Teacher collaboration attenuating the school composition effect? An exploratory analysis for francophone Belgium

Dirk JACOBS Emilie MARTIN Julien DANHIER Alejandra Alarcon

dirk.jacobs@ulb.ac.be Twitter: @DirkJacobs71

FACULTÉ BHILOSOPHIE SCIENCES SOCIALES Solvay Brussels School Economics & Management



The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement 28360



EQUOP data set

Data collection beginning school year 2014-2015 2nd year of Secondary education, Francophone schools in Belgium

Sample of 164 secondary schools contacted (=1/3 of total number of schools), 106 participated

12570 pupils620 classes398 mathematics teachers106 schools

Merged on individual level with test scores on national tests CEB (end of primary school) and CE1D (end of 2nd year of secondary education)

Integrated (and usable) dataset: 10395 pupils 589 classes 388 mathematics teachers 103 schools

Procedure of opt-out by parents and pupils (570 did so)



Index Socio-Economic Position, calculated in a factor analyses using the variables: highest educational level parents, highest professional status parents, home possesions and number of books at home Results on standardized national mathematics test at the end of the 2^{nd} year of secondary education, Class mean result (n=608)



Index Socio-Economic Position, class means, calculated in a factor analyses using the variables: highest educational level parents, highest professional status parents, home possesions and number of books at home

Model 0: Variance explained by 3 levels (school, class, pupils) ICC

53% pupils, 14% classes, 33% schools

Model 1a: Variance at pupil level, without prior achievement

	RESU	ILTS		
	Fixed	part		
Parameter	Est	Sd	Print	No significant
[F] Const (Lev:1)	476.5098	5.6498	476.51 (5.65) ***	gender effect
[F] Male (Lev:1)	1.3376	1.5151	1.34 (1.52)	
[F] SESFactor (Lev:1)	24.8742	2.0717	24.87 (2.07) ***	Disadvantage
[F] AllochtFGEN (Lev:1)	-18.1838	2.6693	-18.18 (2.67) ***	pupils score
[F] AllochtSGEN (Lev:1)	-11.3698	1.7957	-11.37 (1.8) ***	worse, richer children bette
	Randor	n part		

Peremeter	Eat	6.2	Detect
Farameter	Est	Ju	Frint
[R] Const (Lev:3)	2886.01	457.1036	2886.01 (457.1) ***
[R] Const (Lev:2)	1266.29	101.7295	1266.29 (101.73) ***
[R] Const (Lev:1)	5324.49	76.8029	5324.49 (76.8) ***

Goodness of fit

Parameter	Print	
[Fit] Deviance (Lev:0)	119883.15	
[Fit] P (Lev:0)	8	
[Fit] AIC (Lev:0)	119899.15	
[Fit] BIC2 (Lev:0)	119934.3	
[Fit] BIC1 (Lev:0)	119957.15	
[Fit] R2Var3 (Lev:0)	15.87	
[Fit] R2Var2 (Lev:0)	12.87	
[Fit] R2Var1 (Lev:0)	2.18	

ied r ter

First and second generation immigrants score worse

Model 1b: Variance at pupil level, with prior achievement

Fixed part

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[F] Const (Lev:1)	492.6426	2.5494	492.64 (2.55) ***
[F] MathEquop (Lev:1)	0.6004	0.0000	0.6 (0) ***
[F] GradeRep (Lev:1)	-28.0782	1.3681	-28.08 (1.37) ***
[F] Male (Lev:1)	-5.2460	1.1184	-5.25 (1.12) ***
[F] SESFactor (Lev:1)	16.1556	1.6084	16.16 (1.61) ***
[F] AllochtFGEN (Lev:1)	2.7094	2.0650	2.71 (2.07)
[F] AllochtSGEN (Lev:1)	-0.3680	1.3192	-0.37 (1.32)

Random part

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[R] Const (Lev:3)	523.07	92.0744	523.07 (92.07) ***
[R] Const (Lev:2)	417.98	37.7847	417.98 (37.78) ***
[R] Const (Lev:1)	2881.93	41.7631	2881.93 (41.76) ***

Goodness of fit

Parameter	Print
[Fit] Deviance (Lev:0)	113218.81
[Fit] P (Lev:0)	10
[Fit] AIC (Lev:0)	113238.81
[Fit] BIC2 (Lev:0)	113282.74
[Fit] BIC1 (Lev:0)	113311.3
[Fit] R2Var3 (Lev:0)	84.75
[Fit] R2Var2 (Lev:0)	71.24
[Fit] R2Var1 (Lev:0)	47.05

Once checking for prior achievement (beginning of year) and grade repetition:

- Boys do slightly worse than girls
- No longer a significant effect of migrant background (due to fact that migrants make more progress in course of year)
- Impact of SES diminishes but still important

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[F] Const (Lev:1)	498.9282	1.8730	498.93 (1.87) ***
[F] MathEquop (Lev:1)	0.5844	0.0000	0.58 (0) ***
[F] GradeRep (Lev:1)	-26.6184	1.3642	-26.62 (1.36) ***
[F] Male (Lev:1)	-4.9592	1.1137	-4.96 (1.11) ***
[F] SESFactor (Lev:1)	14.0342	1.6421	14.03 (1.64) ***
[F] AllochtFGEN (Lev:1)	3.6976	2.0417	3.7 (2.04)
[F] AllochtSGEN (Lev:1)	0.2156	1.3118	0.22 (1.31)
[F] ClaMathEquop (Lev:2)	0.1890	0.0316	0.19 (0.03) ***
[F] ClaSESFactor (Lev:2)	19.1042	3.5081	19.1 (3.51) ***

Model 2: Composition effect

Random part

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[R] Const (Lev:3)	228.986	47.1621	228.99 (47.16) ***
[R] Const (Lev:2)	330.303	31.9413	330.3 (31.94) ***
[R] Const (Lev:1)	2878.835	41.6895	2878.83 (41.69) ***

Both academic class composition as socio-economic class composition have a significant effect

Goodness of fit

Parameter	Print
[Fit] Deviance (Lev:0)	113062.96
[Fit] P (Lev:0)	12
[Fit] AIC (Lev:0)	113086.96
[Fit] BIC2 (Lev:0)	113139.68
[Fit] BIC1 (Lev:0)	113173.95
[Fit] R2Var3 (Lev:0)	93.33
[Fit] R2Var2 (Lev:0)	77.27
[Fit] R2Var1 (Lev:0)	47.11

Teacher collaboration (TALIS-items)

Unsatisfactory CFA solution, Acceptable fit but limited factor loadings



Professional collaboration

take part in collaborative professional learning? (CollabEduc4)

 engage in joint activities across different classes and age groups (eg. projects) (CollabEduc3)

observe other teachers's classes and provide feedback? (CollabEduc2)

- teach jointly as a team in the same class? (CollabEduc1)

Exchange and coordination

attend team conferences?(CollabExch4)

 engage in discussions about the learning development of specific students? (CollabExch2)

exchange teaching material with colleagues? (CollabEXch1)

Fixed part

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[F] Const (Lev:1)	498.9162	1.8619	498.92 (1.86) ***
[F] MathEquop (Lev:1)	0.5844	0.0000	0.58 (0) ***
[F] GradeRep (Lev: 1)	-26.6262	1.3632	-26.63 (1.36) ***
[F] Male (Lev:1)	-4.9552	1.1132	-4.96 (1.11) ***
[F] SESFactor (Lev:1)	14.0328	1.6376	14.03 (1.64) ***
[F] AllochtFGEN (Lev:1)	3.6922	2.0415	3.69 (2.04)
[F] AllochtSGEN (Lev:1)	0.2098	1.3119	0.21 (1.31)
[F] ClaMathEquop (Lev:2)	0.1898	0.0316	0.19 (0.03) ***
[F] ClaSESFactor (Lev:2)	19.0906	3.5073	19.09 (3.51) ***
[F] CollabEduc (Lev:2)	0.8312	1.2447	0.83 (1.24)
[F] CollabExch (Lev:2)	-0.2516	0.8970	-0.25 (0.9)

Model 3: Impact of Teacher Collaboration (factors)?

Hypothesis rejected: No (attenuating) effect of teacher collaboration

Random part

Parameter	Est	Sd	Print
[R] Const (Lev:3)	225.038	46.8204	225.04 (46.82) ***
[R] Const (Lev:2)	330.334	31.9785	330.33 (31.98) ***
[R] Const (Lev:1)	2878.881	41.6842	2878.88 (41.68) ***

Goodness of fit

Parameter	Print
[Fit] Deviance (Lev:0)	113061.95
[Fit] P (Lev:0)	14
[Fit] AIC (Lev:0)	113089.95
[Fit] BIC2 (Lev:0)	113151.46
[Fit] BIC1 (Lev:0)	113191.44
[Fit] R2Var3 (Lev:0)	93.44
[Fit] R2Var2 (Lev:0)	77.27
[Fit] R2Var1 (Lev:0)	47.11

« On average, in your school, how often do your work with other teachers to ensure common standards in evaluations for assessing student progress? » Model 3b: Impact of Teacher Collaboration (items)?

						95% Confidence Interval	
Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intercept	534,632708	2,837017	363,651	188,449	,000	529,053689	540,211727
Male	-9,621316	1,533047	5238,685	-6,276	,000	-12,626728	-6,615905
gmSES	21,542685	1,683096	4928,903	12,799	,000	18,243067	24,842303
AllochtFGEN	4,845742	2,763231	5198,827	1,754	,080,	-,571352	10,262836
AllochtSGEN	,757715	1,790172	5159,819	,423	,672	-2,751780	4,267210
GradeRep	-23,093828	1,883995	5249,352	-12,258	,000	-26,787242	-19,400415
gmMathEquop	,606963	,009675	4975,029	62,738	,000	,587997	,625929
gmCollabEduc1	,211981	1,103873	381,892	,192	,848,	-1,958449	2,382411
gmCollabEduc2	-1,652165	3,889242	308,446	-,425	,671	-9,304967	6,000637
gmCollabEduc3	-,531806	1,561426	388,591	-,341	,734	-3,601706	2,538094
gmCollabEduc4	3,896367	2,248304	385,108	1,733	,084	-,524120	8,316854
gmCollabExch1	-1,075954	,926360	393,769	-1,161	,246	-2,897184	,745276
gmCollabExch2	-1,380584	1,360591	416,151	-1,015	,311	-4,055071	1,293903
gmCollabExch3	1,786768	,905456	399,803	1,973	,049	,006718	3,566818
gmCollabExch4	2,237017	1,570563	361,068	1,424	,155	-,851583	5,325617
gmClaSESFactor	13,118270	4,301416	478,642	3,050	,002	4,666277	21,570263
ClaMathEquop	,200198	,033810	505,089	5,921	,000	,133773	,266624

Estimates of Fixed Effects^a

a. Dependent Variable: (((CE1D_TOTAL_MATH - 68.29)/26.023) *100)+500..

Estimates of Covariance Parameters^a

						95% Confidence Interval	
Parameter		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald Z	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Residual		2736,565706	55,540126	49,272	,000,	2629,845716	2847,616428
Intercept [subject = IDSchool]	Variance	185,544147	49,750425	3,729	,000,	109,701463	313,821069
Intercept [subject = IDClass * IDSchool]	Variance	296,844107	41,735441	7,113	,000	225,347064	391,025391

a. Dependent Variable: (((CE1D_TOTAL_MATH - 68.29)/26.023) *100)+500..

Information Criteria^a

-2 Log Likelihood57293,812Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)57333,812Hurvich and Tsai's Criterion (AICC)57333,971Bozdogan's Criterion (CAIC)57485,275Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion (BIC)57465,275