



Department  
for Education

# **Evaluation of the Phonics Screening Check: Technical Appendices**

## **Research report**

### **May 2013**

**Matthew Walker, Shelley Bartlett, Helen  
Betts, Marian Sainsbury & Palak Mehta**

**National Foundation for Educational  
Research**

# Contents

Table of figures	2
Literacy Coordinator - Data tables	13
Teacher Questionnaire - Data tables	41

## Table of figures

### Literacy Coordinator - Data tables

Table 1 Role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire	13
Table 2 Role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire who indicated they held an 'other role' [filter question from Table 1]	13
Table 3 The proportion of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Reception	14
Table 4 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 3 above]	14
Table 5 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 3 above]	14
Table 6 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some pupils in Reception [filter question based on the proportion responding 'no' in Table 3 above]	14
Table 7 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on the proportion responding 'no' in Table 3 above]	15
Table 8 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 1	15
Table 9 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 8 above]	15

Table 10 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 8 above]	15
Table 11 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some pupils in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 8 above]	16
Table 12 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 11 above]	16
Table 13 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 2	16
Table 14 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 13 above]	16
Table 15 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 13 above]	17
Table 16 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some, but not all, pupils in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 13 above]	17
Table 17 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 16 above]	17
Table 18 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 3	17
Table 19 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 18 above]	18
Table 20 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 18 above]	18
Table 21 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 18 above]	18

Table 22 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 21 above]	18
Table 23 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 4	19
Table 24 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 23 above]	19
Table 25 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 23 above]	19
Table 26 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 4 [filter question from Table 23 above]	19
Table 27 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 26 above]	20
Table 28 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 5 and 6	20
Table 29 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 28 above]	20
Table 30 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 28 above]	20
Table 31 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 5 and 6 [filter question from Table 28 above]	21
Table 32 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 31]	21
Table 33 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Reception	21
Table 34 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Reception [filter question based on Table 33 above]	21
Table 35 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Reception	22

Table 36 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Reception [filter question based on Table 35 above]	22
Table 37 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 1	22
Table 38 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 1 [filter question based on Table 37 above]	22
Table 39 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 1	23
Table 40 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 1 [filter question based on Table 39 above]	23
Table 41 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 2	23
Table 42 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 2 [filter question based on Table 41 above]	23
Table 43 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 2	24
Table 44 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 2 [filter question based on Table 43 above]	24
Table 45 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 3	24
Table 46 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 3 [filter question based on Table 45 above]	24
Table 47 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 3	25
Table 48 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 3 [filter question based on Table 47 above]	25
Table 49 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 4	25

Table 50 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 49 above]	25
Table 51 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 4	26
Table 52 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 51 above]	26
Table 53 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 5 and 6	26
Table 54 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 53 above]	26
Table 55 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 5 and 6	27
Table 56 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 55 above]	27
Table 57 Agreement with given statements characterising the school's approach to phonics within early literacy teaching	27
Table 58 Schools' use of published phonics resources (in addition to 'core' programmes)	28
Table 59 Number of published phonics resources (in addition to 'core' programmes) schools used	28
Table 60 Number of schools who have made changes to phonics teaching in anticipation of the check	28
Table 61 Types of changes made by schools in anticipation of the check [filter question from Table 60 above]	29
Table 62 Types of changes made by schools in anticipation of the check where 'other changes' were indicated [filter question from Table 61 above]	29
Table 63 Year groups in which changes were made in anticipation of the check [filter question from Table 61 above]	30
Table 64 The point in the year in which changes were made [filter question from Table 60 above]	30

Table 65 The number of teachers in the school who have received externally provided training focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2011/12	30
Table 66 Other than external training, other ways literacy coordinators reported staff learnt about phonics teaching in the school year 2011/-12	31
Table 67 Other than external training, other ways literacy coordinators reported staff learnt about phonics teaching in the school year 2011/12, when 'other' was indicated [filter question from Table 66 above]	31
Table 68 How well literacy coordinators felt staff in their schools were prepared to provide effective phonics teaching	32
Table 69 The proportion of teachers who were in schools which gave access to externally provided training focused on the phonics screening check	32
Table 70 How did Year 1 teachers in the school prepare for the phonics screening check	32
Table 71 How did Year 1 teachers in the school prepare for the phonics screening check, responses of those who ticked 'other' [filter question from Table 70 above]	33
Table 72 The actions that will be taken to use the results of the check within the school	34
Table 73 The actions that will be taken to use the results of the check within the school by those who indicated 'other' actions [filter question from Table 72 above]	35
Table 74 Descriptive statistics for the financial cost (£s) of administering the check reported within schools	35
Table 75 Descriptive statistics for the time cost (hours) of administering the check reported within schools	36
Table 76 Information provided to parents/carers prior to the administration of the check	36
Table 77 How information was communicated to parents/carers after the administration of the check	36

Table 78 How information was communicated to parents/carers after the administration of the check by those who responded 'other' [filter question from Table 77 above]	37
Table 79 The additional information given to parents/carers of the children who were shown to require support	37
Table 80 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching'	38
Table 81 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading'	38
Table 82 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy'	38
Table 83 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words'	39
Table 84 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children'	39
Table 85 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers'	39
Table 86 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement 'The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents'	40

### **Teacher Questionnaire - Data tables**

Table 1 Percentage of pupils who reached the required standard as reported by participating Year 1 teachers	41
Table 2 Descriptive statistics for percentage of pupils who reached the required standard	41
Table 3 Year 1 teachers' reactions to the standard of the check	41
Table 4 The number of pupils considered for disapplication from the check by individual Year 1 teachers	42
Table 5 The number of pupils actually disappplied from the check by individual Year 1 teachers [filter based on Table 4 above]	43
Table 6 The people involved in the decision to disapply children from the check [filter based on Table 4 above]	43



Table 7 The people involved in the decision to disapply children from the check, based on those who indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 6 above]	44
Table 8 The mechanisms for parental involvement in disapplication [filter question based on Table 4 above]	45
Table 9 Reasons given for disapplying children from the screening check [filter question based on Table 4 above]	45
Table 10 Reasons given for disapplying children from the screening check, when 'other' was indicated [filter question based on Table 9 above]	46
Table 11 The criterion applied to make a judgement of a child having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence [filter question based on Table 4 above]	46
Table 12 The criterion applied to make a judgement of a child having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence when the respondent indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 11 above]	47
Table 13 The ease of judging if and when to stop the check early due to a child struggling	47
Table 14 The descriptive statistics for the number of children with whom Year 1 teachers stopped the check early	48
Table 15 Factors which influenced teachers' judgements about if and when to end the check	48
Table 16 Factors which influenced teachers' judgements about if and when to end the check when respondent indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 15 above]	49
Table 17 The proportion of teachers who reported having experience of administering the check with the relevant group of pupils	49
Table 18 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with sight impairments	50
Table 19 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with hearing impairments	50
Table 20 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with speech, language and communication needs	50

Table 21 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with other learning difficulties	51
Table 22 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with English as an additional language	51
Table 23 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with sight impairments [filter question based on Table 17 above]	52
Table 24 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with hearing impairments [filter question based on Table 18 above]	52
Table 25 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with speech, language or communication needs [filter question based on Table 19 above]	53
Table 26 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with other learning difficulties [filter question based on Table 20 above]	54
Table 27 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those pupils learning English as an additional language [filter question based on Table 21 above]	55
Table 28 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with basic letter sound recognition only	55
Table 29 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read basic CVC words	56
Table 30 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read decodable texts	56
Table 31 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read a range of simple texts using a variety of cueing systems	56
Table 32 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for independent and readers	57
Table 33 Interventions for children who had difficulty completing section 1 of the check	57
Table 34 Interventions for children who could complete section 1 but had difficulties with section 2 of the check	57
Table 35 Interventions for children who scored close to, but under, the threshold score	58

Table 36 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who had difficulty completing section 1 of the check	58
Table 37 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who could complete section 1 of the check but had difficulties in section 2	59
Table 38 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who scored close to, but under, the threshold score	59
Table 39 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to continue with systematic phonics teaching only	60
Table 40 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive intensive learning for small groups of children (without individual support)	60
Table 41 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive individual teacher or teaching assistant support (without group support)	60
Table 42 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive individual teacher or teaching assistant support (without group support)	61
Table 43 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive 'other' kinds of support	61
Table 44 The other types of support given to children who did not reach the standard	61
Table 45 The numbers of teachers expecting to make use of published phonics resources specifically designed for the purpose of phonics 'catch-up'	62
Table 46 Descriptive statistics; of those who did reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive additional support in the future, over and above any routine phonics teaching	62
Table 47 Evidence teachers used to decide if or what type of support should be provided to a child	62
Table 48 Evidence teachers used to decide if or what type of support should be provided to a child, responses by those who indicated 'other' [filter question from Table 46 above]	63

Table 49 How teachers plan to use the results of the check in their general teaching 63

Table 50 How teachers plan to use the results of the check in their general teaching, responses by those who indicated 'other' [filter question from Table 49 above] 64

## Literacy Coordinator - Data tables

**Table 1 Role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire**

Role	%
Literacy coordinator	70
Key stage/ year group coordinator	29
Headteacher	17
Other senior leader	21
Other role	8
Missing	3
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 2 Role of teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire who indicated they held an 'other role' [filter question from Table 1]**

'Other roles' held by teachers responding to the literacy coordinator questionnaire	%
Key Stage 1 classroom teacher	57
Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	12
Phonics Leader	8
Deputy Head	8
Complex Learning Difficulties and Disabilities Coordinator	5
Reading Recovery Teacher	2
Assistant Curriculum Manager	2
Advanced Skills Teacher (AST)	2
Head of Teaching and Learning	2
Literacy Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA)	2
Missing	4
N=65	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 3 The proportion of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Reception**

Response	%
Yes	96
No	1
Missing	4
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 4 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 3 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	4.9
Median	5
Std. Deviation	0.4
No response	30
N=840	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 5 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 3 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.2
Median	2
Std. Deviation	1.1
No response	93
N=840	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 6 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some pupils in Reception [filter question based on the proportion responding 'no' in Table 3 above]**

Response	%
Yes	75
No	<1
Missing	25
N=4	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 7 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Reception if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on the proportion responding 'no' in Table 3 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	0.5
No response	1
N=4	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 8 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 1**

Schools reported	%
Yes	95
No	1
Missing	4
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 9 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 8 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	4.8
Median	5
Std. Deviation	0.5
No response	22
N=839	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 10 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 8 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.2
Median	2
Std. Deviation	1.1
No response	82
N=839	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 11 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some pupils in Year 1 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 8 above]**

Schools reported	%
Yes	80
No	<1
Missing	20
N=5	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 12 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 1 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 11 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.6
Median	1.6
Std. Deviation	0.4
No response	1
N=5	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 13 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 2**

Schools reported	%
Yes	93
No	2
Missing	6
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 14 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 13 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	4.7
Median	5
Std. Deviation	0.7
No response	36
N=830	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012



**Table 15 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 13 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.1
Median	2
Std. Deviation	1.0
No response	93
N=830	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 16 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to only some, but not all, pupils in Year 2 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 13 above]**

Schools reported	%
Yes	72
No	<1
Missing	29
N=14	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 17 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 2 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 16 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.3
Median	2.1
Std. Deviation	1.1
No response	4
N=14	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 18 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 3**

Schools reported	%
Yes	36
No	34
Missing	30
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 19 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 18 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	3.9
Median	4
Std. Deviation	1.3
No response	256
N=561	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 20 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'yes' in Table 18 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.6
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	1.0
No response	276
N=561	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 21 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 3 [filter question based on proportion responding 'no' in Table 18 above]**

Schools reported	%
Yes	86
No	4
Missing	10
N=283	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 22 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 3 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 21 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.7
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	1.1
No response	58
N=272	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 23 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 4**

Schools reported	%
Yes	24
No	42
Missing	35
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 24 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 23 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	3.8
Median	4
Std. Deviation	1.4
No response	290
N=494	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 25 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 23 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.5
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	1.0
No response	305
N=494	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 26 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 4 [filter question from Table 23 above]**

Schools reported	%
Yes	79
No	8
Missing	13
N=350	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 27 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 4 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 26 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.7
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	0.4
No response	75
N=321	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 28 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to all pupils in Year 5 and 6**

Schools reported	%
Yes	15
No	44
Missing	41
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 29 The number of days per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 28 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	3.6
Median	4
Std. Deviation	1.5
No response	345
N=473	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 30 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 28 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.4
Median	1.0
Std. Deviation	1.0
No response	350
N=473	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 31 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught to some, but not all, pupils in Year 5 and 6 [filter question from Table 28 above]**

Statistic	%
Yes	65
No	18
Missing	18
N=371	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 32 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics in Year 5 and 6 if it is taught to some, but not all, pupils [filter question based on Table 31]**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.6
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	1.1
No response	97
N=306	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 33 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Reception**

Schools reported	%
Yes	90
No	1
Missing	9
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 34 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Reception [filter question based on Table 33 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.7
No response	482
N=840	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 35 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Reception**

Schools reported	%
Yes	59
No	3
Missing	39
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 36 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Reception [filter question based on Table 35 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.7
No response	461
N=823	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 37 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 1**

Schools reported	%
Yes	90
No	<1
Missing	9
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 38 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 1 [filter question based on Table 37 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.6
Median	1.8
Std. Deviation	2.7
No response	475
N=841	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 39 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 1**

Schools reported	%
Yes	59
No	3
Missing	39
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 40 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 1 [filter question based on Table 39 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.6
Median	1.8
Std. Deviation	2.7
No response	452
N=821	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 41 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 2**

Schools reported	%
Yes	87
No	1
Missing	11
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 42 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 2 [filter question based on Table 41 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.6
No response	485
N=833	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 43 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 2**

Schools reported	%
Yes	56
No	3
Missing	41
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 44 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 2 [filter question based on Table 43 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.6
No response	467
N=823	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 45 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 3**

Schools reported	%
Yes	45
No	15
Missing	40
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 46 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 3 [filter question based on Table 45 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.4
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.6
No response	535
N=721	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012



**Table 47 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 3**

Schools reported	%
Yes	40
No	6
Missing	54
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 48 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 3 [filter question based on Table 47 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.3
Median	1.3
Std. Deviation	2.5
No response	552
N=795	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 49 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 4**

Schools reported	%
Yes	33
No	21
Missing	46
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 50 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 49 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.3
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.6
No response	512
N=666	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 51 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 4**

Schools reported	%
Yes	36
No	8
Missing	56
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 52 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 4 [filter question based on Table 51 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.2
Median	1.0
Std. Deviation	2.4
No response	551
N=774	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 53 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught in discrete phonics sessions in Year 5 and 6**

Schools reported	%
Yes	23
No	25
Missing	52
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 54 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics discretely in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 53 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.5
Median	1.5
Std. Deviation	2.9
No response	528
N=637	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 55 The number of schools reporting phonics is taught integrated into other work in Year 5 and 6**

Schools reported	%
Yes	31
No	10
Missing	58
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 56 The number of hours per week schools spent teaching phonics integrated into other work in Year 5 and 6 [filter question based on Table 55 above]**

Statistic	N
Mean	2.2
Median	1.0
Std. Deviation	2.5
No response	575
N=756	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 57 Agreement with given statements characterising the school's approach to phonics within early literacy teaching**

Statement	%
Systematic synthetic phonics is taught 'first and fast'	53
Phonics is taught discretely alongside other cueing strategies	26
Phonics is always integrated as one of a range of cueing strategies	5
No response	17
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 58 Schools' use of published phonics resources (in addition to 'core' programmes)**

Resource	% ticking resource
Supplementary phonics programmes or resources	70
Decodable readers	71
Catch-up resources	52
None ticked	9
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 59 Number of published phonics resources (in addition to 'core' programmes) schools used**

Number of resources	%
1	24
2	32
3	35
None ticked	9
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 60 Number of schools who have made changes to phonics teaching in anticipation of the check**

Response	%
Changes made	34
No changes made	65
No response	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 61 Types of changes made by schools in anticipation of the check [filter question from Table 60 above]**

Type of change	% of respondents
Adopted a new mainstream phonics programme	26
Started to use phonics programme more systematically	39
Increased the time devoted to phonics teaching	46
Increased the frequency of phonics teaching	34
Increased the number or length of discrete phonics sessions	26
Changed to teaching phonics 'first and fast'	16
Increased assessment of progress in phonics	48
Other (please specify)	26
None ticked	7
N=292	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 62 Types of changes made by schools in anticipation of the check where 'other changes' were indicated [filter question from Table 61 above]**

Type of change	% of respondents
Use of "Phonics Play" Resources	4
Introduced nonsense words into phonics reading	47
Introduced grouping or streaming	16
CLLD Project	1
Timetable Re-organisation	3
Staff Training/CPD	3
Purchased new resources	5
Phonetically decodeable books	1
Early Screening Programme	1
Practice Tests	3
Increased pace of learning	5
Extra interventions	3
Focus on phoneme spotting	3
Focus on articulation	1
Changes had already taken place	1
Extra Staff	1
Support from ECAR teacher	1
Whole school priority	1
No response	4
N=75	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 63 Year groups in which changes were made in anticipation of the check [filter question from Table 61 above]**

Year group	% of respondents
Reception	66
Year 1	94
Year 2	63
Key Stage 2 year groups	24
None ticked	2
N=292	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 64 The point in the year in which changes were made [filter question from Table 60 above]**

Year group	% of respondents
Autumn term	42
Spring term	38
Summer term	9
No response	11
N=292	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 65 The number of teachers in the school who have received externally provided training focused on the teaching of phonics in the school year 2011/12**

Training received	%
Yes	47
No	51
No response	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 66 Other than external training, other ways literacy coordinators reported staff learnt about phonics teaching in the school year 2011/-12**

Method of learning	% of respondents
Individual reading / private study	39
In-school workshop or training	49
Staff meeting	56
Key stage or year group planning meeting	50
Other (please specify)	5
None ticked	13
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 67 Other than external training, other ways literacy coordinators reported staff learnt about phonics teaching in the school year 2011/12, when 'other' was indicated [filter question from Table 66 above]**

Method of learning	% of Respondents
DfE website	7
Professional Day	2
Peer Working	14
Training Courses	26
Observation	14
Visiting other local schools	7
Lesson Study	2
Local Authority Updates	12
Early Reading Project for Year 1	2
Literacy Network Groups	2
Webinar	2
Reference to ARA phonics	2
Coaching	2
Training Video	2
'None'	14
No response	2
N=43	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 68 How well literacy coordinators felt staff in their schools were prepared to provide effective phonics teaching**

Level of preparedness	%
Very well	53
Quite well	36
Partially or mixed	8
No response	3
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 69 The proportion of teachers who were in schools which gave access to externally provided training focused on the phonics screening check**

Training attended	%
Yes, provided by the local authority	50
Yes, provided by another provider	5
No	44
No response	2
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 70 How did Year 1 teachers in the school prepare for the phonics screening check**

Method of preparation	% of Respondents
Individual familiarisation with the Check Administrators' Guide	97
Watching the online video: Scoring the Year 1 phonics screening check training	82
Discussion with Literacy Coordinator	61
Year group or key stage meeting	56
Other (please specify)	13
None ticked	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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



**Table 71 How did Year 1 teachers in the school prepare for the phonics screening check, responses of those who ticked 'other' [filter question from Table 70 above]**

Method of preparation	% of Respondents
Parents Meeting	5
Staff Discussions	40
Feedback from training	6
Pilot	2
Cluster meetings	11
Video	1
Practice Check	9
Collaboration with other schools	4
Moderation Meetings	5
Mentor Meetings	1
Briefing at LEA	7
Work with PTL	1
Workshops	4
Online Webinar	1
Letters to parents	1
RWI Trainer	1
Course to deliver check	1
SLT meeting	1
Contacted helpline	1
Did not take part	12
'None'	1
Other relevant/vague comment	4
No response	7
N=106	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 72 The actions that will be taken to use the results of the check within the school**

Action to be taken	% of Respondents
Review of results by individual Year 1 teacher	81
Review/revision of teaching plans by individual Year 1 teacher	48
Discussion amongst Year 1 teachers	54
Discussion between Year 1 teacher(s) and Literacy Coordinator, headteacher or other senior leader	88
Identification of children experiencing difficulties with phonics	80
Specific teaching plans for children experiencing difficulties with phonics	61
Discussion between Year 1 and Year 2 teachers	79
Review/revision of teaching plans by Year 2 teacher(s)	48
Discussion between Year 1 and Reception teachers	62
Other	8
None ticked	2
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 73 The actions that will be taken to use the results of the check within the school by those who indicated 'other' actions [filter question from Table 72 above]**

Action to be taken	% of Respondents
Aware without the screening	28
Feedback to SENCO	5
Identification done on a day-to-day basis	5
Full staff discussion	9
Continue phonics intervention	11
Continue own check	5
Grouping for Read Write Inc	5
Review of phonics teaching	8
Identify common mistakes to put in next year's plan	3
Re-organise timetable	3
Buy new resources	2
Evaluation of results to identify training needs	9
Advice for parents	2
Mixed age classes	3
Streaming	5
New Staff	3
Network meetings (Pyramid)	2
Run QUEST Programme	2
One-to-one support	5
Focus on nonsense words	2
Re-test	2
Introduce phonics in Key Stage 2	2
'None'	2
Other relevant/vague comment	5
N=66	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 74 Descriptive statistics for the financial cost (£s) of administering the check reported within schools**

Statistic	N
Mean	744
Median	400
Std. Deviation	1384
Minimum	0
Maximum	20400
N=513	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 75 Descriptive statistics for the time cost (hours) of administering the check reported within schools**

Statistic	N
Mean	8.4
Median	6
Std. Deviation	9.3
Minimum	0
Maximum	90
N=593	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

**Table 76 Information provided to parents/carers prior to the administration of the check**

Information	% of Respondents
Information on how parents/carers can help with their child's phonics learning	57
Information about how the check is administered	47
Information about what is expected of their child	38
Information on how the data will be used	21
None ticked	25
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 77 How information was communicated to parents/carers after the administration of the check**

Method of Communication	% of Respondents
As part of the child's individual end of year written report	66
In a separate letter to parents/carers	37
In informal discussion with parent(s)/carer(s)	25
At parents'/carers' evening / meeting	24
Other	3
None ticked	2
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 78 How information was communicated to parents/carers after the administration of the check by those who responded 'other' [filter question from Table 77 above]**

Method of communication	% of Respondents
End of year teacher assessment results	4
Headteacher has not yet informed staff	11
Certificate	4
Part of Individual Education Plan review meeting for SEN pupils	7
Training session for parents	4
One-to-one meetings with the teacher	33
Letter of explanation	26
Annual Report	7
'None'	4
No response	4
N=27	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 79 The additional information given to parents/carers of the children who were shown to require support**

Additional Information	% of Respondents
Information about the type of in-school support planned	61
Information about how they can support their child	73
None ticked	19
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 80 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘I am convinced of the value of systematic synthetic phonics teaching’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	64
Agree somewhat	25
Uncertain or mixed views	6
Disagree somewhat	1
Disagree	1
No response	2
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 81 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘Phonics should always be taught in the context of meaningful reading’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	63
Agree somewhat	23
Uncertain or mixed views	7
Disagree somewhat	4
Disagree	2
No response	2
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 82 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘Phonics has too high a priority in current education policy’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	12
Agree somewhat	24
Uncertain or mixed views	17
Disagree somewhat	23
Disagree	22
No response	3
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 83 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘A variety of different methods should be used to teach children to decode words’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	67
Agree somewhat	22
Uncertain or mixed views	5
Disagree somewhat	2
Disagree	3
No response	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 84 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘Systematic phonics teaching is necessary only for some children’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	7
Agree somewhat	19
Uncertain or mixed views	15
Disagree somewhat	26
Disagree	29
No response	3
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 85 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for teachers’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	8
Agree somewhat	18
Uncertain or mixed views	21
Disagree somewhat	20
Disagree	32
No response	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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

**Table 86 Literacy Coordinator agreement with the statement ‘The phonics screening check provides valuable information for parents’**

Level of agreement	%
Agree	4
Agree somewhat	12
Uncertain or mixed views	24
Disagree somewhat	22
Disagree	36
No response	1
N=844	

Source: NFER survey of literacy coordinators, 2012

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



## Teacher Questionnaire - Data tables

**Table 1 Percentage of pupils who reached the required standard as reported by participating Year 1 teachers**

Statistic	N
Mean	61
Median	60
Std. Deviation	39.7
Missing	62
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 2 Descriptive statistics for percentage of pupils who reached the required standard**

Statistic	N
Mean	61
Median	60
Std. Deviation	39.7
Missing	62
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 3 Year 1 teachers' reactions to the standard of the check**

Judgement	%
Slightly too easy	1
It is about right	44
Slightly too difficult	40
Much too difficult	11
Total	96
System	4
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 4 The number of pupils considered for disapplication from the check by individual Year 1 teachers**

Number of children considered for disapplication	%
0	48
1	20
2	10
3	5
4	2
5	1
6	<1
7	<1
8	1
10	<1
12	<1
14	<1
16	<1
Missing	12
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 5 The number of pupils actually disapplied from the check by individual Year 1 teachers [filter based on Table 4 above]**

Number of children disapplied	%
0	40
1	33
2	14
3	6
4	1
5	2
6	1
8	1
10	1
14	<1
16	<1
Missing	1
N=379	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 6 The people involved in the decision to disapply children from the check [filter based on Table 4 above]**

Person involved	% of Respondents
You (the Year 1 teacher)	91
The headteacher	72
The literacy coordinator	33
The child's parents/carers	20
Other (please specify)	24
None ticked	3
N=379	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 7 The people involved in the decision to disapply children from the check, based on those who indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 6 above]**

People involved	% of Respondents
Learning Support Assistant (LSA)	1
You and Colleague	2
Key Stage 1 Coordinator	8
Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	31
Local Authority SEN	1
Deputy Headteacher	16
Training Coordinator	1
Local Authority Assessment Department	2
Assessment Team	2
Speech and Language Therapist	2
PD Advisor	1
Unaware that this was an option	1
DfE	1
Phonics Leader	3
Foundation Stage Teacher	2
INA	1
Head of Department	1
Child's Support Assistant	8
Assistant Head Lit Coordinator	1
Moderator	1
Social Worker	1
Inclusion Manager	1
Hearing Unit Teacher in Charge	2
Deputy Head of Key Stage 1	1
Assistant Head of Year 1	1
School Governors	1
Reading Recovery Teacher	1
Other relevant/vague comment	1
Irrelevant/Uncodeable	2
No response	11
N=92	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 8 The mechanisms for parental involvement in disapplication [filter question based on Table 4 above]**

Mechanism for involvement	% of Respondents
Talking with you	23
Talking with the headteacher	6
Talking with the literacy coordinator	3
Other (please specify)	4
Not applicable	45
None ticked	30
N=379	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 9 Reasons given for disapplying children from the screening check [filter question based on Table 4 above]**

Reason given	% of Respondents
They showed a lack of understanding of grapheme-phoneme correspondences	43
The child only uses British Sign Language (BSL) or other sign supported communication to spell out individual letters	4
The child has selective mutism	5
Other (please specify)	27
None ticked	43
N=379	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 10 Reasons given for disapplying children from the screening check, when 'other' was indicated [filter question based on Table 9 above]**

Reason given	% of Respondents
Child not yet Level 1	9
Speech and Language Needs	13
Developmental Delay	6
Autistic	10
No understanding of sound	4
On School Action Plans	1
Downs Syndrome	4
Child does not speak English	24
Speech Difficulty	2
Year 2 in a Year 1 class	1
Psychological Condition	1
Child under consideration for statutory assessment	2
Child is unable to speak	8
SEN Registered learning difficulty	31
Left School	1
CODE REMOVED	1
Struggles with concentration	1
Personal Reasons	3
Child has not been taught phonics	4
Parental Choice	1
Missing	2
N=103	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 11 The criterion applied to make a judgement of a child having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence [filter question based on Table 4 above]**

Criterion given	%
The child had not yet developed letter sound recognition	22
The child had basic letter sound recognition	8
The child had basic letter sound recognition but was unable to fully blend	15
Other (please specify)	3
No response	52
N=379	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 12 The criterion applied to make a judgement of a child having no grapheme-phoneme correspondence when the respondent indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 11 above]**

Criterion given	% of Respondents
Child very easily upset	8
Selective Mute	8
Child doesn't speak English	8
Special Needs	17
Speech Difficulties	8
Hearing Difficulties	8
Reads in Recognition only	8
Non-Verbal	17
Additional SEN support in place	17
No response	8
N=12	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 13 The ease of judging if and when to stop the check early due to a child struggling**

	%
Very hard	2
Quite hard	3
Mixed	8
Quite easy	30
Very easy	23
NA	33
No response	1
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 14 The descriptive statistics for the number of children with whom Year 1 teachers stopped the check early**

Statistic	N
Mean	1.6
Median	1.0
Std. Deviation	2.4
Missing	131
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 15 Factors which influenced teachers' judgements about if and when to end the check**

Factors influencing judgement	% of Respondents
If the child was beginning to struggle	59
If the child got several words in a row incorrect	46
If the child was becoming tired or distracted	40
If the child had taken a long time to answer a question	12
If the child was taking too long to complete the check	8
If it became obvious the child was not going to reach the expected threshold	47
Other (please specify)	12
None ticked	19
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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



**Table 16 Factors which influenced teachers' judgements about if and when to end the check when respondent indicated 'other' [filter question based on Table 15 above]**

Factors influencing judgement	% of respondents
If child became distressed	36
If child showed negativity	10
If child was unable to blend	7
If child showed anxiety in test conditions	9
EAL child	6
Child showed closed body language	1
If child loses concentration	3
If the child is unfamiliar with a phase	10
Child struggling to access the test due to SEN	3
Child asks to stop	4
Child already in Reading Recovery	1
Child reads on sight	1
Decided in advance whether or not child takes the test	4
Child still struggles after a break	1
'None'	1
Other relevant/vague comment	10
No response	11
N=70	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 17 The proportion of teachers who reported having experience of administering the check with the relevant group of pupils**

Group of pupils	% of respondents
Pupils with sight impairments	18
Pupils with hearing impairments	21
Pupils with speech, language and communication needs	66
Pupils with other learning difficulties	66
Pupils with EAL	49
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 18 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with sight impairments**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	19
Quite unsuitable	16
Average suitability	20
Quite suitable	35
Very suitable	9
N=172	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 19 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with hearing impairments**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	21
Quite unsuitable	17
Average suitability	20
Quite suitable	31
Very suitable	11
N=196	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 20 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with speech, language and communication needs**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	19
Quite unsuitable	31
Average suitability	26
Quite suitable	22
Very suitable	2
N=616	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 21 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with other learning difficulties**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	21
Quite unsuitable	29
Average suitability	27
Quite suitable	21
Very suitable	3
N=619	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 22 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with English as an additional language**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	13
Quite unsuitable	22
Average suitability	30
Quite suitable	28
Very suitable	8
N=463	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 23 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with sight impairments [filter question based on Table 17 above]**

Explanation	% of Cases
Children may know sound but misread the words	2
Need for Braille	5
Need for large copies	6
Pass mark is too high	1
Printing of letter /"k/" commonly mistaken for letter /"r/"	3
Too hard	9
Unable to recognise phoneme grapheme	5
Not dyslexia friendly	1
Found concept of test difficult to understand	2
Struggled with pseudo-words	1
Struggled to blend	1
Shiny paper	1
Need bold lettering	1
None	48
Other relevant/vague comment	15
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	8
N=131	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 24 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with hearing impairments [filter question based on Table 18 above]**

Explanation	% of Cases
Cannot access the test	10
Immediately disadvantaged	4
Cannot show reading ability	4
Not age-appropriate	1
Not at the correct level to pass test	3
Too hard	4
May pronounce badly due to hearing the sound wrongly	18
Struggle to blend	6
Child finger-spells	1
None	43
Other relevant/vague comment	9
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	6
N=145	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 25 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with speech, language or communication needs [filter question based on Table 19 above]**

Explanation	% of Cases
Had to do in a few chunks	<1
Confused with pseudo words	10
Difficult to distinguish between phonic knowledge and incorrect speech	24
Difficult to communicate answers	20
Answers not always clear	3
Test is too long	1
Test would cause distress	6
Use of context to decode words	3
Irrelevant	2
Not at the correct level to take test	3
Lack of routine	<1
Depends of the seriousness of the impediment	4
No allowance for SEN children	1
The child sight-reads	1
Booklet distracted child	3
No support for the child	1
Child struggles to blend	3
Lack of understanding	2
Non-verbal children cannot pick words from choice	<1
Cannot access the test	2
Selective Mutism	<1
Not a fair representation of their ability	1
Not age-appropriate	<1
High pass mark	<1
None	21
Other relevant/vague comment	7
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	4
N=488	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 26 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those with other learning difficulties [filter question based on Table 20 above]**

Explanation	% of Respondents
Had to do in a few chunks	1
Confused with pseudo words	11
Use other methods (eg sight)	5
Depends on specific needs	2
Difficulty with phonics	3
Irrelevant	2
Still working at /"P/" scales	1
Length of the test	6
Not at required level for the test	8
Unable to access the test	4
Undiagnosed learning difficulty	<1
Difficulty articulating sounds	1
Pressure	2
High Pass Mark	1
Child did not receive sufficient SEN Support	1
Distracted	14
Did not understand the nature of the test	3
Test does not help them to learn	4
Struggle with digraphs	<1
Receiving other SEN support	1
Struggle with blending	3
Out of routine	2
Lack of context	3
Could cause distress	5
Pitch of test was too high	<1
None	26
Other relevant/vague comment	9
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	6
N=501	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 27 Teachers' explanation of why the check is not suitable for those pupils learning English as an additional language [filter question based on Table 21 above]**

Explanation	% of Cases
Pseudo-words now part of their vocabulary	1
Difficulty understanding pseudo words	24
If the child does not speak sufficient English	13
Pronunciation	9
Also deaf	<1
Child is SEN	2
K's look like R's	<1
Anxiety	1
Not a fair representation of their ability	2
Lack of context	3
Could not access test	2
Too young	1
Could not blend	2
Lack of home support	<1
Not enough additional support	<1
Pitch of test was too high	<1
None	33
Other relevant/vague comment	10
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	6
N=329	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 28 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils with basic letter sound recognition only**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	31
Quite unsuitable	20
Average suitability	20
Quite suitable	20
Very suitable	6
No response	3
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 29 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read basic CVC words**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	15
Quite unsuitable	25
Average suitability	25
Quite suitable	24
Very suitable	8
No response	3
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 30 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read decodable texts**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	10
Quite unsuitable	12
Average suitability	30
Quite suitable	31
Very suitable	14
No response	3
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 31 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for pupils able to read a range of simple texts using a variety of cueing systems**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	22
Quite unsuitable	21
Average suitability	22
Quite suitable	22
Very suitable	10
No response	3
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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



**Table 32 Teachers' judgements of the suitability of the check for independent and readers**

Teachers' judgement	%
Very unsuitable	22
Quite unsuitable	18
Average suitability	18
Quite suitable	19
Very suitable	21
No response	3
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 33 Interventions for children who had difficulty completing section 1 of the check**

Interventions	%
Continue with systematic phonics teaching only	4
Intensive learning groups for small groups of children (with no one on one support)	16
Extra one on one time with teacher / classroom support (with no small group support)	5
Both extra support in small groups and one on one situations	64
No response	12
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 34 Interventions for children who could complete section 1 but had difficulties with section 2 of the check**

Interventions	%
Continue with systematic phonics teaching only	12
Intensive learning groups for small groups of children (with no one on one support)	50
Extra one on one time with teacher / classroom support (with no small group support)	5
Both extra support in small groups and one on one situations	25
No response	9
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 35 Interventions for children who scored close to, but under, the threshold score**

Interventions	%
Continue with systematic phonics teaching only	48
Intensive learning groups for small groups of children (with no one on one support)	26
Extra one on one time with teacher / classroom support (with no small group support)	3
Both extra support in small groups and one on one situations	14
No response	11
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 36 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who had difficulty completing section 1 of the check**

Other interventions	%
Parental Involvement	1
Receive Individualised Programmes	1
Lexia Reading Programme	<1
Depends on other children at same level	<1
Precision Teaching	<1
After-School Provision	<1
Stimulate and encourage reading	<1
Continue with whole-class teaching	<1
Continue what was already in place	1
Small-group support	1
RWI Programme	<1
Reading Recovery	<1
Other relevant/vague comment	1
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	12
No response	84
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 37 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who could complete section 1 of the check but had difficulties in section 2**

Other interventions	%
Parental Involvement	1
Receive Individualised Programmes	1
TA Support	<1
Lexia Reading Programme	<1
Depends on other children at same level	<1
Precision Teaching	<1
After-School Provision	<1
Stimulate and encourage reading	1
Continue with whole-class teaching	<1
Continue what was already in place	1
Small-group support	<1
Subject to teachers' time/finance etc	<1
RWI Programme	<1
IT Games	<1
Better Reading Partnership	<1
'None'	<1
Other relevant/vague comment	<1
Irrelevant/Unicodeable comment	12
No response	82
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 38 Other interventions listed by teachers for children who scored close to, but under, the threshold score**

Other interventions	%
Parental Involvement	1
Receive Individualised Programmes	<1
Lexia Reading Programme	<1
Depends on other children at same level	<1
After-School Provision	<1
Stimulate and encourage reading	1
Continue with whole-class teaching	<1
Continue what was already in place	1
Small-group support	1
RWI Programme	<1
Reading Recovery	<1
'None'	1
Other relevant/vague comment	<1
Irrelevant/Unicodeable comment	12
No response	83
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 39 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to continue with systematic phonics teaching only**

Statistic	N
Mean	9
Median	5
Std. Deviation	12.3
Missing	461
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 40 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive intensive learning for small groups of children (without individual support)**

Statistic	N
Mean	8
Median	5
Std. Deviation	9.3
Missing	403
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 41 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive individual teacher or teaching assistant support (without group support)**

Statistic	N
Mean	4
Median	2
Std. Deviation	6.8
Missing	668
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 42 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive individual teacher or teaching assistant support (without group support)**

Statistic	N
Mean	6
Median	4
Std. Deviation	7.7
Missing	336
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 43 Descriptive statistics; of those who did not reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive 'other' kinds of support**

Statistic	N
Mean	1
Median	1
Std. Deviation	0
Missing	938
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 44 The other types of support given to children who did not reach the standard**

Type of support	% of Respondents
Child will continue to learn English	<1
Reading Recovery Intervention at later date	<1
In a special school setting	<1
Already been taking place prior to the check	2
Lexia Reading for all	<1
Dancing Bears Programme for Children on the SEN Register	<1
After-school reading clubs	<1
Streaming for daily phonics teaching	2
Support at a later stage	<1
EAL	<1
Homework	<1
Toe by Toe Programme	<1
RWI Programme	<1
Group work	<1
One to one	<1
Individual Learning Plan	<1
None	<1
Other relevant/vague comment	2
Irrelevant/Uncodeable comment	12
No response	80
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 45 The numbers of teachers expecting to make use of published phonics resources specifically designed for the purpose of phonics ‘catch-up’**

Intentions to make use of ‘catch-up’ resources	%
Yes	53
No	39
No response	8
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 46 Descriptive statistics; of those who did reach the required standard, the number of pupils likely to receive additional support in the future, over and above any routine phonics teaching**

Statistic	N
Mean	1
Median	0
Std. Deviation	4.3
Missing	74
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

**Table 47 Evidence teachers used to decide if or what type of support should be provided to a child**

Evidence used	% of Respondents
The phonics screening check results	51
The results of other assessments	74
My own records of progress	88
Discussion with the Special Educational Needs coordinator (SENCO)	44
Other, (please specify)	7
No response	6
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 48 Evidence teachers used to decide if or what type of support should be provided to a child, responses by those who indicated 'other' [filter question from Table 46 above]**

Evidence used	% of Respondents
Continued Extra Support	6
Knew the child would not reach the standard before the tests.	9
Teacher Records	5
Combination of Phonics Screening and own assessments	14
Educational Psychologist Advice	8
Previous School/Setting Records	6
Parental Concerns	3
HTTA Assessment	5
Guided Reading	6
Joint Teacher Discussion	24
Group Support (eg Read, Write INC)	12
Pupil Progress Meeting	3
'None'	6
Other relevant/vague comment	11
No response	3
N=66	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 49 How teachers plan to use the results of the check in their general teaching**

Planned use	% of Respondents
I will review the way in which I teach phonics	27
I will create specific teaching plans for children experiencing difficulties with phonics	38
I will discuss the results with the literacy coordinator	52
I will discuss the results with the other year 1 teacher(s)	43
I will discuss the results with the year 2 teacher(s)	61
I will discuss the results with the Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	43
I will ask for more support / more trained classroom support	11
Other (please specify)	11
No response	10
N=940	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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

**Table 50 How teachers plan to use the results of the check in their general teaching, responses by those who indicated 'other' [filter question from Table 49 above]**

Planned use	% of Respondents
Not at all	26
Commonly mispronounced sounds will be revisited	6
Reviewing how to teach phonics	13
Split Diagraphs	1
Focus on in-house assessment and records	7
Results discussed at pupil progress meetings	9
Practice	2
Allow children to become more familiar with nonsense words	6
More rigorous record keeping	4
Continue with RWI Scheme	8
TA will attend relevant courses to aid teaching	2
Already have extra support in place	18
One-to-one work	4
Parental involvement	4
Reading Recovery	1
'None'	1
Other relevant/vague comment	6
No response	3
N=101	

Source: NFER survey of Year 1 teachers, 2012

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





Department  
for Education

© National Foundation for Educational Research 2013 [May 2013]

**Ref: DFE- RR286B**

**ISBN: 978-1-78105-226-6**

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  
4th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BT

Email: [nicola.mackenzie@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.mackenzie@education.gsi.gov.uk)

This document is also available from our website at:  
<http://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/research>