2548
7-NUM	0.6179*	0.4482*	0.0575	0.0481	-0.1366	0.6513*	1.0000	0.7038*	0.4451*	0.4140
8-ABST	0.7041*	0.3369*	0.0693	0.0703	-0.1307	0.7763*	0.7038*	1.0000	0.6838*	0.4307
9-MECH	0.5398*	0.1885	-0.0345	0.1236	-0.0348	0.5968*	0.4451*	0.6838*	1.0000	0.3627
10-SPAT	0.3078*	0.2969*	-0.1197	0.1163	-0.0372	0.2548*	0.4140*	0.4307*	0.3427*	1.0000
11-CLER	0.2572*	0.3001*	-0.0292	-0.0740	-0.0954	0.3243*	0.3221*	0.4114*	0.2863*	0.2048
12-SPLL	0.4957*	0.3065*	0.0670	0.1400	-0.0273	0.6100*	0.4900*	0.5170*	0.4717*	0.1693
13-SENT	0.5937*	0.3490*	0.0085	0.1204	-0.0419	0.6728*	0.5744*	0.6650*	0.4841*	0.3175
14-V-N	0.6259*	0.4532*	-0.0146	0.0820	-0.1275	0.8231*	0.7582*	0.7059*	0.4537*	0.3222
15-DROP	0.0	0.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16-WHY-Lack of Interest	-0.0063	-0.0390	0.1036	-0.1620	0.0549	-0.0549	-0.0136	-0.1402	-0.1180	-0.0595
17-Non-Attendance	-0.0792	-0.1499	0.1324	0.3568*	-0.0878	0.0524	-0.1172	0.0400	-0.0262	-0.0575
18-Suspended	0.0835	0.0413	-0.1351	0.1334*	0.0392	0.0065	0.1206	0.0187	0.0072	0.1784
19-Sex	0.0953	-0.1942	-0.0250	-0.1306	0.0037	0.1758	0.1993	0.1512	0.1132	0.0128
20-Pregnant	0.2289	0.2747*	0.0351	-0.0229	-0.0391	0.1200	0.0766	0.1742	0.1868	0.0928
21-Married	-0.0715	-0.0105	-0.1308	-0.1005	-0.0391	-0.1840	-0.1363	-0.1365	-0.1418	-0.0917
22-Work	0.0843	0.0013	-0.1004	-0.2833	0.0514	0.0553	0.0851	0.1045	0.1659	-0.0250
MEAN	95.5980	1.3982	41.7059	0.4706	0.7745	32.7059	35.5000	31.1176	33.9019	35.7055
STD. DEV.	11.4885	0.5085	33.1850	0.4991	0.4179	27.8133	28.6020	26.0848	24.4294	26.3638

Variable No.	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1- I Q	0.2572*	0.4967*	0.5987*	0.6259*	0.0	-0.0063	-0.0792	-0.0835	0.0953	0.2285
2-GPA	0.3001*	0.3065*	0.3490*	0.4532*	0.0000	-0.0390	-0.1499	0.0413	-0.1942	0.2747
3-ABSS	-0.0292	0.0670	0.0085	-0.0146	0.0	0.1036	0.1324	-0.1351	-0.0250	0.0351
4-ARMY	-0.0740	0.1400	0.1204	0.0820	0.0	-0.1620	0.3568*	0.1334	-0.1305	-0.0225
5-HSWF	-0.0954	-0.0273	-0.0419	-0.1275*	0.0	0.0549	-0.0878	0.0392	0.0037	-0.0391
6-VERB	0.3243*	0.6100*	0.6728*	0.8231*	0.0	-0.0549	0.0524	0.0065	0.1758	0.1200
7-NUM	0.3221*	0.4900*	0.5744*	0.7582*	0.0	-0.0136	-0.1172	0.1205	0.1993	0.0766
8-ARST	0.4114*	0.5170*	0.6650*	0.7059*	0.0	-0.1402	0.0400	0.0187	0.1512	0.1742
9-MECH	0.2863*	0.4717*	0.4841*	0.4637*	0.0	-0.1180	-0.0262	0.0072	0.1132	0.1866
10-SPAT	0.2048	0.1693	0.3175*	0.3221*	0.0	-0.0595	-0.0575	0.1786	0.0128	0.0928
11-CLER	1.0000	0.3030*	0.1546	0.3027*	0.0	0.0177	-0.0687	-0.0537	0.1070	0.0353
12-SPLL	0.3030*	1.0000	0.5791*	0.5638*	0.0	-0.0692	0.0206	-0.0246	0.0035	0.2335
13-SENT	0.1546	0.5791*	1.0000	0.6917*	0.0	-0.1258	-0.0742	0.1340	0.0357	0.1317
14-V-N	0.3027*	0.5638*	0.6917*	1.0000	0.0	-0.0744	-0.0915	0.1523	0.1676	0.0538
15-DROP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000	0.0	0.0 *	0.0	0.0	0.0
16-WHY-Lack of Interest	0.0177	-0.0692	-0.1258	-0.0744	0.0	1.0000	-0.4097*	-0.3186*	0.1876	-0.2005
17-Non-Attendance	-0.0687	0.0206	-0.0742	-0.0915	0.0	-0.4097*	1.0000	-0.2393*	-0.1702	-0.1504
18-Suspended	-0.0537	-0.0246	0.1340	0.1523	0.0	-0.3186*	-0.2393*	1.0000	0.2124	-0.1171
19-Sex	0.1070	0.0035	0.0357	0.1676	0.0	0.1876	-0.1702	0.2124	1.0000	-0.2334
20-Pregnant	0.0353	0.2339*	0.1317	0.0538	0.0	-0.2005	-0.1506	-0.1171	-0.2334*	1.0000
21-Married	0.0594	-0.1706	-0.1081	-0.1848	0.0	-0.2005	-0.1506	-0.1171	-0.3117*	-0.0737
22-Work	0.0505	0.0537	0.1146	0.1616	0.0	-0.2697*	-0.2025	-0.1575	0.1337	-0.0991
MEAN	47.6667	40.2647	36.1569	35.1373	1.0000	0.3529	0.2353	0.1569	0.5686	0.0686
STD. DEV.	28.9297	26.5551	27.6571	28.1174	******	0.4779	0.4242	0.3637	0.4953	0.2528

1-I Q	-0.0715	0.0843
2-GPA	-0.0105	0.0013
3-ABSS	-0.1308	-0.1004
4-ARMY	-0.1005	-0.2833*
5-HSWF	-0.0391	0.0514
6-VERB	-0.1840	0.0553
7-NUM	-0.1363	0.0851
8-ABST	-0.1365	0.1045
9-MECH	-0.1418	0.1659
10-SPAT	-0.0911	-0.0259
11-CLER	0.0594	0.0505
12-SFLL	-0.1706	0.0537
13-SENT	-0.1081	0.1146
14-V-N	-0.1848	0.1616
15-DROP	0.0	0.0
16-WHY-Lack of Interest	-0.2005	-0.2697*
17-Non-Attendance	-0.1506	-0.2025
18-Suspended	-0.1171	-0.1575
19-Sex	-0.3117*	0.1337
20-Pregnant	-0.0737	-0.0991
21-Married	1.0000	-0.0991
22-Work	-0.0991	1.0000
MEAN	0.0686	0.1176
STD. DEV.	0.2528	0.3222

Variable No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1—I Q	1.0000	0.6227*	-0.1103	0.0038	0.0057	0.6638*	0.7068*	0.6287*	0.5830*	0.4958
2—GPA	0.6227*	1.0000	-0.3020*	0.0363	-0.0312	0.7226*	0.7167*	0.5954*	0.5175*	0.4557
3—ABSS	-0.1103	-0.3020*	1.0000	0.0709	-0.0636	-0.0772	-0.1173	-0.0024	-0.1014	-0.0245
4—ARMY	0.0038	0.0363	0.0709	1.0000	0.1077	-0.0239	-0.0707	0.0140	-0.0916	-0.1153
5—HSWF	0.0057	-0.0312	-0.0636	0.1077	1.0000	-0.0842	-0.0974	-0.0244	-0.0577	-0.0054
6—VERB	0.6638*	0.7220*	-0.0772	-0.0239	-0.0842	1.0000	0.7396*	0.7276*	0.5439*	0.4854
7—NUM	0.7068*	0.7167*	-0.1173	-0.0707	-0.0974	0.7396*	1.0000	0.6720*	0.5950*	0.5145
8—ABST	0.6287*	0.5954*	-0.0024	0.0140	-0.0244	0.7276*	0.6720*	1.0000	0.6023*	0.5176
9—MECH	0.5830*	0.5175*	-0.1014	-0.0916	-0.0577	0.5439*	0.5950*	0.6023*	1.0000	0.6152
10—SPAT	0.4958*	0.4557*	-0.0245	-0.1153	-0.0054	0.4854*	0.5145*	0.5176*	0.6152*	1.0000
11—CLER	0.0765	0.1829	0.0166	0.1743	0.0617	0.0968	0.1897	0.0967	0.0983	0.1063
12—SPLL	0.3600*	0.5964*	-0.1369	0.0488	-0.1041	0.5723*	0.4765*	0.2628*	0.1649	0.2199
13—SENT	0.5861*	0.7204*	-0.1450	0.0419	-0.0398	0.6864*	0.6841*	0.5550*	0.4334*	0.4384
14—V-N	0.7052*	0.7398*	-0.1225	-0.0371	-0.0526	0.9030*	0.8889*	0.7280*	0.5381*	0.5101
15—DROP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16—WHY Lack of Interest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17—Non-Attendance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18—Suspended	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
19—Sex	-0.0591	-0.2257	-0.0241	0.1472	0.1072	-0.2002	-0.2036	-0.2326*	-0.2202	-0.2579
20—Pregnant	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21—Married	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22—Work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEAN	104.4786	2.4346	23.1709	0.2650	0.7265	54.4615	60.2650	56.5299	52.8205	54.6154
STD.DEV.	11.0902	0.6653	17.9402	0.4413	0.4458	27.8339	27.4701	29.9077	29.4742	29.4159

Variable No.	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1-I Q	0.0765	0.3600*	0.5861*	0.7052*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0591	0.0
2-GPA	0.1829	0.5964*	0.7204*	0.7398*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2257	0.0
3-ABSS	0.0166	-0.1369	-0.1450	-0.1225	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0241	0.0
4-ARMY	0.1743	0.0488	0.0419	-0.0371	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1472	0.0
5-HSWF	0.0617	-0.1041	-0.0398	-0.0526	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1072	0.0
6-VERB	0.0968	0.5723*	0.6864*	0.9030*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2002	0.0
7-NUM	0.1897	0.4765*	0.6841*	0.8889*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2036	0.0
8-ABST	0.0967	0.2628*	0.5550*	0.7280*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2326*	0.0
9-MECH	0.0983	0.1649	0.4334*	0.5381*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2202*	0.0
10-SPAT	0.1063	0.2199	0.4384*	0.5101*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2579*	0.0
11-CLER	1.0000	0.2306*	0.1649*	0.1617	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0127	0.0
12-SPLL	0.2306*	1.0000	0.5755*	0.5360*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0541	0.0
13-SENT	0.1649	0.5755*	1.0000	0.7721*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0130	0.0
14-V-N	0.1617	0.5360	0.7721*	1.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1768	0.0
15-DROP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16-WHY Lack of Interest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17-Non-Attendance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18-Suspended	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
19-Sex	0.0127	-0.0541	0.0130	-0.1768	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000	0.0
20-Pregnant	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21-Married	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22-Work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEAN	65.8803	47.9573	51.4872	57.9914	**********	**********	**********	**********	0.5556	0.0
STD. DEV.	25.5230	30.2625	29.5573	28.5533	**********	**********	**********	**********	0.4969	0.0

VARIABLE NO.	21	22
1–I Q	0.0	0.0
2–GPA	0.0	0.0
3–ABSS	0.0	0.0
4–ARMY	0.0	0.0
5–HSWF	0.0	0.0
6–VERB	0.0	0.0
7–NUM	0.0	0.0
8–ABST	0.0	0.0
9–MECH	0.0	0.0
10–SPAT	0.0	0.0
11–CLER	0.0	0.0
12–SPLL	0.0	0.0
13–SENT	0.0	0.0
14–V–N	0.0	0.0
15–DROP	0.0	0.0
16–WHY Lack of Interest	0.0	0.0
17–Non–Attendance	0.0	0.0
18–Suspended	0.0	0.0
19–Sex	0.0	0.0
20–Pregnant	0.0	0.0
21–Married	0.0	0.0
22–Work	0.0	0.0
MEAN	0.0	0.0
STD. DEV.	**********	**********

A COMPARISON OF DROPOUTS TO GRADUATES
IN A MEDIUM SIZE HIGH SCHOOL IN KANSAS, 1963-1969

by

Philip James Wegman

B.A., St. Benedict's College, 1967

————————————

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Administration and Foundations

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Many studies have centered on the dropout problem in an effort to determine factors that influence early school leavers. The various studies, however, have each focused on the dropout problem from different points of view.

Some studies have attempted to identify selected characteristics or factors that would enable the school to adjust its curriculum in an effort to prevent early withdrawal. Emphasis has also been given on what community agencies could do to help the person after he drops out of school.

Other studies have compared school leavers to graduates. Through a comparison of personality characteristics as well as educational, social, and family factors it was hoped that a differentiation of traits could be established between the two groups.

The study was made to review the literature concerning the national dropout problem and to compare dropouts to graduates in order to determine the differentiation in traits that existed between the two groups.

The review of the literature revealed that more students presently graduate than drop out of school. However, the national dropout rate was still found to be around thirty-five percent.

Studies were reviewed which emphasized these facets of the dropout problem: school and personality adjustment, intelligence, family background, socio-economic status, grade retention, grade point average, and extra-curricular activities.

The implications seemed to indicate the need for a comprehensive guidance program, and improvement of the school curriculum.

Improvements such as a well run work-study program, and courses in which the student was the focal point instead of subject matter, could help greatly to retain students in school.

The second part of the report correlated a determined number of variables for both dropouts and graduates in order to determine the degree of correspondence for each group. A direct comparison was then made possible and a differentiation of traits was established between the two groups.

The results indicated that dropouts had a lower mental ability level, earned lower grades, performed much lower on most areas of the DAT, and missed more days at school than did graduates.

The most frequent reasons for dropping out included: lack of interest in school, non-attendance, and marriage.

The individuality of youth must be considered in every phase of a school program and curriculum. In order to provide for the individual needs of students and increase the possibility of success of each student, appropriate counseling must be started at an early age. Provisions in the school curriculum must be made so as to enable the student to fulfill his needs and achieve a success that will make possible a satisfactory adjustment to both the school and the community.