A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTEREST LEVEL ON THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK AND SEPARATION FROM COLLEGE OF A SELECTED GROUP OF STUDENTS

by

PATRICIA NELSON CLARK

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1950

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

THE PROBLEM

One of the most important problems confronting education and psychology today deals with the causes behind a student's dismissal from college because of academic failure. During the first year away from home the student must learn to budget his time and it is necessary for him to become accustomed to the somewhat unrestricted freedom he finds at college in comparison with the controls which he found at home. Sometimes it takes a student a semester to become settled in his new environment, and then he is able to proceed intelligently and actively as a new member of the campus.

On the other hand, there are those students who seem to be completely unable to adjust to the requirements of college and who are found repeatedly with grades so low that, after being reinstated at least once and sometimes two or three times, it is necessary to add their names to the ever growing dismissal list. There are innumerable reasons given by students as the causes for failure to maintain a passing average. According to what they say some of these individuals are working too many hours a week to be able to adequately cover their class assignments, some are worried about personal matters, and there are those who seem to indicate that they just don't care and that they can get a good job without a college education.

However, there are students who have manifested average or poorer than average ability on orientation tests and who are still able to carry the customary hours of class work, be active in extra class activities, and perhaps carry a work load to aid their financial status. For some reason these individuals manage to stay away from the dismissal list while others who have shown about the same scholastic ability are included.

Why is this latter group unable to succeed? Many investigators have noted

factors other than intelligence which they consider significant.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

A number of writers have found that several factors other than intelligence are important in academic success or failure. Wallace (1949) found that the correlations between course grades and ACE scores are small. He concluded that although the scores may be used as one of several aids, one must refrain from putting undue emphasis upon the results of this examination as a predicting factor. The test cannot indicate what extra class or personal influences will appear on the scene to alter the predicted grades in either a positive or a negative manner. Fusfeld (1949) stated that the outside factors pressing upon the student during the one, two, three, or four years in college greatly affect academic achievement. Athletics, financial need, and extra class activities are perhaps the primary categories for these extra scholastic pressures. Consequently, a student may have a comparatively high ACE score but turn right around and produce at a low level. Therefore, according to Fusfeld, one cannot successfully predict from the ACE test alone. According to Goodenough (1945) one of the standard credos in psychology is that, among college students, academic achievement is not substantially commensurate with intellectual ability because of so many qualifying factors confronting the student during the four years.

Harris (1940) mentioned the relation between college grades and a number of factors: intelligence, age, sex, family circumstances, physical conditions, personality factors and attributes, interest, liberalism, the subjects studied in high school, the size and location of the institution, the time spent in study, reading ability, student load, fraternity membership and athletic ability. He continued to say:

The essential factors in student achievement are, in the order of their importance: (1) ability (or intelligence or scholastic aptitude, etc.); (2) effort (or drive or degree of motivation, etc.); (3) circumstance (personal, social, economic, academic, etc.). Tests tap only the first. Two-thirds of the components are not taken into account.

In addition to the factors other than intelligence involved in academic success discussed in the previous studies, there are problems arising out of an unwise vocational choice. A number of writers have indicated the necessity for helping the student on this point. According to Punke (1951) a general misunderstanding of the nature of intelligence and of test results brings on a feeling of anxiety. Intelligence tests are to be looked upon not to reveal new capacities but as offering a new way of estimating the extent to which people differ in their capacities. The major aim of testing should be to help students in their development, to help students recognize the aspects of their intellectual development which have been neglected and which are most in need of attention, or to recognize lines along which they might expect to find further development easy or difficult.

Punke (1951) stated that youth are too immature to face unpleasant or 'inflationary truths' and that the way to keep them immature is to continue to treat them as such and prevent them from having experiences that will help them mature. Learning about oneself and analyzing data would help a student to evaluate himself and provide valuable experience for developing independence and self-respect. Youth should be given related information and someone to work with (not <u>for</u>) them in outlining a program for future growth and development in the social order that really exists. The best method depends upon the prevailing attitudes and the level of understanding.

Test results should be used to help youth get a more objective understanding of their interests, potentialities, and limitations, and to plan their fu-

tures accordingly. Withholding results is withholding important information which youth should take into account in arriving at judgments affecting their futures. Protecting them is keeping them from knowing what fate has in store for them. Arsenian (1942), in a study of 125 college freshmen, concluded that students who grossly over- or under-estimate their abilities, knowledge, and adjustment, are, as a group, less intelligent and less well adjusted.

That the college student needs help in vocational selection is evident. Vocational interests and selections on the part of students do follow a general pattern: vocations which require advanced professional training are generally selected by the students with high mental abilities, while occupations which require little or no academic training are selected by students who have relatively lower mental abilities. This conclusion was reached by Moser (1949) on the basis of results found on a study of 550 students at Pittsburg, California. Webb (1949) made a study of 421 students which showed that fifty-five percent of the individuals had chosen no vocation or were uncertain as to the appropriateness of their choice. Of this group, fifty-nine percent were already juniors or seniors in college.

> One of two conditions may exist at the present time: (1) universities may be teaching efficiently a group of individuals who are not sure why they are being taught, or; (2) the students may not be taught efficiently and still, they are not prepared to decide on their vocation and the purpose of the university is merely to provide a time-knowledge span during which they may decide.

Geller (1951) recognized the influence of social class on children's choices of occupations. As the child shifts from one choice to another he is indicating the trends of his thought and his values. The younger children of the lower-class are more influenced by extrinsic reasons than are the upper-middle class children. The older children do not show this difference. No statistically significant differences are found between younger and older children within each

social class. However, one cannot suggest that the higher proportion of pupils giving extrinsic reasons indicates greater immaturity. The upper-middle class children more frequently (significantly) chose their fathers' occupations. This is a sign of high status.

On the values test given by Geller at Chicago the upper-middle boys had higher scores. The two age groups rated the same; i.e., the altruistic reasons rated high while the extrinsic reasons rated low. Lower class boys were motivated by extrinsic reasons rather than altruistic reasons to a much greater extent than are upper-middle class boys. The girls of the two groups did not differ on their scores. The older girls had higher value scores than younger girls in each of two schools.

In selecting professions, the lower-status jobs were chosen least often. The upper-middle class boys chose occupations which have higher social status. This tendency appeared more with the older boys. The same result was shown with the girls, although to a lesser extent. Social class definitely influenced the occupation choice of high school students and the reasons for their choices, many of which carry on to college.

Welch (1949) found that occupations at the professional level were ranked highest in his study while those at the semi-skilled and skilled levels were ranked lowest. There was little variation by sex. Experience, schooling, and passage of time seemed to have little influence on attitudes toward occupational prestige. In comparing the ranking by freshmen with the ranking by teachers he found a correlation of .98.

Educators should attempt to develop an appreciation of all worthwhile occupations by the leaders themselves. In-service training for classroom teachers, subject specialists, and counselors should break down the mental sets relating to the status of different occupations. Functional, occupational courses should

be offered which would abandon teaching 'en masse' and bring to each student knowledge of and experience in as many occupations as possible. This would enable students to make a more rational comparison of aptitudes, interests, and abilities with qualifications, requirements, and the opportunities at hand.

Kitson (1948) asked can one, in the end, predict vocational success? This depends upon the individual's degree of intelligence, his health and physical status, economic circumstances of the family, social environment, emotional stability, moral and vocational factors (drive, character), specialized skill and knowledge, and a pinch of 'luck' thrown in for good measure. Not to be forgotten are the unforeseen circumstances which can and will arise. The students' industriousness, sobriety, initiative, imagination, persistence, and so forth, are influenced by his personal and economic status, health, and any previous experience. With all these in hand, then would one dare predict?

Recktenwald (1946) has found that little is known about the difference between the students who make realistic vocational choices and those who make unrealistic ones. When a student fails to face the facts squarely he frequently selects an occupation which does not correspond with his abilities, interests, and personality. Or, he has not looked into the fact that the occupation may be overcrowded. The choice may have been made, without the aid of a competent counselor, because of one of three reasons: (1) chance; (2) current popularity; or (3) lack of knowledge, according to Stubbins (1948). The individual will need assistance in changing a vocational choice incorrectly made. Heck (1942) and Recktenwald (1946) made studies which purport to show that greater realism results when pupils have been given occupational information.

On the other hand, Hoppock's study (1935) has provided evidence to warrant the supposition that about two-thirds of the employed population manage to find satisfying jobs without any special assistance or guidance either while in school

or out in the field. He concluded to say that counselors in schools and colleges have noted that the majority of students made satisfactory educational plans without the benefit of counseling.

It has been brought out in the preceding pages that (1) there are important factors other than intelligence in collegiate academic success, (2) many forces tend to result in unwise vocational selection, and (3) evaluation of these factors, so as to aid the student in improving his vocational and educational objectives, is important in reducing academic failure.

One possible hypothesis that apparently has never been studied is that interest maturity is one of the important factors involved in academic success or failure. In this study an attempt was made to test this hypothesis by comparing interest maturity scores of successful and unsuccessful students.

PROCEDURE

Lists of students dismissed because of academic failure were obtained from deans of all schools on the campus of Kansas State College for the second semester of 1949-1950 and the first semester of 1950-1951.

Cumulative record folders for the students on the lists were taken from the files of the Counseling Bureau. All foreign students, married students, and veterans were omitted from the study in an effort to eliminate as many variables as possible. The students were divided into three groups according to the date of entrance and were handled in these divisions throughout the study. The first group included those individuals who entered Kansas State College as freshmen in the Fall, 1948, while the second and third groups included the students who had entered in the Fall, 1949, and in the Fall, 1950. Students who had not entered Kansas State College as freshmen were also omitted from the study.

From the cumulative records the following information was taken: the date of entrance as a freshman, sex, age at the time of entrance, the school in which the student was majoring, and the raw scores and the percentile ranks from the individual's interest maturity score on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and from the American Council on Education Examination. With this information, an attempt was made to match each student who was dismissed from school in every particular except the interest maturity score, with a student who was still in school. An alphabetical method was employed in matching; i.e., the first student following each dismissed student in the class roll whose data met the requirements was used in the matching group. In matching the American Council on Education Examination raw score, a deviation of not over five points was allowed. In matching age, a deviation of not over two years was allowed.

Both the dismissed students and the ones matched with them were divided according to year of entrance and the school in which they were enrolled, that is: agriculture, engineering and architecture, home economics, and arts and sciences.

Due to the lack of ACE raw scores at the first percentile for students still in school it was necessary to omit seven students who were on the Fall, 1950, dismissal list and three individuals who were on the dismissal list of January, 1951. It was impossible to match these students because there were so few still in school who had scores at this low level. Two students were eliminated from the study because it was impossible to match age and, also, three veterans and one foreign student were omitted from the study. There were no married students on the dismissal lists. This left 247 pairs of students to be used in the study.

RESULTS

In order to indicate the comparability of the matched groups, the means and standard deviations of the scores on the ACE are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of the ACE results for the dismissed and the in school groups.

School	Year	N	Dismissed $\bar{X}$	Dismissed σ	In School $\bar{X}$	In School σ
Ag.	1948	3	95.6	14.2	95.3	16.2
	1949	28	80.3	14.5	80.9	14.82
	1950	25	67.5	23.4	67.7	23.3
E&A	1948	15	101.2	16.7	102.5	16.1
	1949	30	90.2	20.3	90.8	23.7
	1950	14	90.3	14.5	90.1	14.5
HE	1948	2	88.5	5.45	86.0	3.0
	1949	7	78.3	22.8	76.4	20.0
	1950	2	67.5	4.62	70.0	6.7
A&S	1948	11	90.9	22.8	92.3	23.2
	1949	56	79.2	19.5	79.6	20.1
	1950	54	78.5	22.8	79.3	19.5

The formulas, $\bar{X} = \frac{\text{sum of scores}}{N}$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\text{sum of (scores)}^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\text{sum of scores}}{N}\right)^2}$ were used. The similarity between the means and the standard deviations in the matched groups indicates the success of the matching on the basis of ACE scores. Only in groups where the number of cases was fifteen or less was the difference in mean scores as much as one point.

The differences of interest maturity scores between the dismissed and in school groups together with the significance of these differences is shown in Table 2. The standard error of the differences between the means of the matched groups by years was found for each school. The formula $\sigma_{m_d} = \frac{\sigma_d}{\sqrt{N-1}}$ was used for this analysis. To find the significance of the difference, the formula $t = \frac{\bar{X}_{in} - \bar{X}_{out}}{\sigma_{m_d}}$ was employed to test the null hypothesis, $\bar{X}_{in}$ was used to show the students still in school and $\bar{X}_{out}$ to represent those who were dismissed.

Table 2. Significance of the differences in interest maturity scores between the dismissed and in school groups.

School	Year	N	Dismissed $\bar{X}$	Dismissed σ	In School $\bar{X}$	In School σ	Diff. in Means	σ_{m_d}	t
Ag.	1948	3	1.7	14.6	-30.7	123.	-32.4	61.9	.52
	1949	28	-74.8	115.	-23.8	104.3	51.	46.9	1.087
	1950	25	-36.1	125.	-97.4	106.9	-61.3	37.4	1.69
	Total	56	-53.4		-57.1		- 3.7	23.0	.158
E&A	1948	15	-27.2	103.	-21.0	77.1	- 6.2	30.3	.205
	1949	30	-18.0	73.5	-40.3	113.0	-22.3	30.3	.735
	1950	14	-26.3	111.0	-.4	100.5	25.9	38.3	.675
	Total	59	-22.0		-25.9		-3.9	19.0	.212
HE	1948	2	18.0	137.2	117.	35.	99.0	172.0	.576
	1949	7	-12.6	81.9	97.3	103.0	109.9	43.8	2.5
	1950	2	-23.0	4.0	29.0	40.0	52.0	37.3	1.395
	Total	11	-8.9		88.4		97.3	36.7	2.63

Table 2 (concl.). Significance of the differences in interest maturity scores between the dismissed and in school groups.

School	Year	N	Dismissed $\bar{X}$	Dismissed σ	In School $\bar{X}$	In School σ	Diff. in Means	σ_{Md}	t
A&S	1948	11	24.2	107.4	62.6	76.1	38.4	43.3	.885
	1949	56	19.6	115.	1.10	118.	-18.6	23.9	1.
	1950	54	2.46	103.8	29.5	91.4	27.	18.1	1.5
	Total	121	7.9		19.3		11.4	14.1	.81

In none of the groups was there any significant difference.

There was no evidence from these data that the interest maturity scores from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank measured an important factor in academic success. Further evidence of the failure of interest maturity scores to differentiate the two groups is shown by the fact that seven of the sixteen differences between the means were negative as compared with nine positive differences.

Although the means of the groups showed no significant differences, on account of the large standard deviations a few large erratic scores might seriously have affected the means. A study of the original data might show a tendency for scores of unsuccessful and successful students to be grouped differently. In order to investigate this, Table 3 was constructed.

Table 3. Interest maturity scores for dismissed and in school students in the school of agriculture

Scores	1948		1949		1950	
	In School	Dismissed	In School	Dismissed	In School	Dismissed
200						1
180						
160						
140					1	
120			2			
100			2	2		3
80	1		4	2		1
60	1		1	1	1	2
40	1		1	2		1
20			2		2	
0		3	3	3	2	4
-20			1	2	1	2
-40			2		2	1
-60			1	2	1	3
-80			2		4	
-100		1		1		
-120				2	2	1
-140				2	1	
-160			3	5	2	1
-180					1	1
-200	1		1		2	2
-220				2		
-240			2	1	2	1
-260				1		
-280						1
-300						
-320					1	

Table 4. Interest maturity scores for dismissed and in school students in the school of engineering and architecture.

Scores	1948 In School	1948 Dismissed	1949 In School	1949 Dismissed	1950 In School	1950 Dismissed
180					1	
160		1	2		1	
140				1		1
120			1			2
100	1					
80	2	2			1	
60			1	2	1	1
40	1	3	1	4	1	
20			3	1	2	
0	2	2	3	7	1	2
-20	2		5	4		2
-40	3			2		1
-60	1			2	2	
-80	1	3	1	1	1	
-100			3	1	1	2
-120		1	2	1	2	2
-140	2		1	1		
-160		1	3	1		
-180		1				
-200		1	1			
-220						
-240						1
-260						
-280						
-300			1			

Table 5. Interest maturity scores for dismissed and in school students in the school of home economics.

Scores	1948		1949		1950	
	In School	Dismissed	In School	Dismissed	In School	Dismissed
240			1			
220						
200						
180			1			
160						
140	1	1	1			
120						
100						
80	1		1			
60				2	1	
40			1	1		
20			1			
0				1	1	1
-20						1
-40						
-60			1			
-80				1		
-100		1		1		
-120				1		

Table 6. Interest maturity scores for dismissed and in school students in the school of arts and sciences.

Scores	1948 In School	1948 Dismissed	1949 In School	1949 Dismissed	1950 In School	1950 Dismissed
220					1	
200	1			1		1
180			1	1	1	2
160			3		3	1
140	1	1	3	2	1	
120	1		2		4	
100			6		1	3
80		1	2	5	5	5
60	1		5	3	6	7
40	4		1	9	4	3
20		3	7	3	6	5
0	1	1	3	10	4	5
-20		1	2	3	3	3
-40		1	4	2	4	4
-60			4		2	1
-80					3	1
-100			2		1	3
-120		1	3	7		3
-140	1		1	2	2	2
-160			3	2	1	2
-180						1
-200		1	2	3	1	1
-220				1		
-240				1		
-260			2			
-280						
-300				1		

A study of the preceding tables revealed no tendency for the pattern of scores for dismissed students to be different from that of the successful students. In each group the scores of both the dismissed and the successful students were scattered through approximately the same range. Except for the seven pupils in the home economics group of 1949 it was not possible to find a cutting point that would segregate an appreciably greater number of either dismissed or successful students than of the other group.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has not shown that interest maturity level is not of importance, but no evidence has been presented which indicates that interest maturity level, as measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank enables one to discriminate between dismissed and in school students. The study has not shown that interest maturity level is one of the many factors other than intelligence that affect the student's scholastic achievement.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results from this study do not give any indication of the probability of finding important differences by the procedure used. If further studies are made, it is suggested that the matching be done on the basis of an intelligence test other than the ACE, and that the matching be based upon other factors such as reading ability, in addition to intelligence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer deeply appreciates and is sincerely grateful for the time and interest given almost entirely after office hours by Dr. D. F. Showalter, Associate Professor, Kansas State College, in guiding her through the research and formation of this thesis.

REFERENCES

Arsenian, S. "Own Estimate and Objective Measurement." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIII:291-302, 1942.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1946.

Fusfeld, Irvin Sidney. "On the ACE Psychological Examination." School and Society, 70:117-18, 1949.

Galler, E. H. "Influence of Social Class on Children's Choices of Occupations." Elementary School Journal, 51:439-45, 1951.

Goodenough, F. L. Developmental Psychology. Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century, 1945.

Harris, D. "Factors Affecting College Grades. A Review of the Literature." Psychological Bulletin, 37:125-26, 1940.

Hoppock, Robert. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper, 1935.

Kitson, H. D. "Can We Predict Vocational Success?" Occupations, 26:539-41, 1948.

Moser, W. E. "Vocational Preferences as Related to Mental Ability." Occupations, 27:460-1, 1949.

Neck, E. W. "High School Boys Choose Vocations." Occupations, XX:264-5, 1942.

Punke, H. H. "Tell Students Their Intelligence Ratings." School and Society, 73:407-9, 1951.

Recktenwald, L. N. "Attitudes Toward Occupations Before and After Vocational Information." Occupations, XXIV:222-3, 1946.

Anonymous. "People are Test-Happy; Test Not Patent Medicine." Science News Letter, 57:88, 1950.

Stubbins, J. "Lack of Realism in Vocational Choice." Occupations, 26:410-18, 1948.

Wallace, W. L. "Differential Predictive Value of the ACE Psychological Examination." School and Society, 70:23-5, 1949.

Webb, W. B. "Occupational Indecision Among College Students." Occupations, 27:331-2, 1949.

Welch, M. N. "Ranking Occupations on the Basis of Social Status." Occupations, 27:237-41, 1949.

APPENDIX

Table 7. Data on students entering Kansas State College as freshmen in the fall of 1948 or 1949 who were dismissed during the second semester of 1949-1950.

					Interest Maturity		ACE	
Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Score	Percentile Ranks	Raw Score	Percentile Ranks
1	48	F	18	H Ec	-119	9	84	26
2	49	M	19	Ag.	-10	20	12	27
3	49	M	18	Ag.	-129	9	77	19
4	49	M	18	Ag.	79	56	85	31
5	49	M	17	Ag.	-223	2	76	18
6	49	M	18	Ag.	-147	8	65	8
7	49	M	18	Ag.	-161	6	71	18
8	49	M	18	Ag.	-233	2	85	31
9	49	M	17	Ag.	4	33	65	8
10	49	M	19	Ag.	83	52	92	42
11	49	M	17	Ag.	108	77	63	7
12	49	M	17	Ag.	-71	20	101	56
13	49	M	18	Ag.	-7	29	103	58
14	49	M	18	Ag.	-241	1	74	16
15	48	M	17	Ag.	-106	5	84	26
16	49	M	17	Ag.	-170	5	104	60
17	49	M	18	Ag.	42	45	67	11
18	49	M	19	Ag.	-162	1	64	3
19	49	M	18	Ag.	-275	1	105	62
20	49	M	17	Ag.	-142	8	78	21
21	49	M	18	Ag.	-178	4	77	19
22	49	M	19	Ag.	-111	5	66	9
23	49	M	17	Ag.	-127	10	67	10
24	49	M	17	E & A	-156	7	94	45
25	49	M	17	E & A	-115	12	101	56
26	49	M	16	E & A	49	68	72	14
27	49	M	18	E & A	1	29	90	38
28	49	M	17	E & A	28	48	107	68
29	48	M	20	E & A	47	34	102	50
30	48	M	18	E & A	-196	4	68	9
31	48	M	18	E & A	-130	3	77	18
32	48	M	22	E & A	-82	4	105	54
33	49	M	18	E & A	-57	20	66	9
34	49	M	18	E & A	66	62	105	62
35	49	M	18	E & A	53	51	118	82
36	48	M	18	E & A	-80	8	95	40
37	48	M	17	E & A	14	62	106	57
38	49	M	21	E & A	14	24	72	14
39	49	M	17	E & A	-8	38	76	18
40	49	M	18	E & A	-21	26	83	29
41	49	M	18	E & A	-178	5	55	3
42	49	M	17	E & A	50	57	76	18
43	49	M	17	E & A	72	62	151	97

Table 7 (cont.)

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Ranks	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Ranks
44	49	M	17	E & A	14	42	80	83
45	48	M	17	E & A	58		107	61
46	48	M	17	E & A	-83	18	98	44
47	48	M	19	E & A	-170	5	120	83
48	49	M	18	E & A	-93	12	63	7
49	49	M	17	A & S	44	52	75	16
50	49	M	18	A & S	-58	22	58	3
51	49	M	18	A & S	-3	29	73	15
52	48	M	17	A & S	-205	3	82	23
53	49	M	18	A & S	202	95	74	16
54	49	M	17	A & S	62	57	67	10
55	49	M	17	A & S	54	57	64	7
56	49	F	17	A & S	-132	10	61	6
57	49	M	18	A & S	-6	29	83	29
58	49	M	19	A & S	-49	11	86	33
59	48	F	18	A & S	27	39	93	36
60	49	M	18	A & S	83	60	96	48
61	48	F	18	A & S	-41	24	87	30
62	49	M	17	Ag.	86	67	68	11
63	49	M	20	Ag.	56	41	101	56
64	48	M	17	Ag.	11	42	98	44
65	48	M	18	Ag.	13	33	111	78
66	48	M	18	Ag.	-19	26	78	18
67	48	M	19	E & A	18	23	118	30
68	48	M	18	E & A	164		86	29
69	48	M	22	E & A	96	56	77	18
70	48	M	19	E & A	58	40	110	66
71	48	M	17	E & A	80	67	117	78
72	48	F	18	H Ec	155	81	93	36
73	49	F	17	H Ec	-82	18	64	7
74	49	M	19	E & A	47	33	66	9
75	49	M	20	E & A			127	90
76	49	M	18	E & A	-10	29	101	56
77	49	M	17	E & A	-25	33	87	35
78	49	M	17	E & A	-22	33	116	80
79	49	M	18	E & A	-35	24	60	5
80	49	M	18	E & A	-65	17	85	31
81	49	M	17	E & A	-67	20	78	21
82	49	M	18	E & A	146	81	120	83
83	49	M	19	Ag.	-61	9	94	45
84	49	M	18	Ag.	-23	26	87	35
85	49	M	17	Ag.	-22	33	77	19
86	49	M	17	Ag.	-170	5	104	60
87	49	M	17	A & S	47	52	109	71
88	49	M	19	A & S	40	33	82	27

Table 7 (Concl.)

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity Raw Score	Interest Maturity Percentile Ranks	ACE Raw Score	ACE Percentile Ranks
89	49	M	21	A & S	42	32	88	38
90	49	M	17	A & S	90	60	118	72
91	49	M	21	A & S	-120	3	53	3
92	49	F	17	A & S	5	38	105	62
93	49	M	17	A & S	-304	1	48	3
94	49	M	21	A & S	153	81	93	44
95	49	F	19	A & S	-146	8	75	17
96	49	M	17	A & S	1	29	104	60
97	49	M	22	A & S	66	41	74	16
98	49	F	16	A & S	-25	33	111	74
99	49	F	19	A & S	-8	29	97	49
100	49	M	18	A & S	-207	3	58	5
101	48	M	17	A & S	-205	3	82	23
102	48	M	18	A & S	86	60	131	91
103	48	M	18	A & S	27	39	51	2
104	48	M	18	A & S	-130	9	88	31
105	49	M	22	A & S	148	76	50	3
106	49	M	18	A & S	26	39	129	91
107	49	M	20	A & S	-27	18	50	3
108	48	M	17	A & S	141	85	92	35
109	48	M	18	A & S	35	45	134	92
110	49	M	18	A & S	37	45	91	40
111	49	M	20	A & S	41	34	84	30
112	48	F	17	A & S	19	48	91	34
113	49	M	18	A & S	-134	8	75	17
114	49	M	18	A & S	-23	26	87	35
115	49	M	18	A & S	-172	5	54	3
116	49	M	17	A & S	-216	2	61	6
117	49	F	22	A & S	59	33	70	12
118	49	M	18	A & S	-152	7	80	23
119	49	M	17	A & S	42	52	91	40
120	49	M	18	A & S	-120	9	82	27
121	48	M	19	A & S	-20	16	69	9
122	49	M	18	A & S	-8	29	98	51
123	49	F	16	A & S	-215	2	51	3
124	49	M	17	A & S	-235	2	67	10
125	49	F	18	A & S	81	60	96	48
126	49	M	18	A & S	9	33	62	7

Table 8. Data on students entering Kansas State College as freshmen in the fall of 1948, 1949, or 1950, who were dismissed during the first semester of 1950-1950.

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Ranks	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Ranks
1	50	M	18	Ag.	-134	9	62	4
2	50	M	18	Ag.	207	96	97	38
3	50	M	18	Ag.	-183	4	80	16
4	50	M	17	Ag.	-64	20	85	21
5	50	M	18	Ag.	-8	29	46	1
6	50	M	17	Ag.	1	42	85	21
7	50	M	18	Ag.	-1	33	46	1
8	50	M	17	Ag.	-160	1	32	1
9	50	M	35	Ag.	75	29	92	31
10	50	M	19	Ag.	-75	8	76	13
11	50	M	18	Ag.	75	56	96	37
12	50	M	18	Ag.	44	45	43	1
13	50	M	17	Ag.	103	61	60	3
14	50	F	18	Ag.	-202	4	85	21
15	50	M	18	Ag.	-288	1	90	28
16	50	M	19	Ag.	-200	1	44	1
17	50	M	20	Ag.	99	56	32	1
18	50	M	18	Ag.	3	33	40	1
19	50	M	18	Ag.	-28	24	49	1
20	50	M	19	Ag.	114	66	89	27
21	50	M	19	Ag.	-27	18	79	15
22	50	M	18	Ag.	-75	14	50	1
23	50	M	18	Ag.	-49	21	99	42
24	50	M	19	Ag.	-246	1	32	1
25	50	M	18	Ag.	117	72	98	41
26	50	M	21	E & A	-123	3	76	13
27	50	M	17	E & A	127	81	87	24
28	50	M	18	E & A	-250	1	100	44
29	50	M	18	E & A	-109	12	59	3
30	50	M	18	E & A	-10	29	93	32
31	50	M	18	E & A	-23	26	88	25
32	50	M	18	E & A	-25	16	117	71
33	49	M	21	E & A	-132	8	87	35
34	50	M	17	E & A	67	56	80	16
35	49	M	18	E & A	-15	26	76	18
36	50	M	18	E & A	143	81	105	51
37	48	M	18	E & A	-202	4	106	57
38	49	M	19	E & A	-57	21	125	89
39	50	M	17	E & A	135	81	92	31
40	50	M	18	E & A	-125	9	95	35
41	49	M	18	E & A	-15	12	101	56
42	50	M	18	E & A	-8	29	101	45
43	50	M	19	E & A	-116	3	78	14
44	50	M	17	E & A	9	23	69	11

Table 8 (cont.)

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Ranks	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Ranks
45	49	M	19	E & A	9	23	69	11
46	49	M	18	A & S	-129	8	77	19
47	50	M	18	A & S	180	89	86	23
48	50	M	19	A & S	38	45	53	2
49	50	F	18	A & S	60	51	48	1
50	50	F	18	A & S	-42	24	70	9
51	50	M	19	A & S	-205	1	76	13
52	50	F	18	A & S	69	56	89	27
53	50	F	18	A & S	-137	8	60	3
54	50	M	18	A & S	-162	6	58	3
55	50	M	18	A & S	91	52	91	29
56	50	M	19	A & S	-99	6	86	23
57	50	M	18	A & S	-72	9	88	25
58	50	M	18	A & S	-159	6	110	61
59	49	M	18	A & S	127	77	114	78
60	50	M	18	A & S	33	28	67	6
61	50	M	18	A & S	61	51	90	28
62	50	M	19	A & S	78	46	36	1
63	50	F	18	A & S	35	45	90	28
64	50	F	18	A & S	73	56	64	5
65	50	M	18	A & S	99	66	75	12
66	50	M	18	A & S	95	60	85	21
67	49	M	18	A & S	16	33	95	47
68	49	M	18	A & S	82	67	36	1
69	50	M	18	A & S	-57	21	86	23
70	50	M	21	A & S	-36	11	47	1
71	49	M	18	A & S	-161	6	56	3
72	50	M	18	A & S	15	33	76	13
73	50	M	17	A & S	-2	42	90	28
74	50	M	19	A & S	-103	5	70	9
75	49	F	19	A & S	-8	29	97	49
76	50	M	18	A & S	-4	29	86	23
77	50	M	19	A & S	116	66	60	3
78	50	F	18	A & S	86	60	45	1
79	50	M	19	A & S	-138	2	76	13
80	50	F	19	A & S	-4	20	71	9
81	49	M	17	A & S	-18	33	78	21
82	50	M	18	A & S	-30	15	70	9
83	50	M	19	A & S	-20	26	120	75
84	50	M	18	A & S	-117	12	67	6
85	50	M	18	A & S	177	89	84	20
86	50	M	18	A & S	119	72	106	54
87	50	M	18	A & S	53	51	107	55
88	50	F	18	A & S	44	52	104	50
89	50	M	17	A & S	-101	12	65	5

Table 8 (concl.).

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Ranks	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Ranks
90	50	M	18	A & S	-59	21	73	10
91	50	M	18	A & S	-153	6	97	38
92	50	M	18	A & S	-127	9	66	6
93	50	M	20	A & S	31	28	100	55
94	50	M	18	A & S	-10	29	62	4
95	50	M	17	A & S	216	96	93	23
96	50	M	18	A & S	81	60	90	28
97	50	M	19	A & S	113	75	105	51
98	49	M	19	A & S	-253	1	79	22
99	50	M	20	A & S	66	47	85	21
100	49	M	19	A & S	36	45	82	27
101	50	M	20	A & S	43	34	81	17
102	50	M	19	A & S	-40	15	52	2
103	50	M	20	A & S	182	84	107	55
104	49	F	18	A & S	81	60	96	49
105	50	M	17	A & S	-166	5	86	23
106	50	M	18	A & S	79	56	55	2
107	50	M	18	A & S	-184	4	50	1
108	49	M	19	A & S	77	56	58	5
109	50	M	18	A & S	20	39	128	84
110	49	F	18	A & S	-11	38	74	16
111	50	M	21	A & S	7	20	67	6
112	49	M	19	A & S	-133	3	72	14
113	49	M	19	A & S	188	91	98	51
114	49	F	18	H Ec	58	51	72	14
115	49	F	18	H Ec	-104	12	83	29
116	49	F	18	H Ec	9	33	84	30
117	49	F	18	H Ec	-123	9	42	2
118	50	F	18	H Ec	-27	24	64	5
119	49	F	19	H Ec	76	56	97	49
120	49	F	18	H Ec	78	56	106	65
121	50	F	19	H Ec	-19	16	71	9

Table 9. Data on students still in school in the fall of 1950-1951 matched with students dismissed during the second semester of 1949-1950.

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity Raw Score	Interest Maturity Percentile Rank	ACE Raw Score	ACE Percentile Rank
1	48	M	18	H Ec	152	81	83	25
2	49	M	20	Ag.	104	29	82	27
3	49	M	18	Ag.	14	33	77	19
4	49	M	19	Ag.	-219	2	85	31
5	49	M	19	Ag.	97	66	73	15
6	49	M	18	Ag.	4	33	65	8
7	49	M	19	Ag.	102	60	71	13
8	49	M	18	Ag.	5	33	86	33
9	49	M	17	Ag.	-161	10	61	6
10	49	M	19	Ag.	83	52	92	42
11	49	M	21	Ag.	-99	12	66	9
12	49	M	18	Ag.	34	45	101	56
13	49	M	19	Ag.	31	28	103	58
14	49	M	19	Ag.	-173	5	73	15
15	49	M	18	Ag.	-243	1	86	29
16	49	M	18	Ag.	130	77	102	57
17	49	M	21	Ag.	-74	5	65	8
18	49	M	20	Ag.	-120	3	64	7
19	49	M	19	Ag.	-245	1	106	65
20	49	M	17	Ag.	94	67	78	21
21	49	M	18	Ag.	-43	21	74	16
22	49	M	19	Ag.	-161	6	61	6
23	49	M	19	Ag.	130	74	68	11
24	49	M	22	E & A	4	20	97	49
25	49	M	18	E & A	-116	12	100	55
26	49	M	21	E & A	77	44	72	14
27	49	M	18	E & A	-205	4	91	40
28	49	M	23	E & A	-21	26	113	70
29	48	M	17	E & A	-71	20	105	54
30	48	M	25	E & A	92	50	70	10
31	48	M	18	E & A	-154	7	80	20
32	48	M	18	E & A	-80	18	106	57
33	49	M	24	E & A	179	74	70	12
34	47	M	23	E & A	14	13	104	60
35	49	M	19	E & A	-29	24	118	82
36	48	M	18	E & A	-55	11	96	41
37	48	M	18	E & A	14	13	107	61
38	49	M	18	E & A	33	48	73	15
39	49	M	18	E & A	-95	15	75	17
40	49	M	18	E &A	-25	26	85	31
41	49	M	18	E & A	-120	9	60	5
42	49	M	18	E & A	49	68	72	14
43	49	M	18	E & A	20	39	151	99
44	49	M	24	E & A	-144	1	78	21

Table 9 (cont.).

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Rank	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Rank
45	48	M	18	E & A	-25	18	110	61
46	48	M	18	E & A	-12	29	95	40
47	48	M	17	E & A	-33	24	123	88
48	49	M	18	E & A	-173	5	67	10
49	49	M	18	A & S	22	39	78	21
50	49	M	18	A & S	-178	5	55	3
51	49	M	18	A & S	-74	17	70	12
52	48	M	20	A & S	51	41	82	23
53	49	M	18	A & S	32	48	71	13
54	49	M	19	A & S	178	89	73	15
55	49	M	19	A & S	-210	1	61	6
56	49	F	18	A & S	-18	26	61	6
57	49	M	19	A & S	-77	8	84	30
58	49	M	17	A & S	-64	20	83	29
59	48	F	19	A & S	69	56	94	38
60	49	M	18	A & S	99	66	97	49
61	48	F	18	A & S	56	51	90	33
62	49	M	18	Ag.	-27	9	67	10
63	49	M	18	Ag.	48	45	98	51
64	48	M	18	Ag.	40	52	97	42
65	48	M	19	Ag.	71	46	115	75
66	48	M	18	Ag.	-203	4	74	13
67	48	M	18	E & A	-153	6	121	83
68	48	M	19	E & A	118	72	86	29
69	48	M	18	E & A	56	51	76	15
70	48	M	20	E & A	84	52	110	66
71	48	M	18	E & A	-42	21	116	77
72	48	F	17	H Ec	82	67	89	32
73	49	F	17	H Ec	42	52	57	4
74	49	M	17	E & A	16	42	71	13
75	49	M	17	E & A	-314	1	132	93
76	49	M	18	E & A	172	89	98	51
77	49	M	23	E & A	130	68	86	33
78	49	M	28	E & A	-10	16	121	85
79	49	M	18	E & A	-178	5	55	3
80	49	M	24	E & A	-30	5	86	33
81	49	M	18	E & A	-126	9	74	16
82	49	M	17	E & A	79	62	123	87
83	49	M	19	Ag.	83	52	92	42
84	49	M	18	Ag.	-92	12	91	40
85	49	M	18	Ag.	-43	21	74	16
86	49	M	18	Ag.	73	56	106	65
87	49	M	18	A & S	-50	21	113	76
88	49	M	17	A & S	75	62	81	25
89	49	M	17	A & S	39	52	92	42
90	49	M	18	A & S	-56	21	119	83
91	49	M	18	A & S	-161	6	56	3

Table 9 (concl.).

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity Raw Score	Interest Maturity Percentile Rank	ACE Raw Score	ACE Percentile Rank
92	49	F	17	A & S	149	85	105	62
93	49	M	19	A & S	124	74	53	3
94	49	M	20	A & S	-76	7	93	44
95	49	F	18	A & S	184	93	74	16
96	49	M	25	A & S	165	80	104	60
97	49	M	18	A & S	23	39	76	18
98	49	F	16	A & S	118	88	109	71
99	49	F	18	A & S	35	52	95	47
100	49	M	18	A & S	105	66	61	6
101	48	M	18	A & S	217	96	82	23
102	48	M	19	A & S	44	34	131	91
103	48	M	20	A & S	59	41	54	2
104	48	M	18	A & S	-148	8	89	32
105	49	M	18	A & S	80	60	46	2
106	49	M	18	A & S	156	86	128	90
107	49	M	19	A & S	-51	21	49	3
108	48	M	19	A & S	57	40	92	35
109	48	M	17	A & S	124	81	139	95
110	49	M	18	A & S	105	66	90	38
111	49	M	18	A & S	36	45	82	27
112	48	F	18	A & S	141	81	91	34
113	49	M	18	A & S	-115	12	78	21
114	49	M	19	A & S	36	33	89	38
115	49	M	19	A & S	-266	1	59	5
116	49	M	17	A & S	-210	2	65	8
117	49	F	18	A & S	133	77	72	14
118	49	M	20	A & S	100	57	78	21
119	49	M	22	A & S	175	79	92	42
120	49	M	18	A & S	-29	26	83	29
121	48	M	17	A & S	18	48	70	9
122	49	M	18	A & S	105	66	99	53
123	49	F	18	A & S	-120	10	48	3
124	49	M	18	A & S	-148	8	63	7
125	49	F	17	A & S	76	62	96	48
126	49	M	18	A & S	150	70	67	10

Table 10. Data on students still in school in the fall of 1950-1951 matched with students dismissed the first semester of 1950-1951

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity: Raw Score	Interest Maturity: Percentile Rank	ACE: Raw Score	ACE: Percentile Rank
1	50	M	18	Ag.	-14	26	67	6
2	50	M	18	Ag.	-172	5	96	37
3	50	M	18	Ag.	-79	14	78	14
4	50	M	18	Ag.	-332	1	85	21
5	50	M	18	Ag.	-99	5	55	1
6	50	M	18	Ag.	-42	24	85	21
7	50	M	20	Ag.	39	34	51	1
8	50	M	19	Ag.	-142	2	35	1
9	50	M	17	Ag.	-91	15	89	27
10	50	M	19	Ag.	-84	8	75	12
11	50	M	18	Ag.	-45	21	97	38
12	50	M	18	Ag.	3	33	40	1
13	50	M	18	Ag.	-160	5	60	3
14	50	F	19	Ag.	-253	1	84	20
15	50	M	18	Ag.	71	56	91	29
16	50	M	18	Ag.	-82	14	40	1
17	50	M	19	Ag.	-246	1	32	1
18	50	M	18	Ag.	-200	1	41	1
19	50	M	20	Ag.	-200	1	45	1
20	50	M	18	Ag.	-129	9	91	29
21	50	M	21	Ag.	-193	1	76	13
22	50	M	18	Ag.	144	81	55	2
23	50	M	18	Ag.	-135	8	100	44
24	50	M	18	Ag.	27	29	29	1
25	50	M	18	Ag.	-25	16	100	44
26	50	M	19	E & A	-87	8	72	10
27	50	M	18	E & A	21	39	86	23
28	50	M	18	E & A	161	86	101	45
29	50	M	18	E & A	-78	14	60	3
30	50	M	18	E & A	68	56	95	35
31	50	M	18	E & A	-12	29	86	23
32	50	M	19	E & A	93	66	118	73
33	49	M	20	E & A	-25	26	85	31
34	50	M	18	E & A	-121	9	76	13
35	49	M	18	E & A	33	48	73	15
36	50	M	18	E & A	193	84	106	54
37	48	M	20	E & A	84	52	106	57
38	49	M	18	E & A	-119	12	130	93
39	50	M	18	E & A	41	23	94	34
40	50	M	18	E & A	-133	9	99	38
41	49	M	18	E & A	-111	12	98	51
42	50	M	19	E & A	-72	9	104	50
43	50	M	18	E & A	22	39	75	12
44	50	M	18	E & A	-102	12	90	28

Table 10. (cont.)

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity Raw Score	Interest Maturity Percentile Rank	ACE Raw Score	ACE Percentile Rank
45	49	M	18	E & A	-173	5	67	10
46	49	M	17	A & S	100	72	75	17
47	50	M	18	A & S	-70	17	88	25
48	50	M	18	A & S	33	39	55	1
49	50	F	18	A & S	91	52	49	1
50	50	F	18	A & S	99	66	65	5
51	50	M	19	A & S	53	53	71	9
52	50	F	20	A & S	21	39	88	25
53	50	F	19	A & S	-33	28	65	5
54	50	M	18	A & S	30	39	59	3
55	50	M	18	A & S	-67	1	90	28
56	50	M	18	A & S	-94	15	83	19
57	50	M	17	A & S	-9	38	85	21
58	50	M	17	A & S	-19	6	108	57
59	49	M	20	A & S	-129	3	113	76
60	50	M	18	A & S	22	39	67	6
61	50	M	18	A & S	128	77	91	29
62	50	M	18	A & S	-148	1	39	1
63	50	F	18	A & S	233	98	93	32
64	50	F	19	A & S	81	52	69	8
65	50	M	18	A & S	69	56	79	15
66	50	M	19	A & S	28	28	89	26
67	49	M	18	A & S	-32	24	97	49
68	49	M	19	A & S	47	40	31	1
69	50	M	18	A & S	75	62	86	23
70	50	M	19	A & S	-29	26	50	1
71	49	M	18	A & S	-164	5	60	5
72	50	M	18	A & S	133	77	77	13
73	50	M	18	A & S	-80	14	92	31
74	50	M	19	A & S	-205	1	65	5
75	49	F	18	A & S	65	56	93	44
76	50	M	19	A & S	-100	5	85	21
77	50	M	18	A & S	-11	29	64	5
78	50	F	19	A & S	33	33	46	1
79	50	M	18	A & S	-42	28	77	13
80	50	F	18	A & S	-170	5	68	7
81	49	M	18	A & S	15	33	79	22
82	50	M	18	A & S	51	51	71	9
83	50	M	21	A & S	123	64	121	72
84	50	M	21	A & S	171	92	66	6
85	50	M	17	A & S	-87	18	79	15
86	50	M	18	A & S	120	72	107	55
87	50	M	18	A & S	65	56	103	57
88	50	F	18	A & S	184	89	107	55
89	50	M	18	A & S	-10	29	62	4

Table 10. (concl.)

Number	Date	Sex	Age	School	Interest Maturity Raw Score	Interest Maturity Percentile Rank	ACE Raw Score	ACE Percentile Rank
90	50	M	19	A & S	-140	8	78	14
91	50	M	18	A & S	146	81	99	42
92	50	M	18	A & S	82	60	65	5
93	50	M	18	A & S	-51	21	105	51
94	50	M	19	A & S	76	29	67	6
95	50	M	18	A & S	174	89	94	35
96	50	M	18	A & S	-32	24	92	31
97	50	M	18	A & S	43	52	105	51
98	49	M	18	A & S	-120	10	78	21
99	50	M	18	A & S	108	66	87	24
100	49	M	18	A & S	5	33	84	30
101	50	M	20	A & S	66	47	85	21
102	50	M	19	A & S	-47	21	49	1
103	50	M	20	A & S	189	91	105	51
104	49	F	18	A & S	-50	23	93	44
105	50	M	18	A & S	163	86	89	26
106	50	M	18	A & S	83	60	52	2
107	50	M	18	A & S	-44	28	50	1
108	49	M	18	A & S	-129	9	62	7
109	50	M	18	A & S	61	51	128	84
110	49	F	18	A & S	-278	1	69	11
111	50	M	19	A & S	51	51	63	4
112	49	M	19	A & S	62	40	72	14
113	49	M	18	A & S	70	62	98	51
114	49	F	18	H Ec	-75	14	67	10
115	49	F	18	H Ec	87	60	85	31
116	49	F	18	H Ec	196	93	85	31
117	49	F	18	H Ec	154	85	45	2
118	50	F	19	H Ec	-11	29	64	5
119	49	F	18	H Ec	27	39	93	44
120	49	F	18	H Ec	250	99	104	60
121	50	F	18	H Ec	69	56	76	13

A Study of the Relationship Between the Interest Level on the Strong Voctional Interest Blank and Separation from College of a Selected Group of Students

by

PATRICIA NELSON CLARK

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1950

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education and Psychology

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1952

The problem of the study was to determine some factor in addition to intelligence that influences academic success. The interest maturity level of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank was selected because it seemed possible that it might be important and because apparently its value had not been investigated.

Dismissal lists were obtained from the deans of all schools on the campus of Kansas State College for the second semester of 1949-1950 and the first semester of 1950-1951. All foreign students, married students, and veterans were omitted from the study in an effort to eliminate as many variables as possible. Students who had not entered Kansas State College as freshmen were also omitted from the study.

The students were divided into three groups according to date of entrance and were handled in these divisions throughout the study. The first group included those individuals who entered Kansas State College in the fall of 1948, while the second and third groups included the students who had entered in the fall, 1949, and in the fall, 1950.

Each student who was dismissed from school was matched in every particular except the interest maturity score with a students who was still in school. The date of entrance as a freshman, sex, age at the time of entrance, the school in which the student was majoring and the raw scores from the individual's ACE examination were held constant with an allowance of two years in age and five points on the ACE.

No statistical difference was found between interest maturity scores of the matched groups described above.

This study has not shown that interest maturity level is not of importance, but no evidence has been presented which indicates that interest maturity level, as measured by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, is one of the many factors other than intelligence that affect the student's scholastic achievement.