



Teacher Voice

NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus March 2013 Survey

Spending Priorities for the Pupil Premium

The Sutton Trust

This report was written by: Rob Ager and Katie Pyle.

Please direct all questions about this report to Katie Pyle, Project Manager of the Omnibus at the NFER (k.pyle@nfer.ac.uk).

May 2013

Contents

Introduction	1
Context	1
Analysis of findings	2
The sample	2
Pupil Premium Spending Priorities	2
How do the findings about the top priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?	3
The second priority for Pupil Premium spending	5
How do the findings about the second priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?	5
The third priority for Pupil Premium spending	7
How do the findings about the third priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?	8
Decision making about the approaches and programmes adopted to improve pupil learning	9
How do the findings about decision making compare with those found in 2012?	10
Conclusions and implications for the client	11
Supporting information	12
How was the survey conducted?	12
What was the composition of the panel?	12
How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?	12
How accurately do the results represent the national position?	17

Introduction

The Sutton Trust submitted two questions to NFER's Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey in March 2013. The questions covered the following topics:

- The top three priorities for the use of money received through the Pupil Premium
- How decisions are made in schools about the approaches and programmes to adopt to improve pupil learning.

This report provides an analysis of the responses to the questions, along with supporting information about the survey. Results are presented by school phase (primary and secondary) and, where relevant, by seniority of respondent (classroom teachers or senior leaders).

This report forms one part of the output from the Omnibus survey. The analysis is also presented and given in more detail in a set of interactive web-based tables produced separately (in Pulsar Web).

Context

The Pupil Premium is additional funding provided to schools to help pay for resources needed to improve the learning of disadvantaged pupils. It also aims to increase social mobility, enabling more pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds to get to top universities, and to reduce the attainment gap nationally. It was introduced in 2011 and is intended to target funding to those pupils who have been eligible for free school meals in the previous six years, as well as looked-after pupils and the children of service personnel.

Schools receive the funding from central government and have the responsibility of deciding how to best spend the money. Schools are seen to be in the best position to know what will be the most economical and effective way to help their own pupils.

The Sutton Trust-EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit¹ provides guidance for schools on how to use their resources to improve disadvantaged pupils' attainment.

In 2012 the Trust submitted two questions about the Pupil Premium to the NFER Omnibus survey. Now, twelve months later, the Omnibus survey has repeated those questions. This report will outline the current situation in schools and examine if there has been any change since the last survey.

¹ Education Endowment Foundation (2013). *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* [online]. Available: <http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit> [5 April, 2013].

Analysis of findings

The sample

A sample of 1587 teachers completed the survey. The sample was weighted to ensure that it was representative and included teachers from a wide range of school governance types and subject areas. Sample numbers were sufficient to allow for comparisons between the primary and secondary sectors. Detailed information about the sample is given in the supplementary section of this report.

Pupil Premium Spending Priorities

The first question submitted to the Teacher Voice survey asked teachers about how the Pupil Premium was spent in their school. Table 1 shows the main priority for extra spending in 2012/13. We asked teachers to select one of ten possible areas of spending. Subsequent tables show the second and third priorities.

Table 1. With the money received through the Pupil Premium, what is the main priority for extra spending at your school in 2012/2013?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Reducing class sizes	4%	3%	6%
Additional teaching assistants	9%	14%	4%
Additional teachers	6%	8%	3%
More one-to-one tuition	13%	13%	13%
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils	1%	1%	1%
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils / providing more feedback that is effective	4%	4%	3%
Early intervention schemes	23%	27%	19%
Extending the breadth of the curriculum	2%	2%	2%
Improving the classroom or school environment	2%	2%	3%
Offsetting budget cuts elsewhere	3%	2%	4%
Other	2%	2%	1%
Don't know	30%	22%	39%
None	1%	1%	1%
Local base (N)	1582	796	791

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

Three in ten teachers who participated in the survey did not know what the main priority was for spending the extra Pupil Premium funds. Among primary teachers there was greater awareness of how the funds were prioritised (though still more than a fifth (22%) did not know what was the highest priority). Almost two-fifths of secondary teachers did not know the main priority (39%).

Two-thirds of teachers (67%) indicated what the top priority for spending the Pupil Premium was in their school. The most common top priority was *early intervention schemes*. Overall, nearly a quarter of teachers (23%) chose this option, with 27 per cent of primary school teachers and 19 per cent of secondary school teachers selecting it. The next most commonly selected responses were *more one-to-one tuition* (13% chose this) and *additional teaching assistants* (selected by 9% of teachers). The remaining options were selected by only very small proportions of teachers. *Additional teaching assistants* was the second most common response among primary teachers (selected by 14% of them, compared with only 4% of their secondary counterparts). Among secondary teachers, *more one-to-one tuition* was the second most frequently selected main priority for Pupil Premium spending.

As would be expected, senior leaders had higher levels of awareness of the priorities for Pupil Premium funds in their schools; while 37 per cent of classroom teachers were unaware of the top priority for spending the Pupil Premium, only three per cent of senior leaders said that they did not know the top priority.

It is worth noting that improving feedback, which is currently ranked at the top of the Teaching and Learning Toolkit², was the fifth most common response overall, selected by four per cent of teachers. Drilling down into the data by phase and seniority, we found some variations in responses. Ten per cent of secondary senior leaders said it was the top priority for Pupil Premium spending in their school (and it was ranked third of the ten options provided in the survey). For primary senior leaders, eight per cent said it was the top priority, making it the fifth most selected option. Among classroom teachers it was less commonly chosen: of primary school teachers, three per cent chose it (sixth in the ranking), while two per cent of secondary teachers said it was their school's top priority, ranked eighth out of ten.

How do the findings about the top priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?

Comparing the findings from March 2013 with those from February 2012, shows that a very slightly greater proportion of teachers said that they did not know what the top priority was for Pupil Premium spending in their school for 2013/14. *Early intervention schemes* remained the most commonly cited approach, but this year the proportion of teachers choosing it has increased from 16 to 23 per cent. In 2012, the second most selected top spending priority was *reducing class sizes* (chosen by 15% of teachers). In

² Education Endowment Foundation (2013). *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* [online]. Available: <http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit> [5 April, 2013].

2013 this has become the fifth most common option, chosen by four per cent of teachers. The proportions of teachers reporting that the money would be used for *offsetting budget cuts elsewhere* has reduced from eight per cent to three per cent between the 2012 and 2013 surveys. These differences are reflected similarly in the responses of both primary and secondary teachers.

Looking at the responses to the two surveys grouped by seniority reveals little difference in the order of popularity of responses and the percentages of respondents selecting each option. One notable difference concerns the top choice of senior leaders from both rounds of the survey which was: *early intervention schemes*. In 2012, a quarter (25%) of senior leaders said this was the top priority for spending; in 2013 this had increased to a third (34%). One option which saw a reduction in the proportion of senior leaders saying it was the top priority was *offsetting budget cuts elsewhere*; from 11 per cent in 2012 to three per cent in 2013. For classroom teachers, the most common response in both surveys was *don't know* (34% in 2012 and 37% in 2013). Ignoring those who said they did not know, the most common response for this group of teachers in 2012 had been *reducing class sizes*, selected by 17 per cent. In 2013 the proportion was much smaller: four per cent, and it had become the fifth ranked item (including 'don't know' as the first). In 2013, the most common response (aside from 'don't know') was *early intervention schemes*, selected by a fifth of respondents (20%) compared with 13 per cent in 2012.

The second priority for Pupil Premium spending

We next asked respondents to identify their school's second priority for extra spending. Respondents were given the same options with their main priority removed from the list.

Table 2. With the money received through the Pupil Premium, what is the second main priority for extra spending at your school in 2012/2013?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Reducing class sizes	4%	3%	4%
Additional teaching assistants	13%	18%	7%
Additional teachers	5%	6%	4%
More one-to-one tuition	17%	16%	18%
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils	1%	1%	2%
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils / providing more feedback that is effective	4%	4%	3%
Early intervention schemes	21%	23%	19%
Extending the breadth of the curriculum	4%	5%	3%
Improving the classroom or school environment	5%	4%	6%
Offsetting budget cuts elsewhere	3%	2%	5%
Other	9%	7%	11%
Don't know	4%	4%	4%
None	11%	7%	15%
Local base (N)	1477	751	730

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

As Table 2 shows, responses followed the pattern seen for the top priority, with *early intervention schemes* again the most commonly cited option (selected by 21%). This was, again, followed by *more one-to-one tuition* (selected by 17%) and additional teaching assistants (selected by 13%). The remaining options were selected by only very small proportions of teachers. Variations by phase and seniority reflected those seen in discussions about respondents' main priority for the extra spending of the Pupil Premium.

How do the findings about the second priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?

The three most common second-priority areas for spending remained the same in 2013 as were found in 2012, but with a slightly increased proportion of teachers selecting *more one-to-one tuition* which increased from 11 per cent to 17 per cent. For primary teachers there were only small changes in proportions. An additional difference found for

secondary teachers was the proportion saying the second priority for spending was *additional teachers*, which reduced from ten per cent in 2012 to four per cent in 2013.

The choices of second-priority areas for spending grouped by seniority were very similar in the 2012 and 2013 surveys. One difference was an increase in the number reporting that *more one-to-one tuition* was the second priority for spending. For senior leaders this was chosen by 17 per cent in 2012 and 23 per cent in 2013. For classroom teachers the increase was from nine per cent to 15 per cent.

The third priority for Pupil Premium spending

Finally, we asked respondents to identify what the third priority was for extra spending in their school. Teachers were asked to select from the same ten possible areas of spending as in the previous two questions with their main and second priorities removed from the list. Table 3 shows these third priorities for extra spending in 2012/13.

Table 3. With the money received through the Pupil Premium, what is the third main priority for extra spending at your school in 2012/2013?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Reducing class sizes	4%	4%	4%
Additional teaching assistants	11%	11%	11%
Additional teachers	7%	7%	7%
More one-to-one tuition	11%	13%	10%
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils	3%	2%	4%
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils / providing more feedback that is effective	5%	5%	5%
Early intervention schemes	14%	14%	14%
Extending the breadth of the curriculum	7%	7%	6%
Improving the classroom or school environment	8%	8%	8%
Offsetting budget cuts elsewhere	5%	4%	6%
Other	9%	10%	6%
Don't know	7%	7%	7%
None	11%	9%	14%
Local base (N)	1313	701	612

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

As can be seen in Table 3, *early intervention schemes*, *more one-to-one tuition* and *additional teaching assistants* once again held the top positions in the priorities for spending when teachers were asked about the third priority at their school. Just over a quarter of responses (27%) were given to the options *none*, *other* and *don't know*. There was little difference across phases of schooling.

The biggest differences shown between senior leaders and classroom teachers was the level of knowledge about the third priority for Pupil Premium spending. While *none* and *don't know* were the two least commonly chosen options among senior leaders, they were the first and third most commonly chosen options among classroom teachers respectively. (*None* and *don't know* were selected by 1% and 2% of senior leaders

respectively and 14% and 9% of classroom teachers respectively.) This may be because senior leaders are closer to spending decisions than classroom teachers.

How do the findings about the third priority for spending compare with those found in 2012?

The findings for 2013 for the third-priority area for spending Pupil Premium funding were again similar to those from 2012. The biggest change was seen in the proportion of teachers reporting that *improving the classroom or school environment* was the third priority area for their school. In 2012 this had come as the joint top response with *early intervention schemes* with 14 per cent of respondents choosing this. In 2013 the percentage had fallen to eight, and it was the fifth most chosen area for spending.

Examining the findings broken down by level of seniority reveals that, in 2012, among senior leaders *more one-to-one tuition* was the fifth most common identified third-priority area for spending, selected by ten per cent of senior leaders. In 2013 this was the most commonly chosen area, with nearly a fifth of senior leaders giving this response (19%). The option *improving the classroom or school environment* was the most common area selected by classroom teachers (chosen by 15%) in 2012. In 2013, the percentage selecting this option had reduced to nine, making it the sixth most commonly given response. A similar reduction was seen in the responses of senior leaders to this item from ten to five per cent.

Decision making about the approaches and programmes adopted to improve pupil learning

We asked respondents to identify how decisions were made at their school about which approaches and programmes to adopt to improve pupil learning. The results are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. How does your school decide which approaches and programmes to adopt to improve pupil learning?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Using past experience of what works	55%	61%	49%
Considering research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes	42%	43%	40%
Evaluating different approaches and programmes then deciding which to adopt	46%	51%	40%
Considering which approaches and programmes are the most cost effective	23%	25%	21%
Reading the pupil premium toolkit, published by the Sutton Trust	14%	15%	14%
Learning from what works in other schools	46%	48%	44%
Consulting the school's governing body	10%	9%	11%
Consulting the Local Authority	15%	20%	10%
Other	7%	7%	7%
Don't know	21%	15%	28%
Local base (N)	1577	793	789

Respondents were able to select more than one response so percentages may sum to more than 100.

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

As the data shows, more than half of teachers indicated that their school used *past experience of what works* to decide which approaches to adopt to improve pupil learning (55%). This was the most common response overall and for each of the primary, secondary, senior leader and classroom teacher subgroups. This approach was selected by just over three quarters of senior leaders (76%) and half of classroom teachers (50%). The next most common approaches were each chosen by 46 per cent of respondents overall; they were *learning from what works in other schools* and *evaluating different approaches and programmes then deciding which to adopt*.

While *using past experience of what works* was the top priority among both primary and secondary teachers, the proportions choosing this option differed, at 61 and 49 per cent respectively. A greater proportion of primary than secondary teachers also chose *evaluating different approaches and programmes then deciding which to adopt* (51%

compared with 40% respectively). Primary school teachers were also proportionally more likely to say they would consult their Local Authority compared with secondary teachers (20% compared with 10% respectively). For the remaining approaches, there was little difference in the order of popularity or the proportion of responses given.

When looking at the responses of senior leaders and classroom teachers, we found that the order of their choices is quite similar, with senior leaders and classroom teachers selecting the same top four approaches: *using past experience of what works*; *considering research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes*; *evaluating different approaches and programmes then deciding which to adopt*; and *learning from what works in other schools*. As expected given their different roles in school, proportionally more classroom teachers than senior leaders said they did not know how their school decides which approaches and programmes to adopt to improve pupil learning (26% compared with 1%).

How do the findings about decision making compare with those found in 2012?

The responses from 2013 about how decisions are made about approaches to adopt to improve pupil learning were very similar to those given in 2012. The rank order was very similar and most of the percentages changed little. There were noticeable differences in the proportions for only two options. Firstly, the fourth most popular approach was *considering research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes* in both surveys, but the proportion of teachers selecting this option increased from 36 per cent to 42 per cent from 2012 to 2013. Secondly, the proportion reporting they *read the pupil premium toolkit, published by the Sutton Trust*, increased from five to 14 per cent. These findings were found for both primary and secondary teachers.

The responses of classroom teachers in 2013 were similar to those given in 2012. Among senior leaders there were three options which showed a change. The second most common approach selected by senior leaders in 2013 was *considering research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes*. This was chosen by two-thirds (67%) of senior leaders, which compares with just over half in 2012 (52%). The option, *reading the pupil premium toolkit, published by the Sutton Trust*, also saw an increase in response among senior leaders, from one in ten in 2012 (11%) to over a third in 2013 (36%). The approach which saw the biggest reduction in responses among senior leaders was *consulting the local authority*, from 25 per cent in 2012 to 17 per cent in 2013.

Conclusions and implications for the client

When deciding how to spend the Pupil Premium to improve pupil learning, large proportions of teachers said their schools use informal methods of evaluating approaches and programmes, such as experience of what has worked in their schools and other schools. As was found in 2012, teachers also indicated that research evidence was used to guide decisions on spending. However, only a small proportion indicated that the Teaching and Learning Toolkit was used in their schools. This apparent lack awareness of the Toolkit is reflected in the popularity of the approaches teachers said were used in schools this year. We found that the top priorities for spending were *early intervention schemes* and *more one-to-one tuition* – while these feature in the top five approaches listed in the Toolkit they are not its top recommended approach and the remaining priorities do not all fit with the Toolkit's findings. Since the 2012 survey the popularity of *improving feedback* (the Toolkit's top approach to improving learning) has not increased.

One encouraging finding is that the proportion of teachers saying they read the *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* when deciding which approaches and programmes to adopt increased from one-in-twenty teachers overall in 2012 to around one-in-seven in 2013. Among senior leaders this increase was from around one in ten in 2012 to over a third in 2013. It must be noted that some of the Teacher Voice panel members will have been made aware of the Toolkit as a result of the 2012 survey. The findings suggest that there is a need to further publicise the Toolkit.

Supporting information

How was the survey conducted?

This report is based on data from the March 2013 survey. A panel of 1587 practising teachers from 1243 schools in the maintained sector in England completed the survey. Teachers completed the survey online between the 1st and 6th March 2013. During the survey period, a team of experienced coders within the Foundation coded all ‘open’ questions (those without a pre-identified set of responses).

What was the composition of the panel?

The panel included teachers from the full range of roles in primary and secondary schools, from headteachers to newly qualified class teachers. Fifty per cent (795) of the respondents were teaching in primary schools and 50 per cent (792) were teaching in secondary schools.

How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?

There was an under-representation of schools in the highest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals in the sample of primary schools. There was an under-representation of schools in the highest quintile and second lowest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals in the sample of secondary schools. In the overall sample (primary and secondary schools) there was under-representation in the highest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals. To address this, weights were calculated using free school meals factors to create a more balanced sample. Due to the differences between the populations of primary schools and secondary schools, different weights were created for primary schools, secondary schools and then for the whole sample overall. The weightings have been applied to all of the analyses referred to in this commentary and contained within the tables supplied in electronic format (via Pulsar Web)³.

Tables S.1, S.2 and S.3 show the representation of the weighted achieved sample against the population. Table S.4 shows the representation of the weighted teacher sample by role in school.

³ The sample was not weighted for missing free school meal data

Table S.1 Representation of primary schools (weighted) compared to primary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by KS2 2011 data)	Lowest band	18	14
	2nd lowest band	18	17
	Middle band	17	20
	2nd highest band	21	23
	Highest band	25	26
	Missing	1	<1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale) (2010/11)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	1	<1
Primary school type	Infants	8	9
	First School	5	3
	Infant & Junior (Primary)	74	72
	First & Middle	0	0
	Junior	7	12
	Middle deemed Primary	0	1
	Academy	5	4
Region	North	31	24
	Midlands	32	30
	South	37	46
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	13
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	21
	English Unitary Authorities	18	20
	Counties	51	46
Number of schools		16753	718

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

Table S.2 Representation of secondary schools (weighted) compared to secondary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by GCSE 2011 data)	Lowest band	17	18
	2nd lowest band	19	16
	Middle band	19	23
	2nd highest band	19	21
	Highest band	20	20
	Missing	6	3
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale) (2010/11)	Lowest 20%	19	19
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	19	19
	2nd highest 20%	19	19
	Highest 20%	19	20
	Missing	4	2
Secondary school type	Middle	6	3
	Secondary Modern	2	1
	Comprehensive to 16	21	23
	Comprehensive to 18	24	29
	Grammar	5	6
	Other secondary school	<1	0
	Academies	42	39
Region	North	29	24
	Midlands	33	33
	South	38	43
	London Borough	13	14
Local Authority type	Metropolitan Authorities	21	22
	English Unitary Authorities	19	19
	Counties	47	46
Number of schools		3228	525

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent.

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

Table S.3 Representation of all schools (weighted) compared to all schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (By KS2 2011 and GCSE 2011 data)	Lowest band	18	16
	2nd lowest band	18	17
	Middle band	17	21
	2nd highest band	21	22
	Highest band	24	23
	Missing	2	1
	% eligible FSM (5 pt scale) (2010/11)	Lowest 20%	20
2nd lowest 20%		20	20
Middle 20%		19	20
2nd highest 20%		20	20
Highest 20%		20	20
Missing		1	1
Region	North	30	24
	Midlands	32	31
	South	37	45
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	14
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	22
	English Unitary Authorities	18	19
	Counties	51	45
Number of schools		19942	1243

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013.

Table S.4 Comparison of the achieved (weighted) sample with the national population by grade of teacher (not including Academies)

Role	Primary schools				Secondary schools			
	National Population ¹		NFER Sample		National Population ¹		NFER Sample	
	N ¹	%	N	%	N ¹	%	N	%
Headteachers	15.4	8	66	9	2.1	2	7	1
Deputy Headteachers	10.8	6	80	11	3.3	2	20	4
Assistant Headteachers	6.4	3	52	7	7.6	6	50	10
Class teachers and others	155.6	83	561	74	119.2	90	420	85

1. National population figures are expressed in thousands and for headteachers, deputy heads and assistant heads are based on full-time positions. NFER sample figures include all staff with these roles and so may include part-time staff.

2. The NFER sample for classroom teachers and others is based on headcount whereas the national population data is based on FTE teachers

3. Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

4. Sources: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013, DfE: School Workforce in England, November 2011, <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001062/sfr06-2012v7.pdf> [21 March 2013].

Table S.5 Comparison of the achieved (weighted) Academies sample with the national population by grade of teacher

Role	All Academies (primary and secondary)			
	National Population ¹		NFER Sample	
	N ¹	%	N	%
Headteachers	1.4	2	6	2
Deputy Headteachers	2.1	3	15	5
Assistant Headteachers	4.0	5	31	10
Class teachers and others	67.7	90	269	84

1. National population figures are expressed in thousands and for headteachers, deputy heads and assistant heads are based on full-time positions. NFER sample figures include all staff with these roles and so may include part-time staff.

2. Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

3. Sources: NFER Omnibus Survey March 2013, DfE: School Workforce in England, November 2011, <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001062/sfr06-2012v7.pdf> [21 March 2013].

How accurately do the results represent the national position?

Assuming that our data is representative of the population at large (and we have no evidence to suggest otherwise) we can calculate the precision of results from each of our samples based on the number of respondents. The smallest number of respondents is for the secondary school sample where we have 792 respondents. In this case we can calculate that all results based on the full sample will be precise to within at worst plus or minus 3.48 percentage points. This means that we are 95 per cent sure that if we were to collect results from all secondary schools in the country the results we would get would be within 3.48 percentage points of the results presented in this report. We have marginally more respondents within the primary school sample and hence can be even more confident about our results. For this reason, **within any of our samples, the precision of results based on all respondents will be precise to within at worst plus or minus 3.48 percentage points.**

Certain questions within the survey were filtered and in these cases the number of respondents to questions may be much smaller. In these cases we may need to be more cautious about the precision of the percentages presented within the report. The table below gives a rough guide to the level of precision that can be attributed to each table based upon the total number of respondents. For example, if a table is based upon just 40 respondents we can only be sure that the percentages within that table are correct to within plus or minus 16 percentage points.

Table S.6 Precision of estimates in percentage point terms

Number of respondents	Precision of estimates in percentage point terms
30	18
40	16
50	14
75	12
100	10
150	9
200	7
300	6
400	5
600	4
700	4