





# Advantages of Linked Administrative and Survey Data Examples from Educational Research

LSE/NATCEN Conference, London School of Economics, 24 April 2009

**Lorraine Dearden** 

**Director ADMIN** 

Institute of Education

Email: I.dearden@ioe.ac.uk







### Introduction

- New linked admin/longitudinal data has potential to:
  - Get a better understanding of the implications of missing covariates in administrative (and possible survey data)
  - Get a better understanding of implications of attrition and non-response in survey data
  - Allow us to understand the implications and extent or recall bias in surveys.....
  - Reduce the costs of longitudinal survey data







# Illustrations from Educational Data linkage

- Already been extensive linkage of educational longitudinal survey data
  - MCS, ALSPAC, "Next Steps"
- This linkage has already started to be exploited
- But I think, from those concerned with methodological issues in empirical social research it has the potential to offer a lot more







# Why?

- These are longitudinal panel data following children and families over time therefore shares all the advantages of longitudinal data that we are all familiar with
- BUT it is its linking to well established administrative education data which I think opens up a whole range of possibilities in advancing applied social research







#### Focus of this talk

- Concentrate on one of these data sets Next Steps
- Follows a cohort of English children born in 1989/90 and has interviewed them and every year since they were 13/14 years old as well as their parents
- Sample originally drawn from National Pupil Database (NPD)







### **Next Steps link to NPD**

- All individuals who participated in 'Next Steps' agreed to have their survey records linked to the NPD if in State Sector
- Means that alongside 'Next Steps' we have an administrative panel data set that covers every child in the state schooling system who are in the same school cohort
  - We know who the kids are in the NPD who are in Next Steps and we know who was invited to join Next steps but refused, later dropped out etc







# Why is this exciting?

- NPD is increasingly being used to examine school policy and effectiveness but it is not clear how well it can do this as lacks detailed family background
- Using 'Next Steps' we can assess how best to use administrative data to look at important and topical issues rather than just hoping that appropriate proxies are sufficient
  - E.g. Contextualised Valued Added debate how close is it really getting to measure what schools add?
  - Understanding sources of Ethnic inequalities in child outcomes
  - Does FSM really capture socio-economic status?







## **Panel Attrition and Missing Data**

- Possibility of new ways of dealing with perennial problems associated with Longitudinal data
  - We know exactly how well children who drop out of Next Steps perform at school as we can follow them in the administrative data
- Admin data may be used to fill in gaps in survey data and vice versa







# **Examples of what we can do with 'Next Steps'**

- Measuring socio-economic disadvantage are typical proxies in admin data good enough?
- Do School League tables (based on admin data) really do what they say on the tin?
- What is the best method for dealing with attrition and non-response in survey data?

• .........







# Can educational admin data proxy social disadvantage?

- Huge debate about how good proxies in school administrative data are for social disadvantage
- Have good ethnicity measures, fsm status, but no information on parents employment, education or income/wealth
- Generally use postcode/local area information and/or FSM to proxy these missing covariates
- But how do they perform?
- Can assess this using NPD







### Is FSM a good proxy of disadvantage?

- Construct a measure of socio-economic position using data on income, and occupation of parents
- This is what FSM should capture as only eligible if on benefits







# OK but not great.....

| Quintile of SEP | Not on FSM (%) | On FSM (%) |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| 1 (Bottom)      | 9.78           | 10.21      |
| 2               | 17.32          | 2.66       |
| 3               | 19.39          | 0.61       |
| 4               | 19.70          | 0.31       |
| 5 (Top)         | 19.96          | 0.05       |
| TOTAL           | 86.16          | 13.84      |







### **Ethnic Inequality in Child Outcomes**

- Most of the evidence on ethnic inequality in child outcomes is based on administrative data
  - Sample sizes in most surveys too small to look at this issue properly
- Next Steps (and MCS) provide us with guidelines as to how to best use administrative data for all cohorts of children, to look at this important issue
- Can we proxy background characteristics just using admin data controls?







### **KS3** Results for Pakistani Males

| I |        | No       | NPD      | 'Next    | NPD +    |
|---|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ı |        | Controls | Controls | Steps'   | 'Next    |
| ı |        |          |          | Controls | Steps'   |
| l |        |          |          |          | Controls |
| I | NPD    | -0.314   | -0.222   |          |          |
| ı | sample | (0.019)  | (0.018)  |          |          |
| ı |        |          |          |          |          |
| 1 | LSYPE  | -0.356   | -0.265   | -0.129   | -0.111   |
| 1 | sample | (0.068)  | (0.070)  | (0.068)  | (0.069)  |

NB: Results show differences in standardized score outcomes







### Not if interested in Ethnic Inequality

- Why?
- Things like mother's education differ hugely by ethnicity and typical proxies (area based census measures) can't capture this
  - Could get census runs to overcome this potentially (education by ethnicity)
  - Could use other surveys to proxy this but not typically done
  - New linked survey data will allow us to come up with better proxies







## **School League Tables**

- Contextualized value added is the flavour of the month
- Recognised the fact that traditional league tables did not take into account differences in prior academic achievement or socio-economic background
  - Hugely disadvantaged schools in poor areas even if adding a huge amount of value to the child's education
- CVA seen as solution to this







#### But....

- Can only control for variables in data
- What we see in Next Steps, however, is that things like home tutoring, time spent with child doing homework etc has significant impact on child outcomes
- Can't control for this in Admin data so where it happens, school rather than parents get credit for this
- Implications for school league tables
  - Depends crucially whether this behaviour is a supplement or complement to the job being done by the school
- With Next Steps can come up with methods to limit these types of biases in CVA measures







### **Conclusions**

- More and more survey data sets are going to be linked to admin data and this has huge potential
- Demonstrated some of the areas this should impact on in the education field – but easily transferable to other areas of social policy...