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Project Overview

- Professor Nagle collected data over past 4 years.
- There have been changes made to Education Department curriculum, he want to know which changes are working best by comparing cohorts.
- He asked a total of 10 questions which graduating students answered on a scale from 1–5, 1 being “No Knowledge" and 5 being “Expert Knowledge".
- He also asked them qualitative questions, which he has been analyzing this semester.
- The education department is working towards increasing the knowledge of their students in terms of English Language Learners, or ELLs (People with English as a second language).
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Introduction to Data

- **5 Cohorts**: Elementary, Secondary, Graduate Elementary, Graduate Secondary, and Graduate ESL
- **Academic years**: 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12
- **Responses**: No Knowledge, Low Knowledge, Adequate Knowledge, High Knowledge and Expert Knowledge
- **10 Questions**: each is a statement and the response is the level of knowledge the graduating student feels they have on the topic in the given statement
Logistic Regression Model

Binary Response \( Y \):
- \( Y = 1 \) if success, \( Y = 0 \) if failure
- \( P(Y = 1) = \pi \)

Logistic CDF:

\[
P(X \leq x) = \frac{e^{(x-\mu)/\tau}}{1 + e^{(x-\mu)/\tau}}, \quad -\infty < x < \infty
\]

Logit (log-odds link) and Logistic Regression

\[
\pi_i = \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta x_i}}{1 + e^{\alpha + \beta x_i}} \quad \log \left( \frac{\pi_i}{1 - \pi_i} \right) = \alpha + \beta x_i
\]

The odds of success increase by \( e^\beta \) for every 1 unit increase in \( x \).
Logistic Regression Model

- This model only works for a binary response.
Logistic Regression Model

- This model only works for a binary response.

- For the Education data, there are 5 categories in the response.
Logistic Regression Model

- This model only works for a binary response.

- For the Education data, there are 5 categories in the response.

- The 5 categories have a natural ordering.
Logistic Regression Model

- This model only works for a binary response.

- For the Education data, there are 5 categories in the response.

- The 5 categories have a natural ordering.

Solution?
Ordinal Logistic Regression

- Used this model because the response has a natural ordering to it from "No Knowledge" to "Expert Knowledge"
Ordinal Logistic Regression

- Used this model because the response has a natural ordering to it from “No Knowledge" to “Expert Knowledge"

- Most common Ordinal Logistic Regression is proportional odds.
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- **Assumption**: A variable’s effect (Academic Year, Cohort) on the odds of response (Score) below the $j$-th category is the same for all value of $j$. Necessary to combine Cohorts and Scores in order to meet assumptions. The model in R not only produces odds, but it can also produce predicted probabilities for the response, given specific values of the cohort and academic year. Because it is easier to make interpretations from probabilities, that is the main outcome that will be presented.
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- **Assumption**: A variable’s effect (Academic Year, Cohort) on the odds of response (Score) below the $j$-th category is the same for all value of $j$.

- Necessary to combine Cohorts and Scores in order to meet assumptions.

- The model in R not only produces odds, but it can also produce predicted probabilities for the response, given specific values of the cohort and academic year. Because it is easier to make interpretations from probabilities, that is the main outcome that will be presented.
Proportional Odds

How does the assumption of proportional odds work?

\[ L_j(x_1) - L_j(x_2) = \log \left( \frac{P(y \leq j|x_1)}{P(y > j|x_1)} \right) - \log \left( \frac{P(y \leq j|x_2)}{P(y > j|x_2)} \right) \]

\[ = \alpha + \beta' x_1 - \alpha - \beta' x_2 \]

\[ = \beta' (x_1 - x_2), \]

where \( \alpha \) is the intercept and \( \beta' \) are the coefficients for the independent variables.

As I move from Cohort to Cohort, I would expect the odds to be about the same, so if they line up I can make the assumption which allows me to use the ordinal logistic regression.
Proportional Odds
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Results

- In order to meet the assumptions of the ordinal logistic regression, I had to collapse most of the categories of the response, and one of the explanatory variables.

- I combined all the graduate programs together into one Cohort called “Graduate”, and all the undergraduate programs together into one Cohort called “Undergraduate”.

- I combined the “No Knowledge” and “Low Knowledge” to make one group, and I combined the “High Knowledge” and “Expert Knowledge” into another group.

- In the end, my data had the Cohorts “Graduate” and “Undergraduate” and were being rated on a scale of 1–3, 1 being “No to Low Knowledge”, 2 being “Adequate Knowledge”, and 3 being “High to Expert Knowledge”.

Question #1

- WIDA Standards that define appropriate and sufficient objectives for ELLs

- WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design Assessment) has teaching standard that are used to better teach ELLs – they have a “Can Do" vision which focuses on what each individual student can do opposed to what they should try to improve
Question #1: Results

Estimated Predicted Probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>No to Low Knowledge</th>
<th>Adequate Knowledge</th>
<th>High to Expert Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all questions showed similar improvement from 2008-09 to 2011-12

- **Question #2:** The mechanism and process of how ELLs acquire and learn English as a second language for academic purposes
- **Question #4:** The primary schooling practices in the country of the origin of the ELLs enrolled in my classroom
- **Question #6:** The pedagogy to teach language forms, mechanics, and uses
- **Question #7:** Practices and strategies for reinforcing and refining ESL instruction objectives or standards-based content classroom
- **Question #8:** Local community organizations that support ELL families in my school
- **Question #9:** Recent research and theory concerning instruction of English as a second language
- **Question #10:** Vermont policy and laws concerning instruction of linguistically and culturally diverse students
Other Questions: Results

The exceptions:

- **Question #3**: The language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies of ELLs in my classroom

- **Question #5**: The connection between language, culture, and identity
Question #3: Results

Estimated Predicted Probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>No to Low Knowledge</th>
<th>Adequate Knowledge</th>
<th>High to Expert Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>2008-09 0.38</td>
<td>2008-09 0.36</td>
<td>2008-09 0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12 0.49</td>
<td>2011-12 0.33</td>
<td>2011-12 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2008-09 0.29</td>
<td>2008-09 0.36</td>
<td>2008-09 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12 0.38</td>
<td>2011-12 0.36</td>
<td>2011-12 0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #5: Results

Estimated Predicted Probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>No to Low Knowledge</th>
<th>Adequate Knowledge</th>
<th>High to Expert Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Almost all of the questions showed improvement from 2008-09 to 2011-12

- The exceptions were Question #3 (about language backgrounds in the classroom) and Question #5 (about the connection between language, culture, and identity in the classroom)
Future Work

- In the future, I would like to use the proportional odds results I have already obtained to look at residuals for diagnostic purposes.
- Analyze these data using multinomial logistic regression – no proportional odds assumption to worry about. Downside is that it does not use the natural ordering like ordinal logistic regression does.
- Investigate what changes in a particular curriculum actually work.