NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus March 2013 Survey

Support for pupils with cancer

CLIC Sargent

This report was written by: 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).

March 2013

Contents

Introduction

CLIC Sargent submitted one question to NFER's Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey in March 2013. The question asked teachers to what extent they agree that enough information resources and guidance are available to teachers to support a pupil with cancer in school.

This report provides a table of the results along with supporting information about the survey.

Cross tabulation of question by school phase

Table 1. To what extent do you agree that enough information resources and guidance are available to teachers to support a pupil with cancer in school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Strongly agree	2%	2%	3%
Agree	11%	9%	12%
Neither agree nor disagree	22%	24%	20%
Disagree	21%	19%	23%
Strongly disagree	13%	11%	15%
Don't know	31%	36%	27%
Local base (N)	1580	796	788

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.

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)[1].

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.

---

[1] 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
Local Authority type	London Borough	13	14
	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	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