

REPORT CARD FORMS AND ACHIEVEMENT

by

SISTER MARY LOU PFANNENSTIEL
B. A., Marymount College, 1967

3735

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:



Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation and gratitude is expressed to Dr. Charles Peccolo, Professor of Education, Kansas State University, by the writer. His goodness, patience, interest and invaluable assistance was a source of great encouragement.

The writer is also indebted to Dr. J. Harvey Littrell and Dr. A. Bower Sageser for serving on the Committee, to Sister Mary Augustine and Sister Francis de Sales for their patient assistance, to my pupils, their parents, and the principal of Seven Dolors Grade School, Manhattan, Kansas for their cooperation, and to my parents and friends for their encouragement and enthusiasm.

LD
2668
T4
1970
P48
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Hypothesis	4
Limitations and Delimitations	4
Definition of Terms	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Scope and Functions of Report Cards	7
Historical Review of Report Cards	12
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	55
Sampling	55
Measuring Devices	64
Procedure	66
IV. REPORT OF FINDINGS	69
Analysis Techniques	69
Description of Findings	69
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	75
Purpose of the Study	75
Procedures	75
Summary of the Results	76
Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications	78

CHAPTER	PAGE
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDICES	88
Appendix A	89
Appendix B	91
Appendix C	94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Control Group Pre-Test Grade Scores	57
II. Experimental Group Pre-Test Grade Scores	58
III. Description of the Control Group	59
IV. Description of the Experimental Group	61
V. Pre-Test Grade Score Means of Control and Experimental Group	62
VI. Post-Test Grade Score Means of Control and Experimental Group	70
VII. Mean Gains of Control and Experimental Group	72
VIII. Control Group Post-Test Grade Scores	73
IX. Experimental Group Post-Test Grade Scores	74
X. Summary of Test Results for Control and Experimental Group	77

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Turmoil," according to Caudle, "is the word to describe the concern of teachers and administrators in the elementary schools, as well as the patrons, as to the relative merits of various grading systems now in use."¹ Both lay and professional magazines seem to intensify rather than subdue the controversy. In some school systems even the election of school board members was determined on the basis of reporting form preferences advocated by the candidates.²

The inhabitants of Anatevka in Joseph Stein's Fiddler on the Roof were governed by tradition. Americans are no exception for they, too, are bound by tradition in their grading system. Caudle believed that in view of the social and technological advances, which have been evidenced in recent years, it would seem that the method of reporting to parents concerning the scholastic abilities of their children were in a state of stagnation.³

Hammel, however, stated that with the complexity and compromise involved in the composition of a reporting form, educators were

¹ James B. Caudle, "Educators Look at Grading," Part III. Elementary Level - "A Lingerin Problem," The Texas Outlook, XLV (July, 1961), 14.

² ibid.

³ ibid.

anxiously seeking a more efficient and representative picture of pupil-teacher efforts.⁴

Report cards and grading were as frequently discussed as the weather, but rarely was there any positive, constructive action as a follow-up according to Cummins.⁵

Link envisioned an advanced system that would make grades obsolete. He believed that grades did not aid students in discovering themselves, but only served to increase tension and anxiety.⁶

"Pupil progress reports, regardless of form," stated Rolf, "are not going to solve the problems associated with achievement or lack of achievement. However, sound progress reports can aid achievement if properly designed and administered."⁷

Discouraging as is our present system, Sherry optimistically noted that whatever improvements were made, they could not be any more objectionable or inadequate than the present practices.⁸

⁴John A. Hammel, "Report Cards: A Rationale," The National Elementary Principal, XLIII (May, 1964), 50.

⁵Robert E. Cummins, "Evaluating and Grading," Education LXXXII (March, 1962), 403.

⁶Francis R. Link, "To Grade or Not to Grade," The PTA Magazine, LXII (November, 1967), 12.

⁷Fred J. Rolf, "Reporting to Parents," Ohio Schools, XXXIX (May, 1961), 10.

⁸Joseph E. Wherry, "What Are Current Trends In Reporting Student Growth and Achievement To Parents?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLIII (April, 1959), 155.