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## Introduction

- Academic indicators, such as high school grades and standardized test scores, are among the most commonly used criteria for college admission (NACAC, 2008).
- However, there is a long standing debate over the utility and proper use of test scores and whether or not they should even be required for college admission (e.g., Geiser \& Studley, 2002).
- Many feel that the information provided by SAT scores beyond that provided by high school grade point average (HSGPA) does not outweigh its cost, especially if they provide redundant information (NACAC, 2008).


## Does the SAT add anything?

- The incremental validity of the SAT over HSGPA was 0.08 (Kobrin, Patterson, Shaw, Mattern, and Barbuti, 2008).
- Bridgeman, Pollack, and Burton (2004) demonstrated that the seemingly very small increase in explained variance in FYGPA offered by the SAT after HSGPA is taken into account is actually quite meaningful when you look at the percent of students who succeed rather than the increment in r-squared.
- Straightforward approach


## Straightforward Approach

Percentage of Students Earning a Cumulative College GPA of 3.5 of higher: Incremental Validity of the SAT


## Discrepant HSGPA-SAT Performance

In Kobrin, Camara, \& Milewski (2002), students were divided into three groups based on the difference between their standardized HSGPA and SAT scores.

- 16\% higher HSGPA, 16\% higher SAT score, \& 68\% Nondiscrepant

Demographic Characteristics

- Female, Black, Asian, and Hispanic students comprised a larger \% of the higher HSGPA group than the other two groups.

Predictive Validity

- SAT scores were more predictive of FYGPA than was HSGPA for the higher HSGPA group.


## Current Study

Purpose is to examine:

- The frequency of students with discrepant HSGPA and SAT performance (difference $\geq 1$ SD) for the new SAT.
-Whether certain students are disproportionately more likely to exhibit discrepant performance.
- Among those with discrepant performance, which measure is more indicative of college performance?
- Differential prediction of the SAT and HSGPA by discrepant group.
Sample:
- The College Board collected data on nearly 200,000 first-time, first-year students from 110 institutions for the 2006 academic school year.
- Students who had an SAT score, self-reported HSGPA, and a valid FYGPA were included in analyses ( $N=150,377$ ).


## Measures

## SAT scores

- Official SAT scores were obtained from College Board records. The SAT is comprised of three sections, Critical Reading, Math, and Writing, and the score scale ranges from 200 to 800 for each section.


## SAT Questionnaire Responses

- Obtained from College Board records, HSGPA, demographic information, and high school course work were self-reported and obtained from responses to the SAT Questionnaire, which is completed during registration for the SAT.


## College Performance

- First-year GPA and second year retention data were provided by the participating institutions.


## Procedure

Similar to Kobrin et al., 2002, students were divided into three groups based on the difference between their standardized HSGPA and SAT scores.

1. Both SAT total scores and HSGPA were standardized
2. The standardized HSGPA value was subtracted from the standardized SAT score
3. Students with a difference score:

- less than or equal to -1.00 were categorized as higher HSGPA
- greater than -1.00 but less than 1.00 were categorized as Nondiscrepant
- greater than or equal to 1.00 were categorized as higher SAT


# Distribution of Students by SAT-HSGPA Discrepant Groups 

## Discrepant Groups

Higher HSGPA
Nondiscrepant
Higher SAT
Total

## Frequency Percent

26,094
17.4

98,025
65.2

26,258
17.5

150,377
100.0

## Characteristics of Discrepant Students

| Subgroup |  | Higher HSGPA |  | Nondiscrepant |  | Higher SAT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Gender | Female | 17,116 | 65.6 | 53,503 | 54.6 | 10,420 | 39.7 |
|  | Male | 8,978 | 34.4 | 44,522 | 45.4 | 15,838 | 60.3 |
| Ethnicity | American Indian | 164 | 0.6 | 495 | 0.5 | 135 | 0.5 |
|  | Asian | 2,396 | 9.2 | 8,619 | 8.8 | 3,043 | 11.6 |
|  | Black | 2,866 | 11.0 | 6,021 | 6.1 | 1,356 | 5.2 |
|  | Hispanic | 3,215 | 12.3 | 6,226 | 6.4 | 1,158 | 4.4 |
|  | White | 15,754 | 60.4 | 69,562 | 71.0 | 18,191 | 69.3 |
|  | Other | 800 | 3.1 | 2,819 | 2.9 | 857 | 3.3 |
|  | No Response | 899 | 3.4 | 4,283 | 4.4 | 1,518 | 5.8 |

## Characteristics of Discrepant Students

| Subgroup |  | Higher HSGPA |  | Nondiscrepant |  | Higher SAT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
|  | Less than \$30,000 | 3,597 | 13.8 | 6,322 | 6.4 | 1,143 | 4.4 |
|  | \$30,000-\$50,000 | 3,624 | 13.9 | 8,889 | 9.1 | 1,690 | 6.4 |
| Parental | \$50,000-\$70,000 | 3,459 | 13.3 | 10,721 | 10.9 | 2,092 | 8.0 |
| Income | \$70,000-\$100,000 | 4,556 | 17.5 | 17,280 | 17.6 | 3,912 | 14.9 |
|  | More than \$ 100,000 | 3,845 | 14.7 | 23,258 | 23.7 | 8,014 | 30.5 |
|  | No Response | 7,013 | 26.9 | 31,555 | 32.2 | 9,407 | 35.8 |
| Highest | No High School Diploma | 1,002 | 3.8 | 1,390 | 1.4 | 222 | 0.8 |
|  | High School Diploma | 8,140 | 31.2 | 18,707 | 19.1 | 3,328 | 12.7 |
|  | Associate's Degree | 2,385 | 9.1 | 6,259 | 6.4 | 1,010 | 3.8 |
| Parental | Bachelor's Degree | 7,925 | 30.4 | 33,749 | 34.4 | 8,049 | 30.7 |
| Education | Graduate Degree | 5,402 | 20.7 | 33,196 | 33.9 | 12,198 | 46.5 |
|  | No Response | 1,240 | 4.8 | 4,724 | 4.8 | 1,451 | 5.5 |

## Performance on Academic Measures by SAT-HSGPA Discrepant Groups

|  | Higher HSGPA |  | Nondiscrepant |  | Higher SAT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| SAT total | 1468 | 177 | 1705 | 231 | 1871 | 247 |
| SAT-CR | 480 | 71 | 564 | 87 | 626 | 93 |
| SAT-M | 509 | 79 | 583 | 91 | 632 | 93 |
| SAT-W | 479 | 70 | 558 | 87 | 614 | 94 |
| HSGPA | 3.94 | 0.31 | 3.63 | 0.45 | 3.16 | 0.54 |
| HS Rigor | 2.24 | 1.85 | 2.98 | 2.07 | 3.30 | 2.11 |
| FYGPA | 2.91 | 0.69 | 3.01 | 0.69 | 2.90 | 0.76 |
| Retention | 86.8 | 33.8 | 88.3 | 32.2 | 86.4 | 34.3 |

## FYGPA of SAT-HSGPA Discrepant Groups by HSGPA



Average Overprediction (-) and Underprediction (+) of FYGPA for HSGPA and SAT by SAT-HSGPA Discrepant Groups


Higher HSGPA $\square$ Nondiscrepant $\square$ Higher SAT
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## Summary

- Over one-third of students exhibited discrepant performance.
- Using only HSGPA for admission under-predicted college performance for those students who performed significantly higher on the SAT as compared to HSGPA.
- Results underscore the utility of using both HSGPA and test scores for admission decisions.
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