


1965

A Comparison Study of the Gains Made by Non-Promoted and Promoted Students in the Snoqualmie Valley Elementary Schools

Mae McGill

Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McGill, Mae, "A Comparison Study of the Gains Made by Non-Promoted and Promoted Students in the Snoqualmie Valley Elementary Schools" (1965). *All Master's Theses*. 500.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/500>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

A COMPARISON STUDY OF THE GAINS MADE BY
NON-PROMOTED AND PROMOTED STUDENTS IN THE
SNOQUALMIE VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

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

by
Mae McGill
August 1965

LD
5771.3

M145c

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

130707

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Donald G. Goetschius, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Darwin J. Goodey

Ralph D. Gustafson

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Donald G. Goetschius and Mr. Darwin J. Goodey for their guidance and valuable suggestions offered throughout the writing of this paper.

Equally important is the expression of appreciation to Dr. Ralph D. Gustafson for serving on the graduate committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND THE PROBLEM	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Importance of the study	1
Limitations of the study	3
Definitions of Terms Used	3
Academic achievement	3
Achievement	4
Grade level	4
I. Q.	4
Non-promotion	4
Promotion	4
Retain	5
Retention	5
Methods of Research and Sources of Data	5
Methods of research	5
Sources of data	5
Organization of the Remainder of the Thesis	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Differences in Promotional Practice	10

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	20
The Setting	20
The Tests Used	21
Stanford Achievement Test	21
California Tests of Mental Maturity	21
The Sample	22
Procedure	26
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	31
Statistical Analysis	43
V. SUMMARY	44
Conclusions From The Literature	47
Recommendations	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDIX	53

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. California Tests of Mental Maturity, Boy Subjects	24
II. California Tests of Mental Maturity, Girl Subjects	25
III. Stanford Achievement Test Battery Median Scores, Boy Subjects	34
IV. Stanford Achievement Test Battery Median Scores, Girl Subjects	35
V. Stanford Achievement Arithmetic Scores, Boy Subjects	37
VI. Stanford Achievement Arithmetic Scores, Girl Subjects	38
VII. Stanford Achievement Reading Scores, Boy Subjects	40
VIII. Stanford Achievement Reading Scores, Girl Subjects	41
IX. Total Mean Growth Achieved By Grade Levels . .	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND THE PROBLEM

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there is justification in retaining students:

It was hypothesized that when students are retained they do not make gains as great as students matched on the basis of sex, age, grade level, and intelligence who are promoted. In order to test this hypothesis, records of the children who had not been promoted in the Snoqualmie Valley School District were examined. Their academic growth was measured to determine appreciable gain in subject matter areas and a comparison was made with a matched group of children who were promoted.

Importance of the study. The problem of lenient promotion standards versus promotion based on strict standards of achievement has long been a subject of serious concern for teachers, particularly at the elementary school level. Although the number of students repeating grades in the elementary schools is decreasing, there are still one to three million elementary school

children each year in this country who are not promoted to the next grade (11:438).

It has been the practice in the Snoqualmie Valley School District, in many cases, to retain children who were not performing up to grade level. This did not occur automatically, for if the child had been retained once in the primary grades and once in the intermediate grades he was promoted on an annual promotion basis. The question to be explored was the effect of this retention on the educational achievement of the children in this district.

There is a growing pressure between the number of children to be educated and the ever increasing costs of salaries, buildings and materials which school districts must assume. If non-promotion of children is not producing equal or better achievement than the achievement of matched promoted children, then it is to the advantage of the school districts to re-evaluate their policy.

Education is concerned with prediction about human beings, particularly in relation to their learning capacity, potential growth, success and adjustment. By increasing our ability to predict probable results, we come closer to our purpose of helping children.

Because the practices of the Snoqualmie Valley School District may differ in important aspects from other districts where studies similar to this have been

done, it was considered important to have first hand knowledge of how promotion and non-promotion of matched groups of children effected their educational achievement.

Limitations of the study. This study was restricted to examine only the records of non-promoted students matched with promoted students from the Snoqualmie Valley Schools. The study was limited to students from the second grade through the seventh grade. First grade students, who have the greatest number of retention, were not included, due to the consensus that non-promotion is most beneficial at this level. The schools of the district are all of the 8-4 plan, therefore, records of eighth grade students were not examined due to the impossibility of matching them. Records of students who did not begin their education in the district were not examined. Children who fell below the average I.Q. range (90 - 110) were not included in the study. The study was limited to examine only the arithmetic and reading battery median scores of the Stanford Achievement Test, plus the median grade score of the complete battery of tests.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Academic achievement. Throughout this paper the following term "academic achievement" shall refer to

knowledge attained or skills developed in school subjects, usually designated by test scores of pupils in the academic subjects, such as reading, arithmetic and history.

Achievement. For the purpose of this paper, the term shall refer to the accomplishment of proficiency of performance in a given subject.

Grade level. For the purpose of this paper the following term "grade level" shall refer to a measure of educational maturity stated in terms of the school grade attained by an individual pupil or group of pupils at a given time.

I.Q. Throughout this paper, the following abbreviation "I.Q." shall refer to the words intelligent quotient. Intelligence quotient is the most commonly used device for expressing level of mental development in relation to chronological age.

Non-promotion. For the purpose of this paper, the following term, "non-promotion" shall refer to the failure of a pupil to be promoted to the next higher grade at a regular promotion period.

Promotion. For the purpose of this paper, the following term "promotion" shall refer to the act of

shifting a pupil's placement from a lower to the next higher grade.

Retain. Throughout this report the term "retain" shall be interpreted as meaning the act of keeping a student in a fixed state or condition, such as keeping a student at the same grade level for a second year.

Retention. For the purpose of this report the following term "retention" shall be used interchangeable with the term non-promotion, to mean failure of a pupil to be promoted to the next higher grade.

METHODS OF RESEARCH AND SOURCES OF DATA

Methods of research. To meet the objectives of this report, the following procedures have been used: (1) library research in the Central Washington State College library and the Seattle Public Library; (2) the examination of students' personal record files and class analysis charts in the Snoqualmie Valley Schools; (3) use and examination of all available Stanford Achievement Tests and California Tests of Mental Maturity.

Sources of data. School records were examined which included Stanford Achievement Tests, California

Mental Maturity Tests, journals, books and articles concerning the problem of non-promotion versus promotion. Assistance was given the examiner by members of the Central Washington State College staff concerning the statistical significance of the study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

The remainder of this study includes a review of the literature which presents previous investigations of this and closely related problems. It includes a description of the school district where the study occurred, and a brief description of the tests used in the study. The steps which were followed in gathering the data will be reported. The results of the findings will be expressed in terms of percentages and a brief statistical analysis will be given.

The final chapter will be a summary stating the developments of previous chapters and showing the more important findings and conclusions of the whole study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written in regard to the promotion policies in our schools today. Promotion policies may be fixed or flexible. Guidance concerning promotion may or may not be available. A brief summary of the work done in the area of promotion and non-promotion will be reported in this paper.

Historically, American schools have operated on the grade-standard theory, which many children failed to meet. These standards are now giving way to an emphasis on highest individual achievement in regard to the potential of the student.

The policies that lie behind promotions are varied and numerous. They depend greatly on the school system where the students are attending classes. They depend on the school's educational goals, the size of classes, the remedial teaching program, the system of grouping students for instruction, and how hard the student works. Teachers also differ among themselves concerning the relative merits of promotion and non-promotion (9:33).

Some of the causes for failure in our schools will be examined before a look is taken at the differences in promotional practices.

A survey of the studies on the reasons of grade failure shows that the most common reason is failure

to achieve in academic subjects. Among the causes most frequently listed by most studies are lack of application, slow learning rate, poor health, physical defects, irregular attendance, mental immaturity, mental deficiency, laziness, indifference, carelessness, weak academic background, excessive transferring from school to school, and unwise administrative practice (16:26-27).

Otto found approximately 200 different promotion plans in operation in various elementary schools in 1934. In some instances it is probably the teacher or the parent who causes the child to fail. At other times the type of school organization is responsible for failure. Sometimes the cause lies in the out-of-school environment (17:243).

The fact that children differ from one another as a result of their heredity and environment is one of the fundamental reasons why the problem of non-promotion is so complex. Children are dissimilar physically, mentally, morally, aesthetically, and socially.

Saunders made a list of the causes and values ascribed to non-promotion of elementary school children which seems to cover the subject quite thoroughly:

1. Insufficient achievement
 - A. In previous preparation or in keeping abreast of the class
2. Inadequate mentality
 - A. Sluggish mentality or mental incapacity
 - B. Lack of ability
3. Insufficient attendance
 - A. Truancy
 - B. National and religious holidays

4. Imperfect health

- A. Physical defects
- B. Ill health
- C. Faulty eyesight or hearing
- D. Diseased adenoids
- E. Inadequate diet
- F. Undernourishment
- G. Nervousness
- H. Poor muscular coordination

5. Out-of-school causes

- A. Late entrance to school
- B. Ignorance of the English language, poor home conditions, poor home study habits, and outside activities
- C. Domestic trouble
- D. Moving about

6. Lack of emotional stability

- A. Timidity
- B. Immaturity
- C. Uneven temperament
- D. Poor attitude
- E. Dislike of subject
- F. Dislike of teacher
- G. Dislike of school

7. Inappropriate administrative practices

- A. Carelessness and indifference of pupils
- B. Lack of interest and application
- C. Poor school study habits
- D. Overwork of pupils
- E. Double promotions
- F. Too frequent transfers
- G. Excessive size of classes and over-large registers
- H. Unsatisfactory textbooks
- I. Double session programs
- J. Insufficient school time
- K. Delayed examinations
- L. Too high standards or varying standards of rating pupils
- M. Teacher's subjective judgments
- N. Full-time special schedule

- O. Lack of balance in the teaching strength of the grades
- P. Inadequate number of substitute teachers
- Q. Inefficient teaching and faulty courses of study
- R. Uniform courses of study
- S. Failure to provide financial resources to fill normal vacancies speedily (20:23-25).

From the preceding list the reader may observe the reasons for non-promotion are numerous and complex.

DIFFERENCES IN PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES

Many phases of pupil classification are closely associated with promotion policies and practices. In some schools the primary grades have been organized as flexible groups wherein no formal promotions are made until the end of a child's third or fourth year in school. Within such a primary unit, groups are kept fluid throughout the period so that individual children are reclassified many times each year. Other schools have ungraded remedial rooms which always have a quota of pupils equal to the average size of class in the school.

The promotional practices of a given school are inextricably associated with the plans followed in the classification of pupils, the organization, content, and method of administration of the course of study, the size of classes, the instructional load of teachers, the organization of the program for instruction, methods of teaching, the types and amounts of remedial teaching that can be given, as well as other items that might be named (14:333).

Caswell, in his book Education in the Elementary School states:

There is no consistent, generally accepted basis for non-promotion. (This is not fair to a child) In another school he wouldn't perhaps be retained. There is no consistent relationship between the achievement and mental ability of the pupil and his non-promotion. Does non-promotion maintain high achievement standards? No. Does non-promotion reduce the variability of instructional groups? No. Does non-promotion make pupils work harder? No. Retention has a bad effect on attitudes. Instead of this, a program should be developed in which curriculum is so well adjusted that all can progress (4:146).

At a symposium held recently in California, (1960) the National Education Association had educators from many areas in the United States discuss the promotion policies in our schools today. They listed four types of promotion policies now in use: (1) a grade-standard policy, (2) a continuous-promotion policy, (3) a guidance-promotion policy, and (4) a continuous-progress policy. They evaluated that the grade standard policy implies that each child assimilate a pre-determined body of knowledge within a given school year as a requirement for promotion. The merit of this system appears to be ease of administration. It accepts the theory that fear of failure and/or repeating a grade brings a child "up to standard" and that failure prepares the child for the competitive world of the adult.

In an attempt to correct the shortcomings of the

grade standard practice, the policy of continuous promotion came into vogue. This was based on the 100 per cent promotion theory and was a step toward adapting the school program to children as they are, and not to a mythical standard of academic achievement. This plan did not take into account that some children need additional time for learning.

A more recent practice, known as guidance promotion, recognizes that all children are different and that a few will benefit by repeating a grade. It is concerned with the individual and has a long-range plan of appraisal.

This plan appears to control the nature of failure and guards against the evils of the fixed-standard approach, where the acquisition of knowledge is the sole criterion for promotion. The guidance aspect of this procedure indicates that the failing of a child is too significant to his welfare to be taken lightly.

A continuous-progress plan is less concerned with arbitrary standards, grade lines, beginnings and endings, failure and promotion. It is more concerned with continuity of learning and optimum growth for each child.

A pure continuous-progress plan is a completely non-graded school, which cuts across age lines as well as grade lines to form mixed groups. This procedure appears

to be a promising practice for serving children as they are--different in many ways. As age and grade barriers are completely removed, promotion problems will disappear (25:18-19).

In C. H. Kumpf's article, "Social Promotion a Misnomer," he reports on a new approach to promotion problems that offers challenge to children of all capacities in terms of potential. Under this new concept weaker children learn no less while the stronger pupils learn much more.

In this process, educational specialists, the child's parents, and the child himself are frequently involved. This is sometimes called guidance promotion.

Out of this have grown such adjustments as the continuous progress plan and the ungraded school. The chief merits of these plans evolve out of the fact that they do not violate our understanding of children.

Unfortunately someone called this "social promotion" The term fosters in the mind of the public the notion that pupils are promoted for no other reason than that of keeping them with their social group . . . (13:35-37).

A program of promotion investigation at the Bayless School District, St. Louis, Missouri, is quite different from any review thus far. At Bayless they assume that all new learning failures are due to emotional problems. This is, of course, not true, but the assumption has yielded a

highly useful working plan for them. Their cases are still too few for them to think of their findings as conclusive and generalizable.

Their findings suggest that more learning failures are due to emotional problems, remedial if detected early enough and treated appropriately, than to specific organically originated learning disabilities.

If their findings could be replicated by others elsewhere, then early detection and treatment of learning failures assume new importance for both educators and mental health workers.

In this study parents seem to be the key people. If they are willing and able to work with the school to help the child, social promotions can produce excellent results.

Where the parents are not able or willing to work with the school, retentions can help a significant proportion of failing children if two criteria are used in selecting pupils for retention: first, a per-retention rate of progress that is less than half of normal and, second, a lag amounting to between 1.0 and 1.9 grades, except at Grades 1 and 2, where lags of more than 0.3 and 0.7 grades respectively have been used. The child's rate of progress before retention seems particularly important because it recognizes the child's own growth, regardless of his rank

in the class (24:370-375).

This study stressed that effort was always made to bring the parents into co-operation and to offer--and encourage the parents to provide--any and every additional kind of help that was appropriate and available.

This study differs from most work done in this area but was mentioned because it was a recent study.

Otto and Melby found the values of a non-promotion policy, as contrasted with a one-hundred per cent promotion policy are closely related to the psychological values of success and failure. They found that the group whose members were told throughout the semester they would not pass unless they worked diligently did no better than the pupils who were told they would be promoted regardless of their efforts (18:588-596).

According to Marshall, desirable attitudes are developed by emphasizing children's successes. In the work of any grade children face problems and fail to find correct solutions for some. If, in the process, pupils grow in knowledge, in emotional and moral strength, and in social adjustment, failure is a good experience. But the child who fails some of the daily school work, who does not work to his capacity, and who fails to co-operate with his fellow pupils and teachers, should be clearly

differentiated from the one who fails to be promoted. Repetition of daily assignments is entirely different from doing the work of an entire academic year or semester again.

When a pupil fails in promotion, many bad attitudes habits, and character and personality traits result, according to such writers as Lindsay, Washburne, and Farley. The last author summarized the attitudes of the others when he said,

First we ask a child to undertake something that is impossible for him and then we brand him as a failure on his report card, and in the eyes of his fellows because he does not achieve the impossible. If docile, he bears the ordeal as best he can; if he has more spirit he will revolt, and the problems of discipline and truancy will increase (6:41-42).

Caswell reports that, children of less than average ability gained little more by repeating a grade than they gained by trial promotion, and that those in grades four, five, and six profited more from a trial promotion than did those in grades two and three. Non-promotion was apt to be a deterrent instead of an impetus to acceptable achievement (3:29-30).

Lee J. Cronback in his book, Educational Psychology states that,

The school which decides to hold back a pupil must do so because it believes it can provide for him better that way than if it keeps him with his group. Since non-promotion brands him with failure and upsets whatever social adjustment he has, holding a child back rarely has a net advantage (7:221).

Saunders, Coffield, Caswell, Sandin and Goodlad, reached the following conclusions after an extensive survey of research:

1. Children do not learn more by repeating a grade. In fact, so far as achievement is concerned, potential repeaters, slow-learners actually seem to profit more from promotion than children of like ability who are retained.

2. Non-promotion does not encourage homogeneity and decrease the range of abilities with which a teacher must work.

3. Reproof is less valuable than praise as an incentive for school work and that non-promoted--more than regular progress--pupils show a distaste for school and what it represents to them.

4. There is a higher incidence of troublesome behavior, requiring disciplinary action, among non-promoted than among regular progress pupils.

5. Non-promoted children, significantly more than regularly promoted children, have difficulty in making satisfactory social adjustment and are personally disturbed over their felt inadequacy in the realm of peer group relations (23:201).

In light of the study done by William H. Coffield and Paul Blommers, their investigation found that failure

in the form of non-promotion as a device to insure greater mastery of school subjects matter did not appear to be justifiable. If failure is based solely on the consideration of educational achievement, there is little gained by requiring the repetition of a grade (5:249).

John I. Goodlad and Robert H. Anderson, men who have done extensive research in the area of promotion and non-promotion, report that the arguments favoring promotion or non-promotion, report that the arguments favoring promotion or non-promotion, fit into four major categories: (1) pupil achievement, (2) pupil attitudes toward school and schooling, (3) pupil social-personal adjustment, and (4) the teacher's view of the school's function. The evidence from research comparing non-promoted pupils with promoted pupils in these first three areas is overwhelming.

Promoted slow-learning children achieve at higher levels, are involved less often in aggressive acts toward school and schooling, get along better with their peers, and appear to have more wholesome feelings of personal worth. Upper grade achievement levels are higher in schools that have low non-promotion rates. A major area of tension among promoted slow-learners appears to be associated with fear of failure. They express worry over their school progress, believe their parents to be similarly concerned and frequently resort to cheating as a way of assuring higher achievement.

However, neither promotion nor non-promotion by itself takes care of pupils' nonlearning or the teachers' problems of individualizing instruction (9:34-35).

According to Goodlad, whether or not a child is regularly promoted depends more upon where he goes to

school than upon his ability, present achievement, or how hard he works. Teachers apparently differ among themselves regarding the relative merits of promotion and non-promotion, work under differing degrees of pressure regarding the importance of grade standards, and react quite differently to these pressures (9:41).

While more research is needed in this area, many conclusions may be drawn from the evidence presented.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there is justification in having students repeat the same grade due to their lack of academic achievement as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test.

The sections of this chapter are: (1) a brief description of the school district where the study occurred; (2) a brief description of the types of tests used in the study; (3) an account of the sample; and (4) the procedure followed in gathering the data.

THE SETTING

The Snoqualmie Valley School District is a Second Class District in King County, Washington. The schools of the district are located approximately twenty-nine miles east of Seattle, Washington. The district includes four elementary schools and one high school.

The consolidations which have made the present school district were completed in 1945, and include the towns of North Bend, Fall City, Snoqualmie and Snoqualmie Falls, Washington. An elementary school is located in

each town. Mount Si High School is located between the towns of Snoqualmie and North Bend. The students from the four elementary schools go to Mount Si High School after eighth grade graduation.

The total enrollment in the Snoqualmie Valley Schools as of October 1, 1964 was 2,173. The teaching and administrative staff number 90.

THE TESTS USED

Stanford Achievement Test. The Stanford Achievement test is composed of a series of comprehensive achievement tests developed to measure the important knowledge, skills and understandings commonly accepted as desirable outcomes of the major branches of the elementary curriculum. The tests are intended to provide dependable measures of these outcomes, comparable from subject to subject and grade to grade, for use in connection with improvement of instruction, pupil guidance, and evaluation of progress (2:314).

California Tests of Mental Maturity. The California Tests of Mental Maturity is an excellent and usable test of general intelligence and has real value for comparing an individual's verbal and nonverbal abilities. According to Buros' Fifth Book of Mental Measurement, the manuals

state that the original California Tests of Mental Maturity were designed to correlate with the Stanford-Binet. Herein, it is said, lies one of the chief claims for validity. One study is cited in which this correlation is .88, and the claim is made that several other studies have yielded even higher values (2:25).

THE SAMPLE

The sample used in this study was composed of ninety-six students from the Snoqualmie Valley Schools. The students selected ranged from the second grade through the seventh grade.

Forty-eight non-promoted students were matched with forty-eight promoted students and were paired according to sex, grade level, age and intelligence. All paired students were within three months of age and had I.Q. scores with no greater variance than five points.

This sample included a total of thirty-four non-promoted boy students and fourteen non-promoted girl students. Thus, with their selected promoted matches the complete sample group totaled sixty-eight boys and twenty-eight girls. These students included a total of seven matched second graders, composed of twelve boys and two girls, six matched third graders composed of ten boys and two girls, eight matched fourth graders composed of

fourteen boys and two girls, three matched fifth graders composed of four boys and two girls, fourteen matched sixth graders, composed of twelve boys and eight girls.

The sample was chosen so that none of the students had a reported I.Q. below ninety, although many of these students could be classified as low-achievers.

Goodlad reported that, "the most consistent factor among non-promoted children is that they are low-achievers" (10:32).

All of the students in the non-promoted group fell below the class median on the Class Analysis Charts. It was observed while matching the non-promoted students with promoted students that the majority of pupils who fit the qualifications of a matchee, also fell in the lower levels on the Class Analysis Charts.

While selecting samples for the study there was no limit set as to the upper I.Q. range that a subject could have. The inherent intelligence possessed by the subjects of the sample varied from a low I.Q. of ninety, to a high I.Q. of one-hundred twenty-two in the non-promoted group. The I.Q.'s ranged in the promoted group between a low of ninety-one to a high of one-hundred twenty-five. Tables I and II represent the I.Q.'s of the subjects.

The mean I.Q. for the non-promoted and the promoted

TABLE I
California Tests of Mental Maturity
Boy Subjects

Non-Promoted	I.Q.	Promoted	I.Q.
1	110	1	110
2	112	2	114
3	90	3	94
4	105	4	104
5	94	5	96
6	96	6	100
7	96	7	97
8	104	8	100
9	102	9	101
10	103	10	108
11	90	11	92
12	120	12	115
13	107	13	104
14	99	14	98
15	93	15	96
16	93	16	90
17	102	17	103
18	104	18	109
19	122	19	125
20	102	20	103
21	100	21	97
22	102	22	97
23	94	23	99
24	101	24	105
25	96	25	104
26	112	26	117
27	98	27	96
28	98	28	101
29	107	29	107
30	93	30	93
31	95	31	91
32	90	32	91
33	104	33	99
34	103	34	108
AVERAGE I.Q.	101.08 or 101		101.88 or 102

TABLE II
California Tests of Mental Maturity
Girl Subjects

Non-Promoted	I.Q.	Promoted	I.Q.
1	98	1	100
2	103	2	98
3	91	3	92
4	93	4	96
5	98	5	102
6	100	6	104
7	114	7	113
8	103	8	108
9	95	9	99
10	103	10	100
11	100	11	101
12	98	12	99
13	108	13	107
14	95	14	98
AVERAGE I.Q.	99.92		101.21
	or		or
	100		101

boys, as shown in Table I, was one-hundred one, and one-hundred two respectively.

The girls in the non-promoted group had a mean I.Q. of one-hundred, while the girls in the promoted group had a mean I.Q. of one-hundred one, as shown in Table II.

The chronological ages of the students also differed. The youngest student in the non-promoted group was age seven years and eight months, while the oldest student was fourteen years and three months. In the promoted group the youngest pupil was age seven years six months; the oldest pupil, fourteen years and two months.

The ages reported represent the students' ages at the time they took their first test. Their ages at the time of the second test would be exactly one year older. It is a district policy that the Stanford Achievement Tests are always given during the middle of the month of May.

All the students who are included in the sample had been enrolled continuously in the Snoqualmie Valley School District since the beginning of their first grade year.

PROCEDURE

In the procedure for gathering the data for the study, the first step was to locate the record folders of the boys and girls in grades two through seven who had a

record of non-promotion in the Snoqualmie Valley School District. After a survey of several inventories, class analysis charts, students' permanent record folders, and class record folders, the investigator had acquired the names of one-hundred seven students who had a record of non-promotion.

The permanent record folders of each of these students was then surveyed to determine whether or not the non-promoted student fitted the criteria specified to warrant his qualification as a probable subject for the study.

During the process of examining the non-promoted students records, unfortunately, it was discovered that many of the students were disqualified for the study. Fifty-nine of the non-promoted students were not eligible, due to various reasons: (1) lack of sufficient intelligence, (2) moving to another location, (3) incomplete records, (4) the inability of the examiner to locate a suitable matchee, and (5) the student did not begin his education in the district.

Upon completing the selection for the sample the records of each non-promoted student was then carefully examined and pertinent data recorded.

The second step in the procedure for gathering the data was to examine the records of promoted students in

the school district. This was accomplished by surveying the class analysis charts and class record folders. Students with records of continuous promotion were selected who matched the non-promoted students according to the required specifications previously mentioned. The records of this selected promoted group were then carefully examined and recorded.

For the purposes of comprehension and comparison the investigator recorded only the battery median score for the reading tests, the battery median score for the arithmetic tests, plus the battery median score for the complete battery of tests. The Stanford Achievement Test is designed to measure knowledge in nine areas of subject matter in the second grade, ten areas of subject matter in the fourth and fifth grades, and eight areas of subject matter in the seventh grade. Due to this variance and for the purpose of simplification, the number of scores recorded was limited as specified.

Although the California Tests of Mental Maturity measures both verbal and non-verbal abilities, only the total I.Q. scores were recorded, for the purpose of simplification of recording data.

The next step was the arrangement of the data into logical order. This was achieved by listing each non-

promoted student in rank order according to his grade level. The investigator then recorded the students scores for the year the non-promotion occurred. Just below this data the test scores were recorded showing the students scores for the year following the non-promotion. The same procedure was followed for the promoted group of students (see Appendix A and B, pp. 54-61).

When the total months growth was determined for both the non-promoted and the promoted groups, the data was divided to segregate the boy and girl students in the study. For the purpose of the study these students were then divided into four sub-groups: non-promoted boys, promoted boys, non-promoted girls, and promoted girls.

The total data was then separated into specific areas of achievement for the purpose of determining the growth achieved by each group in the areas of reading and arithmetic. The pupil's total growth in months, determined by the battery median score on the tests, was also calculated separately for each individual group.

For the sake of inquiry, the students were again separated into groups according to grade level and deductions were made concerning achievement growth.

This chapter has presented a view of the school district where the study occurred and a brief description

of the tests from which the data was obtained. It has described the sample population used in the study and the procedures followed in gathering the data.

The findings of this study will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the value in retaining students in the Snoqualmie Valley School District.

This study tests the hypothesis that when students are retained they do not make academic gains as great as matched students who are promoted. Such a finding would indicate that to retain children for the purpose of academic gain in subject matter areas is not justified.

The data expressed in numeral form in this study has been rounded off to the nearest tenth for the purpose of simplification.

The total sample of non-promoted students is shown in Appendix A, pages 54-57 and the total sample of promoted students is shown in Appendix B, pages 58-61. The growth is shown by the gain each individual student achieved and also by the mean growth achieved by the total sample in each group. The mean growth in months is presented at the end of each column.

The total sample of non-promoted students achieved a mean growth of 7.1 months, while the promoted group

achieved a mean growth of 9.5 months, thus attributing the promoted group of students a two and four tenths greater gain in total subject matter areas.

The Stanford Achievement Test scores are calculated on a ten month basis, therefore the promoted group made a twenty-five and three tenths per cent greater gain than the non-promoted group.

The average student is expected to achieve a typical ten month growth on the Stanford Achievement Test, while it may be noted on Appendix A and B that neither the non-promoted nor the promoted group of students achieved this level of expectancy, therefore indicating that the students included in this sample may be classified as low achievers.

It has been previously mentioned that Goodlad found in his study that the most consistent factor among non-promoted children is that they are low achievers.

Walter Worth also makes note of this fact in his article, "Promotion or Non-Promotion" (26:25).

It may be observed on Appendix A, pages 54-57 that there were four students in the non-promoted group who made far greater achievement gains than the rest of the students in the non-promoted sample. The composite gain of these four students accounted for twenty-five per cent of the total

gain made by the entire non-promoted group. It is of interest to note that these four students were older than the mean of the sample, and that they also had higher I.Q.'s than did the mean I.Q. of their group.

The composite gain made by the four highest achievers in the promoted group accounted for only thirteen per cent of the promoted group's total growth. These four high achievers were also the older students.

Table III presents the growth achieved on the battery median scores by the non-promoted boys in the total sample compared to growth achieved by the promoted boys in the sample.

The non-promoted boys made a mean growth of 7.2 months on their battery median scores, while the promoted boys achieved a mean growth of 9.2 months. Thus giving the promoted boys an average of two months or twenty-one and seven tenths per cent greater gain than the non-promoted group of boys on their battery median scores.

Table IV presents the growth achieved by the non-promoted girls in the sample compared to the promoted girls, as measured by their total months gain computed from their battery median scores.

The non-promoted girls achieved a mean gain of 7.0 months while the promoted girls' mean gain was 10.4 months.

TABLE III
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST BATTERY MEDIAN SCORES

Boy Subjects

Growth made by Non-Promoted Boys		Growth made by Promoted Boys	
Subject	Growth (In months)	Subject	Growth (In months)
1	4	1	7
2	-2	2	3
3	4	3	15
4	4	4	11
5	3	5	6
6	6	6	4
7	4	7	3
8	4	8	6
9	8	9	5
10	1	10	6
11	11	11	9
12	16	12	13
13	1	13	6
14	4	14	6
15	1	15	10
16	6	16	9
17	2	17	12
18	5	18	10
19	23	19	14
20	1	20	9
21	2	21	5
22	14	22	4
23	8	23	8
24	3	24	6
25	8	25	11
26	3	26	22
27	11	27	12
28	20	28	22
29	-3	29	19
30	14	30	4
31	-5	31	8
32	27	32	9
33	20	33	7
34	16	34	11

MEAN GROWTH

7.2

9.2

TABLE IV
 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST BATTERY MEDIAN SCORES
 Girl Subjects

Growth made by Non-Promoted Girls		Growth made by Promoted Girls	
Subject	Growth (In months)	Subject	Growth (In months)
1	4	1	10
2	14	2	15
3	4	3	9
4	7	4	6
5	2	5	10
6	13	6	11
7	6	7	10
8	4	8	5
9	7	9	12
10	3	10	10
11	11	11	16
12	14	12	11
13	18	13	17
14	-9	14	4
MEAN GROWTH		7	10.4

Thus showing a greater gain of three and four tenths months or thirty-two and seven tenths per cent greater gain accomplished by the promoted group of girls.

Table V shows the results of the arithmetic scores obtained by both groups of boys in the study. The non-promoted boys achieved an average growth of 6.3 months, while the promoted boys achieved an average gain of 9.3 months. This credits the promoted boys a three months or thirty-two and three tenths per cent greater gain in the arithmetic area than the non-promoted boys.

It may be noted that five boys in the non-promoted sample showed a loss rather than a gain in the number of months growth achieved. These five minus scores have a composite total of twenty-seven months.

It may also be seen that while one non-promoted subject made a growth of twenty months, five of the subjects in the promoted group made a growth of twenty months or higher.

From examination of the data presented in Table VI a comparison may be made of the two groups of girls in the subject area of arithmetic. The non-promoted girls received a battery mean of 7.1 months and the promoted girls achieved a battery mean of 11.8 months or a thirty-nine and eight tenths per cent greater gain than the non-promoted girls in arithmetic.

TABLE V
 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT ARITHMETIC SCORES
 Boy Subjects

Non-Promoted Boys				Promoted Boys			
Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth	Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth
1	2.8	3.0	2	1	3.7	3.7	0
2	3.1	2.7	4	2	3.5	4.5	10
3	1.5	1.9	4	3	2.7	3.9	12
4	1.6	2.1	5	4	3.1	4.1	10
5	2.5	3.2	7	5	2.8	3.2	4
6	1.6	2.3	7	6	3.3	3.8	5
7	3.4	4.3	9	7	3.6	4.2	6
8	2.5	2.7	2	8	3.3	3.6	3
9	3.5	4.4	9	9	3.1	3.6	5
10	3.4	2.9	-5	10	3.5	3.8	3
11	3.2	4.0	8	11	2.9	3.7	8
12	4.0	5.4	14	12	5.3	6.0	7
13	3.6	2.6	-10	13	4.9	5.4	5
14	3.8	4.5	7	14	5.0	5.2	2
15	3.4	3.2	-2	15	3.8	5.2	14
16	3.3	3.6	3	16	4.1	4.8	7
17	3.9	5.9	20	17	5.1	5.8	7
18	3.8	3.3	-5	18	6.1	6.6	5
19	5.2	6.3	11	19	7.3	9.7	24
20	4.6	4.6	0	20	5.5	5.7	2
21	6.1	7.6	15	21	6.5	7.1	6
22	5.9	5.9	0	22	6.8	6.9	1
23	4.7	5.7	10	23	5.9	7.6	17
24	5.8	6.9	11	24	6.8	7.2	4
25	5.4	6.4	10	25	6.2	7.1	9
26	5.4	5.9	5	26	7.3	8.8	15
27	5.9	6.9	10	27	4.4	6.4	20
28	5.6	7.1	15	28	6.1	6.8	7
29	8.7	8.2	-5	29	6.5	9.2	27
30	6.2	6.4	2	30	6.5	7.3	8
31	7.2	8.9	17	31	8.6	10.7	21
32	8.0	9.6	16	32	8.7	10.8	21
33	6.9	7.8	9	33	7.2	7.8	6
34	9.0	10.0	10	34	8.6	10.2	16

MEAN GROWTH

6.3

9.3

TABLE VI
 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT ARITHMETIC SCORES
 Girl Subjects

Non-Promoted Girls				Promoted Girls			
Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth	Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth
1	1.4	2.0	6	1	3.0	4.2	12
2	2.4	3.0	6	2	4.2	5.9	17
3	4.4	4.8	4	3	5.1	6.3	12
4	4.3	5.6	13	4	6.1	7.0	9
5	5.0	5.8	8	5	7.6	8.6	10
6	8.0	8.8	8	6	6.3	7.8	15
7	6.2	6.9	7	7	7.4	9.4	20
8	5.3	5.7	4	8	7.0	7.6	6
9	4.9	6.7	18	9	8.4	8.2	-2
10	6.6	6.5	2	10	6.1	7.2	11
11	6.0	6.5	5	11	7.5	9.6	21
12	5.8	6.4	6	12	5.9	7.1	12
13	7.8	9.1	13	13	7.8	9.4	16
14	5.6	5.5	-1	14	6.8	7.4	6
MEAN GROWTH			7.1				11.8

The mean difference between the non-promoted and the promoted boys in the reading area may be observed in Table VII. The non-promoted boys achieved a mean gain of 6.2 months, while the promoted boys achieved a mean gain of 10.1 months growth.

The promoted boys made a three and nine tenths months or thirty-eight and six tenths per cent greater gain in this area than the non-promoted boys.

Table VIII presents the reading data recorded for the two groups of girls in the sample. The two groups received very similar averages in this area.

The non-promoted group received a mean of 7.7 months growth, and the promoted group received a 7.6 months growth. The non-promoted group had a greater gain of one-tenth of a month or one and three tenths per cent. Two of the students in the non-promoted group received minus scores to total a loss of thirteen months, while the promoted group received three minus scores which totaled a loss of six months.

Table IX permits the reader to observe the growth achieved by both groups of students in the sample according to their grade levels. The subjects in this illustration are not segregated according to sex classification.

It may be noted that the highest gain achieved by

TABLE VII
 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT READING SCORES
 Boy Subjects

Non-Promoted				Promoted			
Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth	Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth
1	2.3	3.0	7	1	3.1	4.2	12
2	2.8	2.0	-8	2	3.7	3.5	-2
3	1.9	2.1	2	3	2.8	3.9	11
4	1.5	2.2	7	4	3.0	3.9	9
5	2.3	2.9	6	5	2.5	3.5	10
6	1.4	1.8	4	6	3.1	3.8	7
7	2.6	3.3	7	7	3.3	3.5	2
8	2.1	2.2	1	8	2.9	4.8	19
9	2.4	2.5	1	9	3.6	4.8	12
10	3.1	3.8	7	10	3.3	4.5	12
11	2.2	3.3	11	11	2.7	3.1	4
12	3.4	5.7	23	12	6.3	6.9	6
13	2.7	2.5	-2	13	5.1	5.1	0
14	3.9	3.7	-2	14	4.9	5.6	7
15	3.7	4.1	4	15	3.7	5.2	15
16	3.2	4.2	10	16	4.6	5.3	7
17	3.5	3.7	2	17	4.3	5.3	10
18	3.3	4.2	9	18	5.3	7.0	17
19	5.4	8.1	27	19	8.6	8.9	3
20	5.0	5.4	4	20	5.7	6.6	9
21	6.7	6.2	-5	21	6.6	7.2	6
22	4.7	5.7	10	22	5.9	6.2	3
23	5.0	5.6	6	23	7.8	8.6	8
24	5.2	4.9	-3	24	7.3	8.6	13
25	4.4	4.2	-2	25	5.1	5.6	5
26	5.3	6.2	9	26	7.5	9.4	19
27	5.9	7.0	11	27	5.7	6.2	5
28	5.3	6.6	13	28	7.4	10.5	31
29	7.8	8.1	3	29	6.9	9.2	23
30	5.9	5.0	-9	30	6.9	6.8	-1
31	6.5	6.3	-2	31	8.4	10.6	22
32	4.3	5.8	15	32	8.4	10.6	22
33	6.9	10.3	34	33	7.2	7.7	5
34	7.4	8.6	12	34	8.2	9.3	11

MEAN GROWTH

6.2

10.1

TABLE VIII
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT READING SCORES
Girl Subjects

Non-Promoted				Promoted			
Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth	Subj.	1st yr	2nd yr	Growth
1	1.9	2.4	5	1	4.6	3.6	-10
2	1.6	2.4	8	2	4.1	5.6	15
3	3.7	4.2	5	3	5.3	5.7	4
4	4.3	6.2	19	4	6.2	7.8	16
5	5.9	6.8	9	5	8.7	8.3	-4
6	5.1	5.3	2	6	6.8	7.3	5
7	6.1	8.2	21	7	8.2	8.7	5
8	4.7	5.1	4	8	7.7	7.6	-1
9	6.3	5.7	-6	9	6.5	8.6	21
10	6.9	7.0	1	10	6.3	6.9	6
11	5.8	6.6	8	11	7.3	8.8	15
12	5.7	7.2	15	12	7.5	8.4	9
13	7.3	9.7	24	13	9.4	11.0	16
14	6.7	6.0	-7	14	7.0	7.2	2
MEAN GROWTH			7.7				7.6

TABLE IX
TOTAL MEAN GROWTH ACHIEVED BY GRADE LEVELS

Grade	Total Matched Pairs Students	Average Total Gain of Promoted Students	Average Total Gain of Non-Promoted Students
Second	14	8 months	3.3 months
Third	12	7.3 months	7 months
Fourth	16	9.4 months	4.9 months
Fifth	6	9.7 months	10.3 months
Sixth	28	10.6 months	7.4 months
Seventh	20	10.6 months	10.3 months

non-promoted students was achieved at the fifth grade level. Although it should be remembered that this grade level had the least number of students measured. The non-promoted second grade students showed the lowest achievement growth.

Statistical Analysis. To establish the statistical significance of the mean difference between the non-promoted and the promoted group in this study, a t-test was computed. The t-test results showed a level of significance of .05. Finding the level of significance to be at the .05 level of confidence would suggest that if the experiment were replicated we would expect to find differences this great or greater ninety-five times out of one-hundred. Therefore we can accept, with confidence, the hypothesis that when students are retained they do not make academic gains as great as matched students who are promoted.

In accepting the hypothesis at the .05 level of confidence one recognizes that there are five chances in one-hundred that the hypothesis is incorrect.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there is justification in retaining children with the intention of improving their academic achievement.

It was hypothesized that when students are retained they do not make academic gains as great as matched students of like abilities who are promoted.

To test this hypothesis, a group of forty-eight non-promoted children were matched according to relevant factors, sex, age, grade level and intelligence, with a group of forty-eight promoted students. Scores were obtained for each child in the two groups from the California Test of Mental Maturity to determine their I.Q. scores and from the Stanford Achievement Test for two consecutive years. This enabled the examiner to measure the achievement growth of each child in the study over a one year period to determine the growth achieved by the non-promoted student as compared to the growth achieved by the matched promoted students.

Limitations of the study should be kept in mind while reading the summarized report. It should be

recognized that the typical gains are expressed in units of months and that these units were determined from restricted grade levels, associated with the Stanford Achievement test battery applied to a sample of children from a particular population. This group was measured only in academic achievement growth, while many other variables such as personal and social adjustment and levels of maturity were not measured.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

From the tabulation of the data, the following conclusions are justifiable, and appear to give an indication of the little value gained by requiring repetition of a grade.

The fundamental results of this study, shown in Appendix A and Appendix B, pages 54-61, may be summarized as follows:

1. The non-promoted students in this study did not make academic achievement growth as great as the promoted students when measured by their total battery median score on the Stanford Achievement Test. The promoted group achieved a two and four tenths months greater average gain in total subject matter areas measured.

2. In comparing the divided groups, according to

battery median scores, the promoted boys made a two months greater gain than the non-promoted boys.

The promoted group of girls achieved a three and four tenths months mean gain over the non-promoted girls.

3. The arithmetic area measured showed the promoted boys making a three months greater gain than the non-promoted boys. Five boys in the non-promoted group showed a loss of achievement totaling twenty-seven months.

The promoted group of girls in the arithmetic area obtained a four months greater gain than the non-promoted girls.

4. Examination of the reading scores for both groups of boys show the promoted boys making a growth of three and nine tenths months average gain over the non-promoted group of boys.

Comparison of the reading scores for the two groups of girls show the non-promoted girls to achieve a greater mean growth by one tenth of a month over the promoted girls. This was the only area measured in which the non-promoted group surpassed the promoted group in academic growth.

5. Using the mean score on the over-all composite scores for all students as a criterion of the level of achievement, a simple t-test was applied to determine

whether or not the criterion means differed significantly for these two groups. The difference obtained favored the promoted students above the non-promoted students and showed their growth to be statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

It should be remembered that five non-promoted students made twenty-five per cent of the non-promoted group's total mean growth, which tended to make the study less significant.

By examination of Appendix A and Appendix B on pages 54-61, the reader may observe that many of the non-promoted pupils were still below expected grade norms after their year of repeating the grade.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE LITERATURE

From a review of the literature the following results have been cited:

Children who are not promoted do no better than children of like ability that are promoted.

Non-promotion practices do not reduce the range of specific abilities with which the teacher has to cope.

The threat of non-promotion does not cause threatened children to achieve more than those who are not threatened.

The failing child is more likely to quit school, to be in difficulty with school authorities, to receive less satisfaction from his school work, and to be antagonistic.

The non-promoted child has greater difficulty in making satisfactory social adjustment than the promoted child of the same ability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. From the evidence research reveals, concerning non-promotion and promotion and its effect on children, it appears that teachers and administrators should be deeply concerned with the findings, and continue to search for more effective ways of planning and organizing the educational program to aid in resolving this problem.

2. Promotion policies which now exist should be carefully re-examined with the intent of clarifying the basis for promotional decisions, and thus reduce the number of non-promoted students for the purpose of improving achievement.

3. Investigations need to be undertaken to ascertain why more boys than girls are non-promoted, so that administrative policies may be modified to account for this sex difference.

4. A study of interest would be to determine why the practice of non-promotion still exists, when research and popular opinion agree that it does not accomplish what teachers and administrators expect it to accomplish.

5. Attention should be given to curriculum improvement and the development of special methods and materials to facilitate individualized instruction, to meet the needs of low achievers.

6. It would be of interest to learn if similar studies would show a significant correlation between a pupil's age and his academic achievement.

7. A study of the attitudes and achievements of adults who have had records of non-promotion in the elementary school would provide very interesting data.

8. Further studies in this area should perhaps be continued over a longer period of time in order to gain greater insight into the problem.

9. The continued development in the types of school organization which will permit continuous pupil progress with the intent to alleviate many of the problems associated with promotion and non-promotion in all school districts, both large and small is recommended.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beck, Robert H., Walter W. Cook, and Nolan G. Kearney. Curriculum in the Modern Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
2. Buros, Oscar Krisen. Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gyphon Press, 1959.
3. Caswell, Hollis L. Non-Promotion in Elementary Schools. Field Study No. 4. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1953.
4. _____, and Arthur W. Foshay. Education in the Elementary School. 2nd ed. New York: American Book Co., 1950.
5. Coffield, W. H. and P. Blommers. "Effects of Non-Promotion on Educational Achievement in the Elementary School." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 47, 1956.
6. Cook, Walter W. Grouping and Promotion in the Elementary Schools. Series on Individualization of Instruction No. 2, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1941.
7. Cronback, Lee J. Educational Psychology. New York; Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1954.
8. Goodlad, John I. "In Pursuit of Visions," Elementary School Journal, October, 1958.
9. _____, and Robert H. Anderson. The Nongraded Elementary School. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1959.
10. _____, "Research and Theory Regarding Promotion and Nonpromotion." Elementary School Journal, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1952.
11. Harris, Chester W., with the assistance of Marie R. Liba. "A Project of the American Educational Research Association." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

12. Herrick, Virgil E., John I. Goodlad, Frank Estvan, and Paul W. Ebberman. The Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
13. Kumpf, C. H. National Elementary School Principal. "Social Promotion a Misnomer?" Educational Press Association of America, Washington, D.C., May, 1961.
14. Lobdell, Lawrence O. "Results of a Non-Promotion Policy in One School District." Elementary School Journal, The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
15. Otto, Henry J. "Grading and Promotion Policies." NEA Journal, 40:128-129, 1951.
16. _____. Elementary School Organization and Administration, New York: Appleton-Century-Croft Co., Inc., 1954.
17. _____. Promotion Policies and Practices in Elementary Schools. Minneapolis: Educational Test Bureau, 1935.
18. _____, and Ernest O. Melby. "An Attempt to Evaluate the Threat of Failure As A Factor In Achievement," Elementary School Journal, 588:96, 1935.
19. Sandin, Adolph. Social and Emotional Adjustment of Regularly Promoted and Non-Promoted Pupils. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944.
20. Saunders, Charleton M. Promotion or Failure for the Elementary School Pupil? New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.
21. Shane, Harold G. "Promotion Policy Dilemma." NEA Journal, 42:411-412, 1953.
22. _____. "Promotion Practices Follow Sound Psychological Principles." Nation's Schools, June, 1952.
23. Spain, Charles R., Harold D. Drummond and John I. Goodlad. Educational Leadership and the Elementary School Principal. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1956.

24. Stringer, Lorene A. "Report On A Retention Program," Elementary School Journal, Vol. 60, April, 1960. University of Chicago Press.
25. Symposium--a. "Promotion Policies in Our Schools." Bibliog. il. National Education Assn. Journal, 49; April, 1960, Washington D.C.
26. Worth, Walter H. "Promotion and Non-Promotion," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 46, January, 1960.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX B

Non-Promoted Boys

Subject	Yrs.	Mo.	Read.	Arith	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
1	7	10	2.3 3.0	2.8 3.0	2.5 2.9	110	4 mo.
2	7	10	2.8 2.0	3.1 2.7	2.8 2.8	112	-2 mo.
3	7	9	1.9 2.1	1.5 1.9	1.6 2.0	90	4 mo.
4	8	0	1.5 2.2	1.6 2.1	1.6 2.0	105	4 mo.
5	8	4	2.3 2.9	2.5 3.2	2.4 2.7	94	3 mo.
6	7	8	1.4 1.8	1.6 2.3	1.7 2.3	96	6 mo.
7	9	7	2.6 3.3	3.4 4.3	3.4 3.8	96	4 mo.
8	9	2	2.1 2.2	2.5 2.7	2.4 2.8	104	4 mo.
9	8	1	2.4 2.5	3.5 4.4	2.4 3.2	102	8 mo.
10	8	0	3.1 3.8	3.4 2.9	3.4 3.5	103	1 mo.
11	8	11	2.2 3.3	3.2 4.0	2.6 3.7	90	11 mo.
12	9	11	3.4 5.7	4.0 5.4	3.8 5.4	120	16 mo.
13	10	2	2.7 2.5	3.6 2.6	2.7 2.8	107	1 mo.
14	10	7	3.9 3.7	3.8 4.5	3.8 4.2	99	4 mo.

APPENDIX B

Non-Promoted Boys

Subject	Yrs.	Mo.	Read.	Arith	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
15	11	0	3.7 4.1	3.4 3.2	3.5 3.6	93	1 mo.
16	10	0	3.2 4.2	3.3 3.6	3.2 3.8	93	6 mo.
17	10	5	3.5 3.7	3.9 5.9	3.5 3.7	102	2 mo.
18	9	8	3.3 4.2	3.8 3.3	3.8 4.3	104	5 mo.
19	11	3	5.4 8.1	5.2 6.3	5.5 7.8	122	23 mo.
20	11	2	5.0 5.4	4.6 4.6	4.8 4.9	102	1 mo.
21	11	8	6.7 6.2	6.1 7.6	6.3 6.5	100	2 mo.
22	12	7	4.7 5.7	5.9 5.9	4.4 5.8	102	14 mo.
23	11	10	5.0 5.6	4.7 5.7	4.8 5.6	94	8 mo.
24	11	10	5.2 4.9	5.8 6.9	5.1 5.4	101	3 mo.
25	12	8	4.4 4.2	5.4 6.4	4.3 5.1	96	8 mo.
26	12	8	5.3 6.2	5.4 5.9	5.5 5.8	112	3 mo.
27	12	7	5.9 7.0	5.9 6.9	5.9 7.0	98	11 mo.
28	12	3	5.3 6.6	5.6 7.1	5.4 7.4	98	20 mo.

Non-Promoted Boys

Subject	Yrs.	Mo.	Read.	Arith	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
29	12	8	7.8 8.1	8.7 8.2	8.5 8.2	107	-3 mo.
30	14	3	5.9 5.0	6.2 6.4	5.8 7.2	93	14 mo.
31	13	8	6.5 6.3	7.2 8.9	6.8 6.3	95	-5 mo.
32	13	10	4.3 5.8	8.0 9.6	4.9 7.6	90	27 mo.
33	13	2	6.9 10.3	6.9 7.8	6.5 8.5	104	20 mo.
34	13	9	7.4 8.6	9.0 10.0	7.6 9.2	103	16 mo.

TOTAL MEAN 7.2

APPENDIX B

Non-Promoted Girls

Subject	Yrs.	Mo.	Read.	Arith.	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
1	8	3	1.9 2.4	1.4 2.0	1.7 2.1	98	4 mo.
2	9	2	1.6 2.4	2.4 3.0	1.6 3.0	103	14 mo.
3	10	11	3.7 4.2	4.4 4.8	3.6 4.0	91	4 mo.
4	11	5	4.3 6.2	4.3 5.6	4.3 5.0	93	7 mo.
5	12	7	5.9 6.8	5.0 5.8	6.1 6.3	98	2 mo.
6	12	0	5.1 5.3	8.0 8.8	5.2 6.5	100	13 mo.
7	11	9	6.1 8.2	6.2 6.9	6.5 7.1	114	6 mo.
8	12	2	4.7 5.1	5.3 5.7	5.0 5.4	103	4 mo.
9	12	7	6.3 5.7	4.9 6.7	5.4 6.1	95	7 mo.
10	11	11	6.9 7.0	6.6 6.8	6.6 6.9	103	3 mo.
11	12	5	5.8 6.6	6.0 6.5	5.7 6.8	100	11 mo.
12	13	7	5.7 7.2	5.8 6.4	5.8 7.2	98	14 mo.
13	13	3	7.3 9.7	7.8 9.1	7.2 9.0	108	18 mo.
14	12	7	6.7 6.0	5.6 5.5	6.4 5.5	95	-9 mo.

TOTAL MEAN

7.0

Promoted Boys

Subject	Years	Months	Read.	Arith.	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
1	8	11	3.1 4.2	3.7 3.7	3.2 3.9	110	7 mo.
2	7	11	3.7 3.5	3.5 4.5	3.8 4.1	114	3 mo.
3	7	6	2.8 3.9	2.7 3.9	2.7 4.2	94	15 mo.
4	8	1	3.0 3.9	3.1 4.1	2.9 4.0	104	11 mo.
5	8	8	2.5 3.5	2.8 3.2	2.7 3.3	96	6 mo.
6	7	8	3.1 3.8	3.3 3.8	3.3 3.7	100	4 mo.
7	9	8	3.3 3.5	3.6 4.2	3.6 3.9	97	3 mo.
8	9	2	2.9 4.8	3.3 3.6	3.3 3.9	100	6 mo.
9	8	1	3.6 4.8	3.1 3.6	3.4 3.9	101	5 mo.
10	7	11	3.3 4.5	3.5 3.8	3.3 3.9	108	6 mo.
11	8	8	2.7 3.1	2.9 3.7	2.7 3.6	92	9 mo.
12	9	11	6.3 6.9	5.3 6.0	5.5 6.8	115	13 mo.
13	10	0	5.1 5.1	4.9 5.4	4.8 5.4	104	6 mo.
14	10	4	4.9 5.6	5.0 5.2	5.0 5.6	98	6 mo.
15	10	9	3.7 5.2	3.8 5.2	3.8 4.8	96	10 mo.

Promoted Boys

Subject	Years	Months	Read.	Arith.	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
16	10	1	4.6 5.3	4.1 4.8	4.1 5.0	90	9 mo.
17	10	3	4.3 5.3	5.1 5.8	4.7 5.9	103	12 mo.
18	9	10	5.3 7.0	6.1 6.6	6.3 7.3	109	10 mo.
19	11	3	8.6 8.9	7.3 9.7	8.1 9.5	125	14 mo.
20	11	0	5.7 6.6	5.5 5.7	5.2 6.1	103	9 mo.
21	11	8	6.6 7.2	6.5 7.1	6.7 7.2	97	5 mo.
22	12	8	5.9 6.2	6.8 6.9	6.0 6.4	97	4 mo.
23	11	11	7.8 8.6	5.9 7.6	7.4 8.2	99	8 mo.
24	12	0	7.3 8.6	6.8 7.2	6.9 7.5	105	6 mo.
25	12	9	5.1 5.6	6.2 7.1	5.7 6.8	104	11 mo.
26	12	5	7.5 9.4	7.3 8.8	7.0 9.2	117	22 mo.
27	12	5	5.7 6.2	4.4 6.4	5.0 6.2	96	12 mo.
28	12	0	7.4 10.5	6.1 6.8	7.6 9.8	101	22 mo.
29	12	9	6.9 9.2	6.5 9.2	6.8 9.7	107	19 mo.
30	14	2	6.9 6.8	6.5 7.3	6.8 7.2	93	4 mo.

Promoted Boys

Subject	Years	Months	Read.	Arith.	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
31	13	8	8.4 10.6	8.7 10.8	8.9 9.8	91	8 mo.
32	13	9	8.4 10.6	8.7 10.8	8.9 9.8	91	9 mo.
33	13	2	7.2 7.7	7.2 7.8	6.8 7.5	99	7 mo.
34	13	11	8.2 9.3	8.6 10.2	8.5 9.6	108	11 mo.
TOTAL MEAN		9.2					

Promoted Girls

Subject	Years	Months	Read.	Arith.	Batt. Mdn.	I.Q.	Growth
1	8	2	4.6 3.6	3.0 4.2	3.2 4.2	100	10 mo.
2	9	3	4.1 5.6	4.2 5.9	4.1 5.7	98	15 mo.
3	10	11	5.3 5.7	5.1 6.3	5.3 6.2	92	9 mo.
4	11	4	6.2 7.8	6.1 7.0	6.2 6.8	96	6 mo.
5	12	7	8.7 8.3	7.6 8.6	7.7 8.7	102	10 mo.
6	12	0	6.8 7.3	6.3 7.8	6.7 7.8	104	11 mo.
7	11	8	8.2 8.7	7.4 9.4	8.0 9.0	113	10 mo.
8	12	1	7.7 7.6	7.0 7.6	7.6 8.1	108	5 mo.
9	12	5	6.5 8.6	8.4 8.2	7.1 8.3	99	12 mo.
10	12	1	6.3 6.9	6.1 7.2	6.0 7.0	100	10 mo.
11	12	3	7.3 8.8	7.5 9.6	7.4 9.0	101	16 mo.
12	13	10	7.5 8.4	5.9 7.1	6.9 8.1	99	11 mo.
13	13	0	9.4 11.0	7.8 9.4	8.0 9.7	107	17 mo.
14	12	7	7.0 7.2	6.8 7.4	7.4 7.8	98	4 mo.

TOTAL MEAN

10.4