

- / *

(479)

(0.88) (0.58) (0.55) -1

(0.49) (0.38) -2

(0.70) (0.90) -3

-4

/ :

(Scholastic Aptitude Test I) (SATI)
 (American College Test) (ACT)

(College Entrance Examination Board) (SATI) (standardized tests)
 (CEEB) _____ *
 .(224 :2001)
 .2008/10/27 2008/4/17

.(2004)

.(Harman, 1994:316)

1989

:1995)

.(77.12)

.(33

)

(%7.5)

.(1999

.(2003)

(General Secondary School Certificate

Examination) (GSSCE)

(1992) Bontekoe

(1987)

(ACT)

(unreliable criterion)

(ACT)

(1989) Noble and Sawyer

(ACT)

(2002)

() (predictor)

() (criterion)

(unreliable criterion)

(1991) :

(1999) (1994)

(2003) (2002)

: (2004)

(1995) (1988)

.(2001) (2003)

(Spahr, 1985) :

2007/2006 2006/2005 2005/2004 (Halloun and Hestenes, 1985)

(Noah and Eckstein, 1989)

(Rickman and (Bontekoe, 1992)

(Petti John, 1995) Green, 1993)

(Sadler and Tai, 2001) (Beecher, 1998)

: (Rebecca et al., 2004) (Rebecca et al., 2003)

-1 (Tai et (Peard, 2004)

(Rauchas et al., 2006) al., 2005)

/ .(Geiser and Maria, 2007)

-2

-3

)

.(

-4

.()

-5

:

-1

-2

-3

(Geiser and Maria, 2007)

(high school grade)

()

-4

1948

1967

.(33 :1993

)

:

:

-2

-1

%70

22)

(

:1993

)

-2

.(35

:

-3

-3

-1

-2

()

-4

.()

-1

:

(UNRWA)

(Haloun and Hestenes,

.2007/2006 2006/2005 2005/2004

1985)

-2

(1500)

(1988

)

:

/

-1

(347)

1993

(Brigham)

American College Test I (ACTI) 1983 1977

(ACTI) (0.320) :) 1980-1977 (

(0.278) (0.480) (0.140) (0.236)

(Rego and Sousa, 1999) (1977) (0.320)

(1980) (0.480) (0.05)

) (1978) (0.01)

(1979)

(

(1867)

(0.419) (0.409) : (1983-1981)

(%12) (0.419) (0.520)

(0.01)

(%28) (1991)

1990-1989

(1989-1988) (1988-1987)

(Salder and Tai, 2001) (²)

:

(0.19) (0.044)

(0.14) (0.18) (0.33)

(1993) (0.05)

(18)

(1996)

(2001)

(125)

(598) (832) (1430) (1986)

(Beecher, 1998)

(Peard, 2004)

()

(300)

(2002)

(8044)

(Rebecca et al., 2004)

(SATI)

(%4.5)

(587)

(SATI)

:

(%16) (%20) (%24)

(SATI)

(Rebecca et al., 2003)

(Scholastic Aptitude Test I) (SATI)

(SATI)

1999

1996

77893

(SAT 2)

(SATI)

(Tai et al., 2005)

(2003)

(1531)

/

(12)

(2000)

2000/1999

(500)

(Ranchas et al., 2006)

-3

(Rebecca et al., 2003) :
(Geiser and Maria, 2007)

(Geiser and Maria, 2007)

-4

(Rego and (Beecher, 1998) :
(2001) Sousa, 1998)
(Rebecca et al., 2004)

(80000)

-5

-1

(2002) (1996)
(2003)

-2

:

*

:

(Halloun and Hestenes, 1985)
(Sadler and Tai, 2001) (1991)
(Tai et al., 2005) (Peard, 2004)
(Ranchas et al., 2006)

*

(Multiple Regression

-2

2005/2004

Analysis)

(479)

(334)

2007/2006
(145)

2006/2005

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

**0.58	**0.55		
**0.88			

145	39	106	
334	70	264	
479	109	370	

.(0.01 = α) **

(2)

(0.01 = α)

(0.55=)

(0.58=)

.(0.88=)

2006/2005 2005/2004

.2007/2006

(0.88)

(0.58)

.(0.55)

(SPSS)

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

(Pearson correlation)

-1

(3)

3.79	89.95	4.52	82.44	
5.71	80.52	7.35	72.84	
4.38	82.54	6.42	75.20	

(4)

(334)	(145)	(334)	(145)	(334)	(145)
**0.38	**0.30	**0.38	**0.30		
**0.87	**0.80				

.(0.01 = α) **

(2003)

(4 3) " "

(3)

(82.44)

(7) (75.20)

(9.6) (Salder and Tai, 2001) (1996)

.(Geiser and Matia, 2007) (2001)

(2.4)

(5)

()

				/
6.59	87.24	4.86	87.80	
7.04	81.86	6.86	77.11	
5.91	83.53	5.83	79.37	

(6)

**0.49	**0.38	**0.47	**0.38		
**0.84	**0.87				

.(0.01 = α) **

(7)

()	()			
21.58	0.58	0.49	0.70	
21.68	0.75	0.80	0.90	

: :
 :1 :1 21.68 + 1 0.75 = 1
 : :
 :2 :2 21.58 + 2 0.58 = 2

(7.4)

(4)

(9.4)

(4)

(3.71) (0.01 = α)

(5.4) .(0.38) (0.30)

(1.7) (0.38) (0.30)

(6) .(0.87) (0.80)

(6) (0.01 = α) (0.87)

(0.47) (0.38) (0.80)

(0.38) .(0.49)

(0.87) .(0.84)

(0.87) (0.84)

) (

(0.38) (6 5) " "

(0.49) (5)

(87.80)

(79.37) (8.4)

(10.7)

(2003) (2001)

(2.3)

(Geiser	(Rebecca et al., 2004)	(2001)			
		and Maria, 2007)			
			(7)		
				(7)	
		(2003)		(0.90)	
				(0.80)	(0.80)
				(0.20)	
			-1		
			(0.70)		
				(0.49)	
			-2		(0.49)
				(0.51)	
			-3		
			-4		
.400-383 :(1) 19					
	1994				
:(4) 10					2004
		.158-123			
	2002				
	.203-162 :(40)				1999
	1988				
				.1999/7/21	
	.61-43 :(15)				1996
	1991				
				.83-57 :(57)	
					2003

- Rhonda, Mclean and Mal (Eds.). Queensland University of Technology: 422-429. .65-33 :(30) 1995
- Pettijohn, T.F. 1995. Correlations among college students grade point average and American college test scores. *Psychological Reports*, 76 (1): 336-338. 2001
- Ranchas, S., Grosman, B. and Kaisaris, G. 2006. Language performance at high school and success in first year computer science. In: Proceedings of the special interest group on computer science education technical symposium, Texas, USA. -219 :(59) 15 .256
- Rebecca et al. 2003. California and the SAT: a reanalysis of University of California admission data. *Research and Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.8.04* ERIC (ED492530).
- Rebecca et al. 2004. SAT validity for linguistic minorities at the University of California, Santa. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 123 (1): 6-16.
- Rego and Sousa, L. 1998. Performance in higher education towards an understanding. *Education Research*, 41 (1): 91-94.
- Rickman, C. and Green, G. 1993. Market segmentation differences using factors of the college selection process, *College and University*, Fall 1992: 32-37.
- Sadler, Ph. and Tai, R. 2001. Success in introductory college physics: the role of high school preparation. *Science Education*, (85): 111-136.
- Sphar, A.E. 1985. Predicting graduation status of nursing students using entering GPA and grade in algebra, biology and chemistry. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 386334).
- Tai, R., Sadler, Ph. and Loehr, J. 2005. Factors influencing success in introductory college chemistry. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42 (9): 987-1012.
- Beecher, M. 1998. High school courses and scores as predictors of college success. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Brigham Young University, Utah.
- Bontekoe, J. 1992. The ACT as predictor of college success at Trinity Christian College. (ERIC Document Reproduction service ED 355258).
- Geiser, S. and Maria, V. 2007. Validity of high-school grade in predicting student success beyond the freshman year: high-school record vs standardized tests as indicators of four-years college outcomes. University of California, Berkeley. Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE. 6.0.7).
- Halloun, I.A. and Hestenes, D. 1985. The initial knowledge state of college physics students. *American Journal of Physics*, (53): 1043-1055.
- Harman, G. 1994. Student selection and admission to higher education: policies and practices in the Asian region. *Higher Education*, (27): 313-339.
- Noah, H.T. and Eckstein, M.A. 1989. Tradeoffs in examination policies: An international comparative perspective. *Oxford Review of Education*, (1501): 17-27.
- Noble, J. and Sawyer, R. 1989. Predicting grade in college freshman English and Mathematics courses. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30 (4): 345-353.
- Peard, R. 2004. School mathematical achievement as a predictor of success in a first year university mathematics foundations unit. In: Putt, Lan, Faragher,

Educational Sciences Faculty (UNRWA) Students' Average Grades in the General Secondary School Examination and their Average Grades in their First Year of Study at the University As Predictors of their University Accumulative Grades

*Moh'd Hasan Amayreh and Intisar Khalil Asha**

ABSTRACT

The study aims to investigate the students' average grades in the General Secondary School Examination (GSSE) and their average grades in their first year of study at the university as predictors of their accumulative grades. The study sample consisted of 479 male and female graduates from the Educational Sciences Faculty (ESF) (UNRWA) in Jordan. To answer the study questions, Pearson correlation coefficients and multi-linear regression were used. The study results revealed that:

- 1- The correlation coefficient between the students' average grades in their first year of study and their accumulative grades was very strong (0.88) compared with the correlation coefficient between students' average grades in the GSSE and their accumulative grades which was (0.58) or between students' GSSE average grades and their average grades in their first year of study at the university which was (0.55).
- 2- The correlation coefficient between female students' average grades in their first year of study at the university and their accumulative grades was stronger than that of their male counterparts.
- 3- The correlation coefficient between literary stream students' average grades in their first year of study at the university and their accumulative grades was stronger than that of their counterparts in the scientific stream. The correlation coefficient between literary stream students' GSSE average grades and their accumulative grades was (0.38) which was less than the correlation coefficient for scientific stream students which was (0.49).
- 4- Students' average grades in their first year of study at the university were the strongest predictor of their accumulative grades, the correlation coefficient for which was (0.90), and that was stronger than the correlation coefficient between students' GSSE average grades and their university accumulative grades which reached (0.70).

Keywords: Educational Sciences Faculty (UNRWA), General Secondary School Examination, Correlation, Predictor, Accumulative Grades, Average Grades in the First Year.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies; and Educational Sciences Faculty, UNRWA, Jordan. Received on 17/4/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 27/10/2008.