



Department
for Education

Phonics screening check evaluation: final report

Technical appendices

June 2015

National Foundation for Educational Research

Contents

List of tables	3
Appendix A: Multilevel Modelling	8
Appendix B: Literacy coordinator questionnaire	28
Appendix C: Year 1 Teacher questionnaire	53

List of tables

Table A1: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2012 cohort)	11
Table A2: National comparison with evaluation responding schools (2013 cohort)	12
Table A3: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2012	13
Table A4: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2013	15
Table A5: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2013	17
Table A6: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2014	19
Table A7: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2014	21
Table A8: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2011-2014	23
Table A9: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2011-2014	25
Table B1: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire	28
Table B2: Q1.1 – The role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire when ‘other role’ was indicated [filter question based on table B1]	28
Table B3: Q2.1 – The proportions of literacy coordinators who reported the following statements best characterised the approach to phonics within overall early literacy teaching in their school	29
Table B4: Q2.2 – The proportion of literacy coordinators reporting each of the ‘mainstream’ or ‘core’ published phonics programme was used to structure most or all phonics teaching in each year group	29
Table B5: Q2.3 – The proportion of literacy coordinators who reported making general changes to phonics teaching this school year, in light of their experience of the phonics screening check in 2012 or 2013	30
Table B6: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 classes in response to the 2013 check [filter question based on table B5]	30

Table B7: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching across year groups in response to the 2013 check where ‘other changes’ were indicated [filter question based on table B6]	31
Table B8: Q3.1 – The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with each of the following statements	32
Table B9: Q4.1 – Literacy coordinators’ views on how well prepared their teachers were to provide effective phonics teaching	33
Table B10: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 and 2013 check	33
Table B11: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2013 check where ‘other teaching methods’ was indicated [filter question based on table B17]	34
Table B12: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers were reported to have used the results of the 2013 phonics screening check	34
Table B13: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers have used the results of the 2013 phonics screening check where ‘other ways’ was indicated [filter question based on table B12]	35
Table B14: Q5.3 – The type of support given to Year 2 pupils who were in each of the categories after the 2013 check	35
Table B15: Q5.4 – The time point at which literacy coordinators felt that pupils, who had not previously done so, reached the required standard of the check	36
Table B16: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check	36
Table B17: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check where ‘other preparation’ was indicated [filter question based on table 62]	37
Table B18: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school	38
Table B19: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to a child?	39
Table B20: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to a child where ‘other evidence’ was indicated [filter question based on table B19]	39

Table B21: Q8.1 – Details of the additional information provided to the parents / carers of current Year 2 pupils who did not meet the standard this year	40
Table B22: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on planning and preparation for the check	40
Table B23: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on the administration of the check	41
Table B24: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on Paperwork	42
Table B25: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on training	43
Table B26: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on reviewing the results of the check	44
Table B27: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on ‘other’ activities surrounding the check	45
Table B28: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to planning and preparation for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	46
Table B29: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to the administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	46
Table B30: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to paperwork, as reported by literacy coordinators	47
Table B31: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to training for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	47
Table B32: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to reviewing the results of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	48
Table B33: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to ‘other’ activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators	48
Table B34: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching’ in 2012 and 2013	49
Table B35: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	49
Table B36: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	50

Table B37: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	50
Table B38: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	51
Table B39: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	51
Table B40: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014	52
Table C1: Q2.2 – The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 1 pupils last year (2013)	53
Table C2: Q2.3 - The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 2 pupils this year (2013)	53
Table C3: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check	53
Table C4: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2014 phonics check when ‘other change’ was indicated [Filter question based on table C3]	54
Table C5: Q2.5 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2014 phonics check gave new information	55
Table C6: Q2.6 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2014 phonics check gave useful information, in terms of planning teaching and learning	55
Table C7: Q2.7 – When thinking only of those pupils who did not have additional difficulties which may have affected their performance on the screening check, teacher’s views on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils	55
Table C8: Q2.8 – The proportions of teachers reporting they had a local authority monitoring visit during the week of the check	56
Table C9: Q2.9 – Teacher reports of how many check administrations were observed during the monitoring visit [filter question based on Table C8]	56

Table C10: Q2.10 – Where one or more observations were undertaken, teacher’s reports of how the check administration observations for the monitoring visit were chosen [filter question based on Table C8]	56
Table C11: Q4.1 – The proportion of teachers who reported they stopped the check early due to a pupil struggling	57
Table C12: Q4.2 – Teachers’ views on ease of judging when to stop the check early due to a pupil struggling [filter question based on Table C11]	57
Table C13: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check	58

Appendix A: Multilevel Modelling

National pupil database (NPD)

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

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

Multilevel modelling

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

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

Four multilevel models were run with the outcome variables:

- Model 1: score on the PSC 2012 for pupils in Year 1 in 2012
- Model 2: KS1 points score 2013 for pupils in Year 2 in 2013
- Model 3: score on the PSC 2013 for pupils in Year 1
- Model 4: KS1 points score 2014 for pupils in Year 2 in 2014.

Background variables included in the model were:

- Pupil characteristics: gender, age, ethnicity, special educational needs (SEN), English as an additional language (EAL)
- Pupil prior attainment: score on the Linking Sounds and Letters (LSL) scale (for Phonics outcome) and score on the Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) scales (for KS1 reading and writing) of the EYFSP
- Pupil-level indicators of socio-economic status: IDACI, FSM eligibility
- School characteristics: type, size, region, KS1 attainment band; proportion of pupils eligible for FSM; proportion of pupils with SEN; proportion of pupils with EAL
- Outcome of latent class analysis (see second interim evaluation report¹).

A multilevel model analysis takes into account all of these background factors then seeks out the significant differences that remain. That is, the statistical method measures the differences between different groups and controls for them in making the comparison. The resulting findings isolate the differences due to each individual factor, once all the other factors have been taken into account. The findings often illustrate significant differences between the background category named and the 'base case'. Tables A3, A4 and A5 list all the background variables in the model and describe the base case for each. They go on to list the coefficients of the model, with pseudo effect sizes² where these proved to be statistically significant.

Longitudinal modelling of NPD data

The final year of the evaluation included analysis of longitudinal KS1 performance of pupils and schools. Because the latent class outcomes were not included as variables in the model, all relevant data from the NPD could be used for analysis. A 'random effects' statistical technique was used to estimate the models, which is similar to a multilevel model, but computationally feasible with more than 2 million pupils in the dataset. The research team compared the results of multilevel and random effects models on a set of randomly drawn subsets of the data and found the results were virtually identical. The random effects model also accounts for both the differences in the circumstances in which different pupils and schools are situated and the hierarchical structure of the data.

1

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307229/Evaluation_of_the_phonics_screening_check_second_interim_report_FINAL.pdf [26/02/15]

² Pseudo effect size is a standardised measure of the size of effect a variable has on the outcome variable. Coefficients are divided by the standard deviation of the outcome variable and, if the variable is continuous, multiplied by the standard deviation of the independent variable and the square root of two. The effect size of a dichotomous independent variable is the coefficient divided by the outcome variable standard deviation.

The background variables included in the longitudinal models were very similar to the multilevel models with latent class outcomes included, with a few major differences that reflect the different research question and the use of more pupil data. These were:

- Rather than including EYFSP CLL total points as a linear variable, the research team included dichotomous variables for each point score. This was possible because the number of pupils achieving each point score was large and preferable because the relationship between EYFSP points and KS1 points appeared to be non-linear
- Dichotomous variables for each year. Previous analysis was cross-sectional and only looked at one year at a time, whereas the research question was to describe attainment trends before and after the introduction of the check
- Interaction variables between EYFSP quintile and dichotomous variables for each year. These variables were included in one model to look at the differential progress made through KS1 by sub-groups according to their attainment at the end of reception.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table A6: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2014

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	0.26	Y	0.07
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.02	Y	0.02
Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	White	-0.48		
Asian		0.26	Y	0.07
Black		0.33	Y	0.09
Mixed		0.13		
Chinese		1.43	Y	0.39
Other		0.32	Y	0.09
Unclassified or missing data on ethnicity		0.38	Y	0.10
Special education needs (SEN) statement		No special education needs	-1.24	Y
School action or action plus status	-0.81		Y	-0.22
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	0.41	Y	0.11
Score on the Communication, Language and Literacy scales of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Higher compared to lower	0.45	Y	1.02
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-0.46	Y	-0.13
IDAC1	Higher compared to lower	-0.68	Y	-0.05
<u>School characteristics</u>				
School type derived from latent class analysis				
Supporters of synthetic phonics and of the check	Supporters of mixed methods	-0.15		
Supporters of synthetic phonics but not of the check		-0.02		
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	0.44	Y	0.12
Middle		-0.62		
Academy		-0.69		
Year 1 cohort size				
Small	Large	-0.20		
Medium		-0.08		
Region				
North	South	-0.09		
Midlands		0.01		

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
KS1 English performance band 2010				
Lowest 20% schools	Highest 20% schools	-0.20		
2nd lowest 20% schools		-0.35	Y	-0.10
Middle 20% schools		-0.28		
2nd highest 20% schools		0.08		
School quintiles based on percentage pupils with FSM				
Low FSM quintile (8%- 20% pupils eligible for FSM)	Lowest FSM Quintile (less than or equal to 8% FSM children)	0.07		
Middle FSM quintile (21%- 35% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.24		
High FSM quintile (36%- 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.47	Y	0.13
High FSM quintile (More than 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.44		
School band based on percentage of pupils with statements (2009/10)				
Schools with no SEN statement pupils	Schools with 1 - 2% SEN statement children	0.01		
Schools with 3 - 29% SEN statement children		0.23		
Schools with 30% or more SEN statement children		-2.41	Y	-0.66
School band based on percentage pupils with English as an additional language 2010/11				
Schools with no EAL children	Schools with 1 - 5% EAL children	0.09		
Schools with 6 - 49% EAL children		0.05		
Schools with 50% or more EAL children		0.06		

Table A7: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – PSC outcomes 2014

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	0.06		
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.02		
Gypsy/Romany and Travellers of Irish Heritage	White	-5.09	Y	-0.61
Asian		1.11	Y	0.13
Black		0.84	Y	0.10
Mixed		0.37		
Chinese		1.69	Y	0.20
Other		0.96	Y	0.11
Unclassified or missing data on ethnicity		0.87		
Special education needs (SEN) statement		No special education needs	-10.92	Y
School action or action plus status	-5.47		Y	-0.65
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	1.65	Y	0.20
Score on the 'Literacy: reading' and 'Communication: understanding' scales on the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Higher compared to lower	3.33	Y	0.64
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-1.09	Y	-0.13
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-1.20	Y	-0.03
School characteristics				
School type derived from latent class analysis				
Supporters of synthetic phonics and of the check	Supporters of mixed methods	0.01		
Supporters of synthetic phonics but not of the check		-0.43		
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	-0.21		
Middle		-1.08		
Academy		-0.81		
Year 1 cohort size				
Small	Large	-0.21		
Medium		0.23		
Region				
North	South	1.02	Y	0.12
Midlands		0.17		

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
KS1 English performance band 2010				
Lowest 20% schools	Highest 20% schools	-0.69		
2nd lowest 20% schools		0.12		
Middle 20% schools		-0.15		
2nd highest 20% schools		0.34		
School quintiles based on percentage pupils with FSM				
Low FSM quintile (8%- 20% pupils eligible for FSM)	Lowest FSM Quintile (less than or equal to 8% FSM children)	-0.57		
Middle FSM quintile (21%- 35% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.17		
High FSM quintile (36%- 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		0.55		
Highest FSM quintile (More than 50% pupils eligible for FSM)		1.17		
School band based on percentage of pupils with statements (2009/10)				
Schools with no SEN statement pupils	Schools with 1 - 2% SEN statement children	0.33		
Schools with 3 - 29% SEN statement children		0.22		
Schools with 30% or more SEN statement children		-7.37	Y	-0.88
School band based on percentage pupils with English as an additional language 2010/11				
Schools with no EAL children	Schools with 1 - 5% EAL children	0.07		
Schools with 6 - 49% EAL children		-0.30		
Schools with 50% or more EAL children		-1.21	Y	-0.14

Table A8: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2011-2014

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	0.24	Y	0.06
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.00	Y	0.00
Asian	White	0.34	Y	0.09
Black		0.37	Y	0.10
Chinese		0.81	Y	0.21
Mixed/ Other		0.23	Y	0.06
Special education needs	No special education needs	-2.03	Y	-0.53
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	0.31	Y	0.08
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-0.35	Y	-0.09
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-0.61	Y	-0.04
Point score on the Communication, Language and Literacy scales of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile				
1	Points = 0	-0.37	Y	-0.10
2		-0.46	Y	-0.12
3		-0.47	Y	-0.12
4		-0.33	Y	-0.09
5		-0.35	Y	-0.09
6		0.09	Y	0.02
7		0.68	Y	0.18
8		1.09		
9		1.58	Y	0.41
10		2.00	Y	0.53
11		2.36	Y	0.62
12		2.67	Y	0.70
13		3.02	Y	0.79
14		3.36	Y	0.88
15		3.66	Y	0.96
16		3.95	Y	1.04
17		4.26	Y	1.12
18		4.52	Y	1.19
19		4.83	Y	1.27
20		5.12	Y	1.34
21		5.42	Y	1.43
22		5.71	Y	1.50
23		6.04	Y	1.59
24		6.39	Y	1.68
25		6.77	Y	1.78
26		7.14	Y	1.87
27		7.53	Y	1.98
28		7.96	Y	2.09
29		8.40	Y	2.21
30		8.90	Y	2.34

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
31		9.38	Y	2.46
32		9.89	Y	2.60
33		10.36	Y	2.72
34		10.82	Y	2.84
35		11.17	Y	2.93
36		11.53	Y	3.03
Year of key stage 1				
Year 2012	Year 2011	0.12	Y	0.03
Year 2013		0.27	Y	0.07
Year 2014		0.23	Y	0.06
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	0.22	Y	0.06
Middle		-0.06	Y	-0.02
Academy		0.01		
Special		-3.22	Y	-0.85
Year 1 cohort size				
Size of cohort	Higher compared to lower	0.00	Y	-0.01
Region				
North	Midlands	-0.03	Y	-0.01
South		-0.02		
London		-0.05	Y	-0.01
School key stage 1 quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.61	Y	0.16
Middle 20%		1.00	Y	0.26
Middle-highest 20%		1.32	Y	0.35
Highest 20%		1.78	Y	0.47
School FSM quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.13	Y	0.03
Middle 20%		0.33	Y	0.09
Middle-highest 20%		0.59	Y	0.16
Highest 20%		0.81	Y	0.21
School SEN quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.18	Y	0.05
Middle 20%		0.30	Y	0.08
Middle-highest 20%		0.43	Y	0.11
Highest 20%		0.63	Y	0.17

Table A9: List of background variables along with raw coefficients and pseudo effect size (where statistically significant) – KS1 reading & writing outcomes 2011-2014

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Girl	Boy	0.24	Y	0.06
Age	Higher compared to lower	0.00	Y	0.00
Asian	White	0.37	Y	0.10
Black		0.34	Y	0.09
Chinese		0.81	Y	0.21
Mixed/ Other		0.23	Y	0.06
Special education needs	No special education needs	-2.03	Y	-0.53
English as an additional language	Not having English as an additional language	0.31	Y	0.08
Eligible for free school meals	Not eligible for free school meals	-0.35	Y	-0.09
IDACI	Higher compared to lower	-0.61	Y	-0.04
Point score on the Communication, Language & Literacy scales of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile				
1	Points = 0	-0.37	Y	-0.10
2		-0.46	Y	-0.12
3		-0.47	Y	-0.12
4		-0.33	Y	-0.09
5		-0.35	Y	-0.09
6		0.09		
7		0.67	Y	0.18
8		1.09	Y	0.29
9		1.58	Y	0.41
10		2.00	Y	0.53
11		2.36	Y	0.62
12		2.67	Y	0.70
13		3.02	Y	0.79
14		3.36	Y	0.88
15		3.66	Y	0.96
16		3.95	Y	1.04
17		4.26	Y	1.12
18		4.53	Y	1.19
19		4.83	Y	1.27
20		5.12	Y	1.34
21		5.43	Y	1.43
22		5.72	Y	1.50
23		6.04	Y	1.59
24		6.40	Y	1.68
25		6.78	Y	1.78
26		7.11	Y	1.87
27		7.51	Y	1.97
28		7.94	Y	2.09
29		8.34	Y	2.19

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
30		8.84	Y	2.32
31		9.32	Y	2.45
32		9.82	Y	2.58
33		10.28	Y	2.70
34		10.74	Y	2.82
35		11.09	Y	2.91
36		11.45	Y	3.01
Year of key stage 1				
Year 2012	Year 2011	0.12	Y	0.03
Year 2013		0.26	Y	0.07
Year 2014		0.23	Y	0.06
Interaction terms between EYFSP quintiles and year of key stage 1				
Lowest 20% * Year 2012	Middle 20% * Year 2012	-0.04	Y	-0.01
Lowest 20% * Year 2013		-0.03		
Lowest 20% * Year 2014		-0.05	Y	-0.01
Middle-lowest 20% * Year 2012		-0.04	Y	-0.01
Middle-lowest 20% * Year 2013		-0.04	Y	-0.01
Middle-lowest 20% * Year 2014		-0.06	Y	-0.02
Middle-highest 20% * Year 2012		0.04	Y	0.01
Middle- highest 20% * Year 2013		0.05	Y	0.01
Middle- highest 20% * Year 2014		0.04	Y	0.01
Highest 20% * Year 2012		0.08	Y	0.02
Highest 20% * Year 2013		0.05	Y	0.01
Highest 20% * Year 2014		0.06	Y	0.02
School type				
Infant/First	Primary combined	0.22	Y	0.06
Middle		-0.06	Y	-0.02
Academy		0.01		
Special		-3.22	Y	-0.85
Year 1 cohort size				
Size of cohort	Higher compared to lower	0.00	Y	-0.01
Region				
North	Midlands	-0.03	Y	-0.01
South		-0.02		
London		-0.05	Y	-0.01
School key stage 1 quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.61	Y	0.16
Middle 20%		1.00	Y	0.26
Middle-highest 20%		1.32	Y	0.35
Highest 20%		1.78	Y	0.47
School FSM quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.13	Y	0.03
Middle 20%		0.33	Y	0.09
Middle-highest 20%		0.59	Y	0.15

Background variable category	Comparator/ base case	Coefficient	Statistically Significant?	Pseudo effect size
Highest 20%		0.81	Y	0.21
School SEN quintile				
Middle-lowest 20%	Lowest 20%	0.18	Y	0.05
Middle 20%		0.30	Y	0.08
Middle-highest 20%		0.43	Y	0.11
Highest 20%		0.63	Y	0.17

Appendix B: Literacy coordinator questionnaire

About you

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

	2012 %	2013 %	2014 %
Literacy coordinator	70	68	64
Key stage / year group coordinator	29	25	27
Other senior leader	17	20	21
Headteacher	21	18	18
Other role	8	7	8
None ticked	3	2	2
N=	844	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

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

	2012 %	2013 %	2014 %
Deputy head/ assistant head	8	15	16
Phonics leader/coordinator/specialist	8	18	21
Special educational needs coordinator (SENCO)	12	10	7
Year 1 teacher	N/A	30	14
Year 2 teacher	N/A	13	12
Assessment leader	N/A	3	2
Literacy Advanced Skills Teacher	2	3	2
No response	4	8	N/A
Other irrelevant or uncodable	N/A	5	12
N=	65	40	70

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

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

	2012 %	2013 %	2014 %
Systematic synthetic phonics is taught 'first and fast'*	53	60	35
Phonics is taught discretely alongside other cueing strategies	26	21	39
Phonics is always integrated as one of a range of cueing strategies	5	7	17
None ticked	17	12	8
N=	844	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014

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

* In 2014 the following clarification was added to the statement about systematic synthetic phonics: *This envisages phonics as the only way to decode words, i.e. with no other cueing strategies, which should underpin pupils' reading of all words.* The clarification was in response to an apparent misunderstanding of the meaning of 'first and fast' in both 2012 and 2013.

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

	Letters and Sounds (%)	Jolly Phonics (%)	Read, Write, INC (%)	Other published programme (%)	No mainstream or core published programme (%)
Reception	72	36	21	12	1
Year 1	73	19	21	13	2
Year 2	72	10	21	13	2
Year 3	35	2	14	12	8
Year 4 upwards	20	2	12	11	11
None ticked	24	63	74	77	88
N=573					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B5: Q2.3 – The proportion of literacy coordinators who reported making general changes to phonics teaching this school year, in light of their experience of the phonics screening check in 2012 or 2013

	2013 %	2014 %
Yes, changes to teaching in Reception	34	29
Yes, changes to teaching in Year 1	52	42
Yes, changes to teaching in Year 2	40	32
No	44	51
None ticked	1	2
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013 and 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B6: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 classes in response to the 2013 check [filter question based on table B5]

	Reception (%)	Year 1 (%)	Year 2 (%)
Adopted a new mainstream phonics programme	24	16	21
Started to use phonics programme more systematically	33	28	33
Increased the time devoted to phonics teaching	38	41	39
Increased the frequency of phonics teaching	34	32	34
Increased the number or length of discrete phonics sessions	54	51	49
Changed to teaching phonics 'first and fast'	19	21	24
Increased assessment of progress in phonics	6	3	4
Started to teach pseudo words	45	48	48
Introduced grouping / setting for phonics	39	47	45
Other	36	37	43
None ticked	10	12	11
	N= 168	N= 242	N= 181

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B7: Q2.4 – The changes made to teaching across year groups in response to the 2013 check where ‘other changes’ were indicated [filter question based on table B6]

	2014 %
Support groups/intervention groups	38
More focus on digraphs	8
Pushed the children on more	3
Changed format of phonics to be cross-key stages	3
Greater emphasis on word reading	3
Extra guidance for parents/carers	5
Now only teachers are teaching phonics	3
More individualised phonics teaching	10
Greater focus on teaching pseudo words	8
Stopped setting for phonics	3
New teaching staff	10
Changed format of teaching to be class-based rather than cross-class	3
Other relevant but vague	15
Other irrelevant or uncodable	10
N=40	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B8: Q3.1 – The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with each of the following statements

	Agree (%)		Agree somewhat (%)		Uncertain/mixed views (%)		Disagree somewhat (%)		Disagree (%)		No Response (%)	
	2012	2014	2012	2014	2012	2014	2012	2014	2012	2014	2012	2014
I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching	64	58	26	31	7	7	2	2	<1	1	2	1
Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading	66	64	24	25	6	5	2	3	1	2	2	2
Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy	11	11	22	20	15	18	28	30	22	20	2	2
A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words	66	64	24	23	5	6	2	3	2	3	1	1
Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children	6	9	18	19	19	17	28	30	28	23	2	3
The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers	10	8	19	20	22	23	20	21	29	28	<1	1
The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers	5	5	17	15	24	24	21	24	33	31	1	1
N=844 (2012) N=573 (2014)												

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012 and 2014

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

Table B9: Q4.1 – Literacy coordinators’ views on how well prepared their teachers were to provide effective phonics teaching

	2013 %	2014 %
Very well	75	77
Quite well	21	20
Partially or mixed	4	2
No response	<1	1
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012 and 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B10: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2012 and 2013 check

	2013 %	2014 %
Systematic synthetic phonics	36	46
Not applicable/I did not disapply any pupils from the 2012/ 2013 check	56	47
Other	7	7
None ticked	5	4
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012 and 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B11: Q5.1 – The teaching methods used with pupils who were disapplied from the 2013 check where ‘other teaching methods’ was indicated [filter question based on table B17]

	2014 %
Other cueing strategies, e.g. sight reading/ picture cues	16
Use British sign language (BSL)	3
Introduction of new phonics scheme	26
Introduced small intervention groups tailored to needs of particular children	11
1-1 support/tuition	18
Introduced sound discovery programme	3
Other irrelevant or uncodable	29
N=	38

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B12: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers were reported to have used the results of the 2013 phonics screening check

	Reception teachers (%)	Year 1 teachers (%)	Year 2 teachers (%)
To review/revise their phonics teaching plans in general	39	54	49
To review/revise teaching plans for individuals or groups	35	57	60
To inform discussions with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	26	41	46
To ask for more support/ more trained classroom support	15	23	21
To conduct diagnostic assessments in phonics	23	34	31
Other	4	5	4
None ticked	37	14	16
N= 573			

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B13: Q5.2 – The ways in which Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 teachers have used the results of the 2013 phonics screening check where ‘other ways’ was indicated [filter question based on table B12]

	2014 %
None/not used	59
Tailoring teaching to weaknesses	5
Confirmation of own results	3
Deciding new resources	2
To group pupils	6
Performance management targets linked to phonics screening check results	6
To help monitor pupil progress	3
To inform training for TAs	5
Other irrelevant or uncodable	12
N=	66

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

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

Table B14: Q5.3 – The type of support given to Year 2 pupils who were in each of the categories after the 2013 check

Children who last year...	Continued with systematic phonics teaching (%)	Intensive learning in small groups (%)	Extra one-to-one time with teacher/classroom support (%)	Diagnostic assessment in phonics (%)	Additional classroom support (%)	None ticked (%)
had difficulty completing section 1 of the check	68	65	49	27	46	14
could complete section 1, but had difficulties in section 2	67	64	35	27	39	13
scored close to, but under, the threshold	72	46	22	20	32	12
N=573						

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B15: Q5.4 – The time point at which literacy coordinators felt that pupils, who had not previously done so, reached the required standard of the check

	2013 %	2014 %
Autumn term 2012	8	6
Spring term 2013	55	56
Summer term 2013	25	25
Most pupils have still not reached the standard	7	7
No response	5	7
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012 and 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B16: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check

	2013 %	2014 %
Externally provided training by local authority	24	16
Externally provided training by another provider	2	3
Individual familiarisation with the Check Administrators' Guide	89	86
Watching the online video: Scoring the phonics screening check training	69	62
Discussion with yourself	57	60
Year group or key stage meeting or other staff discussion	60	57
No specific preparation for this year; most teachers already prepared	N/A	24
Other	3	2
None ticked	<1	1
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013 and 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B17: Q6.1 – How literacy coordinators reported teachers in their school prepared for the phonics screening check where ‘other preparation’ was indicated [filter question based on table 62]

	2013 %	2014 %
Familiarising self with last year's check	13	12
Discussed at network meeting	7	19
Meeting with parents/carers	13	8
Reorganisation of class groups in Year 2 to re-focus support	7	0
Bought sample materials to help with familiarisation	7	4
Practiced with pupils using mock materials	7	4
Carried out own/individual research	13	0
In-school training for staff	N/A	19
No response	87	0
Other relevant but vague	13	0
Other irrelevant or uncodable	33	35
N=	15	26

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013 and 2014

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

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

Table B18: Q7.1 – Following the phonics screening check, literacy coordinators’ reports of what actions will be taken to use the results within school

	All pupils %	Pupil who do not meet the threshold in Year 1 %	Pupil who do not meet the threshold in Year 2 %
Review of results by individual Year 1 teacher	67	33	14
Review of results by individual Year 2 teacher	54	26	33
Discussion amongst class teachers	71	27	26
Discussion between Year 1 and/ or Year 2 teacher(s) and Literacy Coordinator, Headteacher or other senior leader	65	36	30
Identification of pupils experiencing difficulties with phonics	45	49	39
Specific teaching plans for pupils experiencing difficulties with phonics	31	52	42
Discussion between Year 1 and Year 2 teachers	58	33	18
Discussion between Year 2 and Year 3 teachers	38	10	41
No action	2	1	1
Other	1	0	0
None ticked	8	0	0
N=573			

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B19: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to a child?

	Year 1 pupils %	Year 2 pupils %
The phonics screening check results	79	70
The results of other assessments	86	79
Teachers' own records of progress	94	86
Discussion with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	71	68
Other	3	3
None ticked	1	0
N=573		

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B20: Q7.2 – The evidence literacy coordinators planned to use to help them determine if / what type of extra support should be provided to a child where 'other evidence' was indicated [filter question based on table B19]

	2014 %
Discussion with reading recovery teacher	11
Discussion between relevant staff members	28
General classroom observations	11
Discussions with phonics leaders/teachers in other schools	6
Other irrelevant or uncodable	44
N=18	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B21: Q8.1 – Details of the additional information provided to the parents / carers of current Year 2 pupils who did not meet the standard this year

	2013 %	2014 %
Information about the type of in-school support planned	50	59
Information about how they can support their child	59	66
No extra information in addition to the results	29	19
None ticked	8	9
N=	583	573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2013 and 2014
More than one answer could be given so percentages may sum to more than 100

Table B22: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators' estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on planning and preparation for the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	5	13	21	19	26
0.50	3	3	0	2	1
1	25	20	5	12	7
2	16	9	4	6	2
3	6	2	1	1	0
4	3	0	0	1	0
5	3	2	2	1	0
6	1	2	1	1	0
7	1	0	0	0	0
8	1	1	0	0	0
10	2	1	1	1	0
11 to 20	2	1	3	0	0
21 or more	3	2	2	0	0
No response	28	42	58	54	68
N=	414	334	239	261	210

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B23: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on the administration of the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	3	13	29	24	30
0.50	1	2	0	1	1
1	3	10	1	5	2
1.5	0	1	1	0	0
2	6	9	29	3	0
2.5	0	1	0	0	0
3	7	9	1	1	0
4	5	4	1	1	0
5	6	0	1	1	0
6	9	3	1	2	0
7	2	1	0	1	0
8	4	1	0	1	0
9	4	0	1	0	0
10	4	2	1	1	0
11 to 20	10	2	2	4	0
21 or more	4	1	1	0	0
No response	21	38	61	56	66
N=	451	357	224	254	195

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B24: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on Paperwork

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	7	14	28	16	18
0.50	5	5	0	3	0
1	30	22	1	13	13
2	13	6	1	7	5
3	4	1	1	2	1
4	1	1	0	1	0
5	1	1	0	1	0
10	1	1	0	0	0
No response	34	48	65	56	58
N=					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B25: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on training

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	20	22	27	25	31
0.50	2	2	0	0	0
1	16	12	2	6	1
2	8	5	3	4	0
3	5	3	2	1	0
4	2	1	0	1	0
5	2	1	0	0	0
6	1	1	0	0	0
10	0	0	1	0	0
No response	41	52	64	62	67
N=					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B26: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on reviewing the results of the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	4	9	26	10	26
0.50	7	7	1	4	2
1	35	27	6	18	5
1.5	1	0	0	0	0
2	14	8	1	12	2
3	4	2	0	2	1
4	1	1	0	2	0
5	1	1	0	1	0
No response	31	45	65	49	65
N=					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B27: Q9.1 – Literacy coordinators’ estimate of the amount of staff time (in hours) spent on ‘other’ activities surrounding the check

Hours	Year 1 teacher time (%)	Year 2 teacher time (%)	Classroom support staff time (%)	Headteacher or other senior leader time (%)	Admin staff time (%)
0	8	8	8	8	8
0.50	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	2
2	0	0	0	1	1
No response	90	90	90	90	88
N=					

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

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

Table B28: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to planning and preparation for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	5	4	8	2	0
Std. Error of Mean	1	0	2	0	0
Std. Deviation	11	9	37	5	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B29: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to the administration of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	8	3	3	3	0
Std. Error of Mean	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Deviation	8	5	7	4	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B30: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to paperwork, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	2	2	1	1	1
Std. Error of Mean	0	0	1	0	0
Std. Deviation	6	6	7	3	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B31: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to training for the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	2	1	1	1	0
Std. Error of Mean	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Deviation	3	2	2	4	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B32: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to reviewing the results of the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	2	1	0	1	0
Std. Error of Mean	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Deviation	2	1	1	1	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B33: Q9.1 – Details of the mean time (in hours) spent by each member of staff in relation to ‘other’ activities surrounding the check, as reported by literacy coordinators

	Amount of Year 1 Teacher time	Amount of Year 2 Teacher time	Amount of classroom support staff time	Amount of headteacher or other senior leader time	Amount of admin staff time
Mean	3	0	3	0	0
Std. Error of Mean	1	0	2	0	0
Std. Deviation	7	1	13	1	1
N=573					

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

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2014

Table B34: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching’ in 2012 and 2013

	Sample Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	64	64	58
Agree somewhat	25	26	31
Uncertain or mixed views	6	7	7
Disagree somewhat	1	2	2
Disagree	1	<1	1
No response	2	2	1
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B35: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	63	66	64
Agree somewhat	23	24	25
Uncertain or mixed views	7	6	5
Disagree somewhat	4	2	3
Disagree	2	1	2
No response	2	2	2
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B36: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	12	11	10
Agree somewhat	24	22	20
Uncertain or mixed views	17	15	18
Disagree somewhat	23	28	29
Disagree	22	22	20
No response	3	2	2
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B37: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	67	66	64
Agree somewhat	22	24	23
Uncertain or mixed views	5	5	6
Disagree somewhat	2	2	3
Disagree	3	2	3
No response	1	1	1
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B38: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	7	6	9
Agree somewhat	19	18	19
Uncertain or mixed views	15	19	17
Disagree somewhat	26	28	30
Disagree	29	28	23
No response	3	2	3
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B39: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	8	10	8
Agree somewhat	18	19	20
Uncertain or mixed views	21	22	23
Disagree somewhat	20	20	21
Disagree	32	29	28
No response	1	<1	1
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table B40: The extent to which literacy coordinators agree with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents/carers’ in 2012, 2013 and 2014

	Survey Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Agree	4	5	5
Agree somewhat	12	17	15
Uncertain or mixed views	24	24	24
Disagree somewhat	22	21	24
Disagree	36	33	31
No response	1	1	1
	N=844	N=583	N=573

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012, 2013 and 2014
 Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Appendix C: Year 1 Teacher questionnaire

Table C1: Q2.2 – The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 1 pupils last year (2013)

	%
Yes	71
No	29
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C2: Q2.3 - The proportion of teachers reporting they conducted the check with Year 2 pupils this year (2013)

	%
Yes	64
No	36
No response	0
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C3: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2013 phonics check

	%
Made changes to phonics teaching in Year 1 in general	15
Started to teach pseudo-words	16
Carried out familiarisation / practice session(s) with pupils	22
Increased assessment of progress in phonics	14
No change to my practice	15
Other	10
None ticked	1
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2014

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

Table C4: Q2.4 - Ways teachers reported having changed their practice this year in preparation for the 2014 phonics check when 'other change' was indicated [Filter question based on table C3]

	%
Integrated phonics into more / other lessons	6
First year teaching Year 1 / new to the school / staff change	9
Pushed pupils further / moved at quicker pace	1
Taught parents/carers / sent support websites home / sent practice sheets home	5
Taught in sets / groups / streamed pupils	12
Created support groups out of school time	1
Started a new phonics programme	6
Devoted more time to teaching phonics	7
Made general changes throughout the school, e.g., in reception and Year 2	2
Increased time on pseudo words	17
New staff/ changed staff/ staff deployment	5
Provided one-to-one tuition to target children	8
More emphasis on word reading	1
More literacy/ phonics/ CPD for teachers	1
Changed order in which sounds are taught	2
Increased the amounts of phonics assessment	3
Other irrelevant or uncodable	16
N=103	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2014

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

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

Table C5: Q2.5 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2014 phonics check gave new information

	%
To a great extent	61
To some extent	35
To a small extent	2
Not at all	1
No response	1
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C6: Q2.6 – The extent to which teachers felt the results of the 2014 phonics check gave useful information, in terms of planning teaching and learning

	%
To a great extent	12
To some extent	41
To a small extent	31
Not at all	16
No response	0
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C7: Q2.7 – When thinking only of those pupils who did not have additional difficulties which may have affected their performance on the screening check, teacher's views on the suitability of the standard of the check for Year 1 pupils

	%
Much too easy	0
Slightly too easy	1
It is about right	75
Slightly too difficult	20
Much too difficult	2
No response	2
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C8: Q2.8 – The proportions of teachers reporting they had a local authority monitoring visit during the week of the check

	%
Yes	13
No	87
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C9: Q2.9 – Teacher reports of how many check administrations were observed during the monitoring visit [filter question based on Table C8]

Statistic	N
Mean	2.42
Median	2.00
Std. Deviation	2.586
No response	23
N=73	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

Table C10: Q2.10 – Where one or more observations were undertaken, teacher’s reports of how the check administration observations for the monitoring visit were chosen [filter question based on Table C8]

	%
Discussion with Headteacher	17
Decided yourself	34
Discussion with other member(s) of staff	8
Not sure / don’t know	13
Other	7
None ticked	28
N=89	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2014

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

Table C11: Q4.1 – The proportion of teachers who reported they stopped the check early due to a pupil struggling

	%
Yes	40
No	59
No response	<1
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C12: Q4.2 – Teachers' views on ease of judging when to stop the check early due to a pupil struggling [filter question based on Table C11]

	%
Very hard	1
Quite hard	2
Mixed	9
Quite easy	45
Very easy	41
No response	2
N=264	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2014

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

Table C13: Q4.3 – Factors teachers felt would influence their judgment about if and when to stop the check

	%
If the pupil was beginning to struggle or got several words in a row incorrect	48
If the pupil was becoming tired or distracted	49
If the pupil was taking a long time	14
If it became obvious the pupil was not going to reach the threshold	29
If the pupil started to become distressed	84
Other	9
None ticked	2
N=652	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teacher, 2014

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



Department
for Education

© National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) 2015

Reference: DFE-RR418B

ISBN: 978-1-78105-480-2

This research was commissioned under the 2010 to 2015 Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government. Views expressed in this report are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect government policy.

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

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

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

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