

A Comprehensive Study on US College Admissions

Tsirmpas Dimitris
Athens University of Economics and Business
Department of Informatics

May 18, 2023



Athens University of Economics and Business
Department of Statistics
Greece

Contents

1	Abstract	2
2	Introduction	2
3	Results	4
3.1	Writing scores influenced by gender	4
3.2	Writing scores influenced by previous program	4
3.3	Building a predictive model	5
4	Conclusions & Discussion	8
5	Bibliography	9
6	Addendum	9

Name	Type	Description	Range
Id	Nominal	The student's ID	[1-200]
Gender	Binary	The student's gender	{male, female}
Race	Nominal	The student's race	{white, latin-american, asian, african-american}
Schtype	Binary	The type of the student's secondary education institution	{public, private}
Prog	Nominal	The student's previous study cycle	{general, vocation, academic }
Write	Numeric	The grade on the writing test	[0-100]
Math	Numeric	The grade on the mathematics test	[0-100]
Socst	Numeric	The grade on the social studies test	[0-100]

Table 1: An overview of the data used in this study.

1 Abstract

US College Admissions have and continue to be a subject of great debate among scholars and analysts. Such educational institutions have an interest in selecting the most qualified applicants using limited data, while the applicants themselves often protest admission requirements, especially those deemed discriminatory in nature. This study aims to analyze the factors that contribute to successful admissions in US colleges and universities by comparing their performance on standardized tests.

2 Introduction

The study uses a random sample of 200 students who applied to continue their studies in their respective universities. Their application consisted of three standardized tests testing their skills and knowledge in mathematics, social studies and creative writing. The dataset we used is available at [LINK](#). An overview of the data contained can be found in Table 1.

We make the assumption that the dataset has been acquired through random, unbiased sampling. We also make the assumption that the records using different IDs represent different students.

The study is structured as follows. In this Section we make general observations about our data and we form our first hypotheses. In Section 3 we follow up with robust analyses and regression models to prove/disprove these hypotheses. Section 4 follows with an overview and discussion about our findings. Finally, in Section 6 we include graphs, tables and supporting documents.

The numerical variables contained in the dataset are described in Table 2. We observe that they are all almost symmetrical ($-0.5 \leq skew \leq 0.5$), and feature moderate negative (right) skewness with a mean/median hovering just above a score of 50. This indicates most students score around the baseline, most of which pass the exams with a mediocre grade.

Var.	Obs.	Mean	Std	Median	Trim	Min	Max	Skew	Kurt	SE
Write	200	52.77	9.48	54	53.36	31	67	-0.4	-0.7	0.67
Math	200	52.65	9.37	52	52.33	33	75	0.28	-0.6	0.66
Socst	200	52.41	10.74	52	52.99	26	71	-0.3	-0.5	0.76

Table 2: Summary statistics on the numerical data used in the study.

	write	math	socst
write	1 0.000 ****	-	-
math	0.62 0.000 ****	1 0.00 ****	-
socst	0.60 0.000 ****	0.54 0.000 ****	1 0.000 ****

Table 3: Pearson's correlation coefficient (Holm's correction) between the tests and their p-values. Stars indicate significance scores: > 1: ' ', 0.1: '*', 0.01: '**', 0.001: '***', < 0.0001: '****'

We next study the relationships between the three subjects. As shown in Table 3, there is a very statistically significant (p-value = 0.0000), positive ($r > 0.5$) relationship between all three subjects. This could be indicative of either one of the variables influencing the other, or an unknown, interfering variable which positively affects the three test scores. We hypothesize the latter, as the existence of such a variable indicating the student's general competence in tests makes intuitive sense. We will refer to this potential, unknown variable as "Competence" in this report.

Since the three subjects are strongly correlated we can explore correlations between the rest of the factors and any of the tests, assuming that a correlation with one strongly indicates with the other two as well.

We notice a probable correlation between gender and writing scores, as shown in Figure 1, as well as between the student's program and writing scores, as shown in Figure 2.




Figure 1: Boxplot displaying the writing score by gender.




Figure 2: Boxplot displaying the writing score by current program. Notice the significant differences in means.

3 Results

3.1 Writing scores influenced by gender

Our exploratory analysis indicated a possible discrepancy between the results of writing tests between men and women, as well as between different programs. We thus investigate whether gender and the candidate's current program play a role in writing test score.

We begin by verifying the preconditions necessary for the standard t-test in order to compare the genders' scores. We compute the mean differences of the samples by subtracting the global mean by the women's scores [2], and conclude they are not normal (Shapiro-Wilk normality test, $p_value = 0.0024$). The variances are not homogeneous (Levene's test $p_value = 0.0022$), although this should not dissuade us from using a parametric t-test since the relatively large sample size ($N = 200$) and balanced groups ($N_{women} = 109, N_{men} = 91$) means the precondition's violation is not significant [3]. We will use a parametric test since the distribution of the differences has a normal kurtosis (Jarque-Bera Normality Test [1], $p_value = 0.026$).

We conclude there is a statistically significant difference between the writing scores of men and women (Two-sided Welch Two Sample t-test, $p_value = 0.0003$) with women having on average 5 more score than men (Welch Two Sample t-test with $H_a = less$, $p_value = 0.00017$).

3.2 Writing scores influenced by previous program

We will now verify the preconditions for the parametric ANOVA test in order to test which programs are correlated with the writing tests' scores. The variances of the residuals are homogeneous (Levene's test $p_value = 0.0022$), but not normal (Shapiro-Wilk normality test, $p_value = 0.002$). We will thus use a non-parametric test.

We discover there is a statistically significant difference between the groups (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, $p_value = 4e - 08$). We can consult the boxplots in Figure 2, where we observe significant differences between all three groups.

3.3 Building a predictive model

Having confirmed our hypotheses regarding the relationships between the various variables and the writing test scores, we attempt to build a model which will predict a candidate's math and social study scores, testing our hypothesis that the three scores are influenced by the same external factors.

Since there seem to be strong correlations between most independent variables and the writing scores, and since we already established a strong correlation between the scores themselves (attributed to the candidate's "*Competence*"), we will be using a simple, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) model.

We initially build an OLS model predicting the writing scores which involves all the available variables. This model exhibits a good fit ($R^2_{adj} = 0.4753, F = 37.06, p_value = 2.2e - 16, df = 194$). We also verify all the preconditions for the regression model; the residuals appear to be normal (Shapiro-Wilk normality test $p_value = 0.2099$), homogeneous (Levene's Test, $p_value = 0.1057$) and non-correlated (Durbin-Watson test, $p_value = 0.236$) and there are no significant outliers (see Addendum).

Our current model exhibits high confidence about the gender ($p_value_{female} = 0.0056$), previous program ($p_value_{progacademic} = 0.0025$), writing scores ($p_value_{write} = 3.57e - 08$), social study scores ($p_value_{socst} = 0.0053$) and the constant ($p_value_{intercept} = 8.29e - 09$). However, it exhibits low confidence about the candidate's race ($p_value_{raceasian} = 0.05$) and no confidence about his school type ($p_value = 0.6502$). In order to build an optimal model, we consider dropping these two variables. Dropping the candidate's race along with the school type leads to a slight decrease of $R^2_{adj} = 0.4753$. Dropping only the school type on the other hand leads to an improved $R^2_{adj} = 0.4882$. Since the model maintains its confidence about the other variables, we keep this model as the optimal one. A summary of the optimal model can be found in Table 4.

We now follow the same procedure for the social studies test. We fit a model involving all available variables, which explains our sample to a decent degree ($R^2_{adj} = 0.4535, F = 17.7, p_value = 2.2e - 16, df = 188$). We detect an outlier in our precondition verification, a student with an above-average grade in writing but an abysmal one in social studies. Since this individual exerts a significant influence in our model (as it is largely dependent on the writing scores for its predictions) we remove them from the sample. The other preconditions are met, the residuals are sufficiently normal (Shapiro-Wilk normality test $p_value = 0.0125$), homogeneous (Levene's Test, $p_value = 0.3394$) and non-correlated (Durbin-Watson test, $p_value = 0.678$).

As mentioned above, this model is reliant on the math and especially on the writing scores, while the rest of the variables are mostly non-statistically significant. We thus employ a stepwise procedure in order to eliminate variables deemed statistically insignificant while retaining, or increasing our models goodness of fit. A summary of the resulting model can be found in Table 5.

Table 4: Linear regression model predicting math scores, taking into account other test scores

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	math
genrefemale	−2.828*** (−4.799, −0.858)
progacademic	3.788*** (1.346, 6.229)
progvocation	−0.375 (−3.161, 2.410)
write	0.404*** (0.266, 0.542)
socst	0.167*** (0.052, 0.283)
raceasian	4.978* (−0.017, 9.972)
raceafrican-amer	−1.103 (−5.104, 2.898)
racewhite	2.324 (−0.686, 5.334)
Constant	20.334*** (13.730, 26.938)
Observations	200
R ²	0.509
Adjusted R ²	0.488
Residual Std. Error	6.702 (df = 191)
F Statistic	24.729*** (df = 8; 191)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 5: Linear regression model predicting social study scores, taking into account other test scores

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	socst
raceasian	−5.642* (−11.485, 0.201)
raceafrican-amer	0.778 (−3.894, 5.450)
racewhite	0.308 (−3.237, 3.854)
progacademic	2.264 (−0.655, 5.183)
progvocation	−2.939* (−6.171, 0.294)
write	0.479*** (0.327, 0.631)
math	0.233*** (0.073, 0.392)
Constant	14.585*** (6.390, 22.779)
Observations	199
R ²	0.477
Adjusted R ²	0.458
Residual Std. Error	7.844 (df = 191)
F Statistic	24.899*** (df = 7; 191)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

4 Conclusions & Discussion

Donec et nisl id sapien blandit mattis. Aenean dictum odio sit amet risus. Morbi purus. Nulla a est sit amet purus venenatis iaculis. Vivamus viverra purus vel magna. Donec in justo sed odio malesuada dapibus. Nunc ultrices aliquam nunc. Vivamus facilisis pellentesque velit. Nulla nunc velit, vulputate dapibus, vulputate id, mattis ac, justo. Nam mattis elit dapibus purus. Quisque enim risus, congue non, elementum ut, mattis quis, sem. Quisque elit.

Maecenas non massa. Vestibulum pharetra nulla at lorem. Duis quis quam id lacus dapibus interdum. Nulla lorem. Donec ut ante quis dolor bibendum condimentum. Etiam egestas tortor vitae lacus. Praesent cursus. Mauris bibendum pede at elit. Morbi et felis a lectus interdum facilisis. Sed suscipit gravida turpis. Nulla at lectus. Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Praesent nonummy luctus nibh. Proin turpis nunc, congue eu, egestas ut, fringilla at, tellus. In hac habitasse platea dictumst.

Vivamus eu tellus sed tellus consequat suscipit. Nam orci orci, malesuada id, gravida nec, ultricies vitae, erat. Donec risus turpis, luctus sit amet, interdum quis, porta sed, ipsum. Suspendisse condimentum, tortor at egestas posuere, neque metus tempor orci, et tincidunt urna nunc a purus. Sed facilisis blandit tellus. Nunc risus sem, suscipit nec, eleifend quis, cursus quis, libero. Curabitur et dolor. Sed vitae sem. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Maecenas ante. Duis ullamcorper enim. Donec tristique enim eu leo. Nullam molestie elit eu dolor. Nullam bibendum, turpis vitae tristique gravida, quam sapien tempor lectus, quis pretium tellus purus ac quam. Nulla facilisi.

Duis aliquet dui in est. Donec eget est. Nunc lectus odio, varius at, fermentum in, accumsan non, enim. Aliquam erat volutpat. Proin sit amet nulla ut eros consectetur cursus. Phasellus dapibus aliquam justo. Nunc laoreet. Donec consequat placerat magna. Duis pretium tincidunt justo. Sed sollicitudin vestibulum quam. Nam quis ligula. Vivamus at metus. Etiam imperdiet imperdiet pede. Aenean turpis. Fusce augue velit, scelerisque sollicitudin, dictum vitae, tempor et, pede. Donec wisi sapien, feugiat in, fermentum ut, sollicitudin adipiscing, metus.

Donec vel nibh ut felis consectetur laoreet. Donec pede. Sed id quam id wisi laoreet suscipit. Nulla lectus dolor, aliquam ac, fringilla eget, mollis ut, orci. In pellentesque justo in ligula. Maecenas turpis. Donec eleifend leo at felis tincidunt consequat. Aenean turpis metus, malesuada sed, condimentum sit amet, auctor a, wisi. Pellentesque sapien elit, bibendum ac, posuere et, congue eu, felis. Vestibulum mattis libero quis metus scelerisque ultrices. Sed purus.

Donec molestie, magna ut luctus ultrices, tellus arcu nonummy velit, sit amet pulvinar elit justo et mauris. In pede. Maecenas euismod elit eu erat. Aliquam augue wisi, facilisis congue, suscipit in, adipiscing et, ante. In justo. Cras lobortis neque ac ipsum. Nunc fermentum massa at ante. Donec orci tortor, egestas sit amet, ultrices eget, venenatis eget, mi. Maecenas vehicula leo semper est. Mauris vel metus. Aliquam erat volutpat. In rhoncus sapien ac tellus. Pellentesque ligula.

5 Bibliography

References

- [1] Carlos M. Jarque and Anil K. Bera. “Efficient tests for normality, homoscedasticity and serial independence of regression residuals”. In: *Economics Letters* 6.3 (1980), pp. 255–259. ISSN: 0165-1765. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1765\(80\)90024-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1765(80)90024-5). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0165176580900245>.
- [2] Geoffrey R Loftus and Michael EJ Masson. “Using confidence intervals in within-subject designs”. In: *Psychonomic bulletin & review* 1.4 (1994), pp. 476–490.
- [3] Donald W Zimmerman. “A note on preliminary tests of equality of variances”. In: *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 57.1 (2004), pp. 173–181.

6 Addendum

Sed consequat tellus et tortor. Ut tempor laoreet quam. Nullam id wisi a libero tristique semper. Nullam nisl massa, rutrum ut, egestas semper, mollis id, leo. Nulla ac massa eu risus blandit mattis. Mauris ut nunc. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Aliquam eget tortor. Quisque dapibus pede in erat. Nunc enim. In dui nulla, commodo at, consectetur nec, malesuada nec, elit. Aliquam ornare tellus eu urna. Sed nec metus. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.

Phasellus id magna. Duis malesuada interdum arcu. Integer metus. Morbi pulvinar pellentesque mi. Suspendisse sed est eu magna molestie egestas. Quisque mi lorem, pulvinar eget, egestas quis, luctus at, ante. Proin auctor vehicula purus. Fusce ac nisl aliquam ante hendrerit pellentesque. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Morbi wisi. Etiam arcu mauris, facilisis sed, eleifend non, nonummy ut, pede. Cras ut lacus tempor metus mollis placerat. Vivamus eu tortor vel metus interdum malesuada.

Sed eleifend, eros sit amet faucibus elementum, urna sapien consectetur mauris, quis egestas leo justo non risus. Morbi non felis ac libero vulputate fringilla. Mauris libero eros, lacinia non, sodales quis, dapibus porttitor, pede. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Morbi dapibus mauris condimentum nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Etiam sit amet erat. Nulla varius. Etiam tincidunt dui vitae turpis. Donec leo. Morbi vulputate convallis est. Integer aliquet. Pellentesque aliquet sodales urna.

Nullam eleifend justo in nisl. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Morbi nonummy. Aliquam ut felis. In velit leo, dictum vitae, posuere id, vulputate nec, ante. Maecenas vitae pede nec dui dignissim suscipit. Morbi magna. Vestibulum id purus eget velit laoreet laoreet. Praesent sed leo vel nibh convallis blandit. Ut rutrum. Donec nibh.

Donec interdum. Fusce sed pede sit amet elit rhoncus ultrices. Nullam at enim vitae pede vehicula iaculis.

Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Aenean nonummy turpis id odio. Integer euismod imperdiet turpis. Ut nec leo nec diam imperdiet lacinia. Etiam eget lacus eget mi ultricies posuere. In placerat tristique tortor. Sed porta vestibulum metus. Nulla iaculis sollicitudin pede. Fusce luctus tellus in dolor. Curabitur auctor velit a sem. Morbi sapien. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Donec adipiscing urna vehicula nunc. Sed ornare leo in leo. In rhoncus leo ut dui. Aenean dolor quam, volutpat nec, fringilla id, consectetur vel, pede.