**National Foundation
for Educational Research**

Ipsos MORI

# Exploring school support staff experiences of training and development

# First Year Report

## NFER:

David Teeman

Matt Walker

Caroline Sharp

Paula Smith

Emma Scott

Fiona Johnson

Claire Easton

## Ipsos MORI:

Fiona Johnson

Adél Várnai

Matt Barnes

**March 2008**

tda
*developing people, improving young lives*

# Acknowledgements

# Contents

# 1. Introduction

In 2004, the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) current remit was enhanced to include the training and development of the wider school workforce. This was further extended the following year when the Agency was asked by Her Majesty's Government to take forward work focusing on Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers. Consequently, the key purpose of the TDA is now 'To raise children's standards of achievement and promote their well-being by improving the training and development of the whole school workforce[1]. Following this extension of the TDA's role, the School Workforce Development Board (SWDB) was established in 2004, which takes the form of a sector-wide body chaired by the TDA, to guide the Agency's work on the training and development of support staff.

The SWDB published an interim plan, *Building the School Team* (TDA, 2005). This identified the Board's three priorities for action, namely: removing barriers that prevent the take up of training and development; improving the supply of training and development; and strengthening the quality of training and development. Building on the interim plan, the SWDB published a three-year strategy in 2006, *Developing people to support learning* (TDA, 2006), which set out the commitments of the SWDB member organisations to develop the wider school workforce. Through this strategy the SWDB expressed its three objectives:

- supporting schools to develop new ways of training and deploying their staff
- creating a framework of standards and qualifications to enable schools to develop the potential of all support staff
- extending training opportunities to meet the development needs of all support staff.

There was a need for more information about support staff training and development. Evidence was limited on the following issues in particular: the qualifications held by support staff; the training and development activities undertaken by support staff; the extent to which support staff have experienced performance management; the perceptions of support staff towards training, communication and development needs; and the employment and recruitment profiles of support staff. The TDA, therefore, commissioned NFER in partnership with Ipsos MORI, to conduct research to support and inform the implementation of the three-year strategy. The study's main purpose was to

---

[1]    http://www.tda.gov.uk/leaders/roleoftda.aspx [16 April, 2007]

explore support staff perceptions and experiences of training and development. The findings from the research, reported here, are intended to inform the TDA's planning, communications and training provision, and also to inform the work of the SWDB member organisations. This report presents the findings from the first survey of support staff, conducted in the autumn term of 2006.

## 1.1   Research aims

This study has three research aims:

- to explore support staff experiences and perceptions of their training and development
- to provide findings which specifically fill gaps in current knowledge about the training and development of support staff and their related needs
- to measure change over time.

To achieve these aims the research is gathering data, on two occasions, from support staff based on a series of key research themes:

- **Background information.** What roles do support staff have, what were they doing before coming into their current position, what type of contract do they have and what is their length of experience?
- **Qualifications.** For instance, exploring what qualifications support staff hold or are what they working towards and what they need.
- **Experience of performance management.** For instance, what, if any, appraisal system staff have experienced and if this has been linked to their training and development?
- **Communication/information needs.** For instance, how do staff find out about and identify their training and development needs, what is their awareness of related information sources, and how do their roles relate to experiences of accessing information on training and development opportunities?
- **Perceptions of training and development.** For instance, in relation to training and development, what are staff motivations, what (if any) barriers exist, whether they perceive their training needs to have been met and how satisfied have they been with the training and development they have received?
- **Experience of training and development.** For instance what are support staff experiences of training and development in terms of the various sources, contexts and locations of any training and development support staff have experienced?

## 1.2 Methodology

The methodology was designed to provide evidence about the training and development of support staff, relating findings to different types of schools and to the different roles of these staff. With the TDA's agreement, the research adopted six support staff categories, within which there are a broad range of specific support staff roles (see Appendix D). The six main categories are learning support staff, teaching assistants, pupil support, administrative staff, specialist and technical staff and site staff. Furthermore, staff who held more than one role were identified for surveying and analysis purposes.

The research is being conducted over a three-year period (June 2006 to May 2009), and employs two research methods:

- telephone surveys of support staff
- a desk study.

### 1.2.1 Telephone survey

The survey content was designed to gather information that addressed the key research questions presented above and uses multiple-, single-, scale- and open-response questions (see Appendix B). It was designed as a generic document to be appropriate to all roles of support staff regardless of school type or phase.

Prior to the first survey, the questions were piloted with 30 respondents, selected using the information gathered from schools. Piloting was used to confirm that the survey took on average no longer than 15 minutes to complete, that respondents understood the questions, and that the automatic routing and quota matrix system operated as intended. As a result of piloting, the survey was slightly shortened and a small number of questions were re-worded or restructured.

The findings reported here arise from the first of two waves of the telephone survey. The survey was conducted at the end of the autumn term in 2006 and provides a 'baseline' from which data from the second survey can be compared to measure any changes over time. The second survey is planned for autumn 2008.

### 1.2.2 Desk study

To inform the focus and content of the survey and to provide contextual information in which the research findings could be set and discussed, a desk study was conducted by gathering and analysing data from a range of relevant

documentation related to the key research objectives. The desk study commenced in June 2006 and will continue, and run in parallel with, research activity in the remaining two years of the project, concluding in May 2009.

The desk study gathers and analyses data from a range of relevant documents, focusing on research and policy documents concerning the CPD needs of support staff in schools. Specifically, the desk study focuses on information about what is currently known about the training and development of support staff, and also information from governmental and non-governmental organisations, such as that available from the TDA, the National College of School Leadership (NCSL), Unison (Skills4You), the Standards web site and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF).

In the early stages of the project the desk study also explored research into the qualifications held by support staff, the extent to which support staff have experienced performance management, and the employment and recruitment profiles of support staff. This information was used to inform the content of the first survey. The outcomes from the desk study have been considered in relation to all findings and, therefore, have helped set the context for and feed into this report.

To date, 25 potentially relevant documents have been retrieved for closer scrutiny. Of these, 17 were judged to be relevant and included in the desk study. These documents cover the following broad categories:

- policy documents
- research reports that relate specifically to teaching assistants (TAs) and to higher level teaching assistants (HLTAs)
- research reports related to support staff more broadly
- statistical documents.

## 1.3   Sample design and sampling procedures

Findings from a national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Blatchford *et al.,* 2006a; 2007) provide an indication of the possible numbers of full-time equivalent staff for each post title in England. However, at present there is no comprehensive list of support staff working in schools which could have been used as a direct sampling frame. A multi-staged process was therefore adopted, in which the research team identified appropriate samples of schools, collected basic (and up-to-date) information about the support staff in those schools and then, via telephone calls, approached support staff within those schools to participate in the study.

### 1.3.1 School sampling

**Drawing the school sample**

The first part of the sampling process involved the identification of a sample of schools from which information about support staff could be gathered for respondent sampling. Using NFER's Register of Schools[2], schools were randomly selected using a stratified sampling procedure to reflect:

- the overall numbers of primary, secondary and special schools in the nine Government Office Regions in England
- size of school (for special schools, phase of education i.e. whether they were primary or secondary, was used as a stratifier instead of size).

However, different sampling fractions were used for different types of school. There are several reasons for this.

- The overall aim of the survey is to explore the training and development of support staff across the English school system. It was therefore important to ensure that specific subgroups of support staff, both within and across phases/types, were adequately represented within the final sample whilst minimising the administrative burden placed on schools.
- The number of support staff per school (and the nature of their roles) differs depending on phase/type.
- Since there are relatively small numbers of special schools, we selected a larger proportion of them.

**Gathering support staff information**

Once the schools' sample had been drawn, headteachers in these schools were written to and asked to complete (or pass on to another member of staff for completion) an online proforma designed to capture key data about each schools' complement of support staff, including:

- an indication of the total number of support staff at each school
- which category each member of staff belonged to and their role
- the names of support staff
- whether they were employed by the school, local authority or another employer
- the time of day support staff worked in the school (i.e. morning, afternoon or after school).

Over the lifetime of the study, the nature of the respondent profiles means that it will not be possible to rely on being able to survey the same respondents

---

2    The Register contains data on all maintained schools in England including size of schools, levels of attainment, level of entitlement to Free School Meals, location, and headteacher names.

year-on-year, because it is likely that a large number will move job and/or not be available at the time of the second survey. Therefore, a new sample of support staff will be drawn for subsequent surveys, using information collected by NFER's Research Data Services (RDS) but using the same sample of schools each year. New schools will be added as necessary to address any attrition over time.

## Year 1 school response rates

Table 1.1 shows the number of schools that were drawn, the number that provided support staff information, the average number of support staff the research team expected by school category, based on the Annual School Census (ASC), and the average number of support staff actually indicated by the school providing information. It should be noted that while the ASC data is based on FTE (i.e. the numbers presented are based on the equivalent of full-time workers), the average number of support staff indicated by corresponding schools contained a mixture of full-time and part-time staff and as such represents a 'headcount' of staff in those schools returning support staff information.

The sample of schools drawn was based on an assumption that 40 per cent of schools would agree to provide support staff information, and the assumption that one-in-three of the support staff contacted by Ipsos MORI would agree to be interviewed. The research team adopted a target sample of 3,200 completed support staff interviews.

**Table 1.1**   School recruitment and information gathering

| School type | Number of schools: | | Number of support staff records | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | drawn | to be recruited/ achieved | * expected/ achieved per school | expected/ achieved by school type |
| Primary | 1180 | 472 (408) | 8 (18) | 3776 (7281) |
| Secondary | 363 | 145 (96) | 27 (42) | 3915 (4059) |
| Special | 250 | 100 (80) | 21 (30) | 2100 (2418) |
| **Totals** | **1793** | **717 (584)** | **19 (27)** | **9791 (13758)** |

*Numbers not in brackets = intended/expected*
*Numbers in brackets = achieved/actual*
*\* the 'expected' values are means of FTE while the 'achieved' numbers are means*

Table 1.1 shows that despite a comprehensive and sustained programme of telephone and written reminders to schools, fewer schools agreed to provide information than had been anticipated. However, Tables A1 to A3 (see

Appendix A) show that the sample of schools achieved did generally reflect the national picture, with two exceptions:

- the primary school sample included significantly more schools in the smallest size band
- there were significantly more infant schools, when compared to the national picture.

In both cases, it is likely that, because these types of school have fewer support staff, they were less burdened by the gathering of support staff information and, hence, were more likely to agree to participate.

The number of individual staff records provided by schools exceeded the target required. Of those schools that declined participation, the main reason given was the amount of time that they thought would be taken for them complete the online data form. This observation will be taken into account to ensure that the burden on schools in the second survey will be reduced further by:

- simplifying the online proforma (e.g. employing fewer fields)
- pre-populating the online form with data already collected for each of the schools agreeing to participate, so that schools will simply be asked to update the information
- drawing a top-up sample of schools.

## 1.3.2 Respondent sampling

## Respondent sampling

The research team adopted a strategy that sought to achieve broadly similar sample numbers across support staff roles (and school types), rather than attempting a sample that was absolutely representative of the total number of support staff in each role category and by each school type. This has enabled useful analysis of data at the respondent category level and in relation to the school stratifiers previously listed. Table 1.2 shows the intended numbers of survey responses to be achieved by support staff category and by the school stratifiers.

Furthermore, the research team designed a strategy that did not attempt (or need) to gather the personal contact details of support staff, such as addresses and/or personal telephone numbers, from schools and/or third parties.

**Table 1.2** Intended numbers of interviews to be achieved by support staff category and school stratifiers

| PRIMARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Smallest 3rd | 92 | 148 | 111 | 69 | 26 | 88 | **534** |
| Middle 3rd | 106 | 108 | 108 | 47 | 29 | 78 | **476** |
| Largest 3rd | 98 | 97 | 111 | 42 | 43 | 59 | **450** |
| **N=** | **296** | **353** | **330** | **158** | **98** | **225** | **1460** |
| SECONDARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Smallest 3rd | 42 | 62 | 52 | 70 | 52 | 76 | **354** |
| Middle 3rd | 46 | 16 | 39 | 87 | 60 | 74 | **322** |
| Largest 3rd | 61 | 68 | 62 | 115 | 89 | 80 | **475** |
| **N=** | **149** | **146** | **153** | **272** | **201** | **230** | **1151** |
| SPECIAL | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Primary | 24 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 11 | **103** |
| Secondary | 39 | 48 | 25 | 15 | 11 | 16 | **154** |
| Both | 64 | 164 | 96 | 34 | 26 | 61 | **445** |
| **N=** | **127** | **249** | **138** | **57** | **43** | **88** | **702** |

*N=3313*

## Contacting respondents

Once the support staff information had been gathered from schools, it was entered into an electronic quota[3] 'matrix'. The matrix, wherever possible, was configured to provide three matched records for every interview we intended to achieve, in line with the expected one-in-three success rate. The matrix automatically selected respondents for Ipsos MORI staff to telephone, thereby ensuring that the survey was conducted with the required numbers of staff in each of the six categories (and in relation to support staff with more than one role) and according to the school stratifiers. The matrix was successfully piloted at the same time as the survey.

Ipsos MORI staff used the main switchboard telephone number of each school to call the selected respondents. In many cases, as anticipated, more than one call was needed to arrange for the survey to be completed. However, due to the involvement of a smaller number of schools than was intended, there were a larger number of calls made to each school than had been planned (see 'response rates' below for further comment).

---

[3]    In the case of specialist and technical staff a 'census' approach was adopted because the relatively small number of records collected preclude the one-in-three approach.

## Response rates by staff category and school type

Table 1.3 shows that a total of 3,156 respondents were surveyed. It should be noted that, while there were enough staff records collected to follow the one-in-three anticipated success rate, because of a smaller number of schools agreed to take part than was intended, this meant a higher frequency of telephone calls had to be made to each school than had been intended. This might have resulted in a very slight shortfall in the achieved number of interviews. However, Table 1.3 also shows that the research team was successful in contacting support staff from across all categories and school types; therefore providing, as intended, the opportunity to meet the research objectives.

**Table 1.3** Achieved sample by school type and respondent staff category

| PRIMARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Smallest 3rd | 92 | 148 | 111 | 69 | 17 | 88 | **525** |
| Middle 3rd | 106 | 108 | 108 | 47 | 23 | 78 | **470** |
| Largest 3rd | 98 | 97 | 111 | 42 | 32 | 59 | **439** |
| N= | **296** | **353** | **330** | **158** | **72** | **225** | **1434** |
| SECONDARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Smallest 3rd | 42 | 55 | 52 | 70 | 52 | 72 | **343** |
| Middle 3rd | 38 | 16 | 39 | 87 | 60 | 66 | **306** |
| Largest 3rd | 26 | 68 | 47 | 115 | 89 | 54 | **399** |
| N= | **106** | **139** | **138** | **272** | **201** | **192** | **1048** |
| SPECIAL | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Primary | 24 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 11 | **100** |
| Secondary | 35 | 48 | 18 | 15 | 6 | 16 | **138** |
| Both | 61 | 164 | 94 | 34 | 22 | 61 | **436** |
| N= | **120** | **249** | **129** | **57** | **31** | **88** | **674** |

*N=3156*

When Tables 1.2 and 1.3 are compared, results show that, by and large, intended targets were met, although the research fell short of some staff targets. Table 1.4 details the shortfalls.

The potential for having a small number of specialist and technical staff was anticipated, hence the census approach adopted by the research team. The shortfall here was a result of having fewer schools in the sample and therefore obtaining fewer responses than were intended. It is also worth noting that there were shortfalls especially in relation to the largest secondary schools; this may be due to the larger numbers of calls that were made to these schools than was

intended. Both of these issues are to be addressed by increasing, where possible, the top-up sample of schools for the second survey in 2008.

**Table 1.4**   Short falls in quota sampling

| PRIMARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Smallest 3rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **9** | 0 | **9** |
| Middle 3rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **6** | 0 | **6** |
| Largest 3rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **11** | 0 | **11** |
| N= | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | 26 | **0** | 26 |
| SECONDARY | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Smallest 3rd | 0 | **7** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **11** |
| Middle 3rd | **8** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | **16** |
| Largest 3rd | **35** | 0 | **15** | 0 | 0 | 26 | **76** |
| N= | **43** | 7 | **15** | **0** | **0** | 38 | 103 |
| SPECIAL | Learning support | Teaching assistants | Pupil support | Admin | Specialist and technical | Site | N= |
| Primary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **3** | 0 | **3** |
| Secondary | **4** | 0 | **7** | 0 | **5** | 0 | **16** |
| Both | **3** | 0 | **2** | 0 | **4** | 0 | **9** |
| N= | **7** | **0** | **9** | **0** | **12** | **0** | **28** |

*Figures appearing in **bold** are shortfall numbers*
*Highlighted in grey are specialist and technical staff, for who a census approach was adopted*

## 1.4   Analysis and reporting

As intended, three types of analysis were conducted; basic descriptive statistics (cross tabulations), factor analysis and regression, each of which is explained more fully below.

### 1.4.1   Basic descriptive statistics

While overall frequencies, cross tabulations and significance tests on cross-tabulations were conducted, only the overall frequencies are presented in the text of the following sections. This is because the numbers of respondents belonging to any particular subgroup (e.g. school type, gender, category of support staff) varied widely and therefore any interpretation of the resulting data has to be treated with caution. Regression analysis is a more reliable method in these circumstances. However, a separate technical appendix has been produced which presents all descriptive statistics and cross tabulations.

### 1.4.2 Factor analysis

After frequencies had been produced for all questions, factor analysis was carried out to produce outcomes for use in the regression. This analysis grouped together suitable questions that covered similar issues based on their correlation with each other. The questions to be entered into each of the factor analyses were decided by the research team and corresponded to the themes given as headings for chapters within the report structure (e.g. experiences of training and development and experiences of performance management).

A number of items from the survey were included in the factor analyses. Some questions were appropriate as they stood, specifically those on some form of Likert scale. Other questions required some manipulation to put them on a suitable scale for inclusion.

The analysis was carried out on the whole dataset including all types of schools, with an exploration of any differences between school types (primary, secondary and special) within the regression analysis.

### 1.4.3 Regression

The basic analysis enabled the research team to look at the responses overall and then broken-down by key variables. However, the cross tabulations did not allow us to establish whether or not a relationship between two variables ceases to exist once other variables are taken into account. For example, it may appear that males are more satisfied with their training and development than females but if we control for age we may find that the apparent relationship between gender and satisfaction is because men at a particular end of the age range are rating their satisfaction differently to those of different ages. The relationship, therefore, exists not between gender and satisfaction but between age and satisfaction.

Regression is a statistical technique that helps to address this problem by predicting the values of some measure of interest, given the values of one or more related measures. In this case the regression analysis allowed the research team to build on the basic descriptive work by considering the effect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for. All statistically significant findings are reported and relationships between variables are reported in order of significance (see Appendix C1 for a full explanation of the regression analysis and C2 for a list of variables used).

### 1.4.4 The presentation of analysis

The following report is divided into a further eight chapters, a references section and four appendices (A to D). Chapters 2 to 8 present the analysis

described above. In particular, Chapters 3 to 8 are further divided into two parts; the first presents overall descriptive analysis and the second regression analysis[4]. Key findings are summarised at the end of each of the following chapters.

---

[4]  For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

# 2. Sample profile and employment status

This chapter presents information, derived from Sections A and F of the telephone survey (see Appendix B) about the overall respondent sample in terms of: gender; age; ethnicity; and proportions of support staff in these groups in relation to their staff category.

Also presented in this chapter are findings derived from Section A of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). The questions in Section A explored a range of background factors in relation to the employment status of support staff in schools. These were:

- previous role
- the nature of their employment contract (i.e. permanent/fixed-term, full-time/part-time)
- length of time employed in their current school
- length of time in their current role.

## 2.1 The overall profile of respondents

### 2.1.1 Respondents' gender, age and ethnicity

Table 2.1 below shows the achieved sample profile, by gender, age and ethnic background[5].

**Table 2.1** Achieved sample by gender, age and ethnicity

| | Gender | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | 18 – 34 | 35 – 44 | 45 – 54 | 55 + | White | BME |
| N= | 416 | 2740 | 486 | 1055 | 1043 | 548 | 2997 | 137 |
| *%* | *13* | *87* | *15* | *33* | *33* | *18* | *95* | *4* |
| **% missing** | - | | 1 | | | | 1 | |

*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*
*N=3156*

---

[5]    Full ethnicity information was collected (see Technical Appendix, under separate cover). However, for the purpose of analysis, due to the small number of respondents from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups, those involved had to be collapsed into a group labelled 'BME'. This group did not include anyone identifying themselves as white.

The high proportion of female to male staff is immediately noticeable, but is in line with other similar evaluations and was to be expected.

Table 2.1 shows that the sample included respondents across the age range. Two thirds of support staff were distributed across the mid age range bands, leaving the remaining third almost equally distributed between the lower and upper age ranges.

There is not, as far as we are aware and able to ascertain, a reliable and comprehensive source of information of the proportion of support staff in schools from black and minority ethnic groups (BME). Therefore, no target was set regarding the number of BME support staff to be included in the study. To help inform our approach to categorising ethnicity, confirmatory statistical analysis was conducted and this revealed that responses from those staff self-identified as 'white' are broadly similar and homogenous in character. Therefore, the decision was taken to collapse the ethnic groups into two categories: 'white' and 'BME'. The 'white' category includes all respondents who identified themselves as of white ethnic background, including White European and White South African. The BME group includes respondents who identified themselves as being black or from any ethnic group other than that classified as white, including African and Asian (see Appendix A, Table A4 for full breakdown of ethnicity categorisation). In all cases, respondents identified their own ethnicity.

On the basis of the above categorisation, analysis revealed that the proportion of BME support staff responding to this telephone survey is below that of national census data for the English population. According to national census data, 7.9 per cent of the population in England belong to BME groups, compared with four per cent of support staff in the achieved sample. This might suggest that BME respondents answering the survey are slightly under-represented, when compared to national data[6].

---

[6]    It should be noted that sampling at the respondent level did not attempt to 'target' a fixed proportion of respondents from BME groups or by gender or age.

### 2.1.2 Support staff categories by gender, age and ethnicity

Table 2.2 below shows the sample profile by gender, age and ethnicity by support staff category.

**Table 2.2**  Gender, age and ethnicity by support staff category

| Support staff category | Gender % | | Age % | | | | Ethnicity % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | 18 – 34 | 35 – 44 | 45 – 54 | 55 + | White | BME |
| Site staff | 33 | 67 | 8 | 29 | 33 | 30 | 97 | 2 |
| Admin staff | 5 | 95 | 9 | 34 | 36 | 20 | 98 | 1 |
| Specialist and technical | 46 | 54 | 22 | 28 | 31 | 19 | 92 | 6 |
| Pupil support | 4 | 96 | 14 | 36 | 32 | 17 | 93 | 6 |
| Learning support | 5 | 95 | 20 | 33 | 35 | 11 | 92 | 7 |
| Teaching assistants | 5 | 95 | 20 | 37 | 32 | 11 | 96 | 3 |

*Percentages are based on those providing information about their gender age and ethnicity respectively*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*
*Care should be taken in over-interpreting this data to varying and sometimes low numbers of responses*
*N=3156*

Table 2.2 shows that:

- there were larger proportions of males in site and technical roles compared with the proportion of males in all other categories
- there were smaller proportions of staff in the lowest age band, in site and administrative roles compared with those working in other categories
- of those in the 35 – 44 age band, around a third were in each of the staff categories, with the exception of specialist and technical staff, where there were fewer people in this age range
- the 45 – 54 age band shows the most consistent distribution across all categories, with about a third in each
- there was a higher proportion of the oldest age band in site staff roles than in other categories.

## 2.2  Previous employment

Support staff were asked to provide details about what they were doing prior to their current role. Respondents were provided with a list of possible response options. Table 2.3 presents the findings.

**Table 2.3**    Previous employment

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| **Working in current school:** | |
| - in this role but on a voluntary basis | <1 |
| - in a different role on a paid basis | 14 |
| - in a different role on a voluntary basis | 1 |
| **Total working in current school** | **15** |
| **Working in another school:** | |
| - in this role but on a voluntary basis | 1 |
| - in this role on a paid basis | 10 |
| - in a different role on a voluntary basis | 9 |
| - in a different role on a paid basis | <1 |
| **Total working in another school** | **20** |
| **Working outside of education:** | |
| - doing paid work | 37 |
| - doing voluntary work | <1 |
| **Total working outside of education** | **37** |
| **Not working** | **18** |
| **At home/housewife/househusband** | **3** |
| **Studying/training** | **5** |
| **Other** | **<1** |
| **Total working in education and in the same role\*** | **10** |
| **Total working in education but not in the same role\*** | **24** |
| **Total working outside of education\*** | **37** |
| **Total not in employment\*** | **26** |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item, with the exception of \* percentage represents a collapsed item, see Technical Appendix under separate cover*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Around four out of ten support staff said they were working outside of education prior to their current role (this was the highest response). More than a third of support staff reported that they had worked on a paid basis prior to their current role, and almost one quarter said they had been working in a different support staff role (at the same or a different school). A fifth of support staff said they had been working in another school and half of these

staff (a tenth of the overall sample) had been working in the same role. Just over a quarter (26 per cent) of respondents reported that they were not working/at home/studying prior to their current role.

## 2.3  Conditions of current employment

Support staff were asked to provide details about their employment contract (i.e. whether their contract was permanent or fixed-term) and if they worked on a full-time[7] or part-time (including term-time only) basis. The findings are presented in Tables 2.4 and 2.5.

**Table 2.4**    Type of contract

| **Response:** | **%** |
|---|---|
| Permanent | 86 |
| Fixed-term/temporary | 12 |
| No formal/written contract[8] | 1 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Most support staff said that their contract was permanent. Around one tenth said they were on a fixed-term or temporary contract. Very few support staff said that they did not have a formal/written contract or did not know if they had a contract.

**Table 2.5**    Full-time or part-time working

| **Response:** | **%** |
|---|---|
| Part-time | 55 |
| Full-time | 45 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*

---

[7]  30 hours or more per week.

[8]  Support staff were asked what type of employment contract they held and a very small proportion (one per cent) of respondents said that they did not have a contract, however, all support staff have a contract by law. It is possible, for instance, that some support staff may not have had a formal/written contract with the school because they are contracted by an external organisation while others may be volunteers at the school. Therefore, for the remainder of the report, we will refer to such staff by the label 'no formal/written contract'.

The analysis revealed that around half of responding support staff were employed on a part-time basis.

## 2.4   Length of time in role at current school

Support staff were asked to state how long they had worked in their present role at their current school. Table 2.6 presents the findings for this question.

**Table 2.6**      Length of time in role at current school

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Less than 6 months | 8 |
| 6 months or more, but less than a year | 7 |
| 1 – 2 years | 24 |
| 3 – 4 years | 19 |
| 5 – 9 years | 23 |
| 10 years or more | 19 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Analysis revealed that under two thirds of support staff (61 per cent) reported that they had been in their present role at their current school for three years or more compared with just under two fifths (39 per cent) who said they had worked in their current role and school for less than three years. The highest single response was one to two years (24 per cent), followed by five to nine years (23 per cent). However, just under a fifth of support staff (19 per cent) said they had been in their role at their current school for ten years or more.

## 2.5   Length of time in current role at any school

The questionnaire asked support staff to provide information about how long they had worked in their current role, including time spent in this role at other schools. The responses to this question are shown in Table 2.7.

**Table 2.7**    Length of time in current role at any school

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Less than 6 months | 6 |
| 6 months or more, but less than a year | 5 |
| 1 – 2 years | 19 |
| 3 – 4 years | 16 |
| 5 – 9 years | 26 |
| 10 years or more | 28 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

There was a similar pattern of responses to those reported in the previous section. The majority of support staff had been in their current role for three years or more: this was the case for seven in ten of respondents. Around a third of support staff said they had been in their role for less than three years whilst under a third of support staff had been in their current role for ten years or more.

## 2.6  Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- The overwhelming majority of respondents were female (83 per cent). They were distributed across the age range (18 to 55 plus) and only a small minority identified their ethnicity as BME (four per cent).

- Over a third (37 per cent) of support staff had not been working in education prior to their current role. Just under a quarter (24 per cent) had been working in a different role in education prior to their current support role and a fifth (20 per cent) had been working in a different school. In contrast, 18 per cent of respondents had not been in employment prior to their current role.

- In the main, support staff were employed on permanent and part-time contracts (86 per cent and 55 per cent).

- Most support staff (61 per cent) had been employed in their present role at their current school (or 70 per cent at any school) for three years or more.

# 3. Qualifications and ICT skills

This chapter presents the findings from Section B of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). The questions in this section explored the skills and qualifications of school support staff in relation to:

- maths qualifications
- English qualifications
- specific qualifications linked to respondents' roles
- ICT skills.

## 3.1 Mathematics qualifications

Support staff were asked to provide information about whether or not they possessed a maths qualification. Those who said they had a maths qualification were asked to provide additional information about level of qualification achieved. In cases where support staff said they did not have a maths qualification they were asked if they were currently working towards such a qualification.

**Table 3.1**   Maths qualifications

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 69 |
| *at GCSE (or equivalent) grade C or above* | 58 |
| No | 30 |
| Prefer not to say | <1 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Table 3.1 presents the findings about respondents' maths qualifications. Over two thirds of support staff said they had a maths qualification compared with under a third who said they did not. Overall, 58 per cent of support staff said they had a maths qualification at GCSE (or equivalent) at grade C or above. Additional questioning revealed that of those support staff who said they did

not have a maths qualification, five per cent said they were currently working towards gaining one.

## 3.2  English qualifications

Support staff were also asked to provide information about their English qualifications. Those who had an English qualification were asked to provide additional information about the qualification level. In the cases where support staff did not have an English qualification they were asked if they were currently working towards one. Table 3.2 presents findings from this question.

**Table 3.2**     English qualifications

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 78 |
| *at GCSE (or equivalent) grade C or above* | 71 |
| No | 21 |
| Prefer not to say | <1 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Over three quarters of support staff said they had a qualification in English, compared with around a fifth who said they did not. Seventy one per cent of all support staff said they had an English qualification at GCSE (or equivalent) grade C or above. Additional questioning revealed that of those who said that they did not have a qualification in English, three per cent said they were currently working towards gaining one.

## 3.3  Qualifications linked to role

Support staff were asked if they had any other qualifications which were directly related to their role. Table 3.3 below presents the findings[9].

Sixty one of all respondents said they had other qualifications that were directly related to their role in school.

---

[9]   This question led to a large and varied distribution of different response, some providing just 'grades', others giving qualification names with no grades. It is the intention of the research team to review this question for the second survey in 2008.

**Table 3.3**     Qualifications linked to role

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 61 |
| No | 39 |
| Prefer not to say | - |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*

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

The responses to this question revealed a wide range of qualifications. These included both academic and vocational qualifications from level 1 through to level 5, including:

**Academic qualifications**
- Post-graduate degrees     (2 per cent of the sample[10]: N=57)
- Undergraduate degrees     (5 per cent: N=161)
- Foundation degrees     (<1 per cent: N=13)
- A-levels/Scottish Highers (1 per cent: N=39)

**Vocational qualifications**
- HNC/HND     (2 per cent: N=54)
- BTEC & GNVQ     (4 per cent: N=136)
- NVQ     (4 per cent: N=109)

In addition to the above, a wide variety of other qualifications were identified, although the type and level of qualification was not always identifiable from the response given[11]. The subject areas these qualifications were in included the following:

- Accountancy
- Advice and guidance
- Business administration
- Business management
- Catering
- Childcare

---

[10]     Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
[11]     For a full breakdown of these qualifications see Technical Appendix under separate cover.

- Counselling
- Customer service
- Health and nutrition
- Information and communications technology (ICT)
- Librarianship
- Special needs
- Support work in schools
- Work-related skills (e.g. sign language, child protection, first aid)
- Youth work.

Of the support staff who said they did not have other qualifications related to their role, ten per cent said they were currently working towards gaining one.

## 3.4  ICT skills

Support staff were asked three questions concerning ICT: whether or not they felt confident in using email and the internet and if they were able to access computers in relation to their work (when needed for their work). Table 3.4 presents the findings from these questions.

**Table 3.4**     Confidence in using and being able to access ICT

| **Response:** | **% confidence about:** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | using e-mail | using the internet | being able to access computers when needed |
| Very confident | 49 | 50 | 60 |
| Fairly confident | 26 | 31 | 21 |
| Not very confident | 11 | 8 | 5 |
| Not at all confident | 13 | 10 | 5 |
| Do not need it for my role | - | - | 10 |
| Don't know | 1 | <1 | <1 |
| **N=3156** | | | |

*Each column reports a single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

### 3.4.1  Using email

Overall, three quarters of support staff reported they felt confident using e-mail, while almost half of all respondents said they felt very confident using e-mail. Nearly a quarter of support staff reported that they did not feel confident

using e-mail: this includes respondents who said they did not feel very confident and not at all confident.

### 3.4.2 Using the internet

Support staff felt slightly more confident using the internet than using e-mail. Around eight out of ten support staff said they felt 'very' or 'fairly confident' using the internet (half of all respondents said they felt 'very confident'), compared with 18 per cent who said they did not feel confident in using the internet (including respondents who said they did not feel very confident and not at all confident).

### 3.4.3 Access to computers

Eight out of ten support staff said they were either 'very' or 'fairly confident' (six in ten of all respondents said they felt 'very confident') that they could access a computer when they needed to in relation to their work. A tenth of support staff said they did not need access to a computer for their role.

## 3.5 Qualifications and ICT skills, regression analysis

Further analysis[12] examined three factors in relation to a range of variables (see in Appendix C2 for a full explanation of this analysis):

- qualifications in maths (also, see Table C1, Appendix C)
- qualifications in English (also, see Table C2, Appendix C)
- ICT skills (also, see Table C3, Appendix C).

### 3.5.1 Qualifications in maths

#### More likely to hold a maths qualification

Analysis found that the following groups were significantly more likely to hold a maths qualification at GCSE or better:

- administrative staff, specialist and technical staff, teaching assistants, learning support staff and pupil support staff, compared to site staff

---

[12] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

- staff employed by another organisation compared to those employed by schools
- staff at secondary schools compared to those in primary schools
- staff on a fixed-term contract compared to those who had a permanent contract.

## Less likely to hold a maths qualification

Analysis found that the following groups were significantly less likely to hold a maths qualification at GCSE or better:

- staff at schools with high proportions of pupils who are entitled to free school meals (FSM) compared to staff at schools with lower proportions of pupils with FSM
- staff who had been at their school for two or more years compared to those who had started at their school more recently
- support staff aged 45 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44[13].

### 3.5.2 Qualifications in English

## More likely to have an English qualification

The following groups were significantly more likely to have an English qualification at GCSE or better:

- specialist and technical staff, administrative staff, teaching assistants, learning support staff and pupil support staff, compared to site staff
- males compared to females
- staff in secondary and special schools compared to those in primary schools
- staff from schools in the South compared to those from the Midlands.

## Less likely to have an English qualification

Analysis found that the following groups were significantly less likely to have an English qualification at GCSE or better:

- staff who had been at their school for two or more years compared to those who had started at their school more recently
- staff who did not know if they had a contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- support staff aged 45 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44.

---

[13] Note that the comparator age band is 35–44. Where appropriate age bands are always explicitly stated.

### 3.5.3 Confidence in ICT

### More confidence in ICT

The following groups of support staff reported feeling more confident in using ICT:

- administrative staff, specialist and technical staff, teaching assistants learning support staff, and pupil support staff compared to site staff

- support staff with an English qualification compared to support staff without one

- male support staff compared to female respondents

- support staff in the 18 – 24 age band compared to those aged 35 – 44

- support staff employed by an 'other' organisation compared to those employed by a school

- support staff who worked on a full-time basis compared to those who were part-time

- support staff with a maths qualification compared to support staff without one

- support staff from secondary and special schools compared to support staff in primary schools.

### Less confidence in ICT

The following groups of staff reported feeling less confident in using ICT:

- staff who had refused to provide their age compared to those aged 35 – 44

- staff aged 45 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44

- support staff who had been in their role for more than two years, compared to those who had started more recently.

## 3.6 Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Most staff had an English or maths qualification (78 per cent and 69 per cent), and most of these were at GCSE level or better.

- A higher proportion of all support staff had an English qualification at GCSE or better than did for Maths.

- A small number of staff without an English or maths qualification were in the process of working towards achieving one (three per cent and five per cent respectively).

- Support staff reported holding a wide variety of 'other' qualifications that they considered to be relevant to their roles.

- Sixty one per cent of respondents reported having an 'other' qualification which related to their role.

- In relation to ICT, most support staff reported being confident in using email (75 per cent) and the internet (81 per cent), and were confident that they could access ICT when needed to for their job (81 per cent).

Regression analysis revealed that[14]:

- All staff categories, when compared to site staff, were more likely to hold maths and English qualifications (at GCSE or better), as were those their current role at their current school for less than 2 years.

- Support staff aged 45 and over were less likely to hold maths and English qualifications (at GCSE or better) than those aged 35 – 44.

- All staff categories, when compared to site staff, were more confident in using ICT.

---

[14] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. For instance, just one per cent of respondents said that they did not have a formal/written contract.

# 4. Experiences of management and performance review processes

This chapter provides the findings from Section C of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). These questions explored various aspects of line management and performance management amongst support staff, including:

- provision of guidance and support in assessing training and development needs
- whether respondents had a line manager and if so, whether this person was involved in supporting respondents regarding training and development
- performance review processes.

## 4.1 Training and development needs

### 4.1.1 Assessing needs

Support staff were asked to identify who was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role. Table 4.1 presents the findings[15].

**Table 4.1** Who is involved in identifying training and development needs

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Headteacher | 39 |
| Other senior member of the teaching staff * | 28 |
| Senior member of support staff** | 26 |
| Class teacher | 7 |
| School training and development coordinator | 3 |
| Other member of support staff at the same level at the school | 1 |
| No-one | 7 |
| I don't need/want training and development | 1 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Multiple response item, but not all answers are given (see Technical Appendix)*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*
*\* e.g. head of department/year, deputy head*
*\*\* e.g. supervisor (or equivalent) at the school*

---

[15] Only responses one per cent and above are presented in Table 4.1. For other responses see Technical Appendix under separate cover.

Respondents provided multiple responses to this question. Almost two fifths of support staff identified headteachers as one of the members of staff who was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role. Senior teaching staff and senior members of support staff were identified by similar proportions of respondents (over a quarter in each case) as helping them to decide their training and development needs. Furthermore, respondents also identified a range of other staff who had been involved in assessing their training and development needs.

Just under a tenth of support staff said that no-one helped them to identify their training and development needs.

## 4.1.2   Supporting training and development needs

Staff were asked how supported they felt by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Table 4.2 presents the findings from this question.

**Table 4.2**      Supporting training and development needs

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Very well supported | 60 |
| Fairly well supported | 30 |
| Not very supported | 6 |
| Not at all supported | 2 |
| I don't need/want to apply for training and development | 1 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Overwhelmingly, respondents reported that they felt supported by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Three fifths said they felt 'very well supported' and around a third felt 'fairly well supported'. Very few (under one in ten) said that they did not feel supported by their school, in relation to meeting their training and development needs.

# 4.2  Line management

Respondents were asked to identify whether anyone was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role (see Section 4.1.1). Of the 2861 people who did identify someone, the majority (77 per cent) identified one person as being involved in assessing their training

and development needs while the remainder (23 per cent) identified more than one person.

Respondents were then asked whether any of these people were their line manager. Of the 2208 respondents who said only one person was involved in helping them decide their training and development needs, 78 per cent identified this person as their line manager. Of the 653 respondents who said that more than one person was involved in helping them decide their training and development needs, 81 per cent said one of these people was their line manager. The remaining respondents said that they did not have a line manager, that they did not know what a line manager was, or that their line manager was not involved in helping them decide their training and development needs.

Table 4.4 below presents the range of job titles or roles of line managers, as reported by respondents, and split by respondents who received help from just their line manager in deciding what training development they needed, and those receiving help from people other than their line manager.

**Table 4.4**   The identity of line managers and decisions on training and development

| Line manager: | Number of people involved in training and development decisions (%) | | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| | one person (line manager) | more than one person (as well as line manager) | |
| Headteacher | 32 | 26 | 31 |
| Other senior member of the teaching staff * | 25 | 28 | 26 |
| Senior member of support staff ** | 27 | 23 | 26 |
| Class teacher | 2 | 13 | 4 |
| School training and development coordinator | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Other member of support staff at the same level at the school | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Other | 11 | 8 | 11 |
| | **N=1764** | **N=484** | **N=2248** |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*
*\* e.g. head of department/year, deputy head*
*\*\* e.g. supervisor or equivalent at the school*

Of those support staff who said their line manager was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed, more than three out of ten said their line manager was also the headteacher. A quarter said their line manager was a senior member of the teaching staff and a similar

proportion (27 per cent) said their line manger was a senior member of the support staff. For staff who said that one person helped advise them, and that this person was their line manager, the majority identified this person as the school's headteacher. Where support staff said they received advice **from more than one person** (and that one of these people was their line manager), most of them reported that their line manager was a senior member of the teaching staff.

## 4.3   Performance review processes

Respondents were asked if their school had a formal process or system in place through which they were able to discuss their work. Table 4.5 presents the findings.

**Table 4.5**     Management and performance review systems in place

| Response: | % |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | 76 |
| No | 21 |
| Don't need/want to discuss work | <1 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Just over three-quarters of support staff said their school had a formal process or system in place through which they were able to discuss their work.

Support staff who had said there was a system or process in place, were then asked how useful they found this in helping to identify their training and development needs. Additional analysis revealed that of these respondents, nearly all said they found the system 'useful', with 58 per cent saying that they found it 'very useful' and a further third (32 per cent) said it was 'fairly useful'.

Respondents were also asked whom they needed to get permission from in order to apply for training and development. Just over half said they needed permission from the headteacher. Just under a third (32 per cent) said they needed permission from their line manager and 16 per cent said they needed the permission of 'another senior member of the teaching staff' (see Technical Appendix for further breakdown, under separate cover).

## 4.4 Experiences of management, regression analysis

Factor analysis[16] revealed a set of correlated items related to staff experiences of management (see Appendix C for a fuller explanation of this analysis):

- the number of staff involved in deciding training and development (also, see Table C4, Appendix C)

- having a line manager involved in training and development (also see Table C5, Appendix C)

- experience of management and performance reviews (also, see Table C6, Appendix C)

- level of support in meeting training and development needs (see Table C7, Appendix C).

### 4.4.1 The number of staff involved in helping decide training and development needs

#### More staff involved in helping decide training and development needs

The following groups of staff were found to have significantly more people involved in helping them decide their training and development needs, in comparison to site staff:

- learning support staff compared to site staff

- teaching assistants compared to site staff

- pupil support staff compared to site staff

- administrative staff compared to site staff

- support staff with more than one role compared to those with only one role.

#### Fewer staff involved in helping decide training and development needs

The following groups of staff were found to have significantly fewer people involved in deciding their training and development needs:

- support staff who said that they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract

- BME staff compared to their white counterparts.

---

[16] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

### 4.4.2 Having a line manager involved in helping decide training and development needs

**Line manager more likely to be involved**

The following groups were significantly more likely to have involvement from line managers in helping decide their training and development needs:

- administrative staff compared to site staff

- support staff in girls' schools compared to support staff working in mixed schools

- support staff with a qualification in English compared to those without one

- support staff with more than one role compared to those with just one role

- support staff in secondary schools compared to those in primary schools

- learning support staff compared to site staff.

## Line manager less likely to be involved

The following groups were significantly less likely to have the involvement of line managers in helping decide their training and development needs:

- support staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract

- support staff who had been at their school for two years or more compared to those who had arrived at their school more recently.

### 4.4.3 Experience of management and performance review processes

## More positive experience of performance review process

The following groups were found to have significantly more positive experiences of management and performance review:

- support staff in special schools compared to support staff in primary schools

- learning support staff, teaching assistants, pupil support staff and administrative staff compared to site staff

- support staff with more than one role, compared to those with just one role

- support staff who had been in their current role for two or more years compared to support staff who had started in their role more recently.

## Less positive experience of performance review process

The following groups were found to have a significantly less positive experience of their management and performance review:

- support staff who said that they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- staff from boys' schools compared to staff at mixed schools
- specialist and technical compared to site staff
- respondents from schools with high proportions of pupils with SEN compared to staff in schools with lower proportions of pupils with SEN.

## 4.4.4 Satisfaction with school support for meeting training and development needs

## Higher satisfaction with school support

The following groups reported feeling significantly better supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs:

- support staff with more than one role compared to support staff with just one role
- staff aged 55 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44
- administrative staff compared to site staff
- staff from schools in the North compared to staff from schools in the Midlands
- staff from medium-sized schools compared to staff from smaller schools.

## Lower satisfaction with school support

The following groups reported feeling significantly less well supported, by their school, in meeting their training and development needs:

- support staff who said that they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- staff employed by 'other' organisations compared to those employed by schools
- staff from secondary schools compared to those from primary schools
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- staff who had been in their role for two years or more compared to those who had started in their school more recently.

## 4.5  Key findings

Descriptive analysis showed that:

- Support staff identified a range of individuals who were involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role; headteachers being the most popular response.

- Senior teaching staff and senior members of support staff were also identified as helping support staff to decide on their training and development needs.

- Most support staff (71 per cent[17]) reported that their line manager supported them in relation to deciding their training and development needs.

- Most support staff (76 per cent) said there was a formal process or system in place in their school through which they were able to discuss their work, and of these, most (90 per cent) said that they found the process useful.

Regression analysis revealed that:

- A larger number of people were involved in helping decide what training and development was needed in relation to learning support staff and teaching assistants. Fewer people were involved in relation to staff who said that they did not have a formal/written contract and for BME staff.

- The following groups of staff were more likely to have a line manager involved in helping them decide their training and development needs: administrative staff; support staff in girls' schools; staff with a qualification in English; staff with more than one role; staff in secondary schools; and learning support staff. The following groups of staff were less likely to have this kind of support: support staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract and staff who had been at their school for two or more years.

- The following groups of staff were more positive about their experience of line management: support staff in special schools, learning support staff, teaching assistants, pupil support staff, administrative staff, support staff with more than one role and support staff who had been in their current role for two years or more. The following groups of staff were less positive: staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract; staff in boys' schools; specialist and technical staff; and staff from schools with high proportions of pupils with SEN.

- The following groups of staff reported higher levels of satisfaction in relation to their school's ability to meet their training and development needs: staff with more than one role; staff aged over 55; administrative staff; staff from schools in the North of England; and staff from medium-sized schools. The following reported lower levels of satisfaction: support staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract, staff employed by 'other' organisations, staff in secondary schools, specialist and technical staff and staff who had been in their role for two years or more.

---

[17] This figure is calculated by dividing the total number of people who identified their line manager as being involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed (N=2248) by the sample as a whole (N=3156).

# 5. Motivation, barriers and information needs

This chapter provides the findings from Section D of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). The questions in Section D explored support staff perceptions and awareness of training and development opportunities. These included:

- motivational factors in training and development
- barriers to training and development
- access to information about training and development.

## 5.1 Reasons for selecting training and development

Support staff were provided with a list of possible motivational factors (or reasons) which may be influential in their decisions as to whether to take part in training and development. Respondents were asked how important each factor was to them. Table 5.1 presents the findings.

**Table 5.1**   Motivational factors in training and development

| Response: | Very important | Fairly important | Not very important | Not at all important | Don't need/want | Don't know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To provide support in carrying out current role | 74 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 1 | <1 |
| Help with career progression in current role | 44 | 33 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Enable move into a different job | 30 | 32 | 20 | 14 | 2 | 1 |
| Achieve higher pay | 41 | 34 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Take on greater responsibilities | 46 | 36 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Increase job satisfaction | 65 | 28 | 4 | 2 | 1 | <1 |
| Help with self-development | 66 | 29 | 3 | 2 | 1 | <1 |

**N=3156**

*A series of single response items*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

The factor which most support staff said was 'important' in their decision to undertake training and development was the extent to which it would help

support them in carrying out their current role. Just under three-quarters of support staff said this was 'very important' to them. Support staff also said that they would undertake training and development if it helped with their self-development and increased their job satisfaction. Two thirds of support staff felt each of these factors was 'very important'.

Responses suggest that career progression and increases in pay were somewhat less important to most support staff in influencing their decisions to undertake training and development.

## 5.2 Barriers to training and development

Support staff were asked to identify what prevented them from taking part in training and development. Table 5.2 shows the barriers identified by respondents in answer to this open-ended question[18].

**Table 5.2**     Barriers to training and development

| Response: | % |
| --- | --- |
| Nothing stops me | 35 |
| Other commitments/demands on time | 30 |
| Lack of funding for training | 15 |
| Difficult personal circumstances | 5 |
| Age/too old | 3 |
| Don't know what is available | 3 |
| Don't think what is available is relevant | 3 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Multiple response item*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*

Just over a third of respondents said that they did not feel that anything stopped them taking part in training and development. However, slightly under two thirds (65 per cent, including responses reproduced in the Technical Appendix) of staff identified a range of factors which they said prevented them from taking part in training and development. Just under a third of support staff said that other commitments and demands on their time prevented them from taking part in training and development. Lack of funding was also identified as a barrier by one in seven of support staff. Smaller proportions of respondents mentioned other factors that they said prevented them from taking part in training and development, such as being older, not knowing what training and development was available and/or not thinking that the training and development available was relevant to them.

---

[18]     Responses of three per cent and above presented in table. For all responses see Technical Appendix, under separate cover.

## 5.3 Information about training and development

Support staff were asked which organisations they would use if they wanted to access information about training and development. Table 5.3 presents the findings[19].

**Table 5.3**     Organisation used for information

| Response: | % |
| --- | --- |
| My school | 38 |
| Local authority | 28 |
| Don't know | 20 |
| **N=3156** | |

*Multiple response item*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*

Respondents mentioned a wide range of organisations that they would contact if they wanted information on training and development; however, schools and local authorities were the organisations mentioned most frequently. A fifth of support staff said they did not know where to access information about training and development.

Support staff were also asked about their preferred format for receiving such information. Respondents were provided with a range of options to choose from and were also asked if there were any other ways they would like to receive information about training and development. Table 5.4 presents the findings.

**Table 5.4**   Preferred format for training and development information

| Response: | Yes % | No % | Don't want any % | Don't know % |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Other printed material (e.g. flyers, brochures) | 85 | 14 | <1 | <1 |
| Online/internet | 71 | 29 | 1 | <1 |
| Local printed press (e.g newspapers and magazines) | 64 | 35 | <1 | <1 |
| National printed press (e.g newspapers and magazines) | 42 | 56 | 1 | 1 |
| TV and radio | 40 | 59 | <1 | <1 |
| Some other way | 31 | 61 | - | 10 |
| **N= 3156** | | | | |

*A series of single response items*

---

[19]   Responses of ten per cent and above are presented in the table. For all responses see Technical Appendix.

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

Generally, printed materials such as flyers and brochures were the preferred format for receiving information about training and development. However, the internet and local printed press were also popular choices for receiving this type of information. In addition, just under a third of support staff said they would like to receive information about training and development in some other way. This included[20]: post or newsletter (12 per cent); staff at school (nine per cent); and face-to-face (four per cent).

# 5.4 Motivation, barriers and information needs, regression analysis

Factor analysis[21] revealed a set of correlated items which related to:

- personal development[22] (see Table C8, Appendix C)
- career development[23] (see Table C9, Appendix C)
- barriers to personal development (see Table C10, Appendix C)
- sources of information on training and development (see Table C11, Appendix C).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of respondent and school-level characteristics predicted responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C).

## 5.4.1 Personal development as a reason for taking part in training and development

### More importance placed on personal development

The following groups were found to place a significantly greater importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training:

- teaching assistants and learning support staff compared to site staff
- BME staff compared to white respondents

---

[20] For full list of responses see Technical Appendix, under separate cover.

[21] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

[22] Personal development included three items: support in carrying out current role; increase job satisfaction; and help with self-development.

[23] Career development included four items: help with career progression in current role; help move to another job; achieve higher pay; and take on greater responsibilities.

- staff who worked full-time compared to staff who were part-time
- pupil support staff compared to site staff
- staff from schools with a high proportion of pupils with FSM compared to staff from schools with a smaller proportion of pupils with FSM.

## Less importance placed on personal development

The following groups were found to place significantly less importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training:

- staff aged 45 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44
- staff employed by a local authority compared to those employed by schools.

## 5.4.2 Career development as a reason for taking part in training and development

## More importance placed on career development

The following groups were found to place a significantly greater importance on 'career development' as a reason to undertake training:

- staff aged under 35 compared to those aged 35 – 44
- BME staff compared to white staff
- staff who worked on a full-time basis compared to those who were employed part-time
- staff who were on a fixed-term contract compared to those on a permanent contract
- staff in schools with a high proportion of pupils entitled to FSM compared to staff in schools with lower proportions of FSM pupils.

## Less importance placed on career development

The following groups were found to place significantly less importance on 'career development' as a reason to undertake training:

- staff aged 45 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- male staff compared to female staff
- administrative staff compared to site staff
- staff from a medium-sized school compared to those from the smallest schools
- staff from schools with pupil achievement in the second highest band compared to staff from schools in the lowest achievement band

- staff who had been at their school for more than two years compared to those who had started at their school more recently.

### 5.4.3 Barriers to taking part in training and development regression

## A larger number of barriers

The following groups identified a significantly greater number of barriers to taking part in training and development:

- staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- learning support staff compared to site staff
- staff with a qualification in English compared to those without such a qualification
- teaching assistants compared to site staff
- staff in secondary schools compared to those in primary schools
- staff aged 45 – 54 compared to those aged 34 – 44.

## Smaller number of barriers

The following groups reported significantly fewer barriers to taking part in training and development:

- staff aged under 25 compared to those aged 35 – 44
- full-time support staff compared to support staff who worked on a part-time basis.

### 5.4.4 The number of sources of information about training and development used by support staff

## More information sources used

The following groups said they would use a significantly greater number of organisations to access information about training and development:

- learning support staff, administrative staff, teaching assistants and specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- male staff compared to female staff
- staff with a qualification in English compared to those without such a qualification
- pupil support staff compared to site staff

- staff employed on a full-time basis compared to those who were employed part-time

- staff who had been in their school for more than two years compared to staff who had started at their school more recently.

## Fewer information sources used

The following groups said they would use significantly fewer information sources to access information about training and development:

- staff aged under 35 compared to those aged 35 – 44

- support staff working in boys' schools compared to staff working in mixed schools

- staff employed by local authorities compared to those employed by schools

- staff in the largest schools compared to those in smaller schools.

# 5.5 Key findings

Descriptive analysis showed that:

- Higher proportions of respondents thought that support for undertaking their role and personal development were important reasons for determining whether to take part in training and development, compared to career development or financial reward.

- Just over a third of respondents (35 per cent) felt there were no barriers stopping them taking part in training and development; the remaining 65 per cent of respondents identified a range of barriers that they said stopped them taking part in training and development.

- A fifth of respondents (20 per cent) did not know where to obtain information about training and development.

Regression analysis revealed that:

- Teaching assistants, learning support staff and those from BME groups were more likely to cite personal development as a reason for training and development. This was also the case for staff who worked full-time, for pupil support staff and for staff from schools with a high proportion of pupils with entitlement to free school meal (FSM). Personal development was a less important reason for undertaking training and development for staff aged 45 and over and for those employed by a local authority.

- Career development was an important reason for undertaking training and development for staff aged 34 and under, BME staff, for those who worked on a full-time basis, for staff who were on a fixed-term contract and for staff in schools with a high proportion of pupils eligible for FSM. Career development was a less important reason for undertaking training and development for staff aged 45 and over, specialist and technical staff,

male respondents, administrative staff, staff from medium-sized schools and for staff who had been at their school for more than two years.

- Staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract, specialist and technical staff, learning support staff, respondents with a qualification in English, teaching assistants and staff in secondary schools identified a greater number of barriers preventing them from taking part in training. The opposite was true for those in the youngest age band and staff who worked full-time

- Learning support staff, administrative staff, teaching assistants, specialist and technical staff, male respondents, staff with a qualification in English, pupil support staff, staff employed on a full-time basis and staff who had been in their current role at their school for more than two years identified a greater number of information sources about training and development. Staff aged 34 and under, support staff working in boys' schools, staff employed by local authorities and staff in the largest schools identified fewer sources of information.

# 6. Experiences of training and development

This chapter presents the survey findings relating to experiences of training and development in respondents' current role(s) and includes the responses to questions in Section E of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). Support staff were asked about:

- their induction into their current role, and any assessment of their professional development needs
- the focus of any professional development or training received in the past year
- the focus, location and provider of their most recent training undertaken as part of their specified role
- whether this training was leading to a formal qualification or status and if so what this was.

An analysis of support staff responses to questions around these themes is followed by three regression analyses focusing on the school- and respondent-level factors associated with experiencing three types of induction/training:

- their induction into their current role
- any training in a twelve-month period prior to the time of being surveyed
- their receipt of 'child-focused' training in the past 12 months.

Further explanation of these three outcome variables can be found in section 6.5, following the frequency analysis below, and in Appendix C.

## 6.1 Induction into current role

Initially, support staff were asked to consider their experiences on first starting work in their current roles (question E1 Appendix B) and to indicate whether they had been:

- introduced to their line manager
- given a job description
- given an opportunity to discuss their training and development needs.

Their responses can be seen in Table 6.1 below.

**Table 6.1**     Induction into current role

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Given a job description | 87 |
| Introduced to line manager (only asked of those with a line manager) | 84* |
| Given opportunity to discuss training and development needs | 61 |
| Don't know/can't remember | 1 |
| **N= 3156** | |

*Multiple response item (percentage only presented for 'yes' responses)*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*
*\* N=2240*

The great majority of respondents said that they were given a job description and introduced to their line manager when they started working in their current role. Discussion of training and development needs was less routinely carried out, however, and while most support staff reported that they were given an opportunity to discuss their needs, four out of ten (39 per cent) reported that they had not been given such an opportunity.

## 6.2   Training and development in the past 12 months

Respondents were asked whether they had received training and development on a series of given topics in the preceding 12 months, in relation to their specified role (see question E2, Appendix B). These areas were:

- improving or updating their own skills (e.g. ICT, literacy, maths)
- managing pupils' behaviour/discipline
- promoting children's safety and welfare/child protection
- skills and knowledge directly related to their role in school
- understanding the curriculum or supporting a specific subject area/key stage
- working with children or young people with special educational needs.

They were also asked whether this training was completed or ongoing.

Three quarters of support staff (75 per cent) reported having received some training or professional development relating to their current specified role in the past 12 months. Of these respondents a total of 17 per cent had participated in one piece of training over the past year, whilst a further 58 per cent had participated in more than one.

**Table 6.2**     Focus of all training and professional development in the past 12 months

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Role-related skills and knowledge (e.g. ICT) | 56 |
| Promoting safety and welfare / child protection | 46 |
| Managing behaviour / discipline | 38 |
| Working with children with SEN | 37 |
| Supporting specific subject/key stage | 30 |
| Improving basic skills | 29 |
| No response/no training relating to specified role in past 12 months | 24 |

**N= 3156**

*A series of single response items, percentage only presented for 'yes' responses*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Over half of the sample reported that they had received training aimed at developing role-related skills and knowledge. Between a third and a half had received training on pupil welfare or child protection, behaviour management, and working with children with special educational needs. In addition, just under a third (30 per cent) of respondents had received training in supporting a specific subject area or key stage, and their own basic skills.

Additional analysis revealed that, of those respondents who had reported undertaking role-specific training in the last 12 months, just over half (52 per cent) reported that their training had been completed whilst just under half (47 per cent) stated that it was still ongoing.

## 6.3  Focus, location and provider of most recent training

Where support staff had reported attending training relating to at least one of the listed areas for their work in their specified role, they were asked to give some more details regarding their most recent training course (see questions E2/E3, Appendix B). This included information about:

- the focus of the training
- where the training course or event took place
- the nature/type of the training provider.

## 6.3.1 The focus of training received

In order to further explore experiences of training, respondents were asked to provide details of their most recent training. The focus of their most recent training can be seen in Table 6.3.

**Table 6.3** The focus of the most recent training or professional development in the past 12 months

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Role-related skills and knowledge | 29 |
| Promoting safety and welfare / child protection | 22 |
| Managing behaviour / discipline | 16 |
| Working with children with SEN | 12 |
| Improving basic skills | 10 |
| Supporting specific subject/key stage | 7 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| **N=2390** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

The focus of recent training reported by the highest proportion of respondents (nearly 3 in 10) was role-related skills and knowledge, followed by promoting children's safety and welfare/child protection (over a fifth). Lower proportions of respondents reported that they had recently received training in their own basic skills and supporting a specific subject or key stage.

**Table 6.4** Most recent training completed or ongoing?

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Completed | 58 |
| Ongoing | 42 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=2305** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

For the majority of respondents, training had been completed, although a substantial minority said their training was still on-going at the time of the survey.

## 6.3.2  The location of training received

The next question (E5, Appendix B) asked where this most recent training had taken place. A list of possible venues was given and any other responses were also recorded. The most frequent responses to this question can be seen in Table 6.5.

**Table 6.5**  Location of most recent training or professional development

| Response: | % |
| --- | --- |
| At your school (in INSET time) | 38 |
| At your school (in non-INSET time) | 22 |
| At the local authority's premises/office | 16 |
| At another school | 10 |
| At a college/university | 7 |
| At your school (Don't know whether in INSET time) | 3 |
| At a hotel | 3 |
| Somewhere else/open response | 1 |
| Don't know/can't remember | <1 |
| **N=2305** | |

*Multiple response item*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*

The most frequently cited location of recent training and development, was the respondents' own school. Furthermore, well over a third of these respondents said that they had been trained within the school's in-service training programme (INSET) and just over a fifth had received training outside of INSET time.

Local authority premises were also frequently mentioned as a location for training (by 16 per cent of respondents), and one in ten respondents reported that their most recent training had been carried out at another school. Respondents were also given the opportunity to identify 'another' location of their most recent training. Fewer than one per cent[24] identified such alternative locations, which included:

- at home (distance learning)
- employer's premises[25]
- church hall/town hall or community centre

---

[24] See Technical Appendix for further details.
[25] It should be noted that respondents could have also been referring a school/ LA location, but there was no further information in this regard.

- hospital, health centre or NHS premises
- conference centre
- hired venue (other than specified)
- training or development centre
- external training organisation's premises.

### 6.3.3 The providers of the recent training

The next question (see E6, Appendix B) asked respondents to identify which individuals or organisations had provided their most recent training. Their responses can be seen in Table 6.6.

**Table 6.6**   Provider of most recent training and development

| **Response:** | **%** |
| --- | --- |
| Staff from the local authority | 34 |
| Another provider/organisation | 21 |
| Another member of teaching staff at your school | 18 |
| Another member of support staff at your school | 9 |
| Your line manager | 6 |
| Staff from a college/university | 5 |
| A member of teaching staff from another school | 2 |
| A member of support staff from another school | 1 |
| Your learning coach or mentor | <1 |
| Someone else/open response | 2 |
| Don't know/can't remember | 9 |
| **N= 2305** | |

*Multiple response item*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*

Local authority staff were the most frequently cited providers of training, mentioned by just over a third of respondents. Over a quarter of respondents said that their training had been provided by staff from their own school, either by teaching staff or by other support staff. In a small number of cases, respondents said that the trainer was also their line manager. According to just over a fifth of respondents, 'other' training organisations provided their most recent training. Providers of training, mentioned by smaller numbers of support staff included universities, colleges and staff from other schools[26].

---

[26]   See Technical Appendix for further details.

## 6.4   Training for qualification or status

Respondents were asked whether their most recent training was intended to lead to a formal qualification or change in status (see question E7, Appendix B). In addition, those who said that it did contribute towards a qualification or status were asked whether they had achieved this (or in the case of ongoing training whether they expected to achieve it). See table 6.7 for responses to these questions.

**Table 6.7**   Outcomes of training: achievement of qualifications and status

| Response: | % responding: | | | N= |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | yes | no | don't know | |
| Training leading to formal qualifications/status? | 17 | 81 | 1 | **2305** |
| Did you/do you expect to achieve this qualification/status? * | 91 | 6 | 3 | **401** |

*\* Of those whose training led to qualification/status*
*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Just under a fifth of respondents said that their training had led (or would lead) to some form of qualification or status. Those who said that their training had or would lead to a formal qualification were asked to specify the type. A wide range of different types of qualification were reported, but the most frequently cited of these were:

- NVQ level 3, mentioned by seven per cent (subjects included teaching assistant, childcare, learning mentor)
- certificate in behaviour management, mentioned by seven per cent
- HLTA status mentioned by five per cent
- NVQ level 2, mentioned by five per cent (subjects included teaching assistant, learning mentor, food related, cleaning)
- certificate in adult numeracy, mentioned by three per cent (level 2 or unspecified)
- certificate in adult literacy, mentioned by three per cent (level 2 or unspecified)
- certificate in child protection, mentioned by three per cent
- GCSE, mentioned by two per cent
- certificate in food hygiene and handling, mentioned by two per cent
- certificate in health and safety, mentioned by two per cent
- certificate in working with children with autism, mentioned by two per cent.

Over 90 per cent of those who said their training led (or was expected to lead) to a qualification or change of status had either gained that qualification or status or expected to do so.

## 6.5 Experiences of training and development, regression analysis

Regression analysis[27] was used to examine respondent-level and school-level variables associated with respondent's experience of induction and training and development. These three factors were:

- receipt of role-specific induction[28] (see Table C12, Appendix C)
- any training in a twelve-month period prior to the time of being surveyed[29] (see Table C13, Appendix C)
- participation in 'child-focused' training in the past 12 months[30] (see Table C14, Appendix C).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related to specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C).

### 6.5.1 Receipt of a role-specific induction into current post

#### More role-specific induction

The following groups were found to have had significantly more role-specific induction:

- male support staff compared to female staff
- staff aged 25 – 34 compared to those aged 35 – 44
- staff who held a full-time post compared to those who worked part-time.

#### Less role-specific induction

The following groups were found to have had significantly smaller amounts of role-specific induction:

---

[27]  The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

[28]  This represents a sum of three items: introduction to line manager; receipt of job description; and an opportunity to discuss training and development needs during induction.

[29]  This factor represents whether or not the individual had had any training in the past 12 months.

[30]  This factor represents the number of child-focused training opportunities attended in the past year.

- staff who said that they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- staff aged 55 – 64 compared to those aged 35 – 44
- those who had been working in their current role at their school for more than two years, compared to those who had come into their role more recently
- staff aged 45 – 54 compared to staff aged 35 – 44.

## 6.5.2    Any training in the last 12 months

### More likely to have had any training

The following groups were significantly more likely to have had any training/development in the last 12 months:

- staff working full-time compared to those who were part-time
- staff with more than one role compared to those with just one role
- staff from special schools compared to staff from primary schools
- all staff categories compared to site staff.

### Less likely to have had any training

The following groups were significantly less likely to have had any training/development in the last 12 months:

- staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- staff aged 55 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44
- staff from schools in the highest achievement bands, compared to those from schools in the lower achievement bands.

## 6.5.3    Child-focused training in the past 12 months

### More child-focused training

The following groups were found to have participated in significantly more child-focused training/development opportunities:

- learning support staff, teaching assistants and pupil support staff, specialist and technical staff compared to site staff compared to site staff
- those holding multiple roles compared to those with just one role
- staff holding a full-time post when compared to those who were part-time
- support staff in secondary schools compared to those in primary schools

- support staff who held an English qualification compared to those who did not

- staff in schools with a higher proportion of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) compared to those staff in schools with smaller proportions of pupils with SEN.

## Less child-focused training

Support staff in higher achieving schools had received significantly less child-focused training than those in lower achieving schools.

# 6.6  Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- The provision of a job description and an introduction to the line manager was common practice when the support staff represented in this sample began their current role. Discussion of training and development needs was less routinely carried out, with over a third of respondents (39 per cent) reporting that this was not offered to them.

- Whilst the majority of staff (75 per cent) had received some form of professional development in the past twelve months, just under a quarter (24 per cent) had not received training in any of the six key areas specified in the survey.

- Areas most frequently identified as the focus of support staff professional development were: role-related skills and knowledge; pupil welfare or child protection; and behaviour management. These three areas were also most likely to have been the focus of respondents' most recent training experience.

- The most frequently cited location for training/development activity was at the participant's own school, either within or outside the school's in-service training programme (38 per cent and 22 per cent respectively). Local authority premises were also frequently used for training purposes (16 per cent), and one in ten respondents reported that their most recent training had been carried out at another school.

- The most frequently cited training providers were local authority staff. The local authority had carried out the most recent training for just over a third of support staff (34 per cent). For a further quarter of respondents, training had been provided by staff from their own school (27 per cent), either teaching staff (18 per cent) or other support staff (nine per cent).

- Over half the respondents (58 per cent) stated that their training had been completed, whilst less than half (42 per cent) stated that it was still ongoing. Less than a fifth of respondents (17 per cent) said that their training led to some form of qualification or status but amongst those for whom it did, a wide range of different qualification types were represented.

Regression analysis revealed that:

- The following groups were more likely to have had role specific induction: male support staff; staff aged 25 – 34 and full-time staff.

- Groups less likely to have had a role specific induction were: those who said they did not have a formal/written contract, specialist and technical staff, staff aged 55 – 64 and those who had been working in their current role for more than two years.

- The following groups were significantly more likely to have had any training/development in the last 12 months; staff working full-time, staff with more than one role, staff from special schools and all staff categories compared to site staff.

- Those who said they did not have a formal/written contract, staff aged 55 and over, and staff working part-time were most likely not to have had training/development in the 12 months preceding the survey.

- Child-focused training was significantly associated with some support staff roles. Those working as learning support staff, staff with more than one role, teaching assistants, pupil support staff or specialist and technical staff participated in more child-focused training than site staff in the past year. Support staff who worked full-time, those working in secondary schools and those who held an English qualification also received more of this type of training.

- School achievement was also a significant factor in this model, such that support staff in higher achieving schools had received less child-focused training than those in lower achieving schools.

# 7. Satisfaction with training and development

This chapter presents the findings from Section E of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). These questions explored the school support staff satisfaction with their most recent training and development, related to its quality, its relevance to meeting needs, its benefits and support staff preferences regarding the location of training and development.

## 7.1 Quality and relevance of training and development

### 7.1.1 The quality of training and development

Support staff who had received training in the last 12 months were asked to rate the quality of the most recent training and development they had received (see also Section 6). The results from this question are shown in Table 7.1.

**Table 7.1**     Quality of training and development

| **Response:** | **%** |
| --- | --- |
| Very good | 58 |
| Fairly good | 39 |
| Fairly poor | 2 |
| Very poor | 1 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| **N=2305** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Well over half of those questioned said that the quality of the most recent training and development they had received was 'very good', and well over a third indicated it was 'fairly good'. Very few respondents rated the quality of their training and development as 'fairly' or 'very poor'.

### 7.1.2 The relevance of training and development

Respondents were also asked to rate whether the training and development they had received met their needs for their specific role. Table 7.2 presents the findings.

**Table 7.2**    Meeting the needs of support staff roles

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Very good | 54 |
| Fairly good | 40 |
| Fairly poor | 4 |
| Very poor | 1 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| **N=2305** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

Generally, support staff felt the most recent training and development they had received met the needs specific to their role, with over half indicating it had been 'very good' at doing this and two-fifths 'fairly good'.

## 7.2 Benefits of training and development

In an open-ended question, respondents were asked to provide information about the benefits of the most recent training and development they had received or were receiving. Table 7.3 presents the answers given by five per cent or more respondents (see Technical Appendix, under separate cover).

**Table 7.3**    Benefits of training and development

| Response: | % |
|---|---|
| Helped support role | 68 |
| Helped gain confidence | 14 |
| Helped develop awareness, knowledge and skills | 11 |
| Helped self development | 10 |
| Helped respondents undertake greater responsibilities | 5 |
| Had no benefits | 5 |
| **N=2305** | |

*Multiple response item*
*More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100*

Over two-thirds of support staff said the training and development they received most recently had helped support them in carrying out their role. One in seven felt they had gained confidence as a result of their training and development. Similar proportions of respondents said that the training and development had increased their awareness, knowledge or skills and had helped their general self-development. Only one in twenty (5 per cent) of respondents said that there had been no benefits as a result of their most recent training and development.

## 7.3  Preferred location of training and development

All support staff, regardless of whether or not they had participated in training and development in the last twelve months, were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with two statements about the possible location of training and development. Table 7.4 presents the findings.

**Table 7.4**   Preferred location of training and development

| Statement: | Strongly agree % | Agree % | Disagree % | Strongly disagree % | Don't know % | Don't need/ want % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prefer training and development to be held at or near own school | 70 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Would travel any where in England for training and development, if the benefits were good enough | 18 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 1 | 1 |
| **N=3156** | | | | | | |

*A series of single response items*

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

The majority of support staff agreed that they would prefer training and development to be held 'at or near' their own school, with seven out of ten respondents 'strongly agreeing' and just over two out of ten 'agreeing'. Less than one in ten of respondents disagreed with this statement.

However, 45 per cent of respondents said they would be prepared to travel 'anywhere in England' for training if they thought the benefits were good enough. The remainder said they would definitely not travel this far (54 per cent). A small number of respondents said that they didn't want training (one per cent), or that they weren't sure how far they would travel (one per cent[31]).

---

[31]    Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100.

## 7.4 Satisfaction with training and development, regression analysis

Regression analysis was used to examine respondent-level and school-level variables associated with two training and development-related factors, derived from the factor analysis described in Section 1.4 and Appendix C1[32].

These two factors were:

- perceived multiple benefits of training/development[33] (see Table C15, Appendix C)
- perceived relevance of training and satisfaction with training/development[34] (see Table C16, Appendix C).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related to specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C).

### 7.4.1 Perceived multiple benefits of training

### A higher number of perceived benefits

The following groups were found to perceive a significantly greater number of benefits from their recent training/development:

- learning support staff compared to site staff
- teaching assistants compared to site staff
- staff holding an English qualification compared to those without an English qualification.

### A lower number of perceived benefits

Respondents from medium-sized schools reported significantly fewer benefits from their most recent training compared to staff in small schools.

---

[32] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

[33] This factor represents the number of benefits cited by respondents resulting from their most recent training/development opportunity.

[34] This factor represents the satisfaction rating given in relation to the quality of the training/development and its relevance to meeting the needs of the role.

### 7.4.2 Satisfaction with and relevance of training in the past 12 months

## Higher levels of satisfaction

The following groups were found to express significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their most recent training/development and its perceived relevance:

- learning support staff, teaching assistants, administrative staff and pupil support staff compared to site staff
- those holding an English qualification when compared to those without this qualification
- those working in special schools when compared to those in primary schools
- those with more than one role when compared to those with just one role.

## Lower levels of satisfaction

The following groups were found to express significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their most recent training/development and its perceived relevance:

- staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- staff aged 65 and over compared to those aged 35 – 44
- those from schools in the second highest achievement band compared to staff from schools in the lowest achievement band
- those with a fixed-term contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- those working in secondary schools compared to those in primary schools.

# 7.5 Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Generally, respondents rated their most recent training/development highly ('very good'/'fairly good': 97 per cent), with only three per cent of participating support staff rating it as 'fairly' or 'very poor'.
- Respondents' most recent training was overwhelmingly perceived to be appropriate to the needs of those who had taken part (94 per cent rated it 'very' or 'fairly good', with only five per cent of staff rating it 'fairly' or 'very poor').
- Over two-thirds (68 per cent) of support staff said the training and development they received had supported them in carrying out their role.

- Generally, support staff were keen that their training should take place close to their place of work ('strongly agree'/'agree': 91 per cent); nonetheless if the benefits were great enough a large minority of support staff ('strongly agree'/'agree': 45 per cent) stated that they would be willing to travel anywhere in England.

Regression analysis revealed that:

- Perception of a large number of benefits from training were found to be significantly related to being a member of learning support staff and being a teaching assistant. Individuals holding an English qualification also reported a higher number of benefits from their training, whilst respondents in medium-sized schools reported fewer benefits (compared to those in small schools).
- Satisfaction with training and its perceived relevance was predominantly associated with role, such that learning support staff, teaching assistants, administrative staff and pupil support staff all rated their training more highly than site staff.
- Staff from secondary schools, those with no formal/written contract and staff aged 65 and over gave lower ratings to their training.

# 8.    Support staff with more than one role

This section presents the results of analyses relating to support staff holding more than one role in school. When participating in the telephone survey, staff who had more than one role were mainly asked about their experiences in a single role selected by the researcher (see Section 1.3.2)[35], but their perceptions of differences in training and development between this and their other role(s) were addressed in Section F of the survey, and those findings are presented here (see Appendix B).

## 8.1    Differences in training and development between roles for support staff with more than one role

Respondents who had identified themselves as having multiple roles in school were asked to indicate whether their experience of training and development differed between their different roles. A total of 409 respondents (13 per cent) fell into this category and were included in the following analyses.

### 8.1.1    The extent to which training differed between roles for support staff with more than one role

Respondents were asked the extent to which their training and development differed between their roles. The answers to this question can be seen in Table 8.1.

---

[35]    The main role that respondents were asked questions in relation to was selected and determined to reflect the sample category targets in each of the main six categories and according to school stratification criteria.

**Table 8.1**     Extent to which training and development differs between roles

| Response: | % |
| --- | --- |
| A great deal | 26 |
| To some extent | 23 |
| Not very much | 27 |
| Not at all | 17 |
| It depends/can't generalise | 1 |
| Don't know | <1 |
| I haven't had training or development for my other role | 5 |
| I don't need training or development for my other roles | - |
| **N=409** | |

*Single response item*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

As Table 8.1 shows, support staff responses were fairly evenly split, indicating either a fairly high degree of difference ('a great deal'/'to some extent': just over two fifths of responses) and a fairly low level of difference ('not very much'/'not at all': 44 per cent of responses). One in 20 respondents said that they had not had any training or development for their additional role. Just over one in ten respondents said they did not have an additional role, despite their school having indicated that they had more than one role.

## 8.1.2    How training differed between roles for support staff with more than one role

Those support staff who gave a response indicating a fairly high degree of difference between their roles in terms of training and development (a great deal/to some extent), were asked to describe the difference in their own words. Responses were collated under a number of themes. The themes to emerge most commonly are summarised in Table 8.2.

**Table 8.2**    The ways in which training differed for staff with more than one role

| The ways in which training differed: | % |
| --- | --- |
| **Content of training:** | |
| Training develops different skills (for a completely different role) | 30 |
| Training is more specific/less generic | 6 |
| Training is more generic/less specific | 2 |
| **Availability and uptake of training:** | |
| I have not received training (I have in my previously discussed role) | 7 |
| I have received training (none in my previously discussed role) | 5 |
| More training is available | 5 |
| Less training is available | 4 |
| I have received more training | 4 |
| I have received less training | 2 |
| **Location/provider of training:** | |
| Training is external/off site | 4 |
| Training is internal/on site | 2 |
| There is a different training provider | 2 |
| Other | 26 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| **N=197** | |

*Open response question*
*Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100*

As the table shows, by far the most frequent response to this question related to the development of different skills in the training for the additional role, compared with training for the previously discussed role. This response was given by nearly a third of those who were asked this question, and many respondents stressed that their two roles in school were very different from one another.

Some respondents made reference to differences in the specificity of the training provided between their multiple roles. Some respondents highlighted differences in the availability of training or the extent to which they had participated in training between their two roles. More than one in ten respondents (12 per cent) reported receiving training for one of their roles and not for the other. The location and provider of training was also highlighted as a difference between their roles for a small number of respondents (eight per cent).

## 8.2  Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- When asked about differences between the training and development they had received in their different roles, staff with more than one role were fairly evenly split between those who felt that there was a fairly high degree of difference ('a great deal'/'to some extent': 49% of responses) and those who felt that there was little difference ('not very much'/'not at all': 44% of responses).

- Those respondents who reported a high degree of difference were most likely to say that the main difference related to the development of different skills in training for the two roles, with many stressing that their two roles in school were very different from one another.

- Twelve per cent of respondents had received training for one of their roles but not for the others.

Previously reported regression analysis[36] revealed that support staff with more than one role:

- reported a larger number of people helping decide their training and development needs than staff with just one role.

- were more likely to have had their line manager's help in deciding their training and development needs than staff with just one role.

- rated their experience of management and performance review more highly than staff with just one role.

- reported participating in more child-focused training than staff with just one role.

- reported higher levels of satisfaction with regard to the relevance of their most recent training/development than staff with just one role.

---

[36]  The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

# 9. References

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A. and Webster, R. (2007). *Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools* (DCSF Research Report 005). London: DCSF [online]. Available: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR005.pdf [5 September, 2007]

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., Webster, R. and Haywood, N. (2006a). *The Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools* (DfES Research Report 776) [online]. Available: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR776.pdf [16 April, 2007]

Blatchford, P., Russell, A., Bassett, P., Brown, P. and Martin, C. (2006b). *The Role and Effects of Teaching Assistants in English Primary Schools (Years 4 to 6) 2000 – 2003: Results from the Class Size and Pupil-Adult Ratios (CSPAR) KS2 Project* (DfES Research Report 605) [online]. Available: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR605.pdf [19 April, 2007].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2005). *Building the School Team: Our Plans for Support Staff Development 2005-06* [online]. Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/doc/f/faqs-(plan-for-website)-(word).doc [19 April, 2007].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2006). *Developing People to Support Learning: a Skills Strategy for the Wider School Workforce 2006-09* [online]. Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/swdb_3ys.pdf [27 April, 2006].

# Appendix A    Sample representativeness

## Table A1 Primary schools

|  |  | National | | Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Count | % | Count | % |
| **Government Office Region** | North East | 914 | 5.3 | 21 | 5.8 |
|  | North West/Merseyside | 2560 | 14.7 | 45 | 12.4 |
|  | Yorkshire & The Humber | 1747 | 10.1 | 32 | 8.8 |
|  | East Midlands | 1825 | 10.5 | 45 | 12.4 |
|  | West Midlands | 1835 | 10.6 | 33 | 9.1 |
|  | Eastern | 2058 | 11.9 | 53 | 14.6 |
|  | London | 1819 | 10.5 | 28 | 7.7 |
|  | South East | 2669 | 15.4 | 58 | 15.9 |
|  | South West | 1938 | 11.2 | 49 | 13.5 |
| **School type** | Infants | 1648 | 9.5 | 66 | 18.0 |
|  | First School | 1259 | 7.3 | 40 | 10.9 |
|  | Infant & Junior (Primary) | 12700 | 73.1 | 217 | 59.3 |
|  | First & Middle | 106 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | Junior | 1538 | 8.9 | 33 | 9.0 |
|  | Middle deemed Primary | 114 | 0.7 | 7 | 1.9 |
|  | Missing information |  |  | 2 | 0.5 |
| **% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)** | Lowest 20% | 3697 | 21.3 | 76 | 20.8 |
|  | 2nd lowest 20% | 3468 | 20.0 | 86 | 23.5 |
|  | Middle 20% | 3413 | 19.7 | 76 | 20.8 |
|  | 2nd highest 20% | 3347 | 19.3 | 77 | 21.0 |
|  | Highest 20% | 3259 | 18.8 | 49 | 13.4 |
|  | Missing information | 181 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **Achievement Band (KS1 Overall performance 2002)** | Lowest band | 2862 | 16.5 | 62 | 16.9 |
|  | 2nd lowest band | 2739 | 15.8 | 48 | 13.1 |
|  | Middle band | 2729 | 15.7 | 56 | 15.3 |
|  | 2nd highest band | 2729 | 15.7 | 55 | 15.0 |
|  | Highest band | 3053 | 17.6 | 69 | 18.9 |
|  | Missing information | 3253 | 18.7 | 76 | 20.8 |
| **Size of school** | 1 – 180 pupils | 5739 | 33.0 | 149 | 40.7 |
|  | 181 – 271 pupils | 5687 | 32.7 | 114 | 31.1 |
|  | 272 – 951 pupils | 5761 | 33.2 | 101 | 27.6 |
|  | Missing information | 178 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **% of pupils with statements (2005)** | None | 3606 | 20.8 | 91 | 24.9 |
|  | 1 – 2% | 9582 | 55.2 | 183 | 50.0 |
|  | 3 – 29% | 3996 | 23.0 | 90 | 24.6 |
|  | Missing information | 181 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **Single sex/Coeducational schools** | Boys | 3 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Girls | 4 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Mixed | 17307 | 99.7 | 364 | 99.5 |
|  | Missing information | 51 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **Total** |  | **17365** | **100.0** | **366** | **100.0** |

*NOTE: Grey highlight denotes a significant difference between the frequency of the national statistic and the study's sample*

## Table A2 Secondary schools

| | | National | | Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Count | % | Count | % |
| **Government Office Region** | North East | 205 | 6.2 | 7 | 7.7 |
| | North West/Merseyside | 453 | 13.7 | 11 | 12.1 |
| | Yorkshire & The Humber | 290 | 8.8 | 6 | 6.6 |
| | East Midlands | 321 | 9.7 | 8 | 8.8 |
| | West Midlands | 410 | 12.4 | 16 | 17.6 |
| | Eastern | 422 | 12.8 | 9 | 9.9 |
| | London | 390 | 11.8 | 8 | 8.8 |
| | South East | 498 | 15.1 | 14 | 15.4 |
| | South West | 316 | 9.6 | 12 | 13.2 |
| **School type** | Middle deemed Secondary | 248 | 7.5 | 10 | 11.0 |
| | Missing information | 127 | 3.8 | 5 | 5.5 |
| | Comprehensive to 16 | 1223 | 37.0 | 26 | 28.6 |
| | Comprehensive to 18 | 1515 | 45.8 | 42 | 46.2 |
| | Grammar | 163 | 4.9 | 7 | 7.7 |
| | Other Secondary schools | 29 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.1 |
| **% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)** | Lowest 20% | 484 | 14.6 | 14 | 15.4 |
| | 2nd lowest 20% | 853 | 25.8 | 24 | 26.4 |
| | Middle 20% | 862 | 26.1 | 30 | 33.0 |
| | 2nd highest 20% | 679 | 20.5 | 16 | 17.6 |
| | Highest 20% | 426 | 12.9 | 7 | 7.7 |
| | Missing information | 1 | 0.0 | | |
| **Achievement Band (total GCSE point score 2005)** | Lowest band | 653 | 19.8 | 15 | 16.5 |
| | 2nd lowest band | 649 | 19.6 | 28 | 30.8 |
| | Middle band | 620 | 18.8 | 14 | 15.4 |
| | 2nd highest band | 588 | 17.8 | 10 | 11.0 |
| | Highest band | 503 | 15.2 | 13 | 14.3 |
| | Missing information | 292 | 8.8 | 11 | 12.1 |
| **Size of school** | 1 – 813 pupils | 1093 | 33.1 | 36 | 39.6 |
| | 814 – 1133 pupils | 1101 | 33.3 | 26 | 28.6 |
| | 1134 – 2598 pupils | 1110 | 33.6 | 29 | 31.9 |
| | Missing information | 1 | 0.0 | | |
| **% of pupils with statements (2005)** | None | 241 | 7.3 | 10 | 11.0 |
| | 1 – 2% | 1684 | 51.0 | 41 | 45.1 |
| | 3 – 29% | 1378 | 41.7 | 40 | 44.0 |
| | Missing information | 2 | 0.1 | | |
| **Single sex/Coeducational schools** | Boys | 179 | 5.4 | 6 | 6.6 |
| | Girls | 222 | 6.7 | 10 | 11.0 |
| | Mixed | 2903 | 87.8 | 75 | 82.4 |
| | Missing information | 1 | 0.0 | | |
| **Total** | | **3305** | **100.0** | **91** | **100.0** |

## **Table A3** Special schools

| | | National | | Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Count | Col % | Count | Col % |
| **Government Office Region** | North East | 56 | 5.7 | 3 | 4.3 |
| | North West/Merseyside | 163 | 16.6 | 13 | 18.6 |
| | Yorkshire & The Humber | 77 | 7.9 | 4 | 5.7 |
| | East Midlands | 79 | 8.1 | 4 | 5.7 |
| | West Midlands | 125 | 12.8 | 13 | 18.6 |
| | Eastern | 94 | 9.6 | 8 | 11.4 |
| | London | 146 | 14.9 | 9 | 12.9 |
| | South East | 158 | 16.1 | 9 | 12.9 |
| | South West | 81 | 8.3 | 7 | 10.0 |
| **Phase** | Primary | 156 | 15.9 | 14 | 20.0 |
| | Secondary | 224 | 22.9 | 17 | 24.3 |
| | both | 599 | 61.2 | 39 | 55.7 |
| **Achievement Band (KS1 Overall performance 2002)** | Lowest band | 67 | 6.8 | 6 | 8.6 |
| | Missing information | 912 | 93.2 | 64 | 91.4 |
| **% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)** | Lowest 20% | 17 | 1.7 | 2 | 2.9 |
| | 2nd lowest 20% | 10 | 1.0 | | |
| | Middle 20% | 51 | 5.2 | 2 | 2.9 |
| | 2nd highest 20% | 276 | 28.2 | 25 | 35.7 |
| | Highest 20% | 595 | 60.8 | 40 | 57.1 |
| | Missing information | 30 | 3.1 | 1 | 1.4 |
| **% of pupils with statements (2005)** | 3 – 29% | 6 | 0.6 | 1 | 1.4 |
| | 30% + | 943 | 96.3 | 68 | 97.1 |
| | Missing information | 30 | 3.1 | 1 | 1.4 |
| **Single sex/Coeducational schools** | Boys | 82 | 8.4 | 3 | 4.3 |
| | Girls | 4 | 0.4 | | |
| | Mixed | 881 | 90.0 | 67 | 95.7 |
| | Missing information | 12 | 1.2 | | |
| **Total** | | **979** | **100.0** | **70** | **100.0** |

## **Table A4** Ethnicity

| Ethnic category | N |
|---|---|
| **Refused to provide ethnicity** | **22** |
| **White: – British** | 2904 |
| **White: – Irish** | 29 |
| **Another White background:** | |
| *– English* | *6* |
| *– Scottish* | *1* |
| *– Welsh* | *4* |
| *– European* | *39* |
| *– American/Canadian/Australian/Kiwi/South African* | *10* |
| *– other White background (please specify)* | *4* |
| **Another White background (TOTAL)** | **64** |
| **Total White** | **2997** |
| | |
| **Black: – Caribbean** | 29 |
| **Black: – African** | 10 |
| **Any other Black background:** | |
| *– English* | *1* |
| *– British* | *1* |
| *– Afro Caribbean* | *1* |
| **Any other Black background (TOTAL)** | **3** |
| | |
| **Mixed Background** | 16 |
| **Indian** | 43 |
| **Pakistani** | 11 |
| **Bangladeshi** | |
| **Chinese** | 8 |
| **Any other Asian background (TOTAL)** | **11** |
| **Any other ethnic group:** | |
| *– Other ethnic group* | 3 |
| *– Israeli/Middle Eastern/North African* | 3 |
| **Any other ethnic group (TOTAL)** | **6** |
| | |
| **Total BME** | **137** |

*Highlighted in grey are those staff categorised as white*
*Overall sample N=3156*

# Appendix B    Telephone survey

**Good morning/afternoon/evening. I'm from Ipsos MORI, the independent market and opinion research company. In collaboration with a team of independent researchers from the National Foundation for Educational Research, we're conducting research on behalf of the Training and Development Agency for Schools to explore the training and development needs of people working in schools. By training and development, we mean organised activities that lead to the development of your skills and knowledge, for example: external courses and school-based training.**

**In September, your school provided us with the names of staff working in a supporting role, which is why I'm calling. The survey will take about 15 minutes to complete and all answers will be treated confidentially.**

| A | About your role |
|---|---|

**I'd like to begin by asking you a few questions about your role(s) at** <INSERT SCHOOL NAME>.

ASK ALL EXCEPT <ROLE (OTHER) OR UNKNOWN> LEADS IN SAMPLE
**A1. According to the information provided by the school, you currently work as what we're calling a(n)** <INSERT ROLE FROM SAMPLE>**, although your actual job title may be slightly different. Do you agree that you have this kind of role at the school?** INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY**: We know this may not be your only role at the school, but is it one of your roles?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No

ASK ALL <ROLE (OTHER) OR UNKNOWN> LEADS IN SAMPLE
**A2a. Firstly, could you tell me what your role(s) is/are at this school?** DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK.

ASK ALL WHOSE INFORMATION IS INCORRECT (CODE 2 AT A1). OTHERS GO TO A3
**A2b. In that case, could you tell me what your role(s) is/are at this school?** DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK.

SITE STAFF
Assistant cook
Caretaker
Catering assistant
Catering manager/Kitchen supervisor
Cleaner
Cook
Premises supervisor/manager
Site manager
Site staff (other)

ADMINISTRATION
Administrator
Bursar
Clerical assistant
Data manager
Examination invigilator
Examinations manager
Examinations officer
Finance officer
Finance technician
Office manager
Receptionist
School business manager
Secretary/PA
Administrative staff (other)

SPECIALIST AND TECHNICAL
Art and craft technician
Design and technology technician
Food technology technician
ICT manager
ICT technician
Laboratory technician
Librarian
Library/information assistant
Music specialist
Science technician
Textiles technician
Specialist/technical staff (other)

PUPIL SUPPORT
Behaviour mentor
Careers adviser
Connexions personal adviser
Education welfare officer
Extended school club worker/manager
Health care assistant
Home-school liaison officer
Learning mentor
Lunchtime supervisor
Midday supervisor
Out-of-school care worker/manager
Physiotherapist
Playworker
Psychotherapist
School Escort
School nurse
Speech Therapist
Welfare assistant
Pupil support staff (other)

LEARNING SUPPORT
Bilingual support assistant
Classroom assistant
Cover assistant
Cover manager
Cover supervisor
Early years assistant
Foundation stage assistant
Higher level teaching assistant (HLTA)
Learning support assistant
Nursery nurse
Special needs assistant
Sports coach/technician
Teaching assistant
Learning support staff (other)

IF NO (CODE 2) AT A1 AND NONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2a FALL UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2a) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE, OR NONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2b FALL UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2b) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE THANK AND CLOSE INTERVIEW

IF AT LEAST ONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2a/b FALLS UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2a/b) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE, SCRIPT TO ASSIGN THAT ROLE TO BE ASKED ABOUT FOR REST OF THE INTERVIEW. INTERVIEWER READ OUT VERBATIM: **For the rest of the interview we'd like you to answer the questions based on your experience of training and development with reference to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE SELECTED FROM A2a/b RESPONSE>. **You will have the opportunity to comment on training and development for any other role(s) you have at the end of the interview.**

ASK ALL
**A3. In your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**, what type of employment contract do you have?** READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Permanent
Fixed-term/temporary
I do not have a contract DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

**A4. In your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**, do you work full-time or part-time? By full-time, I mean 30 hours per week or more.** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Full-time
Part-time (including term-time only)

**A5. What were you doing before taking up this role?** INTERVIEWER PROMPT IF
MORE THAN ONE THING**: What did you spend the most time doing?** PROBE FULLY.
DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Working in this school in this role but on a voluntary basis
Working in this school in a different role on a paid basis
Working in this school in a different role on a voluntary basis
Working in another school in this role on a paid basis
Working in another school in this role on a voluntary basis
Working in another school in a different role on a paid basis
Working in another school in a different role on a voluntary basis
Doing paid work outside of education/not in a school environment
Doing voluntary work outside of education/not in a school environment
Studying/training
Not working
Doing something else (please specify)
Don't know


**A6. How long have you worked as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE> **at this school?** SINGLE CODE
ONLY

Less than 6 months
6 months or more, but less than a year
1 – 2 years
3 – 4 years
5 – 9 years
10 years or more
Don't know


**A7. And altogether how long have you worked as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>? **Please include
time spent in this role at other schools, but not in other places of work.** SINGLE CODE
ONLY

Less than 6 months
6 months or more, but less than a year
1 – 2 years
3 – 4 years
5 – 9 years
10 years or more
Don't know

| B | Skills and qualifications |
|---|---|

**I would now like to ask you a few questions about your qualifications and skills. I'd just like to remind you that all the answers you give are confidential and the questions are only being asked so we can make sure support staff from all backgrounds are included in the survey.**

ASK ALL
**B1. Do you have any maths qualifications?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO HAVE MATHS QUALIFICATIONS (CODE 1 AT B1). OTHERS GO TO B3
**B2. Is that at GCSE (or equivalent) at grade C or above?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT HAVE A MATHS QUALIFICATION, DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE OR PREFER NOT TO SAY (CODES 2-4 AT B1). OTHERS GO TO B4
**B3. Are you currently working towards a maths GCSE or any higher maths qualification?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL
**B4. Do you have any qualifications in English?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO HAVE QUALIFICATIONS IN ENGLISH (CODE 1 AT B4). OTHERS GO TO B6
**B5. Is that at GCSE (or equivalent) at grade C or above?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT HAVE AN ENGLISH QUALIFICATION, DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE OR PREFER NOT TO SAY (CODES 2-4 AT B4). OTHERS GO TO B7
**B6. Are you currently working towards an English GCSE or any higher qualification in English?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL
**B7. Do you have any** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 1 AT B1 OR B4: **{other}) qualifications directly related to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO HAVE QUALIFICATIONS (CODE 1 AT B7). OTHERS GO TO B9
**B8. Which** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 1 AT B1 OR B4: **{other}) qualifications do you have?** DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK

Support Work in Schools Qualification – Level 2 (Award and/or Certificate)
Support Work in Schools Qualification – Level 3 (Award and/or Certificate)
Support Work in Schools Qualification – Diploma Level 3
NVQ for Teaching Assistants – Level 2
NVQ for Teaching Assistants – Level 3
Any other NVQ (please specify title and level)
Certificate of School Business Management (CSBM)
Diploma of School Business Management (DSBM)
Council for Awards in Children's Care and Education (CACHE) e.g. Teaching Assistants
Certificate Level 2 (please specify)
Other (please specify)
Don't know

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT HAVE ANY QUALIFICATIONS RELATED TO THEIR ROLE, DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE OR PREFER NOT TO SAY (CODES 2-4 AT B7). OTHERS GO TO B10.
**B9. Are you currently working towards [a** TEXT SUB IF CODE 1 AT B1 OR B4: **{another}] qualification related to your role?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL
**B10. Now thinking about using computers in general, how confident are you … ?** READ OUT a)-c) AND SCALE. ROTATE a) TO c) AND REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

a) using e-mail?
b) using the internet?
c) that you can get access to a computer for e-mail/internet use when you need it in relation to your work as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>?

Very confident
Fairly confident
Not very confident
Not at all confident
OPTION FOR STATEMENT c) ONLY: I do not need it for my role DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

| C | Performance Management |
|---|---|

ASK ALL
**C1. Who, if anyone, is involved in helping you to decide what training and development you need in your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>? **Just to remind you, by training and development we mean organised activities that lead to the development of your skills and knowledge.** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK. IF RESPONDENT SAYS LINE MANAGER, PROBE FOR POSITION/JOB ROLE USING PRE-CODES

Headteacher
Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)
A class teacher
School training and development co-ordinator
A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school
Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school
Someone else at the school (please specify)
Someone else not at the school (please specify)
No-one
Don't know
I don't need/want training and development

ASK ALL GIVING ONE RESPONSE FROM CODES 1-8 AT C1. CODES 9-11 GO TO C4
**C2a. Is the person you mentioned your line manager?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

ASK ALL GIVING TWO+ RESPONSES FROM CODES 1-8 AT C1. CODES 9-11 GO TO C4
**C2b. Are any of the people you mentioned, your line manager?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
I don't have a line manager
I don't know what a line manager is

ASK ALL WHO GIVE TWO+ RESPONSES AT C1, ONE OF WHICH IS THEIR LINE

MANAGER AT C2b (CODE 1). OTHERS GO TO C4
**C3. Of the colleagues you mentioned, who is your line manager?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

ONLY SHOW ANSWERS FROM C1

Headteacher
Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)
A class teacher
School training and development co-ordinator
A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school
Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school
Someone else at the school (please specify)
Someone else not at the school (please specify)

ASK ALL
**C4. Is there a formal process or system in place, through which you are able to discuss your work as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know
I don't need/want to discuss my work DO NOT READ OUT

ASK IF YES AT C4 (CODE 1 AT C4). OTHERS GO TO C6
**C5. And how useful, if at all, do you find this process or system in helping to identify your training and development needs?** SINGLE CODE ONLY. READ OUT SCALE. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very useful
Fairly useful
Not very useful
Not at all useful
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL
**C6. When you want to apply for training and development, who do you need to get permission from?** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Headteacher
Line manager
Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)
A class teacher
School training and development co-ordinator
A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school
Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school
Someone else at the school (please specify)
Someone else not at the school (please specify)
No-one, I decide SINGLE CODE ONLY
Don't know SINGLE CODE ONLY
It depends/can't generalise SINGLE CODE ONLY
I don't need/want to apply for training and development DO NOT READ OUT

**C7. Overall, how supported do you feel by your school, if at all, in terms of meeting your training and development needs?** READ OUT SCALE. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Very well supported
Fairly well supported
Not very supported
Not at all supported
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
I don't need/want training and development DO NOT READ OUT

| D | Perceptions and Awareness |
|---|---|

ASK ALL
**D1. People undertake training and development for a number of reasons. Please tell me how important each of the following is to you.** READ OUT a) TO g) AND SCALE. ROTATE a)-g) AND REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

a) To support you in carrying out your current role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>
b) To help you with career progression (promotion) in your current role
c) To enable you to move into a different job to the one you do now
d) To achieve higher pay
e) To be able to take on greater responsibilities
f) To increase job satisfaction
g) To help with self-development

Very important
Fairly important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
I don't need/want to undertake training and development DO NOT READ OUT

**D2. What, if anything, stops you taking part in training and development opportunities?** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Difficult personal circumstances
I am on a short contract
I don't know how to apply
I don't know what I need
I don't know what is available
I don't think what is available is relevant to me
I don't speak very good English
I get very nervous/self-conscious in front of other people
I'm not interested in training and development
I'm worried about my reading and writing skills
Lack of encouragement from my manager/person who makes the decisions
Lack of funding available for training
Other commitments/demands on my time
Previous negative experience of training
Travel/ transport difficulties
Nothing stops me SINGLE CODE ONLY

Other (please specify)
Don't know SINGLE CODE ONLY
I don't need/want to take part in training and development

**D3. If you wanted information on training and development opportunities which were relevant to you and your role a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**, which, if any, organisations would you use to provide the information?** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

My school
My employer
A college/university
Department for Education and Skills (DfES)
Learndirect
Learning and Skills Council (LSC)
Local Authority
Sector Skills Development Agency (SSDA)
Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA)
Trade Union (e.g. UNISON and Skillsforyou)
Other (please specify)
I would not look for information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT
I don't need/want information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

**D4. In which of the following ways, if any, would you prefer to receive information about training and development opportunities?** READ OUT a)-f). SINGLE CODE ONLY FOR EACH

a) National printed press (e.g. newspapers and magazines)
b) Local printed press (e.g. newspapers and magazines)
c) TV and radio
d) Other printed material (e.g. flyers, brochures)
e) Online/internet
f) Some other way (please specify)

Yes
No
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Do not want to receive information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT

---

**E        Training and Development Experiences**

---

ASK ALL
**E1. Thinking about when you first started working as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**at your current school, which of the following did you receive, if any?** READ OUT a)-c). ROTATE b)-c). ITEM a) ALWAYS TO BE READ OUT FIRST. MULTICODE OK

a) An introduction to your line manager ONLY SHOW IF RESPONDENT HAS A LINE MANAGER (CODE 1 AT C2a/b)
b) A job description
c) An opportunity to discuss your training and development needs
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

**E2. Over the last 12 months, have you received any of the following types of training and development in relation to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**?** READ OUT a)-f). ROTATE. SINGLE CODE ONLY FOR EACH

a) Improving or updating your basic skills (reading and writing, maths, Information and Communications Technology/ICT)
b) Managing children and young people's behaviour/pupil discipline
c) Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection
d) Skills and knowledge directly related to your role as an <INSERT ROLE>
e) Understanding the curriculum or supporting a subject area or key stage
f) Working with children and young people with Special Educational Needs

Yes
No
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO RECEIVED TWO+ TRAINING IN LAST 12 MONTHS FROM STATEMENTS AT E2. ALL ANSWERING YES (CODE 1) TO ONE STATEMENT ONLY AT E2, GO TO E4a. OTHERS GO TO E12
**E3. And of these, which type of training and development in relation to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE> **did you receive most recently?** READ OUT a) TO f). SINGLE CODE ONLY

ONLY SHOW ANSWERS FROM E2

a) Improving or updating your basic skills (reading and writing, maths, Information and Communications Technology/ICT)
b) Managing children and young people's behaviour/pupil discipline
c) Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection
d) Skills and knowledge directly related to your role as an <INSERT ROLE>
e) Understanding the curriculum or supporting a subject area or key stage
f ) Working with children and young people with Special Educational Needs
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO SAY YES ONLY ONCE AT E2.
**E4a. Is this training and development in relation to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE> **… ?** READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

ASK ALL WHO HAVE RECEIVED TWO+ TRAINING AND REMEMBER WHICH THEIR MOST RECENT TRAINING COURSE IS (CODES 1-6 AT E3). OTHERS GO TO E12
**E4b. Is the most recent training and development you've received in relation to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE> **… ?** READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Finished
On-going/still underway
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

**I'd now like to ask you a few questions about this example of training.**

**E5. Where [did** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: **{does}**)] **this training and development take place?** READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK

At your school, in INSET time
At your school, in non-INSET time
At your school, don't know if in INSET/non-INSET time
At another school
At a college/university
At the local authority's offices/premises
At your employers' offices/premises
At your home (distance learning)
Somewhere else (please specify)
Don't know/can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

**E6. Who [provided** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: **{is providing}**)] **the training and development?** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Your learning coach or mentor
Your line manager
Another member of the support staff at your school
Another member of the teaching staff at your school
A member of the support staff from another school
A member of the teaching staff from another school
Staff from a college/university
Staff from the local authority
Another provider/organisation
Someone else (please specify)
Don't know/can't remember

**E7. [Was** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: **{Is}**)] **the training and development intended to lead to a formal qualification/status?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes (please specify)
No
Don't know

ASK THOSE WHO UNDERTOOK/ARE UNDERTAKING TRAINING INTENDED TO LEAD TO A FORMAL QUALIFICATION/STATUS (CODE 1 AT E7). OTHERS GO TO E9

**E8. [Did you gain/were you** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: **{Do you expect to gain/be}**)] **awarded the qualification/status?** SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know

**E9**. **Overall, how would you rate the quality of this training and development? Would you say it [was** (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b) **{is}**)] **… ?** READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very good
Fairly good
Fairly poor
Very poor
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

**E10**. **Overall, how would you rate this training and development in meeting your needs for your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>**? Would you say it was … ?** READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very good
Fairly good
Fairly poor
Very poor
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

**E11. What, if any, have been the benefits of this training and development to you?** DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK.

Enabled me to take on greater responsibilities
Has/could enable me to move into a different or new role
Helped me to achieve higher pay
Helped me to communicate better with other staff
Helped me with career progression (promotion) in me current role
Helped with my self-development
Helped with my confidence
Improved my job satisfaction
Supported me in carrying out my current role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>
Other (please specify)
Too early to say
No benefits
Don't know

ASK ALL
**E12. I'm going to read out a number of statements relating to possible locations for training and development. Please tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with each of them.** READ OUT a) TO b). ROTATE START AND REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF THE SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY FOR EACH STATEMENT

a) I prefer the training and development to be held at or near my school
b) I'd go anywhere in England for training and development, if I thought the benefits of the training were good enough

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
I don't need/want training and development DO NOT READ OUT

---

| **F** | **About You** |
|---|---|

ASK IF MORE THAN ONE ROLE AT A2a/b OR ON THE SAMPLE. OTHERS GO TO F3
**F1. So far we have been talking about your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE**> but you have (an)other role(s). Compared to your role as a(n)** <INSERT ROLE>, **would you say your experience of training and development for your other role(s) differs … ?** READ OUT. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

A great deal
To some extent
Not very much
Not at all
It depends/can't generalise DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
I don't have another role DO NOT READ OUT
I haven't had any training and development for my other roles DO NOT READ OUT
I don't need any training and development for my other roles DO NOT READ OUT

ASK IF EXPERIENCE DIFFERS A GREAT DEAL/TO SOME EXTENT (CODES 1 AND 2 AT F1). OTHERS GO TO F3
**F2. What, if any, are the main ways in which your experience of training and development for your other role(s) differs?** PROMPT IF NEEDED **This could be in relation to how your needs are identified or being informed about training and development opportunities or your experiences of training and development.**

ENTER VERBATIM
Don't know

ASK ALL
**F3. Could you tell me how old you are?** DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

18 – 24

25 – 34
35 – 44
45 – 54
55 – 64
65+
Refused


**F4. Finally, which ethnic group do you consider yourself to belong to?** DO NOT READ
OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

White
British
Irish
Another White background (please specify)

Black or Black British
Caribbean
African
Any other Black background (please specify)

Mixed
White and Black Caribbean
White and Black African
White and Asian
Any other Mixed background (please specify)

Asian or Asian British
Indian
Pakistani
Bangladeshi
Any other Asian background (please specify)

Chinese or Other ethnic groups
Chinese
Any other ethnic group

Refused


**F5.** INTERVIEWER RECORD GENDER

Male
Female

# Appendix C    Regression analysis

## C1    Explanation of regression analysis

Regression is a technique that predicts the values of some measure of interest given the values of one or more related measures. In our case the regression analysis allowed us to build on the basic descriptive work by considering the effect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for.

The factor analyses produced sixteen factors:

- having a qualification in mathematics (GCSE or better) *
- having a qualification in English (GCSE or better) *
- confidence in ICT
- staff involved in deciding training & development
- having a line manager involved in deciding your training and development*
- experience of performance management
- level of support in meeting training & development needs
- personal development
- career development
- barriers to personal development
- sources of information on training & development
- having training in the last 12 months *
- role specific induction
- multiple benefits of training
- satisfaction and relevance with training & development
- child-focused training & development.

Each of these factors was used as an outcome in the regression analysis, so in total sixteen regression models were run controlling for a number of staff- and school-level variables[37]. A full list of background variables and the details of which questions fed into each of the factors is given in Appendix C2.

For all but four (see * above) of these outcomes, the analysis looked at both the strength of relationships between various background variables and the

---

[37] The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

outcome and the relative change in the outcome for a change in the background variable. In the regression analyses, there are two types of values of interest-the Beta and B values. B values indicate the change in the outcome for a change of one unit in the background variable. Therefore larger B values (both negative and positive) indicate the background variables that result in the greatest change in the outcome. The B scores are then standardised, that is the variation around the variable is considered, and the resultant figures are called standardised coefficients or 'Beta' values. The Beta values show which predictors are most closely associated with the outcome. The Beta values can be interpreted in a similar way to the B values. The larger the Beta value (either positive or negative) the stronger the relationship is between the background variable and the outcome.

The remaining four models specifically looked at the likelihood of achieving the outcome. For instance, 'Having a line manager involved in deciding your training and development' made use of a logistic regression model since the outcome was binary (yes/no). The data presented for this regression model considers the odds of achieving this outcome compared to other groups. Figures greater than 1 imply a greater chance, or greater odds, of achieving the outcome whilst figures below 1 indicate that the group in question is less likely to have their line manager involved in helping to decide their training and development.

# C2   Regression variables

| Variable labels: | Compared to (comparator): |
| --- | --- |
| Male | Females |
| Multi role | Non multi-role |
| BME | White |
| 18 – 24 | 35 – 44 |
| 25 – 34 | 35 – 44 |
| 45 – 54 | 35 – 44 |
| 55 – 64 | 35 – 44 |
| 65+ | 35 – 44 |
| Refused to give age | 35 – 44 |
| Secondary school | Primary |
| Special school | Primary |
| Medium school | Small school |
| Large school | Small school |
| Pupil support staff | Site staff |
| Learning support staff | Site staff |
| Teaching assistants | Site staff |
| Specialist and Technical staff | Site staff |
| Admin staff | Site staff |
| HLTA (specified by TDA) | All non-specified roles |
| Learning support (specified by TDA) | All non-specified roles |
| Business staff (specified by TDA) | All non-specified roles |
| Catering staff (specified by TDA) | All non-specified roles |
| Full-time in role | Part-time |
| Fixed-term contract | Permanent contract |
| No formal/written contract | Permanent contract |
| Don't know contract | Permanent contract |
| More than 2 years at school in this role | Less than 2 years at school in role |
| More than 2 years in this role overall | Less than 2 years in role overall |
| Have maths qualification(s) | No maths qualification |
| Have English qualification(s) | No English qualification |
| % of pupils eligible for FSM | Higher compared to lower |
| % of pupils with SEN | Higher compared to lower |
| % of pupils with English as an additional language | Higher compared to lower |
| Girls school | Mixed school |
| Boys school | Mixed school |
| Employed by other | Employed by school |
| Employed by LA | Employed by school |
| 2nd lowest quintile | Lowest quintile |
| middle quintile | Lowest quintile |
| 2nd highest quintile | Lowest quintile |
| Highest quintile | Lowest quintile |
| School in the north | Schools in the midlands |
| School in the south | Schools in the midlands |

# C3   Regression tables

**Table C1**     Maths qualifications

| Variable: | Odds ratio[38] |
|---|---|
| Administrative staff | 8.04 |
| Specialist and technical staff | 6.36 |
| Teaching assistants | 6.16 |
| Learning support staff | 5.45 |
| Pupil support staff | 2.04 |
| Employed by an other organisation | 1.99 |
| Secondary school | 1.42 |
| Fixed-term contract | 1.39 |
| % FSM | 0.99 |
| Two years or more in role at current school | 0.65 |
| 45 – 54 years | 0.58 |
| 18 – 24 years | 0.55 |
| 55 – 64 years | 0.25 |
| 65 + years | 0.14 |

*This factor was derived by considering question B2 of the telephone survey. If anyone involved had a maths qualification at GCSE or better this was indicated by a score of 1 on this factor. Those who did not have such a qualification had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having a maths qualification at GCSE or better*

---

[38] An odds ratio of 1 implies that the event is equally likely in the group in question as the base group. An odds ratio greater than one implies that the event is more likely for the group in question. An odds ratio less than one implies that the event is less likely in the group.

**Table C2**     English qualifications

| Variable: | Odds ratio |
|---|---|
| Specialist and technical staff | 6.09 |
| Administrative staff | 5.57 |
| Teaching assistants | 4.56 |
| Learning support staff | 3.56 |
| Pupil support staff | 1.96 |
| Male | 1.46 |
| Secondary school | 1.24 |
| Southern region | 1.21 |
| Special school | 0.70 |
| 45 – 54 years | 0.68 |
| Two years or more in role at current school | 0.63 |
| Did not know if had contract | 0.45 |
| 55 – 64 years | 0.29 |
| 65 + years | 0.09 |

*This factor was derived by considering responses to question B4 of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). If anyone involved had an English qualification at GCSE or better this was indicated by a score of 1 on this factor. Those who did not have such a qualification had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having an English qualification at GCSE or better*

**Table C3**      Confidence in ICT

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Administrative staff | 4.29 |
| Specialist and technical staff | 3.18 |
| Teaching assistant | 2.81 |
| Learning support | 2.62 |
| English qualification | 1.39 |
| Male | 1.26 |
| Pupil support | 1.23 |
| 18 – 24 years | 0.65 |
| Employment other | 0.64 |
| Full-time | 0.54 |
| Maths qualification | 0.39 |
| Secondary school | 0.36 |
| Special school | 0.29 |
| 65+ years | -2.91 |
| 55 – 64 years | -1.51 |
| Refused age | -1.13 |
| 45 – 54 years | -0.54 |
| More than two years in role | -0.26 |

*This factor was derived by considering question B10 of the telephone survey (see Appendix B). The scoring of the items (use of email and the internet and access to ICT) was reversed so a greater perception of confidence in ICT is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this item*

**Table C4**      Staff involved in deciding training and development

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Learning support | 0.42 |
| Teaching assistant | 0.40 |
| Pupil support | 0.22 |
| Administrative staff | 0.12 |
| Multi-role | 0.10 |
| No formal/written contract | -0.48 |
| Ethnic minority group | -0.15 |

*This factor is a sum of question C1 (see Appendix B). Each person involved in deciding training and development was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they have six people involved in helping decide their training and development. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate the involvement of a greater number of people*

**Table C5**    Have a line manager involved in training and development

| Variable: | Odds ratio |
| --- | --- |
| Administrative staff | 1.65 |
| Girls school | 1.63 |
| English qualification | 1.45 |
| Multi-role | 1.42 |
| Secondary school | 1.41 |
| Learning support staff | 1.34 |
| No formal/written contract | 0.47 |
| Two years or more in school | 0.79 |

*This factor was derived by considering telephone questions C2a and C2b (see Appendix B). If anyone involved was the individual's line manager then this was indicated by a score of 1 on this factor. Those who did not have their line manager involved in deciding their training and development or did not know what a line manager was, had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having their line manager involved in deciding their training and development*

**Table C6**    Experience of performance management

| Variable: | B-score |
| --- | --- |
| Special school | 1.47 |
| Learning support staff | 0.50 |
| Teaching assistants | 0.43 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.42 |
| Multi-role | 0.24 |
| More than two years in role | 0.15 |
| Administrative staff | 0.08 |
| No formal/written contract | -0.83 |
| Boys' school | -0.37 |
| Specialist and technical staff | -0.17 |
| % of pupils with SEN | -0.01 |

*This factor considers the ratings of individuals on how useful the performance management system is for discussing progress and identifying training and development needs (C4 and C5 Appendix B). Higher scores on this factor indicate more positive ratings of the system/process*

**Table C7**     Level of support in meeting training and development needs

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Multi-role | 0.17 |
| 55 – 64 years | 0.17 |
| Administrative staff | 0.14 |
| North | 0.10 |
| Medium size school | 0.08 |
| No formal/written contract | -1.21 |
| Employed other | -0.48 |
| Secondary school | -0.35 |
| Specialist technical staff | -0.22 |
| More than two years in school | -0.09 |

*This factor was derived from individuals' responses to question C7 of the telephone survey (Appendix B), which asked respondents how supported they felt in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Higher scores on this factor indicate a greater perception of support*

**Table C8**     Personal development

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Teaching assistants | 0.39 |
| Learning support staff | 0.33 |
| BME | 0.29 |
| Full-time | 0.18 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.15 |
| % pupils eligible for FSM | 0.00 |
| 65+ years | -0.75 |
| 55 – 64 years | -0.45 |
| 45 – 54 years | -0.14 |
| Employed by LA | -0.13 |

*This factor was derived from summing individuals' responses to three items in questions D1 (a, f and g, Appendix B). The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perception of importance of 'personal development' as a motivator is indicated by a higher score on this factor*

**Table C9**  Career development

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| 18 – 24 years | 1.29 |
| 25 – 34 years | 0.64 |
| BME | 0.64 |
| Full-time | 0.57 |
| Fixed-term contract | 0.55 |
| % pupils eligible for FSM | 0.01 |
| 65+ years | -3.93 |
| 55 – 64 years | -2.67 |
| Age refused | -2.45 |
| 45 – 54 years | -0.92 |
| Specialist technical staff | -0.85 |
| Male | -0.71 |
| Administrative staff | -0.62 |
| Medium size school | -0.54 |
| Achievement – 2nd highest quintile | -0.46 |
| More than two years in role in current school | -0.30 |

*This factor sums individuals' responses to the remaining four items in question D1 (b, c, d and e Appendix B). The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perception of importance placed by respondents on career development as a reason for taking part in training and development is indicated by a higher score on this factor*

**Table C10**   Barriers to training and development

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| No formal/written contract | 0.17 |
| Specialist and technical staff | 0.14 |
| Learning support | 0.10 |
| English qualification | 0.09 |
| Teaching assistant | 0.08 |
| Secondary school | 0.08 |
| 45 – 54 years | 0.03 |
| % pupils with SEN | <0.01 |
| 18 – 24 years | -0.12 |
| Full-time | -0.04 |

*This factor is a sum of items in question D2 (Appendix B). Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of barriers*

**Table C11**   Sources of information on training and development regression

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Learning support staff | 0.51 |
| Administrative staff | 0.45 |
| Teaching assistants | 0.42 |
| Specialist and technical staff | 0.29 |
| Male | 0.24 |
| English qualification | 0.22 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.19 |
| Full-time | 0.14 |
| Two years or more in role | 0.09 |
| 18 – 24 years | -0.65 |
| Boys' school | -0.27 |
| 25 – 34 years | -0.12 |
| Employed by LA | -0.10 |
| Large school | -0.09 |

*This factor is a sum of items in question D3 of the telephone survey (Appendix B). Each source of information mentioned was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they would like to receive information in six different ways. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of mediums desired or used for receiving information*

**Table C12**   Role-specific induction

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Male | 0.15 |
| 25 – 34 years | 0.10 |
| Full-time | 0.09 |
| No formal/written contract | -0.97 |
| Specialist and technical staff | -0.26 |
| 55 – 64 years | -0.16 |
| More than two years in role at current school | -0.14 |
| 45 – 54 years | -0.08 |

*The 'role-specific induction' factor is a sum of question E1 (see Appendix B). Each form of induction was given a point, so a score of three for an individual on this factor indicates that they received three different types of role-specific induction. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of types of induction*

**Table C13**   No training in the last twelve months

| Variable: | Odds ratio |
|---|---|
| No formal/written contract | 3.68 |
| 55 – 64 years | 2.76 |
| Achievement 4 | 1.63 |
| Achievement 5 | 1.33 |
| 65 + years | 1.28 |
| Full-time | 0.81 |
| More than one role | 0.67 |
| Special school | 0.59 |
| Specialist and technical staff | 0.47 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.39 |
| Administrative staff | 0.31 |
| Learning support staff | 0.14 |
| Teaching assistants | 0.13 |

*This factor was derived by considering telephone question E2 (see Appendix B). If anyone involved had not had training in the last twelve months this was indicated by a score of 1 on this factor. Those who had training had a score of zero on this factor. (The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having taken part in some form of training in the twelve months preceding the time of the survey.)*

**Table C14**     Child-focused training

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Learning support staff | 1.26 |
| Teaching assistant | 1.23 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.92 |
| Specialist or technical staff | 0.17 |
| Multi-role | 0.13 |
| Full-time staff | 0.12 |
| Secondary school | 0.10 |
| Hold English qualification | 0.09 |
| Percentage of pupils with special educational needs | <0.01 |
| Achievement 2$^{nd}$ highest quintile | -0.33 |
| Achievement highest quintile | -0.23 |

*This factor was derived from creating a score of how many child-focused training and development activities individuals had attended over the past year (items in E2, Appendix B). Each activity was given one point so an individual with three points on this factor had attended three activities-higher scores indicating more activities*

**Table C15**     Multiple benefits from training

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Learning support staff | 0.11 |
| Teaching assistant | 0.07 |
| English qualification | 0.07 |
| Medium sized school | -0.07 |

*This factor is a sum of question E11 (see Appendix B). Each perceived benefit was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they identified six benefits of the training and development they received. Higher scores on this factor indicate a greater number of benefits*

**Table C16**     Satisfaction with and relevance of training

| Variable: | B-score |
|---|---|
| Learning support staff | 0,98 |
| Teaching assistant | 0.97 |
| Administrative staff | 0.82 |
| Pupil support staff | 0.54 |
| Hold English qualification | 0.40 |
| Special school | 0.35 |
| Multi-role | 0.24 |
| No formal/written contract | -1.26 |
| Age over 65 years | -0.89 |
| School achievement quintile 4 (second highest) | -0.41 |
| Fixed-term contract | -0.23 |
| Secondary school | -0.22 |

*This factor sums individuals' responses to questions E9 and E10 (see Appendix B). The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perceived level of satisfaction is indicated by a higher score on this factor*

# Appendix D    Support staff categories and roles

| Category | Role | Category | Role | Category | Role |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Site staff** | Cleaner, Caretaker Premises supervisor/manager Site manager Catering assistant Assistant cook Cook Catering manager/Kitchen supervisor Site staff 'other' | **Pupil support** | Learning mentor Careers adviser *Connexions* personal adviser Behaviour mentor Education welfare officer Home-school liaison officer Welfare assistant Health care assistant School nurse Physiotherapists Psychotherapists Speech Therapists School Escorts Pupil support 'other' | **Specialist and technical** | ICT technician ICT manager Science technician Laboratory technician Music specialist Design and technology technician Food technology technician Textiles technician Art and craft technician Library/information assistant Librarian Specialist and technical 'other' |
| **Administrative staff** | Clerical assistant Administrator Secretary/PA Receptionist Office manager School business manager Finance officer Bursar Finance technician Data manager Examinations officer Examination invigilator Examinations manager Administration 'other' | **Learning support** | Nursery nurse Early years assistant Foundation stage assistant Bilingual support assistant Special needs assistant Learning support assistant Cover assistant Cover supervisor Cover manager Sports coach/technician Learning support 'other' | **Teaching assistants** | Teaching assistant Classroom assistant Learning support assistant Higher level teaching assistant Teaching assistants 'other' |