

A Appendix : The Sample of Schools and Students in 2004

Main Samples, Assessed in English

In 2004, 2876 children from 254 schools were in the main samples to participate in national monitoring. Half were in year 4, the other half in year 8. At each level, 120 schools were selected randomly from national lists of state, integrated and private schools teaching at that level, with their probability of selection proportional to the number of students enrolled in the level. The process used ensured that each region was fairly represented. Schools with fewer than four students enrolled at the given level were excluded from these main samples, as were special schools and Māori immersion schools (such as *Kura Kaupapa Māori*).

In May 2004, the Ministry of Education provided computer files containing lists of eligible schools with year 4 and year 8 students, organised by region and district, including year 4 and year 8 roll numbers drawn from school statistical returns based on enrolments at 1 March 2004.

From these lists, we randomly selected 120 schools with year 4 students and 120 schools with year 8 students. Schools with four students in year 4 or 8 had about a one percent chance of being selected, while some of the largest intermediate (year 7 and 8) schools had a more than 90 percent chance of inclusion. In the two cases where the same school was chosen at both year 4 and year 8 level, a replacement year 4 school of similar size was chosen from the same region and district, type and size of school.



Māori Immersion Sample, Assessed Predominantly in Te Reo

Details of the sample for the Māori immersion assessments will be reported separately.

Pairing Small Schools

At the year 8 level, four of the 120 chosen schools in the main sample had less than 12 year 8 students. For each of these schools, we identified the nearest small school meeting our criteria to be paired with the first school. Wherever possible, schools with eight to 11 students were paired with schools with four to seven students, and vice versa. However, the travelling distances between the schools were also taken into account.

Similar pairing procedures were followed at the year 4 level. Eight pairs and one trio of very small schools were included in the sample of 120 schools.

Contacting Schools

In late May and early June, we attempted to telephone the principals or acting principals of all schools in



the year 8 sample. In these calls, we briefly explained the purpose of national monitoring, the safeguards for schools and students, and the practical demands that participation would make on schools and students. We informed the principals about the materials which would be arriving in the school (a copy of a 20-minute NEMP videotape plus copies for all staff and trustees of the general NEMP brochure and the information booklet for sample schools). We asked the principals to consult with their staff and Board of Trustees and confirm their participation by the end of June.

A similar procedure was followed at the end of July with the principals of the schools selected in the year 4 samples, and they were asked to respond to the invitation by the end of August.

Response from Schools

Of the 254 schools originally invited to participate, 251 agreed. Two schools in the year 8 sample declined to participate: one integrated full primary school because of ERO and special character reviews scheduled during

the assessment period, and one intermediate school for indeterminate reasons. One school was replaced in the year 4 sample because of workload and stress issues associated with the impending closure of the school.

The three schools not participating were replaced with schools, from the same district, matched as closely as possible on size and decile rating.

Sampling of Students

Each school sent a list of the names of all year 4 or year 8 students on their roll. Using computer-generated random numbers, we randomly selected the required number of students (12 or four plus eight in a pair of small schools), at the same time clustering them into random groups of four students. The schools were then sent a list of their selected students and invited to inform us if special care would be needed in assessing any of those children (e.g. children with disabilities or limited skills in English).

For the year 8 sample, we received 102 comments from 62 schools about particular students. In 43 cases, we randomly selected replacement students because the children initially selected had left the school between the time the roll was provided and the start of the assessment programme in the school, or were expected to be away or involved in special activities throughout the assessment week, or had been included in the roll by mistake. The remaining 59 comments concerned children with special needs. Each such child was discussed with the school and a decision agreed. Seven students were replaced because they were very recent immigrants or overseas students who had extremely limited English-language skills. Seventeen students were replaced because they had disabilities or other problems of such seriousness that it was agreed that the students would be placed at risk if they participated. Participation was agreed upon for the remaining 35 students, but a special note was prepared to give additional guidance to the teachers who would assess them.

For the year 4 sample, we received 111 comments from 57 schools about particular students. Thirty-two students originally selected were replaced because the lists originally supplied were incorrect or the student had

left the school or was expected to be away throughout the assessment week. Thirteen students were replaced because of their NESB status and very limited English. Nineteen students were replaced because they had disabilities or other problems of such seriousness the students appeared to be at risk if they participated. Special notes for the assessing teachers were made about 47 children retained in the sample.

Communication with Parents

Following these discussions with the school, Project staff prepared letters to all of the parents, including a copy of the NEMP brochure, and asked the schools to address the letters and mail them. Parents were told they could obtain further information from Project staff (using an 0800 number) or their school principal, and advised that they had the right to ask that their child be excluded from the assessment.

At the year 8 level, we received a number of phone calls including several from students or parents wanting more information about what would be involved. Two children were replaced because of severe medical

issues, one for religious reasons, one because the parents did not want their child video-recorded, one because the child had missed a lot of school, and one for unspecified reasons. In two further cases the parent was happy for the child to participate but the child asked not to.

At the year 4 level we also received several phone calls from parents. Some wanted details confirmed or explained (notably about reasons for selection). Two children were replaced at their parents' request.

Practical Arrangement with Schools

On the basis of preferences expressed by the schools, we then allocated each school to one of the five assessment weeks available and gave them contact information for the two teachers who would come to the school for a week to conduct the assessments. We also provided information about the assessment schedule and the space and furniture requirements, offering to pay for hire of a nearby facility if the school was too crowded to accommodate the assessment programme. This proved necessary in several cases.



Results of the Sampling Process

As a result of the considerable care taken, and the attractiveness of the assessment arrangements to schools and children, the attrition from the initial sample was quite low. Only about one percent of selected schools in the main samples did not participate, and slightly more than two percent of the originally sampled children had to be replaced for reasons other than their transfer to another school or planned absence for the assessment week. The main samples can be regarded as very representative of the populations from which they were chosen (all children in New Zealand schools at the two class levels apart from the one to two percent who were in special schools, Māori immersion programmes, or schools with fewer than four year 4 or year 8 children).

Of course, not all the children in the samples actually could be assessed. Two student places in each sample were not filled because insufficient students were available in those schools. Thirteen year 8 students and nine year 4 students left school at short notice and could not be replaced. Three year 8 students and one year 4 student withdrew or were withdrawn by their parents too late to be replaced. One year 4 student was found to be misclassified (actually year 5). Twenty-nine year 8 students and 15 year 4 students were absent from school throughout the assessment week. Some other students were absent from school for some of their assessment sessions, and a small percentage of performances were lost because of malfunctions in the video recording process. Some of the students ran out of time to complete the schedules of tasks. Nevertheless, for almost all of the tasks over 90 percent of the sampled students were assessed. Given the complexity of the Project, this is a very acceptable level of participation.

Composition of the Sample

Because of the sampling approach used, regions were fairly represented in the sample, in approximate proportion to the number of school children in the regions.

REGION

PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS FROM EACH REGION		
REGION	% YEAR 4 SAMPLE	% YEAR 8 SAMPLE
Northland	4.2	4.2
Auckland	34.2	33.3
Waikato	9.2	9.2
Bay of Plenty/Poverty Bay	8.3	8.3
Hawkes Bay	4.2	4.2
Taranaki	2.5	3.3
Wanganui/Manawatu	5.8	5.0
Wellington/Wairarapa	10.8	10.8
Nelson/Marlborough/West Coast	3.3	3.3
Canterbury	10.8	11.7
Otago	4.2	4.2
Southland	2.5	2.5

DEMOGRAPHY

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES: PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS IN EACH CATEGORY			
VARIABLE	CATEGORY	% YEAR 4 SAMPLE	% YEAR 8 SAMPLE
Gender	Male	50	50
	Female	50	50
Ethnicity	Pakeha	74	69
	Māori	20	21
	Pasifika	6	10
Geographic Zone	Greater Auckland	33	32
	Other North Island	46	46
	South Island	21	22
Community Size	< 10,000	16	15
	10,000 – 100,000	26	25
	> 100,000	58	60
School SES Index	Bottom 30 percent	24	25
	Middle 40 percent	34	41
	Top 30 percent	42	34
Main language at home	English	88	88
	Other	12	12
Size of School	< 25 y4 students	24	
	25 – 60 y4 students	43	
	> 60 y4 students	33	
	<35 y8 students		19
	35 – 150 y8 students		34
Type of School	> 150 y8 students		47
	Full Primary		32
	Intermediate		53
	Other (<i>not analysed</i>)		15