



Department
for Education

Phonics screening check evaluation - Technical Appendices

Research report

May 2014

**National Foundation for Educational
Research**

Contents

List of tables	3
Appendix A: Multilevel Modelling	11
Appendix B: Literacy coordinator questionnaire	21
Appendix C: Year 1 Teacher questionnaire	55

List of tables

Table A1: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2012 cohort)	13
Table A2: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2013 cohort)	14
Table A3: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2012	15
Table A4: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2013	17
Table A5: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2013	19
Table B1: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire	21
Table B2: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire when ‘other role’ was indicated [filter question based on table B1]	21
Table B3: Q2.1 – The proportions of literacy coordinators who reported the following statements best characterised the approach to phonics within overall early literacy teaching in their school	22
Table B4: Q2.2 – The proportion of literacy coordinators reporting each of the ‘mainstream’ or ‘core’ published phonics programme was used to structure most or all phonics teaching in each year group	22
Table B5: Q2.3 – The proportion of literacy coordinators who reported making general changes to phonics teaching this school year, in light of their experience of the phonics screening check in 2012	23
Table B6: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 classes in response to the 2012 check [filter question based on table B5]	23
Table B7: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching across year groups in response to the 2012 check where ‘other changes’ were indicated [filter question based on table B6]	24
Table B7: Q3.1 – The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with each of statement	25
Table B8: Q4.1 – Literacy coordinators’ views on how well prepared teachers in their school are to provide effective phonics teaching	26
Table B9: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken local authority training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	26

Table B10: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken published phonics programme-linked training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	27
Table B11: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken training from some other provider specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	27
Table B12: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken some in-school workshop or training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	28
Table B13: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken individual reading / private study specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	28
Table B14: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had attended a staff meeting or planning meeting specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	29
Table B15: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken an ‘other’ learning activity specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013	29
Table B16: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken the ‘other’ learning activities below specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013 [filter question based on table B15]	30
Table B17: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 check	30
Table B18: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 check where ‘other teaching methods’ was indicated [filter question based on table B17]	31
Table B19: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers were reported to have used the results of the 2012 phonics screening check	32
Table B20: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers have used the results of the 2012 phonics screening check where ‘other ways’ was indicated [filter question based on table B19]	33
Table B21: Q5.3 – The type of support given to Year 2 pupils who were in each of the categories after the 2012 check	33

Table B22: Q5.4 – The time point at which the shown proportion of literacy coordinators felt that pupils, who had not previously done so, reached the required standard of the check	34
Table B23: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check	34
Table B24: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check where ‘other preparation’ was indicated [filter question based on table 62]	35
Table B25: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school	35
Table B26: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school where ‘other action’ was indicated [filter based on table B25]	36
Table B27: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 1 pupils	36
Table B28: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 1 pupils where ‘other evidence’ was indicated [filter question based on table B27]	37
Table B29: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 2 pupils	37
Table B30: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 2 pupils where ‘other evidence’ was indicated [filter question based on table B29]	38
Table B31: Q7.3 – The type of support literacy coordinators envisage pupils will receive if they were in each of the categories after the 2013 check	38
Table B32: Q8.1 – Details of the additional information provided to the parents / carers of current Year 2 pupils who did not meet the standard this year	39
Table B33: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on planning and preparation for the check	39
Table B34: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on the administration of the check	40
Table B35: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on training for the check	41

Table B36: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on reviewing the results of the check	42
Table B37: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on ‘other’ activities surrounding the check	43
Table B38: Q9.1 – ‘Other’ activities staff undertook in relation to the implementation of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators – ‘other’ activity given [filter question based on table B37]	44
Table B39: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to planning and preparation for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	44
Table B40: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to the administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	45
Table B41: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to training for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	45
Table B42: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to reviewing the results of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	46
Table B43: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to ‘other’ activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	46
Table B44: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in total in relation to all activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	47
Table B45: Q9.2 – Details of the mean additional cost in relation to each of the aspects of the introduction and administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	47
Table B46: A comparison between the statement: ‘ <i>A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words</i> ’ and the literacy coordinators’ reported approach to phonics teaching within their school	48
Table B47: The percent of literacy coordinators who reported the following statements best characterised the approach to phonics within overall early literacy teaching in their school in 2012 and 2013	48
Table B48: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching’ in 2012 and 2013	49
Table B49: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading’ in 2012 and 2013	49

Table B50: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement 'Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy' in 2012 and 2013	50
Table B51: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement 'A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words' in 2012 and 2013	50
Table B52: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement 'Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children' in 2012 and 2013	51
Table B53: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement 'The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers' in 2012 and 2013	51
Table B54: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement 'The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers' in 2012 and 2013	52
Table B55: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be reviewed by individual Year 1 teacher	52
Table B56: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed amongst Year 1 teachers	52
Table B57: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed between Year 1 teachers and literacy coordinators	53
Table B58: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used to identify children experiencing difficulties with phonics	53
Table B59: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used to create specific learning plans for children experiencing difficulties with phonics	53
Table B60: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed between Year 1 and Year 2 teachers	54
Table B61: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used in 'other' ways	54
Table B62: Following the phonics check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if information will be provided to parents / carers about the type of in-school support planned	54

Table B63: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if information will be provided to parents / carers about how they can support their child	54
Table C1: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check by individual teachers	55
Table C2: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did not meet the required standard [filter question included only those who responded that fewer pupils did not reach the standard than the total number who were assessed.]	55
Table C3: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did not meet the required standard, but who were expected to [filter question included only those who responded that fewer pupils were expected to reach the standard and did not than the total number who did not reach it.]	55
Table C4: Q2.1 - The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did meet the required standard [filter question based including only those who responded that fewer pupils did reach the standard than the number who were assessed.]	56
Table C5: Q2.1 - The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did meet the required standard, but who were expected not to [filter question including only those who responded that fewer pupils were expected not to reach the standard and did than the total number who did reach it.]	56
Table C6: Q2.2 – The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 1 pupils last year (2012)	56
Table C7: Q2.3 - The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 2 pupils this year (2013)	57
Table C8: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check	57
Table C9: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check when 'other change' was indicated [filter question based on table C8]	58
Table C10: Q2.5 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2013 phonics check gave new information	59
Table C11: Q2.6 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2013 phonics check gave useful information, in terms of planning teaching and learning	59

Table C12: Q2.7 – When thinking only of those pupils who did not have additional difficulties which may have affected their performance on the screening check, teacher’s views on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils	59
Table C13: Q2.8 – The proportions of teachers reporting they had a local authority monitoring visit during the week of the check	60
Table C14: Q2.9 – Teacher reports of how many check administrations were observed during the monitoring visit [filter question based on Table C13]	60
Table C15: Q2.10 – Where one or more observations were undertaken, teacher’s reports of how the check administration observations for the monitoring visit were chosen [filter question based on table C13]	60
Table C16: Q3.1 – How teachers made use of the ‘teacher practice sheet’ (available on the DfE website)	61
Table C17: Q3.1 – How teachers made use of the ‘teacher practice sheet’ (available on the DfE website) when ‘other use’ was indicated [filter question based on table C16]	61
Table C18: Q3.2 – Persons involved in the decision to / not to disapply pupils	62
Table C19: Q3.2 – Persons involved in the decision to / not to disapply pupils when ‘other person’ was indicated [filter question based on table C18]	62
Table C20: Q3.3 – When pupils were disapplied, teacher’s reasons for making the decision to disapply	63
Table C21: Q3.3 – When pupils were disapplied, teacher’s reasons for making the decision to disapply when ‘other reason’ was indicated [filter question based on table C20]	63
Table C22: Q3.4 - If applicable, what criterion teachers applied to make a judgement of a pupil having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence	64
Table C23: Q3.4 - If applicable, what criterion teachers applied to make a judgement of a pupil having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence when ‘other criterion’ was indicated [filter question based on table C22]	64
Table C24: Q4.1 – The proportion of teachers who reported they stopped the check early due to a pupil struggling	65
Table C25: Q4.2 – Teachers’ views on ease of judging when to stop the check early due to a pupil struggling [filter question based on table C24]	65
Table C26: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check	66

Table C27: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check when ‘other factor’ was indicated [filter question based on table C26] 66

Table C28: Teacher’s views in both 2012 and 2013 on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils 67

Appendix A: Multilevel Modelling

National pupil database (NPD)

DfE granted access to an anonymised NPD dataset on pupil outcomes for Key Stage 1 (KS1) teacher assessment and for the phonics screening check (PSC) for the academic year 2012/13. The dataset included prior attainment on the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) for both cohorts and the PSC 2012 outcomes for those pupils now at the end of KS1. It also supplied background characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and free school meals (FSM) eligibility. Pupils from responding schools in the evaluation sample were identified in the dataset. Tables A1 and A2 present the characteristics of these pupils against all pupils nationally for the 2012 and 2013 cohorts respectively.

Tables A1 and A2 show that both samples of responding schools have very similar background characteristics to England as a whole. The proportions of pupils with certain background characteristics in responding schools are generally within one percentage point of the national proportions.

Multilevel modelling

Multilevel modelling is a development of regression analysis which works by jointly examining the relationship between an outcome of interest and many potentially influential background characteristics including prior attainment. It has a number of distinct advantages over other estimation procedures. First, as with other regression analysis, it allows comparison on a like-with-like basis. It is important that any analysis technique used takes account of the differences in the circumstances in which different pupils and schools are situated.

The other major advantage of multilevel modelling, which is particularly important in the analysis of educational data, is that it takes account of the fact that there is often more similarity between individuals in the same school than between individuals in different schools. By recognising the hierarchical structure of the data, multilevel modelling allows the most accurate estimation of the statistical significance of any effects of the programme.

Three multilevel models were run with the outcome variables:

- Model 1: score on the PSC 2012 for pupils in Year 1 in 2012
- Model 2: KS1 points score 2013 for pupils in Year 2 in 2013
- Model 3: score on the PSC 2013 for pupils in Year 1.

Background variables included in the model were:

- Pupil characteristics: gender, age, ethnicity, special educational needs (SEN), English as an additional language (EAL)
- Pupil prior attainment: score on the Linking Sounds and Letters (LSL) scale (for Phonics outcome) and score on the Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) scales (for KS1 reading and writing) of the EYFSP
- Pupil-level indicators of socio-economic status: IDACI, FSM eligibility
- School characteristics: type, size, region, Key Stage 1 attainment band; proportion of pupils eligible for FSM; proportion of pupils with SEN; proportion of pupils with EAL
- Outcome of latent class analysis (see second interim evaluation report).

A multilevel model analysis takes into account all of these background factors then seeks out the significant differences that remain. That is, the statistical method measures the differences between different groups and controls for them in making the comparison. The resulting findings isolate the differences due to each individual factor, once all the other factors have been taken into account. The findings often illustrate significant differences between the background category named and the 'base case'. Tables A3, A4 and A5 list all the background variables in the model and describe the base case for each. They go on to list the coefficients of the model, with pseudo effect sizes¹ where these proved to be statistically significant.

¹ Pseudo effect size is a standardised measure of the size of effect a variable has on the outcome variable. Coefficients are divided by the standard deviation of the outcome variable and, if the variable is continuous, multiplied by the standard deviation of the independent variable and the square root of two. The effect size of a dichotomous independent variable is the coefficient divided by the outcome variable standard deviation.

Table A1: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2012 cohort)

		Responding sample			
		National		Number	%
		Number	%	Number	%
Phonics Screening Check outcome	Met the expected standard	22,526	58%	343,762	58%
	Not met expected standard	15,794	40%	237,767	40%
	Disapplied	511	1%	9,461	2%
	Absent	185	0%	2,419	0%
	Left	8	0%	202	0%
	Maladministration	0	0%	1	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	5	0%
	Total	39,024	100%	593,617	100%
Percentile Group of marks	Lowest quintile	7,631	20%	117,051	20%
	2nd lowest quintile	7,595	19%	111,880	19%
	Middle quintile	7,843	20%	119,616	20%
	2nd highest quintile	6,562	17%	99,908	17%
	Highest quintile	8,689	22%	133,079	22%
	Unknown	704	2%	12,083	2%
	Total	39,024	100%	593,617	100%
Key Stage 1 reading and writing	Below level 2c	5,707	15%	88,292	15%
	Level 2c or above	32,683	84%	495,486	83%
	Missing	634	2%	9,839	2%
	Total	39,024	100%	593,617	100%
Gender	Male	19,876	51%	303,944	51%
	Female	19,148	49%	289,673	49%
	Total	39,024	100%	593,617	100%
Eligible for Free School Meals Spring 2012	No	31,162	80%	471,513	80%
	Yes	7,645	20%	118,715	20%
	Total	38,807	100%	590,228	100%
English as an additional language Spring 2012	No	31,813	82%	485,197	82%
	Yes	7,031	18%	105,502	18%
	Total	38,844	100%	590,699	100%
SEN status Spring 2012	None	32,115	83%	490,989	83%
	School Action or Action Plus	6,162	16%	90,036	15%
	Statement	530	1%	9,203	2%
	Total	38,807	100%	590,228	100%
Ethnicity Spring 2012	White British or White Other	29,191	75%	445,364	75%
	Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	133	0%	2,064	0%
	Asian	4,451	11%	61,786	10%
	Black	1,985	5%	33,017	6%
	Mixed	1,961	5%	31,647	5%
	Chinese	151	0%	2,181	0%
	Other	670	2%	9,789	2%
	Unclassified/missing	482	1%	7,769	1%
Total	39,024	100%	593,617	100%	

Table A2: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2013 cohort)

		Responding sample			
		National			
		Number	%	Number	%
Phonics Screening Check outcome	Met the expected standard	18,518	69%	422,063	69%
	Not met expected standard	7,717	29%	174,640	29%
	Disapplied	393	1%	9,550	2%
	Absent	78	0%	2,019	0%
	Left	14	0%	249	0%
	Maladministration	0	0%	0	0%
	Unknown	0	0%	31	0%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
Percentile Group of marks	Lowest quintile	5,337	20%	122,802	20%
	2nd lowest quintile	5,998	22%	132,702	22%
	Middle quintile	5,288	20%	119,283	20%
	2nd highest quintile	4,195	16%	96,779	16%
	Highest quintile	5,417	20%	125,168	21%
	Unknown	485	2%	11,818	2%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
Gender	Male	13,752	51%	311,880	51%
	Female	12,968	49%	296,672	49%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
Eligible for Free School Meals Spring 2013	No	21,707	81%	489,133	80%
	Yes	5,013	19%	119,419	20%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
English as an additional language Spring 2013	No	21,882	82%	496,057	82%
	Yes	4,838	18%	112,495	18%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
SEN status Spring 2013	None	22,378	84%	512,389	84%
	School Action or Action Plus	3,981	15%	86,557	14%
	Statement	361	1%	9,606	2%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%
Ethnicity Spring 2013	White British or White Other	20,107	75%	455,737	75%
	Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	93	0%	2,167	0%
	Asian	3,032	11%	64,696	11%
	Black	1,329	5%	34,520	6%
	Mixed	1,463	5%	33,951	6%
	Chinese	105	0%	2,468	0%
	Other	375	1%	10,010	2%
	Unclassified/missing	216	1%	5,003	1%
	Total	26,720	100%	608,552	100%

Table A3: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2012

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	-0.07		
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.01		
Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	White	-3.37	Y	-0.33
Asian		1.17	Y	0.11
Black		0.85	Y	0.08
Mixed		0.75	Y	0.07
Chinese		0.76		
Other		0.97	Y	0.09
Unclassified or missing data on ethnicity		0.77		
Special education needs (SEN) statement		No special education needs	-5.40	Y
School action or action plus status	-4.39		Y	-0.43
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	1.28	Y	0.13
Score on the Linking sounds and letters scale of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Higher compared to lower	3.57	Y	0.83
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-1.11	Y	-0.11
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-1.01	Y	-0.02
School characteristics				
School type derived from latent class analysis				
Supporters of synthetic phonics and of the check	Supporters of mixed methods	1.07	Y	0.11
Supporters of synthetic phonics but not of the check		0.81	Y	0.08
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	-0.12		
Middle		0.25		
Academy		-0.01		
Year 1 cohort size				
Small	Large	0.76	Y	0.07
Medium		0.09		
Region				
North	South	0.70	Y	0.07
Midlands		0.15		

KS1 English performance band 2010				
Lowest 20% schools	Highest 20% schools	-0.26		
2nd lowest 20% schools		0.33		
Middle 20% schools		0.36		
2nd highest 20% schools		0.45		
School quintiles based on percentage pupils with FSM				
Low FSM quintile (8%- 20% pupils eligible for FSM)	Lowest FSM Quintile (less than or equal to 8% FSM children)	0.17		
Middle FSM quintile (21%- 35% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.42		
High FSM quintile (36%- 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		1.33	Y	0.13
High FSM quintile (More than 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.24		
School band based on percentage of pupils with statements (2009/10)				
Schools with no SEN statement pupils	Schools with 1 - 2% SEN statement children	-0.17		
Schools with 3 - 29% SEN statement children		-0.52		
Schools with 30% or more SEN statement children		-0.89		
School band based on percentage pupils with English as an additional language 2010/11				
Schools with no EAL children	Schools with 1 - 5% EAL children	0.22		
Schools with 6 - 49% EAL children		0.19		
Schools with 50% or more EAL children		0.31		

Table A4: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2013

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	0.27	Y	0.07
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.00		
Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	White	-0.76	Y	-0.21
Asian		0.33	Y	0.09
Black		0.29	Y	0.08
Mixed		0.28	Y	0.08
Chinese		0.88	Y	0.24
Other		0.24	Y	0.07
Unclassified or missing data on ethnicity		0.03		
Special education needs (SEN) statement		No special education needs	-1.73	Y
School action or action plus status	-1.01		Y	-0.27
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	0.37	Y	0.10
Score on the Communication, Language and Literacy scales of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Higher compared to lower	0.43	Y	0.43
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-0.47	Y	-0.13
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-0.61	Y	-0.04
School characteristics				
School type derived from latent class analysis				
Supporters of synthetic phonics and of the check	Supporters of mixed methods	0.04		
Supporters of synthetic phonics but not of the check		0.04		
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	0.60	Y	0.16
Middle		0.72		
Academy		0.21		
Year 1 cohort size				
Small	Large	0.01		
Medium		-0.02		
Region				
North	South	-0.18	Y	-0.05
Midlands		-0.11		

KS1 English performance band 2010				
Lowest 20% schools	Highest 20% schools	-0.11		
2nd lowest 20% schools		-0.05		
Middle 20% schools		-0.05		
2nd highest 20% schools		0.06		
School quintiles based on percentage pupils with FSM				
Low FSM quintile (8%- 20% pupils eligible for FSM)	Lowest FSM Quintile (less than or equal to 8% FSM children)	0.06		
Middle FSM quintile (21%- 35% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.08		
High FSM quintile (36%- 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.05		
High FSM quintile (More than 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		-0.13		
School band based on percentage of pupils with statements (2009/10)				
Schools with no SEN statement pupils	Schools with 1 - 2% SEN statement children	0.09		
Schools with 3 - 29% SEN statement children		0.10		
Schools with 30% or more SEN statement children		-1.32	Y	-0.36
School band based on percentage pupils with English as an additional language 2010/11				
Schools with no EAL children	Schools with 1 - 5% EAL children	-0.03		
Schools with 6 - 49% EAL children		-0.01		
Schools with 50% or more EAL children		0.11		

Table A5: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2013

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	-0.14		
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.04	Y	0.02
Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	White	-1.32		
Asian		0.87	Y	0.09
Black		1.15	Y	0.12
Mixed		0.31		
Chinese		1.41		
Other		1.38	Y	0.15
Unclassified or missing data on ethnicity		0.89		
Special education needs (SEN) statement		No special education needs	-5.12	Y
School action or action plus status	-3.91		Y	-0.42
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	1.31	Y	0.14
Score on the Linking sounds and letters scale of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Higher compared to lower	3.49	Y	0.85
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-0.74	Y	-0.08
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-1.08	Y	-0.03
<u>School characteristics</u>				
School type derived from latent class analysis				
Supporters of synthetic phonics and of the check	Supporters of mixed methods	0.82	Y	0.09
Supporters of synthetic phonics but not of the check		0.45		
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	-0.29		
Middle		1.60		
Academy		0.31		
Year 1 cohort size				
Small	Large	0.70		
Medium		0.62	Y	0.07
Region				
North	South	0.47		
Midlands		0.00		

KS1 English performance band 2010				
Lowest 20% schools	Highest 20% schools	-0.33		
2nd lowest 20% schools		-0.06		
Middle 20% schools		0.03		
2nd highest 20% schools		0.17		
School quintiles based on percentage pupils with FSM				
Low FSM quintile (8%- 20% pupils eligible for FSM)	Lowest FSM Quintile (less than or equal to 8% FSM children)	0.14		
Middle FSM quintile (21%- 35% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.17		
High FSM quintile (36%- 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.80		
High FSM quintile (More than 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.88		
School band based on percentage of pupils with statements (2009/10)				
Schools with no SEN statement pupils	Schools with 1 - 2% SEN statement children	-0.01		
Schools with 3 - 29% SEN statement children		-0.06		
Schools with 30% or more SEN statement children		-4.49	Y	-0.49
School band based on percentage pupils with English as an additional language 2010/11				
Schools with no EAL children	Schools with 1 - 5% EAL children	-0.48		
Schools with 6 - 49% EAL children		-0.41		
Schools with 50% or more EAL children		0.65		

Appendix B: Literacy coordinator questionnaire

About you

Table B1: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire

	%
Literacy coordinator	68
Key stage / year group coordinator	25
Other senior leader	20
Headteacher	18
Other role	7
None ticked	2
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B2: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire when ‘other role’ was indicated [filter question based on table B1]

	%
Deputy head/ assistant head	15
Phonics leader/coordinator/specialist	18
SENCO	10
Year 1 teacher	30
Year 2 teacher	13
Assessment leader	3
Literacy Advanced Skills Teacher	3
No response	8
Other irrelevant or uncodable	5
N=40	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B3: Q2.1 – The proportions of literacy coordinators who reported the following statements best characterised the approach to phonics within overall early literacy teaching in their school

	%
Systematic synthetic phonics is taught 'first and fast'	60
Phonics is taught discretely alongside other cueing strategies	21
Phonics is always integrated as one of a range of cueing strategies	7
Total	88
None ticked	12
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B4: Q2.2 – The proportion of literacy coordinators reporting each of the 'mainstream' or 'core' published phonics programme was used to structure most or all phonics teaching in each year group

	Letters and Sounds (%)	Jolly Phonics (%)	Read, Write, INC (%)	Other published programme (%)	No mainstream or core published programme (%)
Reception	73	37	19	11	2
Year 1	76	18	19	12	2
Year 2	73	11	20	14	2
Year 3	41	3	16	12	6
Year 4 upwards	28	2	14	12	9
None ticked	24	62	76	79	90
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B5: Q2.3 – The proportion of literacy coordinators who reported making general changes to phonics teaching this school year, in light of their experience of the phonics screening check in 2012

	%
Yes, changes to teaching in Reception	34
Yes, changes to teaching in Year 1	52
Yes, changes to teaching in Year 2	40
No	44
None ticked	1
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B6: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 classes in response to the 2012 check [filter question based on table B5]

	Reception (%)	Year 1 (%)	Year 2 (%)
Adopted a new mainstream phonics programme	25	16	20
Started to use phonics programme more systematically	42	32	33
Increased the time devoted to phonics teaching	42	41	42
Increased the frequency of phonics teaching	27	25	28
Increased the number or length of discrete phonics sessions	18	17	18
Changed to teaching phonics 'first and fast'	18	12	13
Increased assessment of progress in phonics	45	47	48
Started to teach pseudo words	52	63	58
Introduced grouping / setting for phonics	41	35	43
Other	5	9	10
None ticked	5	4	3
	N=197	N=300	N=234

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B7: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching across year groups in response to the 2012 check where ‘other changes’ were indicated [filter question based on table B6]

	%
Support groups/intervention groups	35
More focus on digraphs	6
Pushed the children on more	15
Changed format of phonics to be cross-key stages	15
Greater emphasis on word reading	9
Extra guidance for parents/carers	6
Now only teachers are teaching phonics	6
More individualised phonics teaching	6
Greater focus on teaching pseudo words	9
Staff have undergone training	9
Other relevant but vague	29
Other irrelevant or uncodable	27
N=34	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

3 - Your views about phonics

Table B7: Q3.1 – The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with each of statement

	Agree (%)	Agree somewhat (%)	Uncertain/mixed views (%)	Disagree somewhat (%)	Disagree (%)	No Response (%)
I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching	64	26	7	2	<1	2
Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading	66	24	6	2	1	2
Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy	11	22	15	28	22	2
A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words	66	24	5	2	2	1
Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children	6	18	19	28	28	2
The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers	10	19	22	20	29	<1
The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers	5	17	24	21	33	1
N=583						

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B8: Q4.1 – Literacy coordinators’ views on how well prepared teachers in their school are to provide effective phonics teaching

	%
Very well	75
Quite well	21
Partially or mixed	4
No response	<1
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B9: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken local authority training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	12	11	12	13
1	15	18	13	3
2	8	7	5	4
3	1	2	1	2
4	<1	<1		2
5 or more				5
No response	64	62	69	71
N=583				

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B10: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken published phonics programme-linked training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	12	12	12	11
1	9	8	8	2
2	6	7	6	1
3	3	2	1	2
4	1	1	1	2
5 or more	1	1	1	11
No response	69	70	72	71
N=583				

Table B11: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken training from some other provider specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	12	12	13	12
1	6	9	7	2
2	4	3	2	1
3	1	1	1	1
4	1		<1	1
5 or more		<1	<1	5
No response	77	75	77	79
N=583				

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B12: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken some in-school workshop or training specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	8	7	7	6
1	15	18	18	1
2	12	13	12	5
3	6	5	4	4
4	1	1	2	4
5 or more	<1	1	1	23
No response	58	55	56	57
N=583				

Table B13: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken individual reading / private study specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	8	7	8	10
1	11	15	12	2
2	5	6	5	2
3	2	2	1	1
4	<1	<1	1	2
5 or more	<1	1	<1	3
No response	74	70	74	81
N=583				

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B14: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had attended a staff meeting or planning meeting specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	5	5	6	8
1	19	20	22	3
2	17	20	17	2
3	7	5	4	3
4	1	1	1	5
5 or more	<1	1	1	16
No response	51	49	50	63
N=583				

Table B15: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken an ‘other’ learning activity specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support Staff (eg, TAs) (%)
0	5	5	6	5
1	1	1	1	<1
2	1	<1	<1	<1
3	<1	<1	<1	
4				
5 or more				<1
No response	94	94	94	95
N=583				

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B16: Q4.2 – The proportion of respondents who indicated the corresponding number of staff in each role had undertaken the ‘other’ learning activities below specifically focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2012-2013 [filter question based on table B15]

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)	Support staff (eg TAs) (%)
Phonics workshop for parents/carers	14	17	17	
Meeting/workshop to reflect on phonics teaching and discuss how to improve it	29	33	33	20
Additional support in class to deliver phonics	14	17		
Team teaching with literacy coordinator	14	17	17	20
No response	14	17	33	20
Other relevant but vague	14			
Other irrelevant or uncodable				40
	N=7	N=6	N=6	N=5

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B17: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 check

	%
Systematic synthetic phonics	36
Not applicable/I did not disapply any pupils from the 2012 check	56
Other	7
None ticked	5
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B18: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 check where ‘other teaching methods’ was indicated [filter question based on table B17]

	%
PAT (phonological awareness training)	2
Sight reading	7
Use British sign language (BSL)	5
Introduction of new phonics scheme	17
Introduction of discrete phonics teaching	2
Introduction of key words	2
EAL language support	2
Introduced small intervention groups tailored to needs of particular pupils	20
One to one support/tuition	7
Introduced sound discovery programme	2
No change - normal teaching	5
No response	71
Other relevant but vague	20
Other irrelevant or uncodable	37
N=41	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B19: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers were reported to have used the results of the 2012 phonics screening check

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)
To review/revise their phonics teaching plans in general	42	54	50
To review/revise teaching plans for individuals or groups	36	58	61
To inform discussions with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	26	41	42
To ask for more support/ more trained classroom support	11	20	19
To conduct diagnostic assessments in phonics	19	33	31
Other	3	5	4
None ticked	40	15	17
N=583			

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B20: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers have used the results of the 2012 phonics screening check where ‘other ways’ was indicated [filter question based on table B19]

	%
None/not used	29
Confirmation of own results	11
Deciding new resources	4
To group pupils	7
To help monitor pupil progress	4
To inform training for TAs	7
To provide feedback to governors	4
No response	57
Other relevant but vague	14
Other irrelevant or uncodable	64
	n=28

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table B21: Q5.3 – The type of support given to Year 2 pupils who were in each of the categories after the 2012 check

Children who last year...	Continued with systematic phonics teaching (%)	Intensive learning in small groups (%)	Extra one-to-one time with teacher/classroom support (%)	Diagnostic assessment in phonics (%)	Additional classroom support (%)	None ticked (%)
had difficulty completing section 1 of the check	72	66	47	25	45	15
could compete section 1, but had difficulties in section 2	73	61	31	22	37	13
scored close to, but under, the threshold	78	45	21	20	27	12

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B22: Q5.4 – The time point at which the shown proportion of literacy coordinators felt that pupils, who had not previously done so, reached the required standard of the check

	%
Autumn term 2012	8
Spring term 2013	55
Summer term 2013	25
Most pupils have still not reached the standard	7
No response	5
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B23: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check

	%
Externally provided training by local authority	24
Externally provided training by another provider	2
Individual familiarisation with the Check Administrators' Guide	89
Watching the online video: Scoring the phonics screening check training	69
Discussion with yourself	57
Year group or Key Stage meeting or other staff discussion	60
Other	3
None ticked	<1
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B24: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check where ‘other preparation’ was indicated [filter question based on table 62]

	%
Familiarising self with last year's check	13
Discussed at network meeting	7
Meeting with parents/carers	13
Reorganisation of class groups in Year 2 to re-focus support	7
Bought sample materials to help with familiarisation	7
Practiced with pupils using mock materials	7
Carried out own/individual research	13
No response	87
Other relevant but vague	13
Other irrelevant or uncodable	33
N=15	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table B25: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school

	%
Review of results by individual Year 1 teacher	74
Review of results by individual Year 2 teacher	70
Discussion amongst class teachers	74
Discussion between Year 1 and/ or Year 2 teacher(s) and Literacy Coordinator, Headteacher or other senior leader	82
Identification of pupils experiencing difficulties with phonics	78
Specific teaching plans for pupils experiencing difficulties with phonics	64
Discussion between Year 1 and Year 2 teachers	72
Discussion between Year 2 and Year 3 teachers	58
No action	3
Other	4
None ticked	1
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B26: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school where ‘other action’ was indicated [filter based on table B25]

	%
Check used with Year 3/4 pupils as a benchmark/minimum competency measure	4
Discussion with SENCO	8
A report is produced for the governing body	4
To justify recruitment of additional staff (teachers/TAs) to help teach phonics	4
No response	68
Other irrelevant or uncodable	112
N=25	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table B27: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 1 pupils

	%
The phonics screening check results	71
The results of other assessments	83
Teachers’ own records of progress	91
Discussion with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	67
Other	3
None ticked	1
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B28: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 1 pupils where ‘other evidence’ was indicated [filter question based on table B27]

	%
Discussion with senior leader	12
Assessment of local authority SEN team	6
Use of Phonics and Early Reading (PERA) test scores	6
None as all achieved the check	6
Discussion between relevant staff members	6
General classroom observations	6
Discussions with phonics leaders/teachers in other schools	6
No response	18
Other relevant but vague	18
Other irrelevant or uncodable	18
N=17	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B29: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 2 pupils

	%
The phonics screening check results	64
The results of other assessments	76
Teachers’ own records of progress	84
Discussion with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	63
Other	3
None ticked	9
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B30: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to Year 2 pupils where ‘other evidence’ was indicated [filter question based on table B29]

	%
No response	87
Other relevant but vague	7
Other irrelevant or uncodable	7
N=15	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B31: Q7.3 – The type of support literacy coordinators envisage pupils will receive if they were in each of the categories after the 2013 check

	had difficulty completing section 1 of the check (%)	could complete section 1, but had difficulty with section 2 (%)	scored close to, but under, the threshold score (%)
Continue with systematic phonics teaching	78	81	83
Intensive learning groups for small groups of children	76	72	45
Extra one on one time with teacher / classroom support	58	32	19
None ticked	8	7	9
N=583			

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B32: Q8.1 – Details of the additional information provided to the parents / carers of current Year 2 pupils who did not meet the standard this year

	%
Information about the type of in-school support planned	50
Information about how they can support their child	59
No extra information in addition to the results	29
None ticked	8
N=583	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B33: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators' estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on planning and preparation for the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	9	16	26	20	29
0.25	<1	<1			
0.50	3	3	1	2	1
1	28	21	4	12	6
1.5				<1	<1
2	15	10	5	8	2
3	6	3	1	3	<1
4	4	2	1	1	<1
5	3	2	1	2	
6	2	1	1	<1	<1
7	<1				
8	1	<1			
9	<1				
10	20	1	1	<1	
11 to 20	2	1	2	1	<1
21 or more	2	1	1	<1	
No response	23	38	57	52	63
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B34: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on the administration of the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	5	16	30	22	22
0.50	1	1	<1	1	1
1	9	11	2	9	16
1.5	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
2	7	8	1	4	5
2.5		<1			<1
3	8	8	1	2	1
4	6	3	<1	1	<1
4.5	<1				
5	5	3	1	1	<1
6	8	6	1	1	<1
6.5				<1	
7	2	1		<1	
8	6	1	<1	1	<1
9	2	1	<1		
10	5	2	1	<1	
11 to 20	12	1	2	4	
21 or more	3	<1	1	<1	
No response	22	38	60	53	54
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B35: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on training for the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	18	22	26	24	32
0.50	2	2		1	
1	19	14	5	7	1
2	11	8	4	5	1
3	7	4	2	2	<1
4	3	1	<1	1	
5	1	1	1	1	
6	3	2	1	1	
7	<1	<1		<1	
9	<1				
10	1	<1	1	<1	
11 to 20	1		<1	<1	
21 or more			<1		
No response	34	47	60	59	66
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B36: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators' estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on reviewing the results of the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	4	11	28	9	23
0.25	<1			<1	
0.50	4	5	1	2	2
1	40	30	6	25	10
1.5	<1				
2	17	11	2	13	3
3	5	2	<1	5	<1
4	2	<1		2	<1
5	1	1		2	
6	1	<1		<1	
7				<1	
8				<1	
10	<1	<1	<1	<1	
21 or more	<1	<1			
No response	26	41	63	42	62
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B37: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on ‘other’ activities surrounding the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	13	13	13	13	12
0.50	<1				<1
1	1	1	<1	1	4
2	1	<1		1	1
3			<1		
4	<1	<1	<1		
6	<1		<1		
7			<1		
8			<1		
10			<1		<1
11 to 20			<1	<1	
No response	85	85	85	86	82
N=583					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B38: Q9.1 – ‘Other’ activities staff undertook in relation to the implementation of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators – ‘other’ activity given [filter question based on table B37]

	%
Inputting data/amalgamating results, etc	10
Informing parents/carers	6
Literacy coordinator/phonics manager reviews results	1
No response	82
Other relevant but vague	1
Other irrelevant or uncodable	12
N=83	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give four answers to this question. All four answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table B39: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to planning and preparation for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	3	2	1	1	<1
Std. Error of Mean	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1	<0.1
Std. Deviation	9	9	7	3	1
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B40: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to the administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	6	2	1	1	<1
Std. Error of Mean	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	<0.1
Std. Deviation	8	5	5	4	1
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B41: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to training for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	1	1	1	<1	<1
Std. Error of Mean	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	<0.1
Std. Deviation	2	1	2	1	<1
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B42: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to reviewing the results of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	1	1	<1	1	<1
Std. Error of Mean	0.1	0.1	<0.1	0.1	<0.1
Std. Deviation	3	2	1	1	1
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B43: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to ‘other’ activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Std. Error of Mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Std. Deviation	<1	<1	1	1	1
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B44: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in total in relation to all activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	12	6	3	4	1
Std. Error of Mean	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.1
Median	8	3	0	1	0
Std. Deviation	15	12	12	6	2
N=518					

Note: all respondents in this table gave a response to at least one amount of additional time: missing data has been assumed to imply no additional time. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Table B45: Q9.2 – Details of the mean additional cost in relation to each of the aspects of the introduction and administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	General phonics resources	Phonics-check specific resources	General training on phonics	Specific training on the phonics screening check	External supply cover to attend general phonics training	External supply cover to attend training on the phonics screening check	External supply cover to administer the phonics screening check
Mean	623	40	228	15	55	26	186
Std. Error of Mean	70	13	40	3	7	4	15
Median	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Deviation	1517	292	865	60	155	91	324
N=472							

Note: all respondents in this table reported at least one of the costs: missing data has been assumed to imply no cost. Those respondents with missing responses for all parts of the question have been excluded from this analysis.

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

10 - Comparisons drawn within this year's survey

Table B46: A comparison between the statement: 'A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words' and the literacy coordinators' reported approach to phonics teaching within their school

	Agree	Agree somewhat	Uncertain or mixed views	Disagree somewhat	Disagree
Systematic synthetic phonics is taught 'first and fast'	59	29	8	3	2
Phonics is taught discretely alongside other cueing strategies	75	22	2	2	<1
Phonics is always integrated as one of a range of cueing strategies	90	10	<1	<1	<1
N=508					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

11 - Comparisons drawn between the 2012 and 2013 literacy coordinator's survey

Table B47: The percent of literacy coordinators who reported the following statements best characterised the approach to phonics within overall early literacy teaching in their school in 2012 and 2013

	Sample Year	
	2012	2013
Systematic synthetic phonics is taught 'first and fast'	53	60
Phonics is taught discretely alongside other cueing strategies	26	21
Phonics is always integrated as one of a range of cueing strategies	5	7
No response	17	12
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B48: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching’ in 2012 and 2013

	Sample Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	64	64
Agree somewhat	25	26
Uncertain or mixed views	6	7
Disagree somewhat	1	2
Disagree	1	<1
No response	2	2
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B49: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	63	66
Agree somewhat	23	24
Uncertain or mixed views	7	6
Disagree somewhat	4	2
Disagree	2	1
No response	2	2
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B50: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	12	11
Agree somewhat	24	22
Uncertain or mixed views	17	15
Disagree somewhat	23	28
Disagree	22	22
No response	3	2
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B51: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	67	66
Agree somewhat	22	24
Uncertain or mixed views	5	5
Disagree somewhat	2	2
Disagree	3	2
No response	1	1
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B52: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	7	6
Agree somewhat	19	18
Uncertain or mixed views	15	19
Disagree somewhat	26	28
Disagree	29	28
No response	3	2
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B53: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	8	10
Agree somewhat	18	19
Uncertain or mixed views	21	22
Disagree somewhat	20	20
Disagree	32	29
No response	1	<1
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B54: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers’ in 2012 and 2013

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Agree	4	5
Agree somewhat	12	17
Uncertain or mixed views	24	24
Disagree somewhat	22	21
Disagree	36	33
No response	1	1
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B55: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be reviewed by individual Year 1 teacher

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	81	74
Not ticked	19	26
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B56: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed amongst Year 1 teachers

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	54	74
Not ticked	46	26
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B57: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed between Year 1 teachers and literacy coordinators

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	88	82
Not ticked	12	18
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B58: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used to identify children experiencing difficulties with phonics

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	80	78
Not ticked	2	22
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B59: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used to create specific learning plans for children experiencing difficulties with phonics

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	61	64
Not ticked	39	37
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B60: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be discussed between Year 1 and Year 2 teachers

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	79	72
Not ticked	21	28
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B61: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if results will be used in 'other' ways

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	8	4
Not ticked	92	96
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B62: Following the phonics check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if information will be provided to parents / carers about the type of in-school support planned

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	61	50
Not ticked	39	50
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B63: Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators' reports in 2012 and 2013 of if information will be provided to parents / carers about how they can support their child

	Survey Year	
	2012	2013
Ticked	73	59
Not ticked	27	42
	N=844	N=583

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Appendix C: Year 1 Teacher questionnaire

1 The phonics screening check - general

Table C1: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check by individual teachers

Statistic	N
Mean	38.02
Median	30.00
Std. Deviation	24.995
No response	30
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C2: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did not meet the required standard [filter question included only those who responded that fewer pupils did not reach the standard than the total number who were assessed.]

Statistic	N
Mean	11.47
Median	8.00
Std. Deviation	10.661
No response	0
N=585	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C3: Q2.1 – The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did not meet the required standard, but who were expected to [filter question included only those who responded that fewer pupils were expected to reach the standard and did not than the total number who did not reach it.]

Statistic	N
Mean	3.17
Median	1.00
Std. Deviation	6.386
No response	0
N=501	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C4: Q2.1 - The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did meet the required standard [filter question based including only those who responded that fewer pupils did reach the standard than the number who were assessed.]

Statistic	N
Mean	26.52
Median	23.00
Std. Deviation	17.833
No response	0
N=581	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C5: Q2.1 - The total number of pupils assessed using the phonics screening check who did meet the required standard, but who were expected not to [filter question including only those who responded that fewer pupils were expected not to reach the standard and did than the total number who did reach it.]

Statistic	N
Mean	3.11
Median	1.00
Std. Deviation	5.941
No response	0
N=545	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C6: Q2.2 – The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 1 pupils last year (2012)

	%
Yes	73
No	26
No response	1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C7: Q2.3 - The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 2 pupils this year (2013)

	%
Yes	66
No	33
No response	1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C8: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check

	%
Made changes to phonics teaching in Year 1 in general	40
Started to teach pseudo-words	49
Carried out familiarisation / practice session(s) with pupils	46
Increased assessment of progress in phonics	30
No change to my practice	21
Other	11
None ticked	1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C9: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check when 'other change' was indicated [filter question based on table C8]

	%
Integrated phonics into more / other lessons	3
First year teaching Year 1 / new to the school / staff change	12
Pushed pupils further / moved at quicker pace	3
Taught parents/carers / sent support websites home / sent practice sheets home	9
Taught in sets / groups / streamed pupils	15
Created support groups out of school time	2
Started a new phonics programme	8
Devoted more time to teaching phonics	9
Made general changes throughout the school, e.g., in reception and Year 2	9
Increased time on pseudo words	8
Provided one-to-one tuition to target children	2
More emphasis on word reading	5
Changed order in which sounds are taught	2
Increased the amounts of phonics assessment	2
No response	3
Other relevant but vague	8
Other irrelevant or uncodable	2
N=65	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table C10: Q2.5 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2013 phonics check gave new information

	%
To a great extent	3
To some extent	24
To a small extent	38
Not at all	34
No response	<1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C11: Q2.6 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2013 phonics check gave useful information, in terms of planning teaching and learning

	%
To a great extent	5
To some extent	27
To a small extent	40
Not at all	28
No response	<1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C12: Q2.7 – When thinking only of those pupils who did not have additional difficulties which may have affected their performance on the screening check, teacher’s views on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils

	%
Much too easy	<1
Slightly too easy	1
It is about right	66
Slightly too difficult	27
Much too difficult	3
No response	3
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C13: Q2.8 – The proportions of teachers reporting they had a local authority monitoring visit during the week of the check

	%
Yes	11
No	89
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C14: Q2.9 – Teacher reports of how many check administrations were observed during the monitoring visit [filter question based on Table C13]

Statistic	N
Mean	2.02
Median	2.00
Std. Deviation	1.847
No response	4
N=68	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Table C15: Q2.10 – Where one or more observations were undertaken, teacher’s reports of how the check administration observations for the monitoring visit were chosen [filter question based on table C13]

	%
Discussion with Headteacher	10
Decided yourself	29
Discussion with other member(s) of staff	13
Not sure / don’t know	13
Other	16
None ticked	28
N=68	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

2 - Prior to the check

Table C16: Q3.1 – How teachers made use of the ‘teacher practice sheet’ (available on the DfE website)

	%
Making additional ‘practice sheets’ based on this format	24
Familiarised pupils with the check / layout close to the check administration	56
Throughout the year in preparatory work with pupils	27
Other	6
None ticked	25
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C17: Q3.1 – How teachers made use of the ‘teacher practice sheet’ (available on the DfE website) when ‘other use’ was indicated [filter question based on table C16]

	%
Used other practice sheets/materials instead	18
Not used it at all	28
Was given to parents/carers for home use/information	5
Used to practice pseudo words	8
Created own resources	13
Used to familiarise teacher with the check	5
No response	5
Other relevant but vague	5
Other irrelevant or uncodable	13
N=39	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C18: Q3.2 – Persons involved in the decision to / not to disapply pupils

	%
You	39
The Headteacher	36
The literacy coordinator	13
The child's parents/carers	8
Not applicable - no pupils were disapplied	55
Other	8
None ticked	2
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C19: Q3.2 – Persons involved in the decision to / not to disapply pupils when ‘other person’ was indicated [filter question based on table C18]

	%
Key Stage/year leader	36
One-to-one support workers or TAs	8
SENCO	36
Assistant/deputy head	14
Speech and language therapist	2
Line manager	2
Other Year 1 teacher	8
Phonics lead teacher/coordinator	4
Other Year 2 teachers	2
No response	74
Other relevant but vague	12
N=50	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table C20: Q3.3 – When pupils were disapplied, teacher’s reasons for making the decision to disapply

	%
They showed a lack of understanding of grapheme-phoneme correspondences	23
The pupil only uses British Sign Language (BSL) or other sign-supported communication to spell out individual letters	2
The pupil has selective mutism	2
The pupil does not speak sufficient English	11
Other	11
None ticked	65
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C21: Q3.3 – When pupils were disapplied, teacher’s reasons for making the decision to disapply when ‘other reason’ was indicated [filter question based on table C20]

	%
Severe speech and language issues	18
Not applicable	3
SEN (general 'SEN' or specific issue, e.g., autism, Down’s syndrome, etc)	68
Does not read phonetically	10
No response	94
Other relevant but vague	4
Other irrelevant or uncodable	1
N=71	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

Table C22: Q3.4 - If applicable, what criterion teachers applied to make a judgement of a pupil having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence

	%
The pupil had not yet developed letter sound recognition	12
The pupil had basic letter sound recognition, but was unable to blend at all	11
The pupil had basic letter sound recognition but was unable to fully blend	9
Other	1
No response	68
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C23: Q3.4 - If applicable, what criterion teachers applied to make a judgement of a pupil having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence when 'other criterion' was indicated [filter question based on table C22]

	%
It varied by pupil	17
Not applicable	33
SEN (general 'SEN' or specific issue, e.g., autism, Down's syndrome, etc)	50
N=6	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

3 General administration of the check

Table C24: Q4.1 – The proportion of teachers who reported they stopped the check early due to a pupil struggling

	%
Yes	46
No	53
No response	1
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C25: Q4.2 – Teachers' views on ease of judging when to stop the check early due to a pupil struggling [filter question based on table C24]

	%
Very hard	0
Quite hard	2
Mixed	9
Quite easy	40
Very easy	44
No response	4
N=287	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table C26: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check

	%
If the pupil was beginning to struggle or got several words in a row incorrect	46
If the pupil was becoming tired or distracted	46
If the pupil was taking a long time	13
If it became obvious the pupil was not going to reach the threshold	37
If the pupil started to become distressed	79
Other	2
None ticked	3
N=625	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table C27: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check when ‘other factor’ was indicated [filter question based on table C26]

	%
If prior knowledge /assessment made it clear they would not reach the threshold	13
Fear of distressing the pupil	7
Pupil could not blend	7
If pupil failed part one of the check	20
The was aware they were not doing well and refused to continue	7
Other relevant but vague	7
Other irrelevant or uncodable	27
N=15	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2013

More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Each participant was allowed to give two answers to this question. Both answers have been coded and amalgamated into the table.

4 Comparison of responses to the 2012 and 2013 Year 1 teacher questionnaire

Table C28: Teacher's views in both 2012 and 2013 on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils

	Sample Year	
	2012	2013
Much too easy	<1	<1
Slightly too easy	1	1
It is about right	44	66
Slightly too difficult	40	27
Much too difficult	11	3
No response	4	3
	N=940	N=625

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012, NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2013

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100



Department
for Education

© National Foundation for Educational Research 2014

Reference: DFE-RR339B

ISBN: 978-1-78105-329-4

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Nicola.MACKENZIE@education.gsi.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publication