

Teacher-assigned report card grades and standardized test scores in young children: Do results align?

Theresa Pham, Daniel Ansari, Marc Joanisse, Janis Cardy, & Lisa M.D. Archibald, The University of Western Ontario



Introduction-----

- Measures of achievement include:
 - Teacher-assigned report card marks:** Criticized to be subjective and unreliable, but serve as the main communication of academic success to students and parents
 - Standardized measures:** Said to be objective and reliable given uniform of testing protocols
- The relationship between marks and standardized tests is moderate^{1, 2}, correlation of .40-.60, for children in grades 3-6 and high school students. No research in younger children
- Girls are said to earn higher grades than boys, but boys score higher on standardized tests than girls³

- Research Questions:**
- How correlated are report card marks and standardized scores in grades 1 and 2?
 - Does the relationship depend on the domain, gender, and school?

Methods-----

Participants: 218 participants in grade one (5-6-years-old), of which 124 were re-tested in grade two (6-7-years-old).

- Procedure:**
- Report Card Marks: Letter grades were obtained and converted to a numeric 12-point scale, with 1 = D- (lowest) and 12 = A+ (highest)
- Confirmatory factor analysis identified three domains as the best fit:
Grade 1 fit: CFI = .88; TLI = .86; RMSEA = .14; SRMR = .052
Grade 2 fit: CFI = .98; TLI = .97; RMSEA = .090; SRMR = .030
 - Language (Oral Communication, Media Literacy)
 - Literacy (Reading, Writing)
 - Math (all strands of Mathematics)

- Woodcock-Johnson III (WJ III):** Standard scores were used for analysis
- Confirmatory factor analysis identified three domains as the best fit:
Grade 1 fit: CFI = .99; TLI = .99; RMSEA = .044; SRMR = .030
Grade 2: CFI = .96; TLI = .92; AIC = 6793.128; RMSEA = .11; SRMR = .051
 - Language (Story Recall, Understanding Directions)
 - Literacy (Reading Fluency, Letter-Word Identification, Passage Comprehension),
 - Math (Calculation, Math Fluency, Applied Problems)

Analysis: A z-score was created to compare grades and scores. Spearman’s rho correlations reported, and analysis based on Bayesian statistics

Results-----

- Grade 1

Grade 2
- Correlations among Domains (Table 1)
- Intradomain correlations were higher for Math and Literacy than Language
 - Interdomain correlations were also high. In fact, Language marks correlated higher with WJ III Literacy and Math than Language
- Grade vs. Test Scores across Domains (Table 2, Mean columns)
- Language: WJ III (test score = 104) > marks (grade = 7.76 or B) by .24 points, $BF_{10} > 100$
 - Literacy: Marks (grade = 7.68 or B) > WJ III (test score = 96) by .25 points, $BF_{10} = 41$
 - Language : WJ III (test score = 104) > marks (grade = 8.11 or B) by .30 points, $BF_{10} = 29$
- Gender Differences (Table 2, Gender columns)
- No between gender differences
 - Girls: Literacy marks (7.78 or B) > WJ III (94), $BF_{10} > 100$
 - Boys: Language WJ III (104) > marks (7.20 or B-), $BF_{10} > 100$
 - Girls: Math marks (8.04 or B) > WJ III (95), $BF_{10} = 9$
 - Boys: Language WJ III (103) > marks (7.93 or B), $BF_{10} = 3$
- School Differences
- Marks differed by school, but WJ III did not
 - No school differences

Table 1. Correlations (Spearman’s rho) among domains. Intradomain (similar domains) correlations are highlighted

	WJ III		
	Language	Literacy	Math
Grade 1			
Language	.44	.52	.50
Literacy	.37	.72	.53
Math	.48	.65	.65
Grade 2			
Language	.36	.52	.44
Literacy	.35	.67	.50
Math	.46	.64	.64

Table 2. Summary statistics reported as z-scores (SD) of report card marks and WJ III

	WJ III			Report card		
	Girls	Boys	Mean	Girls	Boys	Mean
Grade 1						
Language	0.22 (0.85)	0.28 (0.77)	0.26 (.81)	0.092 (0.79)	-0.062 (0.73)	0.015 (0.75)
Literacy	-0.41 (1.40)	-0.22 (1.44)	-0.28 (1.41)	0.039 (0.80)	0.40 (0.77)	-0.026 (0.78)
Math	-0.13 (0.95)	0.15 (0.90)	0.033 (.93)	0.0015 (0.76)	-0.018 (0.69)	-0.0046 (0.71)
Grade 2						
Language	0.29 (0.82)	0.19 (0.91)	0.25 (0.87)	0.052 (0.90)	-0.15 (0.78)	-0.046 (0.083)
Literacy	-0.15 (0.93)	-0.016 (0.85)	-0.060 (0.88)	0.059 (0.86)	-0.16 (0.87)	-0.050 (0.87)
Math	-0.36 (0.84)	-0.075 (0.83)	-0.20 (0.84)	-0.082 (0.85)	-0.084 (0.75)	-0.080 (1.98)

Conclusion-----

- Overlap between report cards and standardized tests, explained 15-52% of the variance, aligning with prior work^{1, 2}
- Domain differences:
 - Intradomain correlations higher for Literacy and Math than Language
 - Discrepancies found in verbal subjects (Language and Literacy), with differences minimized for Literacy by grade 2
- Within* gender differences: Female advantage in report card marks; male advantage on standardized tests, consistent with prior work³
- School differences: Differences were minimized by grade 2

Clinical Implications

- Teacher-assigned grades could be a more **valid measure** of student achievement for **literacy and math** than previously suggested, at least in young children. Evidence for language was less convincing

References

- Bowers, A. J. (in press). Report card grades and educational outcomes. In S. M. Brookhart & T. R. Guskey (Eds.), What do we know about grading? Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Ross, J. & Kostuch, L. (2011). Consistency of report card grades and external assessments in a Canadian province. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 23(2), 159–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-011-9117-3>
- Duckworth, A. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Self-Discipline Gives Girls the Edge: Gender in Self-Discipline, Grades, and Achievement Test Scores. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98(1), 198–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.198>



Disclosure Statement: All authors, no conflict of interest

Presented at SRCLD, June 2023