Teacher Rating of Student Adjustment

Grade 11 /Year 12

Fast Track Project Technical Report
Clara G. Muschkin
July 10, 2003

Table of Contents

Citations

Instrument

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1995). *Teacher Rating of Student Adjustment* [On-line]. Available: http://www.fasttrackproject.org/

Report

Muschkin, C. G. (2003). *Teacher Rating of Student Adjustment* (Fast Track Project Technical Report) [On-line]. Available: http://www.fasttrackproject.org/

Research Paper

Muschkin, C. G., and Malone, P. S. (2003). Multiple Teacher Ratings: An Evaluation of Measurement Strategies. Manuscript in preparation: Duke University.

Data Sources

Unscored: T11K
Scored: TSA11

I. Scale Description

The Teacher Rating of Student Adjustment is a 7-item instrument developed by the Fast Track Project to assess dimensions of success in adjusting to middle and high school. The first item queries how well the teacher knows the child; the remaining items target the teacher's perceptions of a student's academic performance, academic motivation, social skills, adult relationships, conduct, and personal maturity. Responses are coded on a five-point scale ranging from 1 to 5, as follows: Poor, unsatisfactory skills (1); Below average skills (2); Average skills (3); Above average skills (4); and Excellent skills (5).

II. Report Sample

This report contains data collected on Cohort 1, Year 12. The data include a high-risk control sample (n=155) and a normative sample (n = 387) for a total N = 463, including overlap. Of the 463 subjects, 199 (43 percent) are missing all responses for this measure, including 164 from the normative group (29 from Durham, 39 from Washington, 33 from Pennsylvania, and 63 from Nashville), and 84 from the control group (11 from Durham, 31 from Nashville, 22 from Pennsylvania, and 20 from Washington), with overlap between the normative and control groups.

III. Scaling

Prior years of data from this measure are distinctive in that multiple teacher ratings of the target behaviors were obtained for each student in grades 6, 7, and 8. The goal was to administer the instrument to teachers in each of the student's core classes, as most middle school students move among several classrooms for core academic subjects. The decision to use multiple informants raised methodological issues that impact scaling and analysis of these data. These issues are addressed in Muschkin and Malone (2003) and are discussed in the corresponding technical reports for years 7, 8, and 9. The data collected in year 10 differ from previous years, in that the instrument was administered to multiple teachers in only two of the four Fast Track sites (Nashville and Pennsylvania). The other two sites collected data from only one teacher. In order for the year 10 data to be comparable across sites, student adjustment ratings were selected randomly from among the set of teacher ratings available for each student. Thus, beginning in year 10, the TSA datasets contain ratings provided by a single teacher on each of the student adjustment items. In years 11 and 12, ratings on the student adjustment items for each student were obtained from a single teacher at all of the Fast Track sites.

IV. Differences Between Groups

T-tests of means on the aggregate scores between the normative and control samples yielded the following results:

	Normative Sample		Control Sample		DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Academic Performance	3.05	1.14	2.59	1.12	262	-2.93	.0037
Academic Motivation	3.09	1.25	2.52	1.27	262	-3.28	.0012
Social Skills	3.53	.99	3.21	.92	262	-2.38	.0181
Relationships with Adults	3.46	1.03	3.04	.90	260	-2.98	.0031
Conduct	3.64	1.19	2.84	1.24	261	-4.75	<.0001
Personal Maturity	3.19	1.29	2.48	1.14	262	-4.07	<.0001

These results reveal significant differences (at an alpha level of .01 or lower) between the normative and control samples for most of the behavior domains. The mean difference for social skills is significant at an alpha level of .05. In each domain, the normative group received a higher mean rating as compared with the control group. This finding indicates that students in the normative group were, on average, significantly more successful in these dimensions of adjustment to eleventh grade, as compared with the high-risk control group.

V. Recommendations for Use

As noted earlier, the data presented in this report are item ratings from a single teacher for each student. The researcher must keep in mind that these variables are not directly comparable to the aggregate scores described in the technical reports for years 7 through 9. Those data were aggregated by averaging the multiple teacher ratings available for each student, to create an average scale score for each of the six behavior domains. The rating scores for year 10 represent the rating from a single teacher, where the score is randomly selected from the set of rating available for each student. It is recommended that analysts wishing to examine student adjustment over time should create random-selection teacher rating variables (described in the year 10 report) for years 7 through 9, using the year 10 scoring program. Comparisons over time would thus involve a single teacher's rating for each student. These scores would then be

comparable to the single teacher ratings contained in the year 11 and year 12 datasets. A discussion of the use of multiple and single teacher ratings of student adjustment is presented in the cited research paper.

Analysts should note the large proportion of cases missing this measure (37 percent), and take into consideration, when making comparisons over time, the potential impact of variation in sample size across project years.

VI. Scale Means and SDs

Means and Standard Deviations for Average Scores,
Teacher Ratings of Student Adjustment
Cohort 1, Year 12 Normative Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
st12k1	single teacher acad. performance	223	2.99	1.14	1.00	5.00
st12k2	single teacher acad. motivation	223	3.01	1.26	1.00	5.00
st12k3	single teacher social skills	223	3.48	0.99	1.00	5.00
st12k4	single teacher student-adult rel.	221	3.38	1.03	1.00	5.00
st12k5	single teacher student conduct	222	3.53	1.24	1.00	5.00
st12k6	single teacher personal maturity	223	3.09	1.30	1.00	5.00

Means and Standard Deviations for Average Scores,
Teacher Ratings of Student Adjustment
Cohort 1, Year 12 Control Sample

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
st12k1	single teacher acad. performance	71	2.59	1.12	1.00	5.00
st12k2	single teacher acad. motivation	71	2.52	1.27	1.00	5.00
st12k3	single teacher social skills	71	3.21	0.92	1.00	5.00
st12k4	single teacher student-adult rel.	71	3.04	0.90	1.00	5.00
st12k5	single teacher student conduct	71	2.85	1.24	1.00	5.00
st12k6	single teacher personal maturity	71	2.48	1.14	1.00	5.00

VII. Scale Correlations

Teacher Ratings of Student Adjustment – Average Score Correlations
Report Sample, Year 12

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0 Number of Observations	st12k1	st12k2	st12k3	st12k4	st12k5	st12k6
st12k1 **single teacher acad. performance**	1.000 264.000	0.777 0.000 264.000	0.509 0.000 264.000	0.606 0.000 262.000	0.591 0.000 263.000	0.734 0.000 264.000
st12k2 **single teacher acad. motivation**	0.777 0.000 264.000	1.000 264.000	0.561 0.000 264.000	0.680 0.000 262.000	0.654 0.000 263.000	0.848 0.000 264.000
st12k3 **single teacher social skills**	0.509 0.000 264.000	0.561 0.000 264.000	1.000 264.000	0.730 0.000 262.000	0.525 0.000 263.000	0.570 0.000 264.000
st12k4 **single teacher student-adult rel.**	0.606 0.000 262.000	0.680 0.000 262.000	0.730 0.000 262.000	1.000 262.000	0.685 0.000 261.000	0.712 0.000 262.000
st12k5 **single teacher student conduct**	0.591 0.000 263.000	0.654 0.000 263.000	0.525 0.000 263.000	0.685 0.000 261.000	1.000 263.000	0.750 0.000 263.000
st12k6 **single teacher personal maturity**	0.734 0.000 264.000	0.848 0.000 264.000	0.570 0.000 264.000	0.712 0.000 262.000	0.750 0.000 263.000	1.000 264.000