

# Peer Effects and Differential Attrition

## Evidence from Tennessee's Project STAR

Sanjay Satish

Duke University

February 21, 2022

# Overview

- 1 Motivation & Thesis Overview
- 2 Identifying Attrition
- 3 Quantifying the Effect of Ability on Attrition
- 4 Identification of Differential Peer Effects From Attrition Across Class Size
- 5 Identification of Peer Effects From Attrition to Private Schools

# Motivation

- Student-to-student peer effects do in fact exist and such effects are potentially influenced by peer quality
- Private schools (charters as well, although less important for my thesis) have entrance exam requirements that result in **cream-skimming**
- In schools, there perhaps exists evidence of **differential attrition** based on peer ability and subsequent **negative peer effects** from such attrition

# Project STAR

- Class-size randomization experiment across grades K-3 in TN between 1985-1989
- 11,600 students across 79 schools voluntarily participated in the study
- Students and teachers randomized into one of 3 class types at beginning of 1985 school year
  - 1 Small Classes (13-17 students)
  - 2 Regular-sized classes (22-25 students)
  - 3 Regular-sized classes with teacher's aide (22-25 students + full-time teacher's aide)

# Project STAR

- After being assigned to a class type, students kept in that class for duration of experiment
- Each participating school required to have one of three class types and randomization occurred within each school
- Key limitation is that at the beginning of 1st grade, students in regular and regular-aide classes were re-randomized across class types
- $\approx 10\%$  of students moved across small and regular-sized classes between grades

# Summary Stats - Grade 1

|                                     | Small Class      | Regular Class    | Regular Class with Aide |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Experimental Characteristics</b> |                  |                  |                         |
| Number of Years in STAR             | 3.2 $\pm$ 1.0    | 2.9 $\pm$ 1.1    | 3.0 $\pm$ 1.0           |
| Number of Years in Small Classes    | 3.0 $\pm$ 1.0    | 0.2 $\pm$ 0.5    | 0.1 $\pm$ 0.3           |
| <b>School Urbanicity</b>            |                  |                  |                         |
| Inner City                          | 19.8%            | 22.1%            | 18.5%                   |
| Suburban                            | 23.5%            | 24.9%            | 21.2%                   |
| Rural                               | 47.3%            | 45.0%            | 50.1%                   |
| Urban                               | 9.4%             | 8.0%             | 10.2%                   |
| <b>Teacher Characteristics</b>      |                  |                  |                         |
| Female                              | 97.5%            | 100.0%           | 100.0%                  |
| White                               | 81.2%            | 83.8%            | 81.6%                   |
| Years of Experience                 | 12.2 $\pm$ 8.7   | 10.3 $\pm$ 8.7   | 12.7 $\pm$ 9.2          |
| Class Size                          | 15.7 $\pm$ 1.6   | 22.7 $\pm$ 2.3   | 23.4 $\pm$ 2.4          |
| Receives Free Lunch                 | 47.8%            | 51.9%            | 50.3%                   |
| Special Education                   | 0.6%             | 1.5%             | 1.5%                    |
| Math SAT Scaled Score               | 538.7 $\pm$ 44.1 | 525.3 $\pm$ 41.7 | 529.6 $\pm$ 42.9        |
| Reading SAT Scaled Score            | 530.0 $\pm$ 56.6 | 513.5 $\pm$ 53.5 | 521.3 $\pm$ 54.7        |
| Listening SAT Scaled Score          | 572.7 $\pm$ 34.5 | 563.8 $\pm$ 32.4 | 567.2 $\pm$ 33.9        |
| Word Study Skills SAT Scaled Score  | 523.0 $\pm$ 52.6 | 506.2 $\pm$ 54.0 | 513.7 $\pm$ 51.8        |

Note: some variables expressed as Mean  $\pm$  Standard Deviation

# Summary Stats - Students in Project STAR in K, left before entering G1

|   | Small Class(N=453)      | Regular Class(N=603)    | Regular Class with Aide(N=580) |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Experimental Characteristics</b>         |                         |                         |                                |
| Number of Years in STAR                     | 1.1 $\hat{A}\pm 0.4$    | 1.1 $\hat{A}\pm 0.5$    | 1.1 $\hat{A}\pm 0.5$           |
| Number of Years in Small Classes            | 1.0 $\hat{A}\pm 0.2$    | 0.0 $\hat{A}\pm 0.2$    | 0.0 $\hat{A}\pm 0.1$           |
| <b>Kindergarten School Urbanicity</b>       |                         |                         |                                |
| Inner City                                  | 28.3%                   | 33.5%                   | 30.7%                          |
| Suburban                                    | 32.2%                   | 27.4%                   | 30.7%                          |
| Rural                                       | 30.0%                   | 31.3%                   | 31.6%                          |
| Urban                                       | 9.5%                    | 7.8%                    | 7.1%                           |
| <b>Kindergarten Teacher Characteristics</b> |                         |                         |                                |
| Female                                      | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                         |
| White                                       | 84.5%                   | 71.5%                   | 82.4%                          |
| Years of Experience                         | 8.5 $\hat{A}\pm 5.7$    | 8.9 $\hat{A}\pm 5.9$    | NA $\hat{A}\pm NA$             |
| Class Size                                  | 15.2 $\hat{A}\pm 1.4$   | 22.6 $\hat{A}\pm 2.1$   | 22.9 $\hat{A}\pm 2.3$          |
| Receives Free Lunch                         | 54.1%                   | 56.7%                   | 57.8%                          |
| Special Education                           | 5.7%                    | 3.8%                    | 4.5%                           |
| Math SAT Scaled Score                       | 473.5 $\hat{A}\pm 51.1$ | 467.8 $\hat{A}\pm 48.5$ | 469.0 $\hat{A}\pm 46.8$        |
| Reading SAT Scaled Score                    | 431.4 $\hat{A}\pm 33.0$ | 425.3 $\hat{A}\pm 29.5$ | 427.3 $\hat{A}\pm 29.7$        |
| Listening SAT Scaled Score                  | 531.7 $\hat{A}\pm 34.7$ | 527.6 $\hat{A}\pm 35.3$ | 527.5 $\hat{A}\pm 33.2$        |
| Word Study Skills SAT Scaled Score          | 427.9 $\hat{A}\pm 35.7$ | 422.0 $\hat{A}\pm 33.9$ | 425.0 $\hat{A}\pm 32.8$        |

Note: some variables expressed as Mean  $\pm$  Standard Deviation

# Summary Stats - Students in Project STAR in K, continued into G1

|   | Small Class(N=1303)      | Regular Class(N=1425)    | Regular Class with Aide(N=1490) |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Experiment Characteristics</b>           |                          |                          |                                 |
| Number of Years in STAR                     | 3.5 $\hat{A} \pm 0.8$    | 3.5 $\hat{A} \pm 0.8$    | 3.5 $\hat{A} \pm 0.8$           |
| Number of Years in Small Classes            | 3.3 $\hat{A} \pm 1.0$    | 0.3 $\hat{A} \pm 0.8$    | 0.3 $\hat{A} \pm 0.7$           |
| <b>Kindergarten School Urbanicity</b>       |                          |                          |                                 |
| Inner City                                  | 18.5%                    | 18.0%                    | 20.3%                           |
| Suburban                                    | 21.0%                    | 17.1%                    | 19.7%                           |
| Rural                                       | 51.0%                    | 57.1%                    | 49.3%                           |
| Urban                                       | 9.4%                     | 7.8%                     | 10.7%                           |
| <b>Kindergarten Teacher Characteristics</b> |                          |                          |                                 |
| Female                                      | 100.0%                   | 100.0%                   | 100.0%                          |
| White                                       | 86.6%                    | 83.2%                    | 85.4%                           |
| Years of Experience                         | 9.0 $\hat{A} \pm 5.8$    | 9.1 $\hat{A} \pm 5.7$    | NA $\hat{A} \pm NA$             |
| Class Size                                  | 15.1 $\hat{A} \pm 1.5$   | 22.2 $\hat{A} \pm 2.2$   | 22.6 $\hat{A} \pm 2.3$          |
| Receives Free Lunch                         | 44.3%                    | 43.2%                    | 45.8%                           |
| Special Education                           | 3.1%                     | 2.8%                     | 2.2%                            |
| Math SAT Scaled Score                       | 497.1 $\hat{A} \pm 47.5$ | 489.8 $\hat{A} \pm 45.8$ | 488.4 $\hat{A} \pm 44.1$        |
| Reading SAT Scaled Score                    | 443.7 $\hat{A} \pm 31.6$ | 438.8 $\hat{A} \pm 30.7$ | 438.7 $\hat{A} \pm 31.7$        |
| Listening SAT Scaled Score                  | 542.9 $\hat{A} \pm 32.2$ | 541.6 $\hat{A} \pm 31.6$ | 538.9 $\hat{A} \pm 32.2$        |
| Word Study Skills SAT Scaled Score          | 441.7 $\hat{A} \pm 37.3$ | 436.2 $\hat{A} \pm 35.9$ | 436.3 $\hat{A} \pm 37.9$        |

Note: some variables expressed as Mean  $\pm$  Standard Deviation



# Research Question(s)

## Essential Question(s):

What was the nature of attrition in Project STAR? Secondly, if student ability was a significant factor in attrition, what are the peer effects from such attrition?


# Classifying Attrition

- There are many new papers on the long-run impacts of Project STAR
- As part of such papers, data has been collected on academic achievement of Project STAR students in grades 4 through 8
- Utilizing this data, it is possible to identify students who left the public school system during the experiment through matching

# Reproducibility

- Rohlfs and Zilora (2014) identify 5 types of attrition within Project STAR
  - ① Students who were in a Project STAR school at time  $t - 1$  but who's school left the experiment at time  $t$
  - ② Students who changed class type within a school
  - ③ Students who left to another Project STAR school
  - ④ Students who left to another public school
  - ⑤ Students who left the public school system
- I aim to reproduce Rohlfs and Zilora's results, specifically strengthening identification by utilizing testing records for both the 4th and 5th grade

# Attrition Chart



**Figure 2:** Status in third grade by initial class assignment in Project STAR, kindergarten entry cohort. Panel A: initially in small class, Panel B: initially in regular class, and Panel C: initially in regular class with aide

Notes: Students are counted as having left the public school system if they do not appear in Project STAR in third grade and TCAP scores are not available for them in 1990 (the year in which most students from the cohort were in fourth grade). Additional details in the text.

# Reproducibility

- Attrition types 1-4 are relatively easy to identify from the data; however, there are issues with type 5
- "Vanishing" may occur through a multitude of processes
  - ① Went to a private school
  - ② Death (likely small)
  - ③ Migration to a different state
  - ④ Not tested (absent, accommodations, etc.)
- Types 1,2,3 are hard to identify and type 4 is perhaps described in the literature

# Survival Analysis

- 1 To quantify the effect of student ability on attrition, I use survival analysis
- 2 Here, evidence of attrition (falling into category 1, 4, or 5) is considered a "failure"
- 3 Utilizing  $T_{i,g,c,s}$  as the failure time (i.e. number of years a student stayed in the experiment until they left) for each student  $i$  in grade  $g$  in classroom  $c$  at school  $s$
- 4 To keep the model simple, I assume that attrition is constant across all years Project STAR took place (exponential hazards) and model survival time through an AFT model

# Survival Analysis - To Do

- 1 Need to analyze missingness in "flag" variables and across experiment
- 2 How do I differentiate between students who left permanently and those who left and re-entered
- 3 What denotes "high ability" (currently using 75th percentile)
- 4 Will touch on this more as we explore plots

# Survival Curve

Turn to R to display plots.



# Model

$$\log(T_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(TS_{i,g,c,s}) + \beta_2(CT_{i,g,c,s}) + \beta_3(X_{i,g,c,s}) + \epsilon_{i,g,c,s} \quad (1)$$

- $TS_{i,g,c,s}$  is the test score for student  $i$  in grade  $g$  in classroom  $c$  in school  $s$
- $CT_{i,g,c,s}$  is a categorical variable for the class type student  $i$  was enrolled in upon entry to the experiment (e.g. small, regular-sized, or regular sized with teachers aide)
- $X_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is a vector of controls for each student including observable student, teacher, and school data

# Mock Logit Model

Turn to R to see mock model

# Interpretability of Survival Model

- If  $\beta_1 = 1$ , then  $\exp(\beta_1) \approx 2.718$ . Holding all other variables constant, an individual with  $TS_{i,g,c,s}$  one unit greater than another is expected to stay in the Project STAR experiment 2.718 times longer than the other. In other words, the probability this individual "survived" to time  $2.718t$  is the same as the probability that another individual has "survived" to time  $t$
- Perhaps this is better modeled through a logistic regression for exit in year  $t$  for  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  (avoids the need to assume constant attrition and allows the relationship between treatment and exit to vary freely with  $t$ )

# Model

$$\begin{aligned}
 TS_{i,g,c,t,s} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(L_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_2(A_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_3(\overline{CA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) \\
 & + \beta_4(\overline{PA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_5(X_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_6(CT_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) \\
 & + \beta_7(\overline{PA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s} \times L_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \alpha_s + \gamma_{t-1} + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

- $TS_{i,g,c,t,s}$  is the test score for student  $i$  in grade  $g$  in classroom  $c$  in school  $s$  at time  $t$
- $L_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is the proportion of students in student  $i$ 's class that left the experiment at time  $t - 1$
- $A_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is student  $i$ 's ability, measured by their test score in time  $t - 1$
- $\overline{CA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is classmate ability for student  $i$ . That is, the average test score of the students in student  $i$ 's class (not including student  $i$ ) that don't leave the experiment, measured by their test score in time  $t - 1$
- $\overline{PA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is the departed peer ability for student  $i$ . That is, the average test score of the students in student  $i$ 's class that left the experiment in  $t - 1$
- $X_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is a vector of controls for each student including observable student, teacher, and school data
- $CT_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is a categorical variable for the class type student  $i$  was enrolled in during time  $t - 1$
- $\alpha_s$  is a school fixed effect,  $\gamma_{t-1}$  is a year fixed effect

# Identifying Private School Students

- To identify students who left for private schools, I aim fit a variation of the k-means clustering algorithm (k=?)
- Allows me to separate students into groups that "look" alike thus allowing me to make assumptions about which students went to private school without the data needed to classify these students as private school students
- I use the Mahalanobis distance in clustering to account for covariances between clusters

$$D_m(\vec{v}_i, \vec{v}_j) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p (\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j)^T \Sigma^{-1} (\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j)} , \forall i \neq j$$

# Regression for Private School Attrition

$$\begin{aligned}
 TS_{i,g,c,t,s} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(L_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_2(A_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_3(\overline{CA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) \\
 & + \beta_4(\overline{\delta}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_5(\overline{PA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_6(X_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) \\
 & + \beta_7(CT_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \beta_8(\overline{PA}_{i,g,c,t-1,s} \times L_{i,g,c,t-1,s}) + \alpha_s + \gamma_{t-1} + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

- Not much has changed from previous equation, here  $\overline{\delta}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  is the cluster peer ability for student  $i$ . That is, the average test score of the students in student  $i$ 's class that left the experiment and the public school system in  $t - 1$  who, through clustering, I treat as having left for private schools
- Ideally, I would sensitize the k-means to different selections of controls, seeing how the coefficient on  $\overline{\delta}_{i,g,c,t-1,s}$  varies based on assumptions I introduce (a variation of what is described in Emily Oster's 2016 paper: *Unobservable Selection and Coefficient Stability: Theory and Evidence*)