

Combinatorial Models of Cross-Country Dual Meets: What is a Big Victory?

Kurt Riedel*

Abstract

Combinatorial/probabilistic models for cross-country dual-meets are proposed. The first model assumes that all runners are equally likely to finish in any possible order. The second model assumes that each team is selected from a large identically distributed population of potential runners and with each potential runner's ranking determined by the initial draw from the combined population.

Keywords: Rank Sum Scoring, Rank Statistics, Cross Country, Wilcoxon Rank Sum Statistic.

AMS MSC 2010: 68R05 Combinatorics 97K20 Combinatorics 97K80 Applied statistics 97M40 Operations research, economics 05A15 Exact enumeration problems, generating functions.

Submitted to on July 27, 2018, final version accepted on June 28, 2019.

1 Introduction

Cross-country racing is a varsity sport in many high schools with more than 15 thousand schools offering cross-country [10]. It is the fourth most popular sport for boys and fifth most for girls, as defined by the number of school teams. Almost half a million high school students compete on cross-country teams every year, and hundreds of thousands of middle school students also compete. Scoring is an application of nonparametric statistics: all that matters is the rank of the runner as he/she crosses the finish line. The team score is the sum of the ranks of the runners whose score counts. This scoring is termed "Rank Sum Scoring." In this article, we calculate the distribution of scores under a variety of assumptions on the relative speed of the runners. First, we address the distribution of scores when all runners have the same distribution of running times.

To the best of our knowledge, the distribution of outcomes has never been analyzed from probabilistic point of view. There is much excellent research on cross-country scoring from a game theoretical perspective [6], [5], [11],[9], [2], [3], [1]. The basic discrepancy/inequity is that in a multi-team meet, Team A can beat Team B under dual-meet scoring and lose to it under the multi-team scoring rule. These papers analyze the multi-team scoring and propose alternative scoring rules that eliminate these paradoxes. In [5] and [2], distributions of scores are calculated for meets involving three or more teams and the probability of a "social choice principle violation" is calculated. In [1], actual multi-team empirical data is analyzed to see how often these scoring paradoxes occur in practice. They find that combinatorial analyses are helpful in predicting the probability of a paradox. Their results lend credence to our combinatorial analysis.

The standard scoring method is well established and unlikely to change. dual-meet scoring is based purely upon the order that the runners finish the race. Our study examines the standard rank-based scoring in a cross-country dual-meet. We derive the actual scoring distributions for the standard scoring rules for dual-meets using combinatorics and rank statistics. Indeed, we believe that the nonparametric (rank-based) nature of cross-country scoring makes it an ideal example for teaching stochastic and combinatorial analysis.

Definition: An (M, N) dual meet consists of a team of M runners. Only the N fastest runners on each team are counted. The meet is scored as follows: the k th runner to finish receives a score of k . The placement of runners from $N + 1$ to M are not included in the score but do increase the score of

*Millennium Partners LLC, 666 Fifth Ave, New York, NY 10103 E-mail: kurt.riedel@gmail.com

the other team. The N lowest scores are added up for each team. The lowest score wins. If the runners $N + 1$ to M do not raise the score of the other team, we refer to the event as a cross-country meet with *no displacement*.

Cross-country meets occur with and without displacement scoring, but displacement scoring is definitely more common. Thus we make displacement scoring the default and explicitly mention *no displacement* in the cases where we study this alternative. For an (M, N) event, the sum of the two scores is between $N * (2N + 1)$ and $N * (M + N + 1)$. The upper bound score, $N * (M + N + 1)$, occurs when all M runners of one team are faster than any of the other team. For the no displacement case, the sum of the two scores is $N * (2N + 1)$.

The standard American dual meet is a $(7, 5)$ with seven runners and lowest five scores are counted. An international dual meet has six runners and four are counted. We will consider two teams, Team A and Team B. In certain cases, we will assume that Team A has the fastest runner or even the fastest two runners. We will denote the score of Team A by s_A and the score of Team B by s_B . The margin of victory for Team A will be denoted by $m_{A,B} = s_B - s_A$.

The following results are well known to the cross-country community.

- 1) The best possible score is $s_A = N * (N + 1) / 2$. The worst possible score is $s_A = MN + N * (N + 1) / 2$
- 2) The biggest possible victory margin is MN . For $M = N = 4$, this is 16, and for $M = N = 5$, the maximum victory margin is 25. For $(M, N) = (7, 5)$, the maximum victory margin is 35. For $(M, N) = (6, 4)$, the maximum victory margin is 24.
- 3) If $N = 5$ and $M \leq 7$ and Team A has the fastest three runners, Team A has won. Proof: $(1 + 2 + 3 + 11 + 12) < (4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8)$.

For no displacement scoring, we have the following results

- A) The sum of the two teams' scores satisfies $s_A + s_B = N * (2N + 1)$. For $N = 4$ and $N = 5$, $s_A + s_B = 36$ and 55 respectively.
- B) Ties can occur only if N is even. In particular, ties can occur for $(6, 4)$, but not for $(7, 5)$.
- C) The score difference is always odd for $(7, 5)$. The score difference for $(6, 4)$ is always even.
- D) If $M = 6$, $N = 4$ and Team A has the fastest two runners, Team A cannot lose. Proof: $1 + 2 + 7 + 8 = 3 + 4 + 5 + 6$

As pointed out by the anonymous referee, the no displacement case is a reparameterization of Wilcoxon rank-sum distribution (Mann-Whitney distribution) [12], [8], [7], [4]. We calculate the distribution of $s_B - s_A = 2s_B - N * (2N + 1)$. The case with displacement seems to be a related but new distribution. In the next sections, we calculate the distribution of victory margins, both one-sided and two sided. We define a large victory to be a score difference (positive or negative) in the .9 quantile range or greater. This means ten percent of the dual-meets will result in a "large" victory by our definition.

2 I.I.D. Outcome Distribution

We begin by considering the case where all runners are equally likely to come in k th place in the competition for k in $1, \dots, 2M$. In other words, the runners' times are independently, identically distributed (IID). We label the places from 1 to $2M$. We then draw M of these without replacement to determine the placement of the runners on Team A. There are $\binom{2M}{M}$ possible outcomes.

To illustrate the distribution and scoring, we consider the three runner case with two scores counting i.e. $(3, 2)$. The list of possible outcomes for Team A is $[(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 4), (1, 2, 5), (1, 2, 6), (1, 3, 4), (1, 3, 5), (1, 3, 6), (1, 4, 5), (1, 4, 6), (1, 5, 6), (2, 3, 4), (2, 3, 5), (2, 3, 6), (2, 4, 5), (2, 4, 6), (2, 5, 6), (3, 4, 5), (3, 4, 6), (3, 5, 6), (4, 5, 6)]$. By assumption, all cases are equally likely. Since only the top two runners count, the corresponding list of scores is distribution of scores for top 2 of each team. When there is no displacement, the distribution of scores is $\{(1, 2) : 4, (1, 3) : 3, (1, 4) : 3, (2, 3) : 3, (2, 4) : 3, (3, 4) : 4\}$. Thus probability of a tie is 0.3, the probability of a two point victory is 0.3 and the probability of a four point victory is 0.4. The team with the fastest runner cannot lose and ends up winning 70 percent of the time. Now consider the case with displacement. We present the scores as a tuple,

(s_A, s_B) for each scenario, $[(3, 9), (3, 8), (3, 7), (3, 7), (4, 7), (4, 6), (4, 6), (5, 5), (5, 5), (6, 5), (5, 6), (5, 5), (5, 5), (6, 4), (6, 4), (7, 4), (7, 3), (7, 3), (8, 3), (9, 3)]$. The distribution of score differences, $s_B - s_A$ is symmetric and satisfies $\{0 : 4, 1 : 1, 2 : 2, 3 : 1, 4 : 2, 5 : 1, 6 : 1\}$. Not surprisingly, displacement increases the diversity of outcomes and can have larger victories.

Let us consider the alternative case of two runners on each team and both runners count, $(2, 2)$. Now, all six cases are equally likely: $[(1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 4)]$. Here the probability of a tie is $1/3$, the probability of winning by two points is $1/3$ and the probability of a four point victory is $1/3$. Finally, consider the case of $(M, 2)$ for large M . As M increases, the distribution of scores converges to the distribution corresponding to drawing with replacement: the probability that one team has the two fastest runners is 0.5. If there is no displacement, the probability of a tie is 0.25 and the probability of a two point margin is 0.25. With displacement, let Team A have the fastest runner. Team A has a score distribution: $\{3 : .5, 4 : .25, 5 : .125, 6 : .0625 \dots\}$ for a mean score of 4. Team B has a score distribution: $\{5 : .25, 6 : .125, 7 : .1875 \dots\}$ for an expected score of 8. (The first Team B runner has an expected score of three while the second Team B runner has an expected score of five.) This illustrates a common theme: the larger M for a given N , the larger the tail event scores are.

These three cases illustrate how the distribution of scores vary as the assumption of number of runners varies. We now focus on the two real-world situations: international dual-meets, $(6, 4)$ and American dual-meets, $(7, 5)$. Rather than trying to derive the score distribution analytically, we write a very short program which evaluates the score for each of the $\binom{2M}{M}$ possible outcomes. In Python, the outcomes are given by `map(tuple, itertools.combinations(range(2 * M), M))`,

We tabulate the score difference, $s_B - s_A$, conditional on Team A having the fastest runner. Remember the team with the lowest score wins, so $s_B - s_A$ is the victory margin for Team A. A negative score means that Team A lost. We begin by computing the distribution with no score displacement in Table 1. There are only 13 distinct values of score difference conditioned on Team A having the fast runner and the maximum victory margin being 16. Given the fastest runner, Team A wins with probability 0.6948 and ties with probability 0.0974. Conditional on Team A winning and having the fastest runner, the mean victory margin is 8.11215. Team A loses with probability 0.20779 and the average loss is 4.45833. To get

Table 1: Distribution of score differences Runner:6 Score:4 No Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	-8	-6	-4	-2	0	2	4
counts	21	15	25	35	45	40	55
prob	.0455	.0325	.0541	.0758	.0974	.0866	.1190
$s_B - s_A$	6	8	10	12	14	16	
counts	45	50	46	36	21	28	
prob	.0974	.1082	.0996	.0779	.0455	.0606	

Table 2: *

Distribution conditional on Team A having the fastest runner without displacement.

the unconditional distribution, $|s_A - s_B|$ (either Team A or Team B may have the fastest runner), we just symmetrize Table 1. The symmetrized distribution is a reparameterization of the Wilcoxon rank-sum distribution. Unconditionally, the mean score difference is 6.56277 ± 4.52355 and median victory is 6. The 75th percentile victory is 10. A reasonable definition of a large victory is the 90% quantile of the score difference. We see that this quantile value is 14.

Table 3 has the more realistic case of displacement. There are now 39 possible values of the score difference. The probability of an odd score difference is nonzero but clearly smaller than the probability of an even score difference. Table 3 has four rows of score differences to accomodate all the possible outcomes. In Table 3, we assume that Team A has the fastest runner. Given the fastest runner, Team A wins with probability 0.6991 and ties with probability 0.0584. Conditional on Team A winning and having the fastest runner, the mean victory margin is 9.08. Team A loses with probability 0.30 and the average loss is 4.973. Thus, displacement makes the importance of the fastest runner in determining which team

Table 3: Distribution of score differences Runner:6 Score:4 with Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	-14	-13	-12	-11	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5
counts	1	1	2	4	5	4	11	4	12	7
prob	.0022	.0022	.0043	.0087	.0108	.0087	.0238	.0087	.0260	.0152
$s_B - s_A$	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5
counts	18	7	24	12	27	9	27	12	33	12
prob	.0390	.0152	.0519	.0260	.0584	.0195	.0584	.0260	.0714	.0260
$s_B - s_A$	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
counts	31	13	31	10	28	11	23	11	17	9
prob	.0671	.0281	.0671	.0216	.0606	.0238	.0498	.0238	.0368	.0195
$s_B - s_A$	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
counts	14	8	7	5	6	2	2	1	1	
prob	.0303	.0173	.0152	.0108	.0130	.0043	.0043	.0022	.0022	

Table 4: *

Distribution conditional on Team A having the fastest runner with displacement.

wins significantly less, because the slower runners have more influence.

To get the unconditional distribution (either Team A or Team B may have the fastest runner) for (6, 4) with displacement, we just symmetrize Table 3 to get the distribution of $|s_A - s_B|$. Unconditionally, the mean score difference is 7.554 ± 5.334 and median score difference is 6.5. The 75th percentile of the score difference is 11. A reasonable definition of a large victory is the 90% quantile of the absolute score difference. We see that this quantile value is 15.

As a variant of the basic distribution, let us consider the scoring distribution of (6, 4) conditional on Team A having the fastest two runners. This result is given in Table 5 for the case of no displacement. In this case, the probability of a tie is 0.0714. The mean score differential is 9.162 ± 4.711 and the median difference is 10. Since this is an American journal, we now evaluate the distribution victory margins

Table 5: Distribution of score differences Runner:6 Score:4 (No Displacement)

$s_B - s_A$	0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16
counts	15	10	20	20	35	25	36	21	28
prob	0.0714	0.0476	0.0952	0.0952	0.1667	0.1190	0.1714	0.1000	0.1333

Table 6: *

Distribution conditional on Team A having the first and second runners (No displacement)

under the IID outcome assumption. The result is in Table 7 for the case of no displacement. Conditional on Team A having the fastest runner, the probability of victory is 72.14% with an average victory of 10.37. The probability of a loss is 27.86% with a mean loss of 5.837. There are no ties. For the symmetric distribution of $|s_A - s_B|$, (not conditioning on Team A having the fastest runner), the mean score difference is 9.108 ± 6.283 with a median value of 9 and .9 quantile of 19. As previously mentioned, the no displacement case is equivalent to the Wilcoxon rank-sum distribution. The distributions conditional on Team A having the fastest runner appear not to be in the literature.

The distribution for (7, 5) with displacement ranges between -23 and 35 conditional on Team A having the fastest runner. Table 9 displays this broad distribution. Odd score differences, $s_B - s_A$, are more likely than even differences. Conditional on Team A having the fastest runner, the probability of victory is 70.22% with an average victory of 11.66. The probability of a loss is 28.15% with a mean loss of 6.882. Overall (not conditional on Team A having the fastest runner), the mean score difference is 10.12 ± 7.100 with a median value of 9. The 75th percentile of the score difference is 15 and the 90th percentile victory is 21 for (7, 5).

Table 7: Distribution of score differences Runner:7 Score:5, No Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	-15	-13	-11	-9	-7	-5	-3	-1	1	3	5
counts	28	21	36	46	71	81	95	100	125	120	135
prob	.0163	.0122	.0210	.0268	.0414	.0472	.0554	.0583	.0728	.0699	.0787
$s_B - s_A$	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25	
counts	125	136	116	117	92	95	64	49	28	36	
prob	.0728	.0793	.0676	.0682	.0536	.0554	.0373	.0286	.0163	.0210	

Table 8: *

Distribution conditional on Team A having the first runner. No Displacement.

Table 9: Distribution of score differences Runner:7 Score:5 with displacement

$s_A - s_B$	-23	-22	-21	-20	-19	-18	-17	-16	-15	-14	-13	-12
counts	1	1	2	2	6	5	7	8	14	9	18	12
prob	.0006	.0006	.0012	.0012	.0035	.0029	.0041	.0047	.0082	.0052	.0105	.0070
$s_A - s_B$	-11	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0
counts	26	16	35	18	47	21	54	23	63	26	69	28
prob	.0152	.0093	.0204	.0105	.0274	.0122	.0315	.0134	.0367	.0152	.0402	.0163
$s_A - s_B$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
counts	79	34	82	31	85	34	83	32	86	33	78	31
prob	.0460	.0198	.0478	.0181	.0495	.0198	.0484	.0186	.0501	.0192	.0455	.0181
$s_A - s_B$	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
counts	73	32	64	27	55	27	43	24	36	19	26	15
prob	.0425	.0186	.0373	.0157	.0321	.0157	.0251	.0140	.0210	.0111	.0152	.0087
$s_A - s_B$	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	
counts	21	11	13	7	8	6	4	2	2	1	1	
prob	.0122	.0064	.0076	.0041	.0047	.0035	.0023	.0012	.0012	.0006	.0006	

Distribution conditional on Team A having the first runner with displacement.

Table 10: Distribution conditional on Team A having the first and second runner $M = 7, N = 5$

$s_A - s_B$	-11	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0
counts	1	1	2	4	5	4	11	4	12	7	18	7
prob	.0013	.0013	.0025	.0051	.0063	.0051	.0139	.0051	.0152	.0088	.0227	.0088
$s_A - s_B$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
counts	25	13	31	12	34	15	40	15	44	19	45	16
prob	.0316	.0164	.0391	.0152	.0429	.0189	.0505	.0189	.0556	.0240	.0568	.0202
$s_A - s_B$	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
counts	48	20	46	18	41	19	36	19	30	17	24	14
prob	.0606	.0253	.0581	.0227	.0518	.0240	.0455	.0240	.0379	.0215	.0303	.0177
$s_A - s_B$	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	
counts	20	11	13	7	8	6	4	2	2	1	1	
prob	.0253	.0139	.0164	.0088	.0101	.0076	.0051	.0025	.0025	.0013	.0013	

Table 11: *

Score difference distribution when Team A has the fastest two runners with displacement, $M = 7, N = 5$.

Similarly, we evaluate the distribution of scoring differences from the IID outcome model when Team A has the fastest two runners. Table 10 presents these results for $(7, 5)$ with displacement. Team A wins with a 90.4% probability with an average victory margin of 14.06 Team A loses with a 8.71% probability with average loss of 3.90. Ties occur with probability 0.9%. If one team has the fastest runner and the other team has the second fastest runner, the distribution of scores for (M, N) then corresponds to a shifted version of (M, N) . In particular for $(7, 5)$, let Team A be the team with the third fastest runner. The distribution of victory margins is given by Table 1 shifted by one. If Team A has the first and third fastest runners, add one to the score differences in Table 1. If Team A has the second and third fastest runners, subtract one to the score differences in Table 1.

3 Population Randomness Only

Our first model postulates that all runners are equally likely to win or come in last. This models the situation where there is a large amount of variation in each runner's time relative to the skill difference between runners. If, on the other hand, the standing of the runners did not vary and the results were predetermined before the start of the race, what would matter is the size of the population from which the runners are chosen.

Assume that School A has a population of M_A potential runners and School B has a population of M_B potential runners. The speeds of the potential runners are randomly distributed over the population of $M_A + M_B$ potential runners. We assume that each coach can perfectly identify the best M runners.

In this random population model, the probability that Team A has the fastest runner (or any other runner) is $M_A/(M_A + M_B)$. One proxy for M_A is the number of students at a school times some constant that corresponds to the participation rate. The participation rate is larger for smaller schools, but we can assume that good coaches always recruit the fastest runners and the recruiting population is proportional to school size. Each coach then chooses the best M runners to compete.

This random population model is parameterized by the tuple (M_A, M_B, M, N) . The random outcome model is a special case with $M_A = M_B = M$. Of course, in the random population model, the rankings are predetermined before the race starts by the abilities of each runner. For each value of (M_A, M_B, M, N) , we could calculate the distribution of results. Instead we consider the limit of $M_A \gg M$ and $M_B \gg M$ such that the ratio $M_A/(M_A + M_B)$ tends to a constant fraction, r . In this limit, the score distribution converges to the distribution which corresponds to drawing runners with replacement.

One very convenient property of cross-country scoring is that the final score depends only on the results of the runners who come in in the first $2N - 1$ places. Thus we need to compute probabilities of the 2^{2N-1} racing scenarios. As M_A and M_B increase, the probability of any of the scenarios converges to $r^k(1-r)^{2N-k-1}$ where k is the number of runners from Team A.

In the large population limit of the random population model with no displacement, the results depend only on N and r . We tabulate the score difference distribution as a function of $r = M_A/(M_A+M_B)$ for $N = 4$ and $N = 5$. Once again, we consider both the case of displacement and the simpler case of no displacement. Tables 12-18 present the summary statistics for the large population limit. In Tables 12-18, *Prob of Win* is the probability that Team A wins, *Mn score Diff* is the mean score difference i.e. the expectation of $s_A - s_B$, *Std Dev Diff* is the standard deviation of $s_A - s_B$, *Mn Win Diff* is the expectation of $s_A - s_B$ conditional on Team A winning and *Mn Loss Diff* is the expectation of $s_A - s_B$ conditional on Team A losing. The final row is our large victory margin, the *quantile(.9)*. For this, we are computing the quantile for the absolute victory margin. Ten percent of the time there will be a victory margin of this size, but it may be a loss for Team A.

Table 12: Statistics of Score Difference: Scorers: 4, No Displacement

Ratio r	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
Prob of Win	.4609	.5541	.6452	.7306	.8070	.8718	.9232
Mn score Diff	0.00	2.03	4.02	5.94	7.76	9.47	11.05
Std Dev Diff	9.24	9.14	8.83	8.33	7.67	6.86	5.94
Mn Diff Win	8.47	8.99	9.53	10.13	10.78	11.49	12.26
Mn Diff Loss	-8.47	-7.99	-7.54	-7.10	-6.67	-6.25	-5.83
Quantile(.9)	12	14	16	16	16	16	16

Table 13: *

Victory margin for four scorers with no displacement. Ratio is the fraction of total population for Team A.

Both the mean victory margin and the standard deviation are larger for the case of displacement as seen by comparing Tables 12 and 14.

Table 14: Statistics of Score Difference: $M = 6$, $N = 4$, Displacement.

Ratio r	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
Prob. of Win	0.4785	0.5785	0.6749	0.7632	0.8395	0.9011	0.9467
Mean Score Diff	0.00	2.94	5.85	8.68	11.39	13.96	16.35
Std Dev Diff	12.04	11.92	11.56	10.97	10.16	9.16	7.99
Mean Win Diff	10.51	11.44	12.45	13.56	14.78	16.11	17.55
Mean Loss Diff	-10.51	-9.67	-8.89	-8.18	-7.51	-6.89	-6.29
Quantile(.9)	16	18	21	23	24	24	24

Table 15: *

Victory margin for six runners, four scorers with displacement. Ratio is the fraction of total population for Team A.

For completeness, we give the score difference distribution as a function of r in Tables 20 and 26. Note that $s_A - s_B = 0$ is the probability of a tie in Table 20. For international dual-meets, Table 20 shows that more often than not the victory margin is divisible by four. Specifically, for $(6, 4)$, the probability that the victory margin is divisible by four is .5625. For the random population problem with ratio $r = .5$, the probability that the victory margin is divisible by four is .59375.

Since a picture is worth a thousand words, Figure 1-4 plot the distributions of Table 20-28. For $N = 4$, $r = .55$, $m_{A,B} = 8$ is the most probable value. As r increases, the primary maximum shifts to the

Table 16: Statistics of Score Difference: $N=5$, no Displacement

Ratio r	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
Prob of Win	.5000	.6037	.7018	.7892	.8623	.9187	.9584
Mean Score Diff	0.00	3.28	6.49	9.56	12.45	15.11	17.53
Std Dev Diff	13.28	13.10	12.60	11.80	10.75	9.52	8.16
Mean Win Diff	11.21	12.19	13.26	14.42	15.68	17.07	18.56
Mean Loss Diff	-11.21	-10.30	-9.43	-8.60	-7.80	-7.00	-6.19
Quantile(.9)	17	21	23	25	25	25	25

Table 17: *

Victory margin for five scorers score versus the fraction of total population.

Table 18: Statistics of Score Difference: $M = 7$, $N = 5$, Displacement

Ratio r	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
Prob. of Win	0.4951	0.6052	0.7089	0.8002	0.8746	0.9301	0.9670
Mean Score Diff	0.00	4.48	8.88	13.12	17.14	20.88	24.31
Std Dev	16.58	16.39	15.81	14.88	13.64	12.14	10.47
Mean Win Diff	13.96	15.44	17.07	18.88	20.87	23.04	25.38
Mean Loss Diff	-13.96	-12.62	-11.39	-10.26	-9.21	-8.20	-7.21
Quantile(.9)	23	26	29	31	34	35	35

Table 19: *

Victory margin for seven runners, five scorers with displacement. Ratio is the fraction of total population for Team A.

Table 20: Distribution of Score Difference: $N = 4$, No Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
-16	0.0625	0.0410	0.0256	0.0150	0.0081	0.0039	0.0016
-14	0.0312	0.0226	0.0154	0.0098	0.0057	0.0029	0.0013
-12	0.0469	0.0350	0.0246	0.0161	0.0096	0.0051	0.0023
-10	0.0547	0.0418	0.0301	0.0202	0.0124	0.0068	0.0031
-8	0.0781	0.0625	0.0476	0.0342	0.0229	0.0139	0.0074
-6	0.0547	0.0468	0.0378	0.0286	0.0200	0.0126	0.0070
-4	0.0703	0.0620	0.0516	0.0404	0.0292	0.0192	0.0111
-2	0.0625	0.0579	0.0507	0.0417	0.0318	0.0220	0.0133
0	0.0781	0.0764	0.0714	0.0635	0.0534	0.0417	0.0297
2	0.0625	0.0640	0.0622	0.0572	0.0494	0.0396	0.0287
4	0.0703	0.0757	0.0774	0.0749	0.0682	0.0577	0.0442
6	0.0547	0.0606	0.0636	0.0632	0.0590	0.0511	0.0401
8	0.0781	0.0934	0.1071	0.1180	0.1245	0.1252	0.1188
10	0.0547	0.0680	0.0809	0.0920	0.1001	0.1038	0.1016
12	0.0469	0.0597	0.0726	0.0843	0.0936	0.0989	0.0983
14	0.0312	0.0412	0.0518	0.0625	0.0720	0.0791	0.0819
16	0.0625	0.0915	0.1296	0.1785	0.2401	0.3164	0.4096

Table 21: *

Victory margin for four runners count versus the fraction of total population for Team A. No Displacement.

Table 22: Distribution of Score Difference: $M = 6$, $N = 4$ Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
-24	0.0156	0.0083	0.0041	0.0018	0.0007	0.0002	0.0001
-23	0.0078	0.0046	0.0025	0.0012	0.0005	0.0002	0.0001
-22	0.0117	0.0071	0.0039	0.0020	0.0009	0.0003	0.0001
-21	0.0059	0.0039	0.0024	0.0013	0.0006	0.0002	0.0001
-20	0.0156	0.0101	0.0061	0.0034	0.0017	0.0007	0.0003
-19	0.0078	0.0056	0.0037	0.0022	0.0012	0.0005	0.0002
-18	0.0176	0.0115	0.0070	0.0039	0.0020	0.0008	0.0003
-17	0.0098	0.0073	0.0050	0.0032	0.0018	0.0009	0.0003
-16	0.0254	0.0178	0.0118	0.0074	0.0043	0.0022	0.0010
-15	0.0117	0.0087	0.0059	0.0037	0.0020	0.0010	0.0004
-14	0.0293	0.0209	0.0140	0.0088	0.0051	0.0026	0.0011
-13	0.0137	0.0103	0.0072	0.0046	0.0026	0.0013	0.0005
-12	0.0312	0.0239	0.0173	0.0116	0.0071	0.0039	0.0018
-11	0.0137	0.0109	0.0080	0.0053	0.0031	0.0015	0.0006
-10	0.0332	0.0269	0.0204	0.0144	0.0093	0.0053	0.0026
-9	0.0117	0.0095	0.0071	0.0048	0.0028	0.0014	0.0006
-8	0.0391	0.0327	0.0257	0.0188	0.0126	0.0075	0.0038
-7	0.0137	0.0116	0.0091	0.0065	0.0042	0.0024	0.0011
-6	0.0391	0.0341	0.0281	0.0218	0.0157	0.0102	0.0058
-5	0.0137	0.0119	0.0095	0.0069	0.0045	0.0026	0.0012
-4	0.0430	0.0385	0.0326	0.0257	0.0187	0.0123	0.0070
-3	0.0137	0.0123	0.0102	0.0077	0.0053	0.0032	0.0016
-2	0.0410	0.0385	0.0341	0.0282	0.0216	0.0149	0.0090
-1	0.0137	0.0129	0.0113	0.0090	0.0064	0.0040	0.0021

Table 23: *

Victory margin for six runners, four scorers versus the fraction of total population for Team A with displacement. (Part 1)

largest possible value, 16, with a secondary maximum at 8. Figure 1 appears smooth while Figure 2 appears highly oscillatory. This is an illusion as the odd numbered values are identically zero for the no displacement case. These same values are small but nonzero for the case with displacement. Our input into the plotting package for Figure 1 does not give the zero values at the odd integers. Figure 3 appears smooth because the even numbered values are identically zero for the no displacement case with $M = 5$. For $M = 5$, the secondary relative maximum of the density occurs at $m_{A,B} = 15$.

4 Other Models and Extensions

We now discuss possible generalizations and alternative models. We can model the effect of an injury during the race such as a pulled hamstring by calculating the score distribution of $(M, M - 1, N)$ such as $(7, 6, 5)$.

The models of Sections II and III are simple to explain and can be computed easily numerically. To get models that can be easily evaluated analytically, we can make more restrictive assumptions on the distribution of speeds. A very simple assumption is that the top runners on both teams are of equal ability and much faster than all other runners. We make this assumption iteratively on the remaining runners on the team. In this scenario, the distribution of scores corresponds to N independent races. The score differences are then a shifted scaling binomial distribution. (The shifting and scaling occur because the score differences are $\{-1, 1\}$, not $\{0, 1\}$.) Another tractable model is to assume that the top




Figure 1: Probability density of score difference for four scorers, no displacement.




Figure 2: Probability density of score difference for four scorers, six runners with displacement.




Figure 3: Probability density of score difference for five scorers, no displacement




Figure 4: Probability density of score difference for five scorers, seven runners with displacement.

Table 24: Distribution of Score Difference: $M = 6$, $N = 4$ Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
0	0.0430	0.0417	0.0382	0.0326	0.0258	0.0185	0.0116
1	0.0137	0.0133	0.0119	0.0098	0.0072	0.0046	0.0025
2	0.0410	0.0412	0.0389	0.0344	0.0282	0.0209	0.0136
3	0.0137	0.0142	0.0136	0.0121	0.0098	0.0071	0.0045
4	0.0430	0.0454	0.0455	0.0432	0.0385	0.0319	0.0240
5	0.0137	0.0145	0.0143	0.0129	0.0106	0.0077	0.0048
6	0.0391	0.0425	0.0438	0.0428	0.0392	0.0332	0.0253
7	0.0137	0.0150	0.0153	0.0144	0.0124	0.0096	0.0064
8	0.0391	0.0442	0.0474	0.0483	0.0463	0.0414	0.0337
9	0.0117	0.0133	0.0139	0.0134	0.0118	0.0093	0.0063
10	0.0332	0.0387	0.0428	0.0447	0.0438	0.0399	0.0329
11	0.0137	0.0158	0.0169	0.0167	0.0150	0.0121	0.0084
12	0.0312	0.0385	0.0450	0.0495	0.0511	0.0488	0.0422
13	0.0137	0.0168	0.0194	0.0209	0.0210	0.0195	0.0163
14	0.0293	0.0391	0.0498	0.0607	0.0707	0.0782	0.0814
15	0.0117	0.0148	0.0174	0.0192	0.0197	0.0185	0.0157
16	0.0254	0.0345	0.0449	0.0558	0.0661	0.0745	0.0788
17	0.0098	0.0123	0.0144	0.0160	0.0165	0.0158	0.0136
18	0.0176	0.0252	0.0341	0.0438	0.0536	0.0621	0.0676
19	0.0078	0.0102	0.0124	0.0142	0.0151	0.0148	0.0131
20	0.0156	0.0226	0.0311	0.0406	0.0504	0.0593	0.0655
21	0.0059	0.0081	0.0105	0.0125	0.0138	0.0139	0.0126
22	0.0117	0.0181	0.0261	0.0356	0.0459	0.0556	0.0629
23	0.0078	0.0125	0.0187	0.0264	0.0353	0.0445	0.0524
24	0.0156	0.0277	0.0467	0.0754	0.1176	0.1780	0.2621

Table 25: *

Victory margin for six runners, four scorers versus the fraction of total population for Team A with displacement. Continued. (Part 2)

two runners of each team are much faster than all other runners and next two runners of each team are much faster than the rest of the runners. This essentially decomposes the scores for a (M, N) race into two independent $(2, 2)$ races plus the residual scoring from the remainder of the team. These last two examples illustrate the ease with which one can create new scenarios for cross-country models

Given actual race time data for each runner, we can create probabilistic models for distribution of race times for each runner. We continue to assume that the runners' times are independent. Of course, this ignores the competitive nature of racing: If another runner is running fast, you are likely to run faster even at the risk of burning yourself out and possibly finishing much worse. We could fit each runner's race times to a density, $p_i(t; c_i)$ where the free parameters c_i are fit to the data. The probability that runner i is faster than runner j is given by $Prob(T_i < T_j) = \int P_i(t; c_i)p_j(t; c_j)dt$ where P_i is the integral of p_i : $P_i(t; c_i) \equiv \int_0^t p_i(s; c_i)ds$. The simplest model is that the i th runner's time is uniformly distributed on the interval, $[b_i, B_i]$. Given the values of b_i and B_i for each runner, one can compute the probability of each possible ordering either evaluating the integrals explicitly (I assume using a symbolic manipulation program) or using Monte Carlo. I believe that the running times are probably more peaked about the mode with a long tail corresponding to "off" days. Thus a shifted stretched beta distribution with $a \approx 1.5$ and $b \approx 3$ may be a more realistic model. The shifted stretched beta distribution has four free parameters and this is often too many.

Not all races or race courses are equally easy. Hilly race courses and unpleasant race conditions

Table 26: Distribution of Score Differences: $N = 5$ No Displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
-25	0.0312	0.0185	0.0102	0.0053	0.0024	0.0010	0.0003
-23	0.0156	0.0101	0.0061	0.0034	0.0017	0.0007	0.0003
-21	0.0234	0.0157	0.0098	0.0056	0.0029	0.0013	0.0005
-19	0.0273	0.0188	0.0120	0.0071	0.0037	0.0017	0.0006
-17	0.0371	0.0261	0.0171	0.0102	0.0055	0.0026	0.0010
-15	0.0430	0.0312	0.0213	0.0134	0.0077	0.0039	0.0016
-13	0.0410	0.0314	0.0223	0.0146	0.0086	0.0044	0.0019
-11	0.0410	0.0326	0.0242	0.0165	0.0102	0.0055	0.0025
-9	0.0469	0.0381	0.0288	0.0201	0.0127	0.0071	0.0033
-7	0.0469	0.0397	0.0313	0.0228	0.0151	0.0088	0.0043
-5	0.0508	0.0446	0.0368	0.0282	0.0200	0.0127	0.0070
-3	0.0469	0.0431	0.0370	0.0295	0.0215	0.0140	0.0079
-1	0.0488	0.0463	0.0411	0.0340	0.0258	0.0176	0.0105
1	0.0488	0.0482	0.0446	0.0383	0.0303	0.0215	0.0133
3	0.0469	0.0477	0.0453	0.0401	0.0326	0.0239	0.0152
5	0.0508	0.0545	0.0551	0.0524	0.0466	0.0381	0.0281
7	0.0469	0.0519	0.0539	0.0525	0.0475	0.0396	0.0295
9	0.0469	0.0541	0.0587	0.0598	0.0570	0.0501	0.0397
11	0.0410	0.0483	0.0534	0.0554	0.0537	0.0479	0.0385
13	0.0410	0.0501	0.0576	0.0620	0.0623	0.0578	0.0484
15	0.0430	0.0560	0.0693	0.0817	0.0917	0.0976	0.0976
17	0.0371	0.0497	0.0630	0.0758	0.0866	0.0936	0.0949
19	0.0273	0.0374	0.0485	0.0598	0.0701	0.0779	0.0813
21	0.0234	0.0328	0.0435	0.0548	0.0655	0.0742	0.0786
23	0.0156	0.0226	0.0311	0.0406	0.0504	0.0593	0.0655
25	0.0312	0.0503	0.0778	0.1160	0.1681	0.2373	0.3277

Table 27: *

Victory margin for five scorers with no displacement versus the fraction of total population in Team A.

Table 28: Distribution of Score Differences: $M = 7$, $N = 5$ with displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
-35	0.0078	0.0037	0.0016	0.0006	0.0002	0.0001	0
-34	0.0039	0.0021	0.0010	0.0004	0.0002	0	0
-33	0.0059	0.0032	0.0016	0.0007	0.0003	0.0001	0
-32	0.0029	0.0018	0.0009	0.0004	0.0002	0.0001	0
-31	0.0073	0.0041	0.0021	0.0010	0.0004	0.0001	0
-30	0.0039	0.0025	0.0015	0.0008	0.0004	0.0001	0
-29	0.0088	0.0052	0.0028	0.0014	0.0006	0.0002	0.0001
-28	0.0044	0.0029	0.0017	0.0009	0.0004	0.0002	0
-27	0.0117	0.0071	0.0039	0.0020	0.0009	0.0003	0.0001
-26	0.0059	0.0039	0.0024	0.0013	0.0006	0.0002	0.0001
-25	0.0142	0.0090	0.0053	0.0029	0.0014	0.0006	0.0002
-24	0.0068	0.0047	0.0029	0.0016	0.0008	0.0003	0.0001
-23	0.0181	0.0115	0.0068	0.0036	0.0018	0.0007	0.0002
-22	0.0088	0.0060	0.0038	0.0021	0.0010	0.0004	0.0001
-21	0.0176	0.0121	0.0077	0.0045	0.0023	0.0010	0.0004
-20	0.0083	0.0061	0.0040	0.0024	0.0012	0.0005	0.0002
-19	0.0200	0.0141	0.0092	0.0055	0.0030	0.0014	0.0005
-18	0.0093	0.0069	0.0047	0.0028	0.0015	0.0006	0.0002
-17	0.0215	0.0158	0.0108	0.0068	0.0038	0.0018	0.0007
-16	0.0093	0.0071	0.0048	0.0030	0.0016	0.0007	0.0002
-15	0.0244	0.0184	0.0129	0.0083	0.0048	0.0024	0.0010
-14	0.0103	0.0080	0.0056	0.0036	0.0020	0.0009	0.0003
-13	0.0254	0.0201	0.0148	0.0101	0.0062	0.0034	0.0015
-12	0.0098	0.0078	0.0056	0.0036	0.0020	0.0010	0.0004
-11	0.0278	0.0223	0.0166	0.0114	0.0071	0.0038	0.0017
-10	0.0107	0.0087	0.0064	0.0042	0.0024	0.0012	0.0005
-9	0.0283	0.0240	0.0188	0.0135	0.0088	0.0050	0.0024
-8	0.0098	0.0083	0.0063	0.0043	0.0026	0.0013	0.0005
-7	0.0293	0.0254	0.0204	0.0151	0.0101	0.0059	0.0029
-6	0.0103	0.0089	0.0071	0.0050	0.0031	0.0016	0.0007
-5	0.0303	0.0271	0.0226	0.0173	0.0120	0.0073	0.0037
-4	0.0098	0.0087	0.0070	0.0051	0.0032	0.0017	0.0007
-3	0.0308	0.0282	0.0239	0.0186	0.0131	0.0081	0.0042
-2	0.0107	0.0100	0.0085	0.0065	0.0044	0.0026	0.0012
-1	0.0312	0.0300	0.0268	0.0222	0.0168	0.0114	0.0066

Table 29: *

Victory margin for seven runners, five scorers with displacement versus the fraction of total population.
(Part 1)

Table 30: Distribution of Score Differences: $M = 7$, $N = 5$ with displacement

$s_B - s_A$	0.5	0.55	0.6	0.65	0.7	0.75	0.8
0	0.0098	0.0093	0.0081	0.0063	0.0044	0.0026	0.0013
1	0.0312	0.0304	0.0275	0.0230	0.0176	0.0120	0.0070
2	0.0107	0.0106	0.0094	0.0076	0.0055	0.0034	0.0018
3	0.0308	0.0313	0.0296	0.0260	0.0208	0.0150	0.0093
4	0.0098	0.0100	0.0093	0.0078	0.0059	0.0038	0.0021
5	0.0303	0.0315	0.0306	0.0275	0.0228	0.0170	0.0110
6	0.0103	0.0107	0.0102	0.0088	0.0067	0.0045	0.0025
7	0.0293	0.0315	0.0315	0.0293	0.0250	0.0192	0.0129
8	0.0098	0.0105	0.0103	0.0091	0.0071	0.0049	0.0027
9	0.0283	0.0312	0.0320	0.0305	0.0267	0.0210	0.0144
10	0.0107	0.0121	0.0125	0.0117	0.0099	0.0074	0.0047
11	0.0278	0.0325	0.0357	0.0366	0.0350	0.0307	0.0241
12	0.0098	0.0112	0.0117	0.0111	0.0095	0.0072	0.0046
13	0.0254	0.0300	0.0334	0.0347	0.0335	0.0297	0.0236
14	0.0103	0.0120	0.0130	0.0128	0.0114	0.0091	0.0062
15	0.0244	0.0303	0.0353	0.0386	0.0394	0.0371	0.0314
16	0.0093	0.0111	0.0122	0.0122	0.0110	0.0089	0.0061
17	0.0215	0.0273	0.0325	0.0363	0.0376	0.0359	0.0308
18	0.0093	0.0114	0.0128	0.0132	0.0123	0.0103	0.0074
19	0.0200	0.0265	0.0329	0.0382	0.0413	0.0412	0.0370
20	0.0083	0.0103	0.0118	0.0124	0.0117	0.0099	0.0072
21	0.0176	0.0238	0.0302	0.0357	0.0393	0.0397	0.0361
22	0.0088	0.0118	0.0146	0.0168	0.0179	0.0174	0.0151
23	0.0181	0.0266	0.0369	0.0483	0.0598	0.0696	0.0755
24	0.0068	0.0093	0.0116	0.0136	0.0147	0.0146	0.0130
25	0.0142	0.0210	0.0294	0.0391	0.0492	0.0585	0.0650
26	0.0059	0.0081	0.0105	0.0125	0.0138	0.0139	0.0126
27	0.0117	0.0181	0.0261	0.0356	0.0459	0.0556	0.0629
28	0.0044	0.0062	0.0082	0.0100	0.0113	0.0116	0.0108
29	0.0088	0.0138	0.0205	0.0285	0.0375	0.0466	0.0541
30	0.0039	0.0056	0.0075	0.0092	0.0106	0.0111	0.0105
31	0.0073	0.0119	0.0182	0.0260	0.0350	0.0443	0.0523
32	0.0029	0.0045	0.0063	0.0081	0.0096	0.0104	0.0101
33	0.0059	0.0099	0.0157	0.0232	0.0321	0.0417	0.0503
34	0.0039	0.0069	0.0112	0.0172	0.0247	0.0334	0.0419
35	0.0078	0.0152	0.0280	0.0490	0.0824	0.1335	0.2097

Table 31: *

Victory margin for five scorers, seven runners with displacement versus the fraction of total population.
Continued.




Figure 5: Score difference, $|s_A - s_B|$, for the IID Outcome with $N = 5$ and no displacement versus the number of runners, M .

will slow down all runners. Any attempt to fit empirical data will likely benefit from standardizing the times by race or at least by race course. I have personal experience with a runner who only wins on hilly race courses. Of course, modelling this would again add an extra free parameter to each density, $p_i(t; c_i)$, and is likely not worthwhile.

5 Summary

The two models presented above, the IID Outcome model and the Large Population model are baseline models from which we get interesting and very testable score distributions. The population model gives a probability of victory when two schools of different sizes compete. Given a database of dual-meet scores and school sizes, it would be of interest to see how well the predictions in Tables 5 - 8 are supported by the data. Our tabulated distributions show that as M increases at fixed N , the probability of a large victory increases. Figure 5 shows the distributions for $N = 5$ as M increases from $M = 5$ to $M = 7$ to $M = \infty$ for the case of no displacement. We defined a big victory to be a victory in the 90th percentile of victories. For the IID Outcome model, a big victory is $|m_{A,B}| = 15$ with displacement and $|m_{A,B}| = 14$ without for (6, 4) (International dual-meets). For American dual-meets, (7, 5), the .9 quantile is $|m_{A,B}| = 21$ with displacement and $|m_{A,B}| = 19$ without.

We have analyzed the statistical properties of rank sum scoring with and without scoring. The true argument in favor of scoring with displacement is to motivate the slower runners so that they can

favorably impact the success of the team.

6 Acknowledgement

We thank the anonymous referee for pointing out the Wilcoxon rank-sum statistic as well as many other references.

References

- [1] Boudreau, J., J. Ehrlich, M.F. Raza and S. Sanders. 2018. "The likelihood of social choice violations in rank sum scoring: algorithms and evidence from NCAA cross country running." *Public Choice* 174:219-238
- [2] Boudreau, J., J. Ehrlich, S. Sanders and A. Winn. 2014. "Social choice violations in rank sum scoring: A formalization of conditions and corrective probability computations." *Mathematical Social Sciences* 71:20-29.
- [3] Boudreau, J. W. and S. Sanders. 2015. "Choosing a flawed aggregation rules: The benefit of social choice violations in a league that values competitive balance." *Economics Letters* 137:106-108.
- [4] Conover, William J. 1980. *Practical Nonparametric Statistics*, John Wiley and Sons, (2nd Edition), pp. 252-256 <https://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/cd-22/manual/v2chapter6.pdf>.
- [5] Hammond, T. H. 2007. "Rank injustice?: How the scoring method for cross-country running competitions violates major social choice principles." *Public Choice* 133:359-375.
- [6] Huntington, E. V. 1938. "A paradox in the scoring of competing teams." *Science* 88(2282): 287-288.
- [7] Lehman, E.L. 2006. *Nonparametrics: Statistical methods based on ranks* New York:Springer.
- [8] Mann, H. B. and D. R. Whitney. 1947. "On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other." *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 18 (1): 50-60
- [9] Mixon Jr, F. G. and E. W. King. 2012. "Social choice theory in 10,000 meters: Examining independence and transitivity in the NCAA cross-country championships." *The American Economist* 57:32-41.
- [10] National Federation of State High School Associations, 2016-17 *Participation Survey Results*, <http://www.nfhs.org/ParticipationStatistics>.
- [11] Szedlik, S. 2010. "May the best team win, determining the winner of a cross-country race." *Mathematics and Sports*, Gallian, Joseph A., Ed., Ch. 24., 295-315, Mathematical Association of America, 2010.
- [12] Wilcoxon, F. 1945. "Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods." *Biometrics Bulletin* 1:80-83.