Data analysis of Te Kura a Rohe o Whaingaroa / Raglan Area School questionnaire February 2021

By David Whyte BSc Msc(tech) 1st class
david@zestos.co.nz

Summary

The summary results have color coded to help with ease of reading. The colors do not mean any specific detail. Overall adults supported uniform, whereas students supported mufti. Detailed break down below:

Overall	Uniform or mufti
Teachers	Strongly pro uniform
Future Parents	Strongly pro uniform
Community	Marginally pro uniform
Parents	Pro uniform
Years 1 – 6	Pro mufti
Years 7 – 8	Strongly pro mufti
Years 9 – 10	No preference
Years 11 – 13	Strongly pro mufti

With regard to full school uniform (years 0 – 13) or equivalent to intermediate+college (years 7-13) then teachers and future parents strong supported uniform, whereas parents and community showed no preference between pro uniform or pro mufti. Students once again were pro mufti. Detailed break down below.

Uniform options	**Years 0 – 13**	**Years 7 – 13**
Teachers	Strongly pro uniform	Strongly pro uniform
Future Parents	Strongly pro uniform	Strongly pro uniform
Community	Marginally Pro mufti	Pro mufti
Parents	No preference	No preference*
Years 1 – 6	Pro mufti	Strongly pro mufti
Years 7 – 8	Strongly pro mufti	Strongly pro mufti
Years 9 – 10	Strongly pro mufti	No preference
Years 11 – 13	Strongly pro mufti	Strongly pro mufti

* if there was one more vote in this category it would have made it to marginally Pro uniform. See more complex data analysis in the report.

Only one group supported a fully branded uniform, future parents. With two groups supporting a partially branded uniform, teachers and parents. Once again students did not support any uniform option. Detailed break down below:

Uniform type	**Fully branded**	**Partially branded**
Teachers	No preference	Strong support
Future Parents	Strong support	No preference
Community	No support	Marginally No support
Parents	No support	Support
Years 1 – 6	Strongly no support	No support
Years 7 – 8	Strongly no support	Strongly no support
Years 9 – 10	No preference	No preference
Years 11 – 13	Strongly no support	Strongly no support

The analysis of the questions around possible concerns are more complex, and thus are not included in this summary, and the results can be found in the relevant section below.

More complex analysis

A more in depth look at the survey is carried out below. This enables more nuanced information to be understood. And further conclusions to be drawn. However what this means is things are not as simple and clear cut. So more time will be required to digest the data and information.

Limitations in the methodology

It is traditionally in any scientific analysis to be upfront about any limitations in the data being analysed. This is because any data will have limitations. This does not mean that that the data is wrong, or shouldn't be used to make decisions from. More that being open and honest about the inherent limitations will reduce the risk that conclusions will be drawn that are incorrect or conclusions are stretched further than the data backs up.

Any feedback tool is going to have limitations and/or bias in the data collection. The obvious two that spring to mind using an internet survey, is the conscientious bias and the limitations of internet access. These are explained below, and should be kept in mind while reviewing the summarised data.

Conscientiousness bias

There is a bias in a survey released to be completed in ones own time. This is a bias towards those who score highly with the trait of conscientiousness. There are various models of human behaviour, and both the Five Factor Model and HEXACO models have a trait called conscientiousness.

To quote from Wikipedia "Conscientiousness is the personality trait of being careful, or diligent. Conscientiousness implies a desire to do a task well, and to take obligations to others seriously. Conscientious people tend to be efficient and organized as opposed to easy-going and disorderly. They exhibit a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement; they display planned rather than spontaneous behavior; and they are generally dependable. It is manifested in characteristic behaviors such as being neat, and systematic; also including such elements as carefulness, thoroughness, and deliberation (the tendency to think carefully before acting) ..... People who score low on conscientiousness tend to be laid back, less goal-oriented, and less driven by success; they also are more likely to engage in antisocial and criminal behaviour."

Thus we would expect those parents / students with higher conscientiousness to be the responders to the survey. Thus given there desire to have things neat, systematic and planned we would expect them to have a preference towards uniform, since a school in uniform is going to exhibit the traits that align with conscientiousness.

Also conscientiousness increases with age, so we would expect more adults, and older adults, (age was not part of the survey for obvious reasons) to want uniforms. Even if those adults would not have wanted them as teenagers.

So therefore one would expect a bias towards the preference for school uniform compared to if the survey had 100% completion rate. This bias is impossible to quantify since it is unknowable.

Internet Access

It is taken for granted that internet access is a given in life. However I recently did a review of the literature around who might not have access to the internet in the Waikato district. The key findings were that the following groups of folk had limited internet access.

- **Low socio-economic groups.** This is a cost issue, that they are unable to afford the cost of internet and/or cost of the IT to access the internet. These folks can access the internet via the library, but are unlikely to do to engage with high school consultation.

- **Elderly.** This group is restricted by both the cost, and lack of IT skills. This group is not directly relevant to the RHS survey.
- **Rural**. Rural areas may not have access to inexpensive, or fast internet. It is geography dependant, and also income dependant. That is rural internet is expensive, so wealthier rural folks can obtain access via satellite installations, which is costly. And the bandwidth is slow / expensive. Others just go without. I am not familiar with the ratio between urban and rural at RHS. Nor am I familiar with the impact of the munga and other hilly locations on wireless / mobile networks and how this flows into internet accessibility. But as a rule wireless systems are line of site, so hills in the way results in poor internet.

So to conclude the on line electronic survey will bias towards those who score highly with the trait of conscientiousness, which are those who things ordered. And there could be a bias towards the urban population, depending on rural internet available in the greater Raglan area.

Limitation in data analysis

If you were given three different colored dice; red green and blue and rolled them all. Fairly regularly there would be a sequence of result from low to high going up red, green and blue. This is common sense, but shows the issues around data analysis of groups of three (Very, Somewhat, Not). So care needs to be given that random noise / variation in the data is actually an insightful conclusion and not just the result of random variation. Now there are statistical tests that can be undertaken to check (called statistically significance or P tests). But these take a considerable amount of time and effort and have not been completed.

A helpful guide, the following questions can be asked – does this make sense? Does it fit in with other trend(s) in the data? And are the other explanations for this result? These and other such types of questions can be helpful in not drawing strong conclusions that may not be supported by the data.

There are other more specific limitations, but these are commented upon with the results.

Response rates

An analysis of the response rate can help indicate what level of engagement has occurred. The response rates of the various groups are outlined in the table below. The following assumptions were made.

- **Teachers** group was total of all paid staff, not just teaching staff
- **Future parents**. The obvious source of error in this, is that how many potential new parents are there. There will be students who instead of enrolling in RAS are sent to another schooling option. Thus these parents are also part of the Future parent group, but quantifying these numbers are beyond the scope of this data analysis
- **Community**. The community population figure was taken from wikipedia.
- **Parents**. There are 567 students at the school. Clearly a proportion of these student come from the same home, thus decreasing the number of parents from 567 pairs to a lower number.

  Making some assumptions we might be able to find an upper and lower bound. Taking the school role of 330 non Maori whose families have 1.8 children (NZ current birth rate per women), and Maori 235 with 2.8 children (NZ current birth rate per Maori women) the total number of families would be 267. So 243 responses would be a 91% compilation rate. However obviously this assumes that both parents are still together. This is not a valid assumption!

  Statistics in the public domain around children whose parents are no longer together was remarkably difficult to find. Thus an estimate has to be created from thin air, and will

inherently be unsubstantiated. In this regard, let us take an upper bound of 75% of students come from parents who are no longer together. Thus making the pool of parents 467, and a response rate of 52%

Lastly the percentages were rounded to zero decimal places, which resulted in the community response rate just making it to 1%, because it was 0.5%.

Year group	**Total number**	**Responses**	**Percentage**
Teachers	74	21	28 %
Future parent	low	12	high
Community	~3 300	18	1 %
Parents	315 - 551	243	52 - 91%
1 – 6	276	43	16 %
7 – 8	89	38	43 %
9 – 10	100	44	44 %
11 – 13	102	38	37 %

The response rate of teachers being 30%. Given that online survey response rates sit around the 30% mark, then this is what could be expected. However a company wide survey response rate for employees is typically above 50% and with good company culture is in the 65-85% rate. Thus a 30% response rate is typically of online surveys it is considered low for employee surveys. It is impossible for me to determine exactly why this is, and could be seen a number or reasons.

There was strong response from the parent community. This is twice the normal online survey response rate, and shows the survey has been well advertised / communicated

The wider community response rate is very low. However given that the stakeholders who would be most impacted (students, parents, teachers) have a much higher response rate, this doesn't concern me, nor surprise me. Since connecting with an average member of the public, would be a challenge for the school in the 'noisey' communication environment (ie hard to get the message out there in a way that actually makes it into some ones brain) and then even if the message was communicated the general buy in / motivation for the average person to complete the survey is low.

The year 1 – 6 response rate is low, being 16%, and the lowest of any group (excluding the wider community). This doesn't surprise me given the average child isn't going to proactively remember and be able to navigate to the survey without parental input.

The other years response rates sit in the high 30's to low 40's.

Data analysis

The data was received in excel format with the duplicates already removed. The data was broken down via who completed the survey. These groups were then summarised, the summary of each group is shown in the following section.

The following tables show the summary of the data. Each heading and associated table shows the results from that group. The first table is the support around a uniform and uniform options. The second table is a summary of the potential concerns around a uniform being implemented.

It is assumed that BOT members are familiar with the questions in the survey, so no explanation of the questions / possible answer choices are required.

What was not undertaken was the complex and detailed scientific statistical significance testing (ie P tests), since this did not seem an appropriate use of time and resources. Thus the 'eyeball' test was used to see if there were strong trends in the data. If there appeared to be a strong trend / difference then the higher value was highlighted in green. Thus drawing attention to the main parts of the data. The cut off used was a 10% increase / difference.

Staff

Staff

Total number 21

	No	Yes
Support	3	18
0-13	7	14
7-13	2	19
Fully branded	12	9
Partial branded	4	17

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	2	18	1
Loss individuality	17	1	3
Gender id	16	5	0
Punishment	17	4	0
Bullying	15	5	2
Income divide	18	2	1

Clearly an overwhelming number support uniform, across all ages, and partially branded. There is not a strong preference either way for fully branded vs partially branded

It is also interesting that there is a very strong belief by teachers that the perceived positive negatives are not a problem. The exception to this is that cost could be somewhat of a barrier.

There could be a number of reasons for this:
a) Confidence in the school. Especially for bullying and if there are concerns around punishment for not complying, if the teacher did not have confidence in RAS ability to deal with these issues, one would like to think that the teacher would be ethically compelled to look for another job where

bullying and punishment was handled appropriately. Given the choice of teaching in nearby Hamilton (so there are alternative employment options) it would make sense then that teachers employed by RAS believe in RAS. This is clearly a good thing, but it also does have a draw back as improvements in systems are harder to achieve and blind spots can develop.

b) Way survey was structured. Given that the survey collated names, a teachers response can be easy isolated. Thus given the information was accessible by board, they dynamic / power play between employee and upper management come into play. Employment matters are fraught with complexity and although we like to think we are honest with our feedback, power imbalances lead to distortions in the data.

c) Self selection. Given the engagement rate was 28% this would indicate that many teachers did not share their opinion. Thus it stands to reason that only those passionate about the subject shared their opinion.

Community Members

Community Member

Total number 18

	No	Yes
Support	8	10
0-13	10	8
7-13	11	7
Fully branded	11	7
Partial branded	10	8

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	3	6	9
Loss individuality	10	1	7
Gender id	9	4	5
Punishment	8	3	7
Bullying	9	6	3
Income divide	8	4	6

The community showed no strong preference for or against a uniform. It could be argued that there is marginal support for uniform, since the yes are just over 10% higher than the No. This is right on the cusp as to if this is a result of noise, or a result of true trend.

The same can be said around the No with regard to full school and Partial branded. This is the nature of setting a cut off, that some data is going to come right up to the line. However given the No for 7-13 and fully branded also shows this trend, there is consistency across these results.

There is a strong trend in the cost concerns, with increase from 3 to 6 then 9. Thus showing that cost is a concern the community is aware of. Whereas the same result, but in opposite direction, occurs for bullying.

There is a possible trend for the other results with responders choose either Not or Very, with not many choosing Somewhat.

Future Parent

Future parent

n 12

	No	Yes
Support	1	11
0-13	2	10
7-13	2	10
Fully branded	1	10
Partial branded	5	7

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	1	9	2
Loss individuality	11	0	1
Gender id	10	1	1
Punishment	8	2	2
Bullying	9	0	3
Income divide	8	3	1

Future parents show a very strong preference for uniform. And are the only <check> group who had a strong preference for a fully branded uniform. They also do not see any of the potential negatives as being an issue, except for the cost which is dominated by the Somewhat answer.

I am not aware of how many future parents of RAS there are in the community, so cannot calculate a percentage or respondents. Also I am unaware of if future parents are parents of children aged 5 and under, or there are major entry points into RAS at other years / ages.

However I would suggest that the following be considered

a) Respondents are thinking and planning well ahead. Given that a Future Parent is unlikely to be putting a child into school in the next month, and more likely not for some months, they are clearly thinking and planning ahead. And also motivated enough to schedule in time to complete a survey. This is no small thing given that <5 year olds have a heavy demand on parental time.

Therefore I would conclude that the folks who answered this survey value education, come from middle to upper class backgrounds and professions, where organisation, scheduling, planning and getting things done are valued. This is describing someone who is has high levels of Continuousness. Thus the bias that these folks bring is likely reflected into the survey results.

b) If the Future Parents are dominated by parents under the age of 5, they are likely to have rose colored glasses on about schools in general, and the ability of schools to run well and deal appropriately with the challenges that a uniform may bring. Like any situation, once one experiences first hand that schools live in the real world thus have challenges with behaver management, kids who don't listen, teachers who have bad days etc. etc. their confidence in schooling system to do things well is likely to reduce.

This is the same with having a first baby, expectant parents often have unrealistic expectations of themselves, and how life with a baby is, and after a few years (or a few kids) the expectations drop from I will never use screen time as a baby sitter, to it has only been an hour today, and that is fine.

So caution should be used in generalizing these responses to all Future Parents, and also that expectations may not be well aligned with reality.

Parent

Parent

n 243

	No	Yes
Support	95	148
0-13	123	120
7-13	110	133
Fully branded	146	97
Partial branded	109	134

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	52	86	105
Loss individuality	114	57	72
Gender id	133	54	56
Punishment	72	76	95
Bullying	148	54	41
Income divide	111	69	63

The majority do support a uniform. However there is not clear support for a fully school uniform or a senior school uniform. This is an unexpected result. Since I would have expected given the higher level of support for a uniform, that one of these categories would have shown clear support.

What I would conclude from this, is that all folk who voted no, voted no on the year options. Whereas the folks who voted yes, divided up their votes between the two options. Thus what was a majority now disappears into noise.

A valid question is why the yes option in year 7 – 13 uniform isn't in green. Since this is a difference of 23 votes. This is because given the high number of responses (243), the difference of 23 votes is less than 10% and therefore it doesn't make the 10% cut off decided upon before the data was analysed. If one person had changed their vote, it would have tipped it over the 10% threshold.

There was strong opposition to a fully branded uniform and support for a Partially branded uniform.

Mirroring the communities response there was a trend upward with regard to concerns about cost. Interestingly though there was not concerns regarding income divide, with the majority saying they were Not concerned about this.

It is concerning to see that parents see punishment as being a concern. There is no clear trend in the data, thus indicating that parents are not confident that appropriate punishment(s) would be undertaken for uniform infractions. This should raise a red flag, and further work undertaken to see how parents think about current punishment systems, and to uncover why there is this lack of confidence.

Students Years 1 – 6

Children yr 1-6

n 43

	No	Yes
Support	23	20
0-13	24	19
7-13	28	15
Fully branded	29	14
Partial branded	25	18

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	21	9	13
Loss individuality	18	11	14
Gender id	25	10	8
Punishment	16	11	16
Bullying	27	8	8
Income divide	19	17	7

I combined both the year 1-3 answers and year 4-6 data. This was for two reasons. Firstly both groups unsurprisingly had lower response rates than the other pupil groups and secondly and more importantly there would be a heavy parent bias in how the child sees the world. That is a parent would nearly always be required to help or put data in (so they are unlikely to say something that will get them punished / have negative consequences). So the responses will strongly reflect the attitudes cultivated in the home. Obviously if the BOT thinks these should be divided out they can be.

There is no clear preference for or against a uniform, but when asked specifically about what years should have a uniform, or what branding / level of uniform, a clear No comes through. This would indicate to me, that the students do not support a uniform.

This makes sense, given that a young child may not understand the theoretical implications of what a uniform is, but when it becomes concrete and asking about specifics, then they more fully understand the concept.

It was good to see that these students were Not concerned about cost. This tells me that there is strong validity in the data. Generally young children are not cognisant of things financial, and thus I would have expected the majority to not be concerned about cost.

It is also good that they do not see bullying as a problem.

Students Years 7 – 8

Intermediate Yr 7-8

n 38

	No	Yes
Support	23	15
0-13	25	13
7-13	25	13
Fully branded	25	13
Partial branded	29	9

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	13	12	23
Loss individuality	19	12	7
Gender id	28	8	2
Punishment	18	12	8
Bullying	23	12	3
Income divide	21	6	11

There is No support for a uniform, across all the categories. Interesting to see that these students now recognize cost being an issue, with the majority being Very concerned about this.

What is interesting is that there is a decreasing trend around loss of individuality. This is unexpected. Again positive news for the school around bullying and punishment.

Intrigued as to the income divide impacts, are not seen as an issue, yet the cost is. Would be interested to understand more around this.

Students Year 9 – 10

Juniors yr 9-10

n 44

	No	Yes
Support	21	23
0-13	31	13
7-13	20	24
Fully branded	24	20
Partial branded	24	20

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	11	19	14
Loss individuality	15	15	14
Gender id	23	16	5
Punishment	17	12	15
Bullying	29	10	5
Income divide	18	15	11

There was no clear preference for or against uniforms in this year group. But intriguingly there was a clear preference against a full school uniform. If the cut off was 9-13, instead of 7-13 then maybe it could be explained as the students in these years want to be in uniform to show how mature / old they are compared to the younger years. But given no one would mistake a 5 year old, with a 15 year old, this doesn't make sense. This may be worth following up / digging deeper into.

There was not clear concern around cost, which is a first in the data. This might be explained by how self centred some teenagers are at this stage in life.

Students Years 11 – 13

Seniors yr 11-13

n 38

	No	Yes
Support	27	11
0-13	30	8
7-13	27	11
Fully branded	29	9
Partial branded	26	12

Concerns	Not	Somewhat	Very
Cost	5	13	20
Loss individuality	5	10	18
Gender id	11	9	18
Punishment	7	15	16
Bullying	15	13	10
Income divide	10	14	14

There is strong opposition to a uniform across all areas for the senior students. These students are also the most concerned about the impacts from any group, being very concerned about the cost, loss individuality, the only group that is, and also about Gender ID which again is the only group that is.

Comparing groups and looking at trends

It can be helpful to look at data in multiple different ways, as this shows trends and information that might not be obvious when only looking at the data in one specific way.

The data was taken, transformed into percentages, and then tabulated to compare across the adult and student groups allowing easy comparison between the sub-groups. For ease of reference the number of respondents were included after the sub group name.

The groups with similar results where highlighted in either light yellow, or orange-yellow. Were there were trends these where highlighted in light grey. A difference had to be more than 5% for it to be deemed a real difference, and not just noise in the data set. So for example a 50:50 split could be anywhere from 45 – 55. This is important to remember, since we are looking for trends, and what groups of folk are thinking, and not getting caught up on the exact numerical figure. This 5% figure is less than the 10% figure of the first data analysis. The

With that regard it is likely I should have rounded up to zero decimal places instead of the one decimal place. However if that is done, due to the rounding, the figured don't always add to 100%, and this is really obvious given the low number of groups. So hence folk can get concerned about accuracy of the data as it gives the illusion of errors in the system.

Adults

	No	Yes	0-13 No	0-13 Yes	7-13 No	7 – 13 Yes	Fully Brand – N	Fully Brand – Y	Partial – N	Partial – Y
Staff (21)	14.3	85.7	33.3	66.7	9.5	90.5	57.1	42.9	19.0	81.0
Future parent (12)	8.3	91.7	16.7	83.3	16.7	83.3	8.3	83.3	41.7	58.3
Community (18)	44.4	55.6	55.6	44.4	61.1	38.9	61.1	38.9	55.6	44.4
Parent (243)	39.1	60.9	50.6	49.4	45.3	54.7	60.1	39.9	44.9	55.1

What is fascinating is that there is close alignment between the future parents and teachers around the strong preference for a uniform, and a strong preference for both 0-13 and 7-13 groups.

Whereas the community and the parents had preference for uniform. But then the community didn't want a full 0-13 full uniform, but the parents were undecided. When it came to the year 7-13 uniform the community was against it, where as the parents were just under the cut of being for it.

There as also common ground in both community and parents having slight preference against full branded uniform. Where as teachers and future parents diverged at this time.

	Cost			Loss Individuality			Gender ID		
	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very
Staff (21)	9.5	85.7	4.8	81.0	4.8	14.3	76.2	23.8	0.0
Future parent (12)	8.3	75.0	16.7	91.7	0.0	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3
Community (18)	16.7	33.3	50.0	55.6	5.6	38.9	50.0	22.2	27.8
Parent (243)	21.4	35.4	43.2	46.9	23.5	29.6	54.7	22.2	23.0

Again there is strong correlation between future parents and staff around cost, with the majority somewhat concerned about cost. Whereas both the community and parents show a trend of increasing concern about cost, and largest group being the Very concerned group.

The loss of individuality is not a concern to staff or future parents, but the community and parent group don't follow this. With the community group being either Not or Very concerned. This indicates a degree of polarization around the issue or individuality.

It is interesting that the staff show a very strong trend not to be concerned about Gender ID. With the majority Not concerned, and a group Somewhat, with no one being Very concerned. Whereas the Community and Parents, although ~50% are Not concerned a quarter are somewhat and a quarter Very.

	Punishment			Bullying			Income divide		
	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very
Staff (21)	81.0	19.0	0.0	71.4	23.8	9.5	85.7	9.5	4.8
Future parent (12)	66.7	16.7	16.7	75.0	0.0	25.0	66.7	25.0	8.3
Community (18)	44.4	16.7	38.9	50.0	33.3	16.7	44.4	22.2	33.3
Parent (243)	29.6	31.3	39.1	60.9	22.2	16.9	45.7	28.4	25.9

Staff are again not concerned about these three issues, with a strong downward trend across all three. The community also shows a decreasing trend with bullying. And once again the Future staff align with the staff tend of decreasing concern about income divide.

There could be a trend in the opposite direction, compared to teachers, for parents about punishment. Although the numbers do increase, the increase is low, and this trend should be treated with caution.

Students

Students	No	Yes	0-13 No	0-13 Yes	7-13 No	7-13 Yes	Fully B -N	Fully B -Y	Partial -N	Partial-Y
Yr 1- 6 (43)	53.49	46.51	55.81	44.19	65.12	34.88	67.44	32.56	58.14	41.86
Yr 7-8 (38)	60.53	39.47	65.79	34.21	65.79	34.21	65.79	34.21	76.32	23.68
Yr 9-10 (44)	47.73	52.27	70.45	29.55	45.45	54.55	54.55	45.45	54.55	45.45
Yr 11-13 (38)	71.05	28.95	78.95	21.05	71.05	28.95	76.32	23.68	68.42	31.58

The year 1 – 6 and year 9 – 10 students are approximately a 50:50 split around the uniform, whereas year 7 – 8 are against it, and the year 11-13 strongly against it. What is interesting is that parents in general are for uniform (60%) yet the young students of year 1 – 6 who I would have expected to mirror the parents to some degree, have a 50:50 split.

All of the students are against a year 0-13, and interestingly as the years increase, the opposition to a fully school uniform increases. Going from a low of 55 against, to ~80% against.

Most groups are against a year 7 – 13 uniform as well. With the year 9-10 being the odd ones out, with again an approximate 50:50 split.

All student groups are against a fully branded uniform, except years 9-10. With years 1-8 having ~65% opposition, whereas the year 9 – 10 group is again different to the rest and have a 50:50 split. And again the senior students year 11-13 being the most against it.

Partial branded, again all students bar years 9-10, are against this, with the years 9-10 having an approximate 50:50 split.

What is really fascinating is that there is often times in this table, years 9-10 were against the trend. This makes we wonder if a strong personality / leader in these years groups were strong advocating for the uniform. Or a teacher was facilitating discussion on the topic, in such a way to encourage students towards a uniform ie talking about the positives and downplaying negatives.

	Cost			Loss Individuality			Gender ID		
	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very
Yr 1- 6 (43)	48.8	20.9	30.2	41.9	25.6	32.6	58.1	23.3	18.6
Yr 7-8 (38)	34.2	31.6	60.5	50.0	31.6	18.4	73.7	21.1	5.3
Yr 9-10 (44)	25.0	43.2	31.8	34.1	34.1	31.8	52.3	36.4	11.4
Yr 11-13 (38)	13.2	34.2	52.6	13.2	26.3	47.4	28.9	23.7	47.4

The only group with a clear trend around cost is the seniors years 11-13, with increasing concern. This is echoed in the loss or individuality. Interesting the years 7-8 show the opposite trend, with decreasing concern about individuality.

All students except the seniors, showed decreasing concern about Gender ID, with the seniors showing increasing concern.

	Punishment			Bullying			Income divide		
	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very	Not	Somewhat	Very
Yr 1- 6 (43)	37.2	25.6	37.2	62.8	18.6	18.6	44.2	39.5	16.3
Yr 7-8 (38)	47.4	31.6	21.1	60.5	31.6	7.9	55.3	15.8	28.9
Yr 9-10 (44)	38.6	27.3	34.1	65.9	22.7	11.4	40.9	34.1	25.0
Yr 11-13 (38)	18.4	39.5	42.1	39.5	34.2	26.3	26.3	36.8	36.8

Both the year 1-6 and year 9-10 show polarization in the punishment data, that is the Not and Very groups are high, and the Somewhat group being lower. Thus indicating folk are more likely to fall into opposite camps on the issue.

The year 7-8 show a decreasing trend with concern around punishment, where as the year 11-13 show an increasing trend.

With regard to bullying years 7-8 and 9-10 actually agree (most of the time they do not) and have a decreasing trend. The senior years 11-13 also show a decreasing trend, but still a quarter are Very concerned about the possible impacts on bullying, whereas the other two groups are down to low numbers at this point.

The income divide the years 1-6 and 9-10 show remarkably similar results with a decreasing concern around income divide.

Written feedback

The comments were sorted and grouped into logical clusters. Thus making digestion of the material easier. The comment clusters were then listed / ranked by total number in each cluster, and if clusters had the same number of comments, they were listed alphabetically by the title of the cluster. The title of the cluster was taken from the theme of that cluster, and consistency was attempted between the groups, but some variation likely exists.

For the No further comment, the No comments were not included in the cluster, only the total sum. Since they don't add any value.

Due to some characters not being recognized by the automated form system, they have appeared in the excel spreadsheet as strange characters. Some of these are caused by the system not recognising apostrophes or quotes. These have been replaced to make reading much easier. However other more 'random' characters have been left in.

In general if the form was left blank, then it may not have been tallied up into the No further comment list. So the sum of all comments, might not add up to the total number of responders. Sometimes it wasn't obvious as to which category things went into. So assumptions were made.

Lastly there were a number of comments 'lost' in among a paragraph or sentence about uniform style, or age / year differences. These could be very helpful to those making decisions. Thus they have been highlighted by changing the text to deep blue, so they are easily noticeable.

Break down of comments
In an attempt to make the long answers more understandable, the follow analysis was undertaken. However in retrospect not convinced that it made for easier conclusions.

Once the data was divided into logical groups, the number in the groups were tabulated, and summarised below. Please note due to keeping the table size to a reasonable length, the 'long tail' of single categories was not included. In this case the 'long tail' was categories that were important to one group of folk. Thus to include them in the table would have made the font so small it was unreadable. So hence the table summaries the topics that were important to at least two groups of people.

The categories that were more than 20% of the responses from that group are highlighted in yellow.

Group	No Further Comment	Other	Pro Mufti	Pro Uniform	Style / Design / Age	Costs	School Pride / Image	Silly Comments
Teachers	38	19				19	29	
Future Parents	42		8	50				
Community	28	17				17	17	
Parents – Short answers	27	0	6	12	12	6		
Parents – Long answers		2	11	5	3			
Years 1 – 6	35	9	23	14	14			7
Years 7 – 8	45	8	21	13	5			
Years 9 – 10	45	7	11	9	14			14
Years 11 – 12	47	21	21	3	8			

What can be seen, apart from no further comment dominates the results, is that Pro mufti comments dominate the student responses, and pro uniform dominate the future parents. While school pride/image dominate the teachers responses.