


AD-A077 793 MILITARY ACADEMY WEST POINT NY OFFICE OF THE DIRECTO--ETC F/G 5/9
COMPARABILITY OF ACT AND SAT TEST SCORES, (U)


UNCLASSIFIED JUN 75 G W MEDSGER
1A4.00-75-022

NL

| OF |
AD
A077793




END
DATE
FILMED
1-80
DDC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

LEVEL II

75-022



AD A 0 2 7 7 9 3



UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

WEST POINT · NEW YORK

COMPARABILITY

OF

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 10 1979
A

ACT AND SAT
TEST SCORES

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

OFFICE OF THE

DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

JUNE 1975

DDC FILE COPY

DUTY-HONOR-COUNTRY

79 20 9 214

6
14
COMPARABILITY OF ACT AND SAT TEST SCORES

Report No. 1A4.00-75-022

Task No. 2107

Prepared by: COL Gerald W. Medsger

June 1975

10

12

11

ABSTRACT

Attempting to adhere to the present scheme of the ABDQC when using both the ACT and SAT batteries presents some inherent problems. Unlike the problem of equivalent scores, the problem of comparable scores is one of "equating" tests of different function or emphasis. Consequently, direct conversions from ACT to SAT scores should be avoided if possible. This report presents a curvilinear method of equating ACT-E/SAT-V, ACT-M/SAT-M, and ACBA/CBA for use in the admissions process.

11

Jun 75

NOTE: Any conclusions in this report are not to be construed as official U. S. Military Academy or Department of the Army positions unless so designated by other authorized documents.

DISTRIBUTION: This document is prepared for official purposes only. Its contents may not be reproduced or distributed (in whole or in part) without specific permission of the Superintendent, U. S. Military Academy, in each instance.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
WEST POINT, NEW YORK 10996

ACQUISITION FOR

NTIS GARDI

DDC TAB

Unannounced

Justification

By _____

Distribution/ _____

Availability Codes

Dist

Avail and/or
special

406247 Gen A

1. Background and Purpose

Attempting to adhere to the present scheme of the ABDQC when using both the ACT and SAT batteries presents some inherent problems because these test batteries do not measure the same things.¹ The matter of "equating" non-parallel tests has been reviewed extensively elsewhere.² Even tests that purport to measure competence in the same subject will differ in emphasis. Unlike the problem of *equivalent* scores which is restricted to the case of parallel tests, the problem of *comparable* scores is a problem of "equating" tests of different psychological function or emphasis. Two tests are comparable (with respect to a particular group of examinees) only if the distributions of scores are identical. Comparability may hold reasonably well with respect to another group if it is drawn from the same population.

Methods used to establish tables of comparable scores are numerous, including both linear and non-linear methods, but none are satisfactory. The method used by Marron in providing the Director of Admissions with scores to be used as determinant handicaps and for College Board Averages (CBA) was to convert linearly the ACT score distributions so that new distributions would have the same means and standard deviations as the SAT score distributions.³ A regression technique was used by Gordon in a recent issue of College and University.⁴ This technique, however, suffers from two faults. First, the solution is not unique because there are two regression lines, one for predicting SAT from ACT and one for predicting ACT from SAT. For example, using Gordon's formulas, the best estimate of a person's ACT-E given a score of 450 on SAT-V is 20.4; however, given a score of 20.4 on ACT-E, the best estimate of his score on SAT-V is 465.4, not 450. The discrepancy gets worse as one gets farther from the mean score. Secondly, the linear regression method introduces bias because (given a prediction equation of the form $Y = aX + b$) individuals scoring below the mean on Test X would be given higher scores on Test Y, closer to the mean; and individuals scoring above the mean on Test X would be given lower scores on Test Y, also closer to the mean.

Because of this lack of symmetry, and because of the regression effect described above, the regression technique probably is not suitable when merging and comparing of scores on both sets of tests are required--as in the USMA admissions process. A better method of defining comparable scores is to administer the two tests to the same basic reference group and then use one of the accepted techniques of equating scores for parallel test forms.

This study was conducted at the request of the Director of Admissions to provide a better table of comparable scores between SAT-V and ACT-E and between SAT-M and ACT-M for use in the admissions selection process.

2. Method

Subjects consisted of 2196 candidates to the Class of 1978 who had all four ACT-E, ACT-M, SAT-V, and SAT-M scores. Noting that the ACT score distributions were considerably more negatively skewed than those for the SAT's, a curvilinear analog (equipercentile) method of equating was used to

define comparable scores for ACT-E/SAT-V, ACT-M/SAT-M, and ACBA/CBA,* respectively.⁵ For each pair of test score distributions, percentile ranks were computed, plotted and smoothed. Corresponding percentiles were used from the curves for both tests and plotted one against the other on graph paper. The curve connecting these plotted points was smoothed and extrapolated. The resulting curve was used to record the conversion from one test score to the other.

The same technique was applied to nearly 6,000 candidates for the Class of 1978 having either SAT-V or ACT-E and either SAT-M or ACT-M scores.

This methodology is somewhat similar to that used by Marron. However, he used only entrants to USMA rather than candidates, and his results depended not only on SAT scores but also on the use of College Board Achievement Tests. Further, his method was based upon a linear transformation, whereas the actual distributions are curvilinear.

3. Results

The resulting curves are shown in Figures 1 through 4. The final conversion tables are given in Table I. The results for candidates with either, but not both, scores gave almost identical results and therefore are not reported.

4. Recommendations

Direct conversions from ACT to SAT scores should be avoided if at all possible. When such conversions are required, it is recommended that the conversion tables in this report be used. Specifically, the following handicaps are recommended: low in English, 18 in ACT-E; low in mathematics, 22 in ACT-M.

It bears repeating that no method of equating ACT and SAT scores will be entirely satisfactory. From a psychometric standpoint, it would be better to review the ABDQC with a view toward eliminating the need for handicaps and the CBA score. In any event, conversion tables should not be used in the computation of the ACEER score.

$$*ACBA = (ACT-E + ACT-M)/2$$

$$CBA = (SAT-V + SAT-M)/2$$





FIGURE 1



Percentiles

FIGURE 2




FIGURE 3




FIGURE 4

TABLE I
TABLE OF CONVERSIONS

ACT-E to SAT-V	ACT-M to SAT-M	ACBA to CBA	
5	220	5	215
6	235	6	230
7	250	7	250
8	275	8	265
9	285	9	280
10	305	10	295
11	320	11	310
12	340	12	325
13	360	13	340
14	380	14	365
15	400	15	375
16	420	16	390
17	440	17	410
18	460	18	425
19	485	19	440
20	510	20	465
21	530	21	480
22	560	22	500
23	585	23	510
24	610	24	525
25	635	25	565
26	650	26	590
27	670	27	610
28	690	28	640
29	705	29	660
30	725	30	685
31	740	31	700
32	755	32	720
33	770	33	740
34	785	34	755
35	795	35	770
36	800	36	780
		37	790
		38	800

References

1. Medsger, G. W. From CEER to ACEER, Report 1A3.09-72-036, Office of Institutional Research, June 1972.
2. Lundquist, E. F., Equating scores on non-parallel tests. In Mehrens and Ebel (Eds), Principles of Education and Psychological Measurement. Rand-McNally; 1967.
3. Marron, J. E. A Computer Assisted Selection System, Report 1A3.08-72-038, Office of Institutional Research, June 1972.
4. Gordon, M. A. Correlation and Regression for ACT and SAT Test Scores, College and University, The Journal of the AACRAO, Vol. 50, No. 1, Fall 1974.
5. Angoff, W. H. Scales, Norms and Equivalent Scores. In Thorndike (Ed) Educational Measurement, 2d Edition. American Council on Education, 1971.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 1A4.00-75-022	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Comparability of ACT and SAT Test Scores	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) COL Gerald W. Medsger	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Office of the Director of Institutional Research United States Military Academy West Point, New York 10996	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Task No. 2107	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same as #9 above.	12. REPORT DATE June 1975	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 9 + 1
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) United States Military Academy West Point, New York 10996	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Reproduction of this document in whole or in part must have prior approval of the Superintendent, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) ACT Scores Admissions Tests CEEB Class of 1978 Psychometrics		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Attempting to adhere to the present scheme of the ABDQC when using both the ACT and SAT batteries presents some inherent problems. Unlike the problem of equivalent scores, the problem of comparable scores is one of "equating" tests of different function or emphasis. Consequently, direct conversions from ACT to SAT scores should be avoided if possible. This report presents a curvilinear method of equating ACT-E/SAT-V, ACT-M/SAT-M, and ACBA/CBA for use in the admissions process.		

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 73

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)