

SES GRADIENT IN TEACHER BIAS & ITS MEDIATORS

Teacher perceptions of academic abilities of primary school students in England, Scotland, and Germany

Valentina Perinetti Casoni

Katherin Barg



THEORETICAL BACKGROUND



MOTIVATION

Self-fulfilling prophecies and feedback loops



3



Self-fulfilling prophecies and feedback loops

Is this biased?

Teacher expectations/ perceptions about student

4

TEACHER JUDGEMENTS & JUDGEMENT BIAS

ACCURACY of teacher judgement varies

From meta-analysis by (Sudkamp et al, 2012)

shared variance between students' achievement around 40% The remaining variance is **INACCURACY**, (positively or negatively) biased teacher judgement

Empirical evidence shows that students from more socioeconomically disadvantaged families often face lower teacher expectations vis-à-vis their objective achievement measures **JUDGED MORE INACCURATELY**

(e.g., Olczyk et al, 2022; Lorenz et al., 2016; Tobisch & Dresel, 2017; Campbell, 2015; Lee & Newton, 2021; Plewis, 1997; Alvidrez & Weinstein, 1999)



STUDENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND - I

Bourdieu's CULTURAL REPRODUCTION

<u>Teachers as gatekeepers</u>: consciously or unconsciously rewarding skills and behaviours of children that are 'closer' to the *culture* of the school. Teacher's assessments of student's performance and abilities might be affected by students' (and their families') **cultural capital**, expressed as/by:

- Linguistic aptitude of a child (i.e., how they express themselves, their accents, their mannerism, etc.) Bourdieu and Passeron, 1964
- <u>extracurricular activities</u>, reading habits, cultural activities (e.g., museum visits), cultural communication at home (e.g., about politics)

Lareau, 2003; DiMaggio 1982; Bodovski and Farkas 2008; Jaeger and Møllegard 2017

parental support (e.g., parent-school contact, parent's interest in child's education

e.g., Barg 2013, 2015

Automatic judgements guided by stereotypes

Π





STUDENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND - II

Bowles and Gintis' **CORRESPONDENCE THEORY**

<u>School systems correspond to the labour market and the</u> <u>work-place:</u> teachers - like employers - reward certain non-cognitive skills depending on the roles and positions of a student/employee.

Bowles and Gintis 1976

Teachers take into account non-cognitive skills when cognitive skills only are assessed.

Farkas et al 1990

Teachers consider habits and traits such as perseverance, dependability, docility, consistency, homework completion, participation in class, effort and organisation when assessing children's abilities. Bressoux and Pansu 2003; Ditton and Krušken 2006; Farkas et al. 1990; Maaz & Nagy, 2009

Low-SES students and high-SES are rewarded for different traits & habits, for example obedience and independent thinking, respectively. Automatic judgements guided by stereotypes

Π

Information-based judgements



TEACHERS, SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

Automatic judgements guided by stereotypes

CHE

П

UDGEME

TEACHER PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

attitudes, knowledge, mindset, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT:

conditions and regulations on schools, school system, teacher training, norms & values, culturalcognitive beliefs

SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

time pressure, judgement goals, social cues, etc.

Information-based judgements

SOCIAL CLASS

SKILLS & ABILITIES

TEACHER ASSESSMENT of language

- Child's **behaviour** and socioemotional issues
- Child's **attitudes** towards school, learning, and teacher
- **Parental involvement** in child's education

FRAMEWORK

- DATA & METHODOLOGY



DATASETS

	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
Data set	<u>Millennium Cohort</u> <u>Study (MCS)</u>	<u>Growing Up in Scotland</u> (GUS)	<u>National Educational</u> <u>Panel Study (NEPS)</u>
PSU	Electoral Wards	(aggregated) Data Zones	Schools
Stratification	(within UK countries) - ethnic, disadvantaged, advantaged	Local Authorities	
Sample at wave 1	(in England) 11,533 cohort members and their families	5,217 cohort members and their families	2,996 (sampled in Kindergarten) + 6,341 sampled in GR1)
Birth Cohort	2000-2001	2004-2005	2005 - 2006

AN Our targ

ANALYTICAL SAMPLES

Our **target analytical sample(s)** are defined as: CMs productive at T2 wave, with a non-missing T2 ability score & T2 teacher rating

		ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
T0 start of primary school		Wave 3 Reception Year age 4/5	Wave 5 Primary 1 age 4/5	Wave 3 Grade 1 age 6/7
T1 during primary school		Wave 4Wave 7Year 2Primary 1age 7/8age 7/8		Wave 4 Grade 2 age 7/8
T2 end of primary school		Wave 5 Year 6 age 10/11	Wave 8 Primary 6 age 9/10	Wave 5 Grade 3 age 8/9
ANALYTICAL SAMPLES	target	6,085	1,758	4,256
	achieved	5,683	1,573	2,227

12



VARIABLES I

	time	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY			
Language skills, test	T2	BAS II Verbal Similarities	WIAT-II Listening Comprehension	Receptive vocabulary (PPVT)			
Teacher rating of child's language skills	T2	In so far as your professional experience will allow, please rate the child in relation to all children of this age in English [well above average, above average, average, below average, well below average]	Please indicate at which stage this child is currently working at in these areas: • Listening and talking • Reading • Writing [developing, consolidating, securing]	Please assess the following skills and abilities of the child. Compare your child with other children of the same age: language skills in German written language skills (reading & writing) [much worse, slightly worse, just as good, slightly better, much better]			
SES	T1	(unweighted) income quintiles	(unweighted) income quintiles created using equivalised disposable income				
Prior ability (language skills)	то	BAS II Naming Vocabulary	BAS II Naming Vocabulary	Receptive vocabulary (PPVT)Grammar (TROG-D)			
Other cognitive skills	T0*	 BAS II Picture Similarities BAS II Pattern Construction 	BAS II Picture Similarities	 DGCF (NEPS-MAT): mental performance DGCF (NEPS-BZT): information processing 			

VARI	ABI	LES II						
	time	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY				
CHILD'S BEHA	/IOUR 8	OTHER SOCIO-EMOTION	IAL ISSUES					
Validated scales	T2	SDQ subscales (emotional issues, conduct problems, hyperactivity & inattention, peer problems, prosocial behaviour)		SDQ subscales (emotional issues, conduct problems, hyperactivity & inattention, peer problems, prosocial behaviour)		SDQ subscales (emotional issues, conduct problems, hyperactivity & inattention, peer problems, prosocial behaviour)		 TASB: Disruptive behaviour scale BIG 5 (Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness)
CHILD'S ATTITU	JDES TC	WARDS SCHOOL, LEARN	ING & TEACHERS					
Effort	T2	How often do you try to do your best at school? [all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never]	How often do you try to do your best at school? [all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never]	I try hard when tasks are difficult [completely disagree, rather disagree, rather agree, completely agree]				
School enjoyment	Т2	l like school [not at all, a bit, a lot]	I look forward to going to school [never, sometimes, often, always]	I like going to school [completely disagree, rather disagree, rather agree, completely agree]				
Academic self-concept	Т2	l am good at English [strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree]	l am good at reading [strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree]					
TSR	T2	 How much do you like your class teacher? [a lot, a little, not at all] How often do you think your class teacher is getting at you? [all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never] 	 How much do you like your class teacher? [all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never] My teacher treats me fairly. [never, sometimes, often, always] 					



VARIABLES III

	time	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY					
PARENTAL INV	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (school-based)								
Parents' evening	T1	During this school year has anyone at home been to a parents' evening or similar event at CM's school? [yes, no, no - parent's evening has not taken place yet]	ring this school year has vone at home been to a rents' evening or similar ent at CM's school? s, no, no - parent's evening has taken place yet] s no, no - parent's evening has taken place yet]						
Other (specifically arranged) meetings	T1*	Apart from parents' evenings, specially arranged meetings v doing at school, during this sc [no meeting, meeting arranged by meeting arranged by both, meeting	How often do you contact teachers outside the parent teacher conferences and open school days regarding behaviour, performance or problems of CM? [never, rarely, sometimes, often, very often]						
Volunteering / extra activities	T1	Thinking about CM's school, do you or your partner get involved with any of the things listed on this card? [help out in class or elsewhere (library, school, trips, etc.), fundraising, sports day, drama groups, PTA, school board,]	Have you or your partner participated in any of the following activities at your child's school? [volunteer in the classroom/library/school office, PTA, Parent Council, school board, school trip, fundraising,]	How often do you engage with the PTA? [never, rarely, sometimes, often, very often] How often do you help with the organisation of parties or events? [never, rarely, sometimes, often, vory often]					



VARIABLES IV

	time	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY					
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (home-based)									
Parents' interest in child's school life	T1* How often do your parents take an interest in your schoolwork? My parents ask about my day in school [all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never] Inever, sometimes, often, always]		How often do your parents ask how school was? [never, seldomEd, sometimes, often, very often]						
Parental educational aspirations	T1	Would you like CM to stay in full-time education after the minimum school leaving age, that is, after 16? [yes, no]	What would you most like CM to be doing at age 16? [staying on at school, go to college/further education, enter family business, start working, start a training course/apprenticeship, do voluntary work, care for a child/family member, start their own family]	No matter which school CM is currently attending or how good their grades are, what school- leaving qualification would you like them to obtain? [Fachhochschulreife, Hochschulreife, Abitur]					
Opinions on education	T1*	How much do you agree or disagree that nowadays you need qualifications in order to get a job worth having? [strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, DNK/not wish to answer]	 It's more important to go out and get a job than to take time gaining lots of qualifications, How well a child does in their education will affect how well they do in life. [strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, strongly disagree] 	My friends expect that I would educate CM as well as possible. [does not apply at all, does not really apply, partially applies, applies to some extent, applies completely]					

ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

STEP 1: ESTIMATE RESIDUALS

Are teacher's perceptions accurate or inaccurate, i.e., are they negatively or positively biased?

STEP 2: UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Is there a SES gradient in (biased) teacher perceptions?

STEP 3: VALUE-ADDED OLS

Is the SES gradient (partially) reduced by any of the sets of MEDIATORS?



TEACHER BIAS: RESIDUALS

METHODOLOGY

- 1. Standardise teacher assessment & student performance & student measure;
- 2. OLS regression of teacher assessment on student performance (& prior ability, other cognitive skills, age at time of testing)
- 3. Compute residuals
- 4. Standardise residuals

POSITIVE residuals = teacher overestimates student's attitude

NEGATIVE residuals = teacher underestimates student's attitude



See Madon et al., (1997); Olczyk et al, 2022; Gentrup et al., (2020); and Hinnant et al., (2009).



RESULTS

T2 ABILITY & TEACHER RATING

			MAXIMUM SAMPLE			COMMON SAMPLE		
			mean	SD	Ν	mean	SD	Ν
	T2 - Language skills ability		58.35	10.07	8474	59.52	9.36	4695
		Well below average	4.4			2.9		
		Below average	15.1			13.6		
ENGLAND	T2 - TR English	Average	35.3		6168	34.7		4695
		Above average	32.1			34.1		
		Well above average	13.2			14.7		
	T2 - Language skills ability		99.11	13.02	3094	100.12	12.39	1573
		Developing	26.7			25.3		
	T2 - TR listening & talking	Consolidating	57.7		1774	58.5		1573
	T2 - TR reading	Securing	15.7			16.2		
SCOTLAND		Developing	27.4			25.6		
		Consolidating	55.1		1782	56.1		1573
		Securing	17.6			18.3		
		Developing	34.6			32.9		
	T2 - TR writing	Consolidating	53.3		1783	54.6		1573
		Securing	12.1			12.5		
	T2 - Language skills ability		2.51	0.94	5600	2.68	0.86	2655
		Much worse	4.5			2.9		
	T2 - TR Vocabulary &	Slightly worse	16.7			13.8		
	sentence construction	Just as good	35.5		44/1	34.4		2655
GERMANY		Slightly better	25.6			28.4		
		Much better	17.7			20.6		
		Much worse	6.8			4.8		
		Slightly worse	20.5			1/.6		0/55
	IZ - IR Reading & writing	Just as good	32.2		4466	32.1		2655
		Slightly better	24.8			27.1		
		Much better	15./			18.5		



T1 INCOME QUINTILE DISTRIBUTION



INCOME QUINTILE DISTRIBUTION

ESTIMATING TEACHER BIAS

	ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
T2 TEST SCOPE (Language alvilla) atd	0.263***	0.230***	0.149***
12 - TEST SCORE (Language skills), sto	(0.014)	(0.027)	(0.026)
T2 ago at time of testing (in months)	0.035***	0.035***	0.007
rz - age at time of testing (in months)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.008)
T0 - PRIOR LANGUAGE SKILLS I, std	0.206***	0.140***	0.060*
(E & S) BAS Naming Vocabulary; (G) PPVT	(0.014)	(0.027)	(0.026)
T0 - PRIOR LANGUAGE SKILLS II, std			0.256***
(E & S) ; (G) Grammar (TROG-D)			(0.022)
T0 - OTHER COG. ABILITIES I, std	0.075***	0.057*	0.173***
(E & S) BAS Picture Similarities; (G) DGCF MAT	(0.013)	(0.025)	(0.018)
T0 - OTHER COG. ABILITIES II, std	0.197***		0.027
(E) BAS Pattern Construction; (S); (G) DGCF BTZ	(0.014)		(0.017)
age controls	Х	Х	Х
Constant	-6.160***	2.124	1.955***
Constant	(0.426)	(3.412)	(0.391)
N° of Observations	4695	1573	2655
R^2	0.286	0.130	0.233

STATISTICAL SIG + * **	NIFICANCE p<0.10 p<0.05 p<0.01	
	P<0.001	22

SES GRADIENT IN TEACHER ASSESSMENTS



MEDIATORS OF SES GRADIENT



	M2a	M2b_1	M2b_2	M2c	M2d	M ALL			
		ENGLAND							
REDUCTION,	-0.17 ***	-0.06 ***	-0.02 **	-0.04 ***	-0.02 ***	-0.2 ***			
compared to IVI I	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)			
%	52.3	18.7	4.6	12.8	4.9	59.5			
			SCOTI	LAND					
REDUCTION, compared to M1	-0.09 *** (0.02)	-0.08 *** (0.02)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.04 ** (0.02)	-0.18 *** (0.04)			
%	30.8	28.6	2.6	10.1	13.4	62.5			
			GERN	IANY					
REDUCTION, compared to M1	-0.03 * (0.02)	-0.02 * (0.01)		-0.07 *** (0.02)	-0.14 *** (0.02)	-0.19 *** (0.03)			
%	6.5	4.7		16.5	33.8	45.4			



CONCLUSIONS



MAIN TAKEAWAYS

Is teacher assessment biased?

Is there an SESgradient to this bias?

What mediates this SESgradient?

- In all three countries, teacher assessments appear to be only partially accurate (at most 30% of its variation is explained by T2 language skills, T0 prior domain-specific abilities, and T0 nondomain-specific abilities
- Teacher assessment seems to reflect T2 language skills (ad the controls) more in England (and Germany) than in Scotland.
- Teacher assessments is strongly graded along SES-lines: the language abilities of students from the top (bottom) two quintiles are overestimated (underestimated) in a statistically significant way
- The modelled mediators account for 45%-63% of the SES-gap but with differences across countries



DISCUSSION POINTS

Is the difference in explained variance of teacher assessment due to higher/lower levels of TEACHER BIAS or to teacher evaluating language skills in a different way (compared to a cognitive test)?

- In Scotland, the Curriculum for Excellence has a broader and well-rounded approach to skills development and assessment
- In England and Germany, the internal and external tracking incentivise teacher to focus on domain-specific & academic skills

Does the mediation of the SES-gradient in M2a & M2b reflect schools & teachers (un)consciously rewarding specific behaviours and attitudes from children

- Teachers tend to be more middle-class in England (and to a certain extent in Scotland) compared to other countries
- Schools, especially in England, tend to be places that exhibit and expect certain middle-class codified behaviours & attitudes

Does the mediation of the SES-gradient in M2c reflect teachers rewarding specific flavours of PI, namely the ones that are perceived as more strongly socially-graded and salient?

- School-based PI although more easily visible to the teacher does not seems to matter as much as homebased P, perhaps because it is no perceived as SES-salient. The difference between the two is much larger in Germany and England than in Scotland.
- The importance of home-based PI, and especially of parental educational aspirations, in Germany perhaps
 reflect the consequence of an educational system with early external tracking: educational aspirations and
 might be perceived as more socially-graded and teacher might consider them more (or be more aware of
 them)





NEXT STEPS

WEIGHTS

FACTOR / COMPONENT ANALYSIS

MEDIATION ANALYSIS To account for item & survey non-response (whether due to wave attrition or non-consent or non-matching to teacher survey or parent survey, we will use a combination of available and constructed weights.

We will use factor and/or component analysis(1) to explore the different mediation paths,(2) as a method of dimension reduction

We will explore several (more sophisticated) methodologies for mediation analysis, e.g., using predicted component from PCA in a SEM to model the causal mediation of SES-gradients in teacher bias





Social and ethnic biases in primary education

THANK YOU!

ANY QUESTION OR THOUGHT?

valentina.perinetticasoni@bristol.ac.uk

Project website: https://bipeproject.blogs.bristol.ac.uk

• REFERENCES



- Alvidrez, J., & Weinstein, R. S. (1999). Early teacher perceptions and later student academic achievement. Journal of educational psychology, 91(4), 731.
- Barg, K. (2013) The Influence of Students' Social Background and Parental Involvement on Teachers' School Track Choices: Reasons and Consequences. European Sociological Review, 29(3), 565-579.
- Barg, K. (2015) Educational Choice and Cultural Capital: Examining Social Stratification within an Institutionalized Dialogue between Family and School. Sociology, 49(6), 1113-1132.
- Bourdieu, P., and J.-C. Passeron. 1964. Les héritiers. Les étudiants et la culture. Paris: Les éditions de minuit.
- Bodovski, Katerina, Farkas, George, 2008. "Concerted cultivation" and unequal achievement in elementary school. Soc. Sci. Res. 37, 903e919
- Bowles, S., and H. Gintis (Eds.). 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.
- Bressoux, P., and P. Pansu. 2003. Quand les enseignants jugent leurs élèves. Paris: PUF.
- Campbell, T. (2015) Stereotyped at seven? Biases in teacher judgements of pupils' ability and attainment. Journal of Social Policy, 44(3), 517-547. Data citation
- DiMaggio, P. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of U.S. High School Students." American Sociological Review 47:189-201.
- Ditton, H., and J. Krüsken. 2006. "Der Übergang von der Grundschule in die Sekundarstufe I." Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft 9:348-72.
- Farkas, G., Grobe, R. P., Sheehan, D., & Y. Shuan (1990) Cultural Resources and School Success: Gender, Ethnicity, and Poverty Groups within an Urban School District. American Sociological Review, 55(1), 127.Gentrup et al., (2020);
- Gentrup, S., Lorenz, G., Kristen, C., & Kogan, I. (2020). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom: teacher expectations, teacher feedback and student achievement. Learning and Instruction, 66, 101296.
- Hinnant, J. B., O'Brien, M., & Ghazarian, S. R. (2009). The longitudinal relations of teacher expectations to achievement in the early school years. Journal of educational psychology, 101(3), 662.Jæger, M. M. & S. Møllegaard (2017) Cultural capital, teacher bias, and educational success: New evidence from monozygotic twins, Social Science Research, 65, 130-144.Kuklinski and Weinstein, 2000
- Jæger, M. M., & Møllegaard, S. (2017). Cultural capital, teacher bias, and educational success: New evidence from monozygotic twins. Social Science Research, 65, 130-144.

REFERENCES - II

- Kuklinski, M., & Weinstein, R. (2000). Classroom and grade level differences in the stability of teacher expectations and perceived differential teacher treatment. Learning Environments Research, 3(1), 1–34.
- Lareau, A. (2003). Unequal childhoods: class, race, and family life. Berkeley, USA: University of California Press.
- Lee, M.W., & Newton, P. (2021). Systematic divergence between teacher and test-based assessment: literature review. Coventry: Ofqual.
- Lorenz, G., Gentrup, S., Kristen, C., Stanat, P., & Kogan, I. (2016). Stereotype bei Lehrkräften? Eine Untersuchung systematisch verzerrter Lehrererwartungen. Kölner Zeitschrift Für Soziologie Und Sozialpsychologie, 68(1), 89–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-015-0352-3.Lorenz, 2020;
- Lorenz, G. (2021). Subtle discrimination: do stereotypes among teachers trigger bias in their expectations and widen ethnic achievement gaps?. Social Psychology of Education, 24(2), 537-571.
- Maaz, K., Nagy, G., Jonkmann, K., & Baumert, J. (2009). Eliteschulen in Deutschland. Eine Analyse zur Existenz von Exzellenz und Elite in der gymnasialen Bildungslandschaft aus einer institutionellen Perspektive. Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 55(2), 211-227.
- Madon, S., Jussim, L., Eccles, J. (1997). In search of the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72(4), 791–809.
- Olczyk, M., et al (2022) Teacher judgements, student social background, and student progress in primary school: A cross-country perspective, Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaften. Plewis, 1997;
- Plewis, I. (1997). Inferences about teacher expectations from national assessment at key stage one. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67(2), 235–247.
- Rosenthal, R., Jacobson, L. F., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom : teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.Schneider, T. 2011. "Die Bedeutung der sozialen Herkunft und des Migrationshintergrundes für Lehrerurteile am Beispiel der Grundschulempfehlung." Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft 14:371-96.Sudkamp et al 2012
- Südkamp, A., Kaiser, J., & Möller, J. (2012). Accuracy of teachers' judgments of students' academic achievement: a meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(3), 743–762.
- Tobisch, A., & Dresel, M. (2017). Negatively or positively biased? Dependencies of teachers' judgments and expectations based on students' ethnic and social backgrounds. Social Psychology of Education, 20(4), 731–752. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9392-z.

DATA CITATION

- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2020). *Millennium Cohort Study: Longitudinal Family File, 2001-2018*. [data collection]. *4th Edition*. UK Data Service. SN: 8172, <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8172-4</u>
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2022). *Millennium Cohort Study: First Survey,* 2001-2003. [data collection]. 14th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 4683, DOI: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-4683-6
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2022). Millennium Cohort Study: Second Survey, 2003-2005. [data collection]. 11th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 5350, DOI: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-5350-6
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2022). *Millennium Cohort Study: Third Survey,* 2006. [data collection]. 9th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 5795, DOI: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-5795-6
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2021). *Millennium Cohort Study: Fourth Survey,* 2008. [data collection]. 8th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 6411, <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6411-8</u>
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2021). *Millennium Cohort Study: Fifth Survey,* 2012. [data collection]. 5th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 7464, <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7464-5</u>
- University of London, Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. (2020). *Millennium Cohort Study: Sixth Survey,* 2015. [data collection]. 7th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 8156, <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8156-8</u>
- ScotCen Social Research. (2022). Growing Up in Scotland: Cohort 1, Primary 6 Teacher Survey, 2014-2015: Special Licence Access. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 8366, DOI: <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8366-1</u>
- ScotCen Social Research. (2022). Growing Up in Scotland: Cohort 1, Sweeps 1-10, 2005-2020: Special Licence Access. [data collection]. 19th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 5760, DOI: <u>http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-5760-12</u>
- NEPS Network. (2022). National Educational Panel Study, Scientific Use File of Starting Cohort Kindergarten. Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi), Bamberg. <u>https://doi.org/10.5157/NEPS:SC2:10.0.0</u>

APPENDIX

SES GRADIENT IN TEACHER ASSESSMENTS

		ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
τοται	mean	0.00	0.00	0.00
IUIAL	sd	1.00	1.00	1.00
Lowest quintile	mean	-0.17	-0.14	-0.20
Lowest quintile	sd	1.05	1.00	0.99
Second quintile	mean	-0.13	-0.14	-0.12
Second quintile	sd	0.99	0.97	0.99
Third quintile	mean	-0.05	-0.05	-0.01
rnina quintile	sd	0.96	0.96	1.04
Fourth quintilo	mean	0.07	0.11	0.09
rourin quintile	sd	1.01	1.01	1.00
Highest quintile	mean	0.16	0.14	0.21
	sd	0.97	1.02	0.92





MODEL 2A: BEHAVIOURAL & SOCIO-EMOTIONAL ISSUES



		ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
	Lowest Q	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
	Second Q	0.022 (0.050)	-0.005 (0.086)	0.097 (0.061)
INCOME QUINTILE	Middle Q	0.042 (0.048)	0.034 (0.081)	0.175** (0.060)
	Fourth Q	0.112* (0.047)	0.191* (0.082)	0.270*** (0.061)
	Highest Q	0.159*** (0.047)	0.197* (0.081)	0.383*** (0.061)
(std) SDQ Subscale: Emotional Symptor	ns	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.029)	
(std) SDQ Subscale: Conduct Issues		-0.026+ (0.016)	-0.036 (0.028)	
(std) SDQ Subscale: Hyperactivity & Inat	-0.275*** (0.017)	-0.196*** (0.030)		
(std) SDQ Subscale: Peer Problems		-0.036* (0.016)	-0.010 (0.030)	
(std) SDQ Subscale: Prosocial Behaviou	r	-0.005 (0.018)	-0.001 (0.031)	
(std) BIG 5: Neuroticism				0.023 (0.019)
(std) BIG 5: Agreeableness				0.014 (0.020)
(std) BIG 5: Conscientiousness				0.237*** (0.020)
(std) TABS: Disruptive Behaviour				-0.007 (0.021)
	CONSTANT	-0.079* (0.037)	-0.094 (0.062)	-0.189*** (0.044)
N°	of Observations	4695	1573	2655
	R^2	0.096 F(9, 4685) =	0.052	0.079 F(8, 2646) =
	F	55.53	F(9, 1563) = 9.60	28.29
	Prob > F	0.000	0.000	0.000

MODEL 2B (1):
CHILD'S
ATTITUDES
TOWARDS
SCHOOL &
LEARNING -
PT.1



	ENGLAND SCOTLAND GERMA				
		Lowest Q	0.000	0.000	0.000
		Second Q	(.) 0.048 (0.049)	-0.024 (0.086)	(.) 0.081 (0.062)
INCOME	OUINTII F	Middle O	0.107*	0.022	0.183**
			(0.048)	(0.082)	(0.061)
		Fourth Q	0.204***	0.184*	0.271***
			(0.040) 0 271***	0.002)	0.002)
		Highest Q	(0.046)	(0.081)	(0.062)
			0.000	0.000	(0.002)
		Never	(.)	(.)	
		Some of the time	-0.077	0.166	
	How often do you try your	Joine of the time	(0.239)	(0.205)	
	best at school?	Most of the time	0.093 (0.230)	0.131 (0.161)	
FFFORT		All of the time	0.090 (0.231)	0.177 (0.157)	
EFFORT	l try hard when tasks are difficult	Completely	. ,	. ,	0.000
		disagree			(.)
		Rather disagree			-0.027 (0.132)
		Rather agree			0.031 (0.112)
		Completely agree			0.162 (0.108)
		Not at all	0.000		
	l like school	A bit	0.210**		
			(0.0/1)		
		A lot	(0.072)		
SCHOOL ENJOYMENT		Never		0.000 (.)	
	l look forward to going to school	Sometimes		0.308** (0.116)	
		Often		0.393*** (0.116)	
		Always		0.313** (0.120)	

			ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
		Completely disagree			0.000 (.)
		Rather disagree			0.109 (0.074)
SCHOOL ENJOYMENT	l like going to school	Rather agree			0.275*** (0.063)
		Completely agree			0.308*** (0.060)
		Strongly disagree	0.000	0.000	
ACADEMIC SELF-	l am good at English	Disagree	-0.016 (0.108)	-0.086 (0.231)	
CONCEPT		Agree	0.429*** (0.103)	0.354+ (0.214)	
		Strongly Agree	0.810***	0.449*	
		CONSTANT	-0.991*** (0.236)	-0.924*** (0.277)	-0.535*** (0.115)
		N° of Observations	4695	1573	2655
		R^2	0.110	0.044	0.040
		-	F(12, 4682)	F(13, 1559)	F(10, 2644)
		F Prob > F	= 48.19 0.000	= 5.47 0.000	= 11.02 0.000

MODEL 2B (1): CHILD'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOL & LEARNING -PT.2



_				ENGLAND	SCOTLAND
			Lowest O	0.000	0.000
			Lowest	(.)	(.)
			Second O	0.042	-0.003
			Second	(0.052)	(0.087)
	INCOM		Middle O	0.111*	0.089
				(0.050)	(0.082)
			Fourth O	0.220***	0.250**
				(0.048)	(0.083)
			Highest Q	0.318***	0.278***
				(0.047)	(0.081)
			Never	0.000	
				(.)	
			Some of the time	0.168+	
		How often do you think your class teacher		(0.087)	
		is getting at you?	Most of the time	0.18/*	
AIIIUDES				(0.079)	
			All of the time	$0.315^{\circ\circ\circ}$	
TOWARDS	TEACHER FAIRNESS		(0.078)	0.000	
		Never		0.000	
TEACHED			Sometimes		(.)
				-0.003	
		My teacher treats me fairly			(0.277)
		Often		(0.293)	
					0 168
		Always		(0.290)	
					0.000
				(.)	(.)
				0.024	-0.178
	TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP	How much do you like your class teacher?	A bit	(0.078)	(0.221)
				0.146+	-0.226
			A lot	(0.076)	(0.223)
			CONICTANT	-0.509***	-0.075
			CONSTANT	(0.096)	(0.293)
			N° of Observations	4695	1573
			R^2	0.028	0.016
				F(9, 4685) =	F(9, 1563) =
			F	15.09	2.91
			Prob > F	0.000	0.002

			ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
		Lowest Q	0.000	0.000	
		Second Q	0.032 (0.051)	-0.007 (0.087)	
INCOME	QUINTILE	Middle Q	0.100* (0.050)	0.065 (0.083)	
		Fourth Q	0.204*** (0.049)	0.230** (0.084)	
		Highest Q	0.291*** (0.049)	0.256**	
	During this school	Yes	0.000	()	
	year has anyone at home been to a	No	-0.209*		
	parents' evening or similar event at CM's school?	No parents' evening has taken place	-0.208+ (0.113)		
	Have you been to a	No		0.000	
PARENT'S EVENING	parent evening this year?	Yes		0.044 (0.085)	
		Never			0.000
		Rarely			-0.026 (0.213)
	the parent/teacher	Sometimes			-0.093 (0.211)
	conterences?	Often			-0.069 (0.192)
		Very often			0.044 (0.188)
		No	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	
SPECIALLY ARRANGED MEETING WITH TEACHERS/SCHOOL	Have you and/or your partner had a specially arranged meeting with your daughter/son's teacher(s)/school?	Yes, arranged by parents Yes, arranged by teachers Yes, arranged by both	-0.183*** (0.045) -0.538*** (0.070) -0.469*** (0.083)	-0.068 (0.067) -0.106 (0.119) -0.199 (0.121)	
		Yes, arranged by neither		0.051 (0.069)	

MODEL 2C (1): SCHOOL-BASED PI - PT. 1



			ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
	How often do you	Never			0.000 (.)
SPECIALLY	contact teachers outside the parent	Rarely			-0.115+ (0.065)
ARRANGED MEETING WITH	teacher conferences and open school days	Sometimes			-0.283*** (0.062)
TEACHERS/SCHOOL	regarding behaviour, performance or	Often			-0.414*** (0.067)
	problems of CM?	Very often			-0.292*** (0.086)
ENGAGEMENT with EXTRA-CURRICULAR	Have you or your partner volunteered	No	0.000	0.000 (.)	
CHILD'S SCHOOL (volunteering)	for any extra-curricular activity at the school?	Yes	(0.031)	(0.061)	
		Never			0.000 (.)
		Rarely			0.056 (0.059)
	How often do you engage with the PTA?	Sometimes			0.093 (0.061)
		Often			0.045 (0.064)
ENGAGEMENT with EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN		Very often			0.021 (0.073)
CHILD'S SCHOOL		Never			0.000 (.)
(volunteering)	How often do you help with the	Rarely			-0.136 (0.093)
	organisation of parties	Sometimes			(0.029
	school?	Often			-0.009 (0.088)
		Very often			0.032 (0.096)
		CONSTANT	-0.109** (0.042)	-0.189+ (0.099)	0.019
	N°	of Observations	4695	1573	2649
		R^2	0.037	0.019 E(10, 1542) -	0.044 E(20 2628) -
		F	r(10, 4004) = 18.15	F(10, 1502) = 3.00	r(20, 2020) = 6,11
		Prob > F	0.000	0.001	0.000

MODEL 2C (1): SCHOOL-BASED PI - PT. 2



					CEDMANN
				SCOTLAND 0.000	GERMANT
		Lowest Q	0.000	0.000	0.000
			(.)	(.)	(.)
		Second Q	0.044	0.008	(0.039
			(0.032)	(0.007)	(0.002)
	INCOME QUINTILE	Middle Q	(0.122°)	0.100	0.125°
			(0.030)	(U.UOZ) 0.222**	(0.001)
		Fourth Q	(0.048)	0.233	(0.063)
			0.317***	0.003)	0.003)
		Highest Q	(0.048)	(0.081)	(0.063)
			0.040)	0.001)	(0.003)
		Never	()	()	
			0 313*	0 249	
PARENTAL INTERES	T How often do you parents take an	Sometimes	(0.124)	(0.172)	
IN CHILD'S	interest in your schoolwork?		0.395**	0.425*	
EDUCATION		Often	(0.121)	(0.172)	
			0.388**	0.321+	
		Always	(0.120)	(0.164)	
		N	, , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.000
		Never			(.)
		Dereh			0.143
DADENITAL INITEDEC	т	категу			(0.182)
	How often do your parents ask how	Somotimor			0.396*
	school was?	Sometimes			(0.166)
LDUCATION		Often			0.476**
		Ollen			(0.159)
		Always			0.424**
		7 11/4/5			(0.157)
PARENTAI	Would you like your daughter/son to	No	0.000	0.000	
EDUCATIONAL	stay in education		(.)	(.)	
ASPIRATIONS	(school/college/further education) at	Yes	0.334**	0.109	
	age 16?		(0.109)	(0.165)	0.000
		Fachhochschulreife			0.000
PARENTAL	No matter which school CM is currently				(.)
EDUCATIONAL	attending or how good her grades are:	Hochschulreife			0.402 + (0.240)
ASPIRATIONS	would you like haute a basis 2				(0.240)
	would you like her to obtain?	Abitur			0.797***
					(0.238)

MODEL 2C (2): HOME-BASED PI - PT. 1



				ENGLAND	SCOTLAND	GERMANY
			Strongly agree	0.000 (.)		
	OPINIONS ON	qualifications in	Agree	-0.105*** (0.031)		
	EDUCATION	worth having	Disagree	-0.173*** (0.048)		
			Strongly disgree	-0.326** (0.115)		
			Strongly agree		0.000 (.)	
		It is more important	Agree		-0.181 (0.393)	
		job than to take time	Neither agree nor disagree		0.122 (0.379)	
		qualifications	Disagree		0.139 (0.378)	
C(2):	OPINIONS ON		Strongly disagree		0.292 (0.383)	
ASED	EDUCATION		Strongly agree		0.000 (.)	
		How well a child	Agree		-0.044 (0.070)	
. ∠		education will affect	Neither agree nor disagree		-0.171* (0.083)	
		life	Disagree		-0.096 (0.084)	
			Strongly disagree		-0.271 (0.204)	
			Does not apply at all			0.000 (.)
		My friends expect	Does rather not apply			-0.003 (0.073)
	OPINIONS ON EDUCATION	that I would educate CM as well as	Does partly apply			-0.057 (0.066)
		possible	Does rather apply			-0.005 (0.065)
			Does completely apply			-0.040 (0.073)
			CONSTANT	-0.801*** (0.163)	-0.626 (0.430)	-1.226*** (0.284)
			N° of Observations	4695	1573	2655
			K^Z	0.026 F(11, 4683) =	0.034 F(16, 1556) =	0.056 F(14, 2640) =
			F	11.26	3.45	11.29
			Prob > F	0.000	0.000	0.000

MODEL 2 HOME-BA PI - PT

