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1. Executive summary

1.1A Background and methodology

In September 2009, the DfT launched a suite of education materials to help schools, road safety officers (RSOs) and out-of-school groups teach road safety to children of Early Years and Primary age. The programme offers a host of digital resources, print resources and ideas for off-line activities, organised according to key Stage and audience type, including parents (http://www.dft.gov.uk/think/education/early-years-and-primary/). A number of methods have been used to actively promote the site, including emails and leaflets sent to schools and digital marketing on the Free Teaching Resources site and TES connect.

EdComs were commissioned in June 2010, to conduct an evaluation of the DfT’s THINK! Education resources in two stages according to the launch date of specific sections. The evaluation aimed to assess the success and impact of the programme against key performance indicators including awareness, uptake, quality and understanding.

Stage One was qualitative and consisted of case study visits to observe usage of the resources in Early Years and Upper Primary settings, as well as requester database and web traffic analysis, while Stage Two was intended to focus on gathering comparable data relating to Lower Primary settings in addition to quantitative data to place these findings in a broader context.

Stage One identified specific issues around uptake and awareness that needed to be further understood within the broader context of road safety education before aiming to further explore the impact of the THINK! Education resources:
- The original methodology was based on assumptions regarding how frequently and extensively road safety education was taught. This affected the ease with which robust research samples could be collated for fieldwork (e.g. for the case study visits) at any given time, to provide feedback based on the practical experience of having used the resources.
- In addition, an examination of changes in attitudes, behaviour and knowledge was not suitably in scope for a formative evaluation of this kind. Difficulties in recruiting robust case study samples meant that it was only possible to access indicative, anecdotal evidence on this front.

Stage One generated invaluable insight regarding how road safety was taught in practice, and the practical barriers and constraints that may impact on awareness and usage of the THINK! Education resources. The objectives and methodology for Stage Two were therefore revisited and optimised to further explore these elements, in order to generate findings that should have value.
both for those involved in developing the THINK! Education resources and those involved in delivering road safety education more widely.

The Stage Two fieldwork involved two online surveys – one survey of primary school teachers and out-of-school group leaders and a second survey of road safety officers. In addition to this, the requester database and website traffic analysis that took place at Stage One was updated with the most current figures to give as accurate a picture as possible of resource usage.

This report details the quantitative findings in relation to Stage Two of the THINK! Education evaluation, drawing on Stage One observations where relevant to provide richer insight.

1.1B Key Findings relating to THINK! Education resources

Awareness
- Awareness of the THINK! Education resources was high, particularly among RSOs.
- Teachers were less likely than out-of-school group leaders to have previously visited the website, underlining the competitive nature of the schools market in relation to road safety resources.

 Appropriateness
- The resources were seen as appropriate for the age groups they were aimed at in the settings for which they were developed.

Engagement
- Perceptions of how engaging the resources were varied between teachers / group leaders and RSOs.
  - Teachers and group leaders felt that the resources were engaging.
  - RSOs were less likely to score them highly in terms of engagement, but this was likely due to their restricted access to IT and the internet during education sessions.

Accessibility
- Teachers were more likely to have access to computers and the internet during education sessions than out-of-school leaders. This suggests the balance of digital versus paper resources aimed at these different audiences to be appropriate.
- RSOs also generally could not rely on computer or internet access during education sessions.

Quality
- The most important determining factor for which road safety resources teachers, group leaders and RSOs chose to use was quality.
THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders, with the vast majority finding them high quality or easy to use. Similarities in ratings between the two groups indicate that the resources are effectively meeting the differing needs of both groups.

RSOs were also positive about the quality of the resources.

1.2 Approach to road safety

- No clear time of year emerged as the most popular time to cover road safety education among teachers and group leaders, although teachers were more likely to select ‘autumn term’ than ‘spring term’.
- Road safety was usually covered as a discrete topic either linked into the PSHE curriculum in schools or to a specific badge to be earned in out-of-school groups.
- A wide range of road safety resources were used to aid education sessions, with teachers most likely to call upon road safety professionals, while out-of-school groups were most likely to use posters.
- Out-of-school group leaders were seen to be more proactive in sourcing their road safety materials, while teachers were more reliant on road safety professionals to give or send them resources.
- Over half of RSOs indicated that resources had been shared with them by a colleague, indicating that word of mouth is an important factor to consider regarding awareness for this group.

General approach

Road safety was a topic covered by all respondents who took part in the survey. However, no particular time of year emerged as the most appropriate. Within schools, the autumn term was slightly favoured due to Road Safety Week, but out-of-school leaders and RSOs displayed no preference.

Responsibility for road safety education was shared within schools, with head teachers and Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) coordinators being the most likely to take the lead role. Any future promotional activity would therefore need to be targeted at these teachers. However, within out-of-school groups, the responsibility was taken by individual group leaders, indicating a more individualised approach to the topic in this setting, and making targeted marketing harder to implement.

Road safety was usually covered as a discrete topic either linked into the PSHE curriculum in schools or to a specific badge to be earned in out-of-school groups. Topics of most interest and relevance were crossing the road safely and pedestrian safety. However, appropriate topics shifted by age group being taught, so that basic messages around how to behave near traffic and ‘stop, look and listen’ were favoured at Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) and Key Stage One, giving way to topics such as cycle safety.
at Key Stage Two. This consolidates Stage One findings about children’s engagement in the topic.

Most road safety sessions were conducted on-site. A wide variety of different resources were used by respondents when teaching about road safety. Teachers were most likely to call upon road safety professionals (including RSOs, police, fire and rescue) to help teach road safety lessons, while posters were most popular with out-of-school group leaders. In general, resources that required technology, such as a computer and/or internet connection, were more likely to be used in schools than in out-of-school settings. RSOs were most likely to use video clips, their own-made resources and posters when delivering sessions in schools.

RSOs were conducting multiple visits to schools and children’s centres over the course of the year, with most making more than 15 visits. In around half of cases, RSOs were not returning to the same establishment within the course of a year, although around a third claimed to visit the same setting two or three times. In these cases, therefore, relationships may be more easily built with schools, potentially aiding the coordination of delivery and providing opportunities for RSOs to act as ambassadors and suppliers of the THINK! Education resources.

Sourcing Road Safety resources
In general, out-of-school group leaders took a more proactive approach than teachers to sourcing their road safety materials given they have less contact with road safety professionals; the internet was therefore a key source for this audience, and they also made their own resources. Conversely, teachers were more reliant on road safety professionals to supply them with the resources they needed (either through being given them or sent them), and were likely to share resources used by other colleagues. This led to a lower awareness of where individual resources came from, confirming Stage One indications based on qualitative observations.

Findings from our survey of RSOs indicated that resources were shared between colleagues in over half of cases, emphasising that word of mouth is an important factor to consider in awareness and may play a bigger role than direct marketing with this group.

In terms of externally supplied resources, teachers and out-of-school groups demonstrated a tendency to be more discerning in using commercially-produced resources compared to those produced by a charity or government organisation. Local authority-produced resources were the most widely used among teachers, but out-of-school group leaders were most likely to say they used THINK! Education as a source for road safety materials. This provides a very encouraging picture of THINK! Education’s market position for this audience, but indicates that the schools’ market is potentially more competitive.
RSOs claimed to make resources themselves or use those supplied by their local authority, but also mentioned the THINK! website as a key source. This demonstrates the importance of maintaining the parent-brand awareness among this audience to continue to keep THINK! Education top-of-mind. RSOs also acted themselves as ambassadors for road safety materials, with most claiming to have recommended materials in the past to teachers, but also many to parents, out-of-school group leaders, RSO colleagues and other road safety professionals. This audience has clear and important potential to raise awareness and extend the reach of THINK! Education materials.

Road safety is a relevant topic taught throughout the academic year, according to the requirements of the curriculum or out-of-school association badges. A variety of resources are used by teachers, out-of-school group leaders and RSOs to cover the topic, with RSOs playing a particularly important role in schools. Within schools, resources are often pooled and shared, while out-of-school group leaders take a more proactive, ad hoc approach to resourcing.

1.3 Awareness of THINK! Education resources

- Awareness of the THINK! Education website was seen to be relatively high, especially as the sample was not based around criteria relating to use of or registration on the site.
- Group leaders were more likely to have visited the site than teachers, indicating the competitive nature of the schools’ market in relation to road safety resources.
- School teachers and group leaders were seen to have differing levels of familiarity with areas of the THINK! Education site, with teachers most likely to be aware of lesson ideas and group leaders most likely to be aware of posters.
- Despite teachers claiming they were most likely to hear of resources through road safety professionals, teachers and group leaders were most likely to have first heard about the THINK! Education website through a search engine, indicating the importance of search engine optimisation and the need for RSOs to be more involved in the promotion of the resources.
- RSOs had often been made aware of the website through the parent THINK! website, indicating that the links between the two sites are working successfully to encourage traffic to the THINK! Education site.

Awareness of the THINK! Education resources was high among the surveyed sample. Interestingly, out-of-school group leaders were more likely to have previously visited the website than school teachers, which again underlines the comparative competitiveness of the schools market compared to out-of-school. Nearly all RSOs were aware of the THINK! Education site.
For the highest proportion of teachers and out-of-school group leaders, this awareness had been prompted by internet searching. For RSOs, awareness was mainly prompted via the main THINK! website.

Website traffic data confirms these trends for internet referrals, with links via other sites and search engines being responsible for the highest level of traffic to the site. The most popular referral sites include talesoftheroad.direct.gov.uk, illustrating the strength of the above-the-line media campaign in raising awareness, and sites such as free-teaching-resources.co.uk which are known to be well used by teachers. The most popular search terms include ‘road safety’ and ‘think education’, again confirming how well-known the THINK! brand is.

In terms of individual resources, high awareness was noted by the sample across most of these. Online games/interactive activities and lesson ideas were best known among teachers, while the out-of-school leaders’ booklet was best-known among the out-of-school leaders, indicating the correct audiences have been targeted for these resources. RSOs demonstrated very high awareness across all resources, with posters being the most well known.

Promotional material via email was deemed the best way to find out about new resources by teachers and out-of-school group leaders, and leaflets were also popular. Teachers wanted to find out about resources via road safety professionals, while professional organisations filled this role for out-of-school group leaders.

Despite there being no clear preference for time of year to cover road safety, the autumn term was seen as the best time of year to market resources as this is when teachers are likely to plan their schemes of work. However, out-of-school group leaders were most likely to state no preference. This is something to consider in planning any future promotional activity.

1.4 Uptake of THINK! Education resources

- Overall, the THINK! Education website averaged over 200 visitors a day and, in the two years prior to April 2011, the site was visited by over 150,000 unique visitors.
- RSOs were the group most likely to have used one or more of the resources available on the website, indicating that the resources are commonly used among this group.
- Teachers and group leaders who had used the THINK! Education resources were most likely to have used them in two lessons over the last year. This repeat use suggests that the resources had worked well during their first use.
- RSOs who had used the THINK! Education resources tended to use them frequently. They were most likely to have used the resources more than 15 times.
- RSOs were most likely to have used the THINK! Education site’s posters, while group leaders tended to use worksheets and teachers used online games and interactive activities. This is likely related to the differing access to resources seen between the groups.
- Among teachers and group leaders who were aware of THINK! Education resources but had not used them, logistical reasons were the most commonly cited reasons for this (e.g. lack of time or internet access).
- RSOs who were aware of but had not used the resources appeared less concerned by logistical issues and were most likely to claim that they preferred using other resources. This suggests that habit may play a role in their resource choice.

Almost all RSO’s had used the THINK! Education website, but around two thirds of out-of-school group leaders and less than half of teachers had done so. Overall, the website averaged over 200 visitors a day.

There was a clear peak in visits to the site around road safety week. The web analytics demonstrated that PDF files were significantly more viewed than media files on the site. The most popular PDF resources accessed were the ‘traffic poster’ and the ‘Tales of the Road’ resource.

Around three in ten teachers and out-of-school group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources had used printed materials ordered through the website, with out-of-school group leaders significantly more likely than teachers to have done so. The majority of teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education printed materials had not ordered them themselves, which indicates the extent to which resources are shared between colleagues.

In terms of requests from the website, school staff and out of school groups were responsible for the highest number of requests for print resources. However, in terms of volume of resources ordered, RSOs ordered the most, accounting for almost half of all the resources ordered. Overall, the most popular resource was the same in each of the three groups. They were all most likely to have ordered Tales of the Road.

Eight in ten RSOs claimed to have used one or more of the resources available on the website to help with their road safety teaching. They were most likely to have used the site’s posters. Group leaders were most likely to have used worksheets and teachers were most likely to have used online games and interactive activities.

Among teachers and group leaders who were aware of THINK! Education resources but had not used them, the main reasons given were logistical –
with teachers most likely to cite lack of time and group leaders most likely to claim that they do not have access to an internet connection. Among RSOs, the most common response was to say that they preferred using other resources, suggesting that habit plays a large role here.

1.5 Coordination and integration of THINK! Education resources

- A high level of co-ordination was indicated between school teachers / group leaders and road safety professionals, in terms of teachers’/leaders’ awareness of content covered during visits and their integration of the visit into their planning (e.g. holding follow-up sessions).
- RSOs appeared to view teachers as relatively inactive during their visits. Less than one in three claimed that the teachers actively contributed during the session always or most of the time.
- Including road safety information in letters home was the most popular way for teachers and out-of-school group leaders to involve parents in road safety education.
- Very few teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources claimed that they tend to just use one THINK! Education resource in isolation, suggesting that THINK! Education resources are regularly integrated with other resources in road safety teaching.
- RSOs who had used THINK! Education resources were also more likely to use them in combination with resources from another source than they were to use only resources produced by THINK! Education.

Coordination

Survey results from teachers suggested a relatively high level of co-ordination between teachers and road safety professionals, in terms of teachers’ awareness of content covered and integration of the visit into school planning (e.g. holding follow-up sessions).

However, as was indicated at Stage One, the level of coordination between the teacher and road safety professional during the sessions appears less high - only around half claimed to always or mostly actively contribute during the session and most claimed road safety professionals brought their own resources.

RSOs perceived teachers as less involved in sessions they delivered, and pre-visit meetings with the teacher appeared fairly rare. Similarly less than one in five RSOs said that in the past year teachers had always or mostly suggested topics that they would like to be covered during the sessions. This indicates a lack of overall coordination between teachers and RSOs, with limited communication around the visit. As this research was conducted only shortly after the Stakeholder Toolkit was launched in February 2011, this
resource may help to address issues around communication and coordination in the future.

Out-of-school leaders rarely engaged external agents to help them deliver road safety education.

Including road safety information in letters home was the most popular way for teachers and group leaders to involve parents in road safety education. However, as observed in Stage One, school teachers were significantly more likely than out-of-school group leaders to engage parents in road safety education at all.

**Integration**
The site was used by respondents in a variety of ways, suggesting integrated usage. Among teachers and group leaders who had visited the THINK! Education website, one third claimed to use the site for planning, improving their own knowledge and as part of a session, equally. RSOs were also most likely to use the site equally for planning school road safety sessions, keeping their own knowledge up to date and as part of road safety education sessions. Among those RSOs who selected just one reason for using the site, the most common response was that they used it to keep their own knowledge up to date, rather than using the site during sessions or for planning. This suggests that more could be done to encourage RSOs to integrate the resources more fully in their road safety teaching.

However, school teachers were more likely to use the site as part of a session while group leaders were more likely to use the site as part of their planning, indicating certain biases in terms of usage.

Resources were also likely to be integrated for usage with several children at once. Teachers, group leaders and RSOs who had used the THINK! Education resources were most likely to have used them with the whole class or group, although school teachers were significantly more likely than out-of-school group leaders to have done so.

The results suggest that THINK! Education resources were regularly integrated with other resources in road safety teaching. Around half of teachers and group leaders claimed to use a combination of their own resources and THINK! Education resources and this was also the most common way that the resources were used by RSOs. These resources were combined in individualised ways, illustrating the adaptability and flexibility of the resource suite. However, fewer respondents claimed to have used more than one THINK! Education resource together, indicating more could be done to encourage more integrated usage in this way.
1.6 Quality of THINK! Education resources

- Quality was the most important factor influencing road safety resource choice for teachers, RSOs and out-of-school group leaders.
- THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders, with the majority of users claiming them to be high quality or easy to use.
- RSOs were most likely to give maximum marks for the resources being appropriate for the age group that they are aimed at and high quality but were less positive regarding how engaging the resources are (likely due to their lack of access to online resources during education sessions).
- Among teachers and group leaders who were aware of the THINK! Education resources but had not used them, the factors most likely to encourage their use were: the provision of more off-line activities, promotional information on the benefits of using the materials and training on the materials included.

The most important determining factor for which road safety resources teachers, group leaders and RSOs chose to use was quality. Convenience seemed to be less influential in determining which road safety resources were used, although this was a higher priority for teachers than group leaders and RSOs. For group leaders, it was especially important that the resources were cost free, while recommendation was seen to be a key factor by both teachers and group leaders. The origin of resources was considered to be important by over three in five RSOs. It may be that RSOs are using the origin of resources as a proxy for their quality.

THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders, with the vast majority finding them high quality or easy to use. Very few differences were seen in the ratings provided by school teachers and out-of-school group leaders, providing encouraging information that the resources are effectively meeting the differing needs of both groups.

RSOs were most likely to give maximum marks for the resources being appropriate for the age group that they are aimed at and high quality. The least positive response came when they were asked to rate how engaging the resources are. This may be due to a lack of internet access among this group during sessions, which results in some of the resources that could be deemed most engaging (e.g. online clips and games) being seldom used. The most commonly mentioned potential improvement by this group was to increase the amount of practical resources that were available (i.e. printed materials, activity workbooks and stickers).

The provision of more off-line activities was seen to be the factor most likely to encourage group leaders who were aware of THINK! Education resources but had not used them to do so (although this was a small number of respondents). Among RSOs and teachers, the most popular response was
that they wanted promotional information on what the benefits of using THINK! Education resources would be.

1.7 Access to facilities and preferences for format

- Access to resources varied among the three groups. During education sessions, access to computers and online resources was much more common for teachers than for group leaders or RSOs.
- Within their place of work, the majority of all three groups were always able to print in black and white.
- Colour printing was less ubiquitous, with around four in ten RSOs and six in ten teachers and group leaders always able to use this facility.
- RSOs were more likely to want THINK! Education resources available in print only than online only but, given the choice, preferred to have resources available in both print and digital formats.

The level of access respondents had to printing and computers varied according to audience. Teachers were more likely to have access to a computer and the internet during sessions than out-of-school leaders, suggesting the correct balance of digital versus paper resources aimed at these different audiences. However, out-of-school group leaders were likely to use the internet to prepare for their sessions.

In general, a preference for printing in black and white was demonstrated by all audiences. This is unsurprising given the expense of printing in colour, but colour printing was also less available to respondents. Any future printed materials developed for these audiences should be designed with this in mind.

RSOs would normally bring all the resources they needed with them to sessions in schools and children’s centres, and could not always rely on internet or computer access in sessions. Likewise, they were not always able to print out copies of everything they needed for a visit. This is likely to affect the kind of activity they carry out with pupils in schools.

While a comparison between online PDF views and equivalent print requests demonstrates a much higher volume of online access to print resources than orders placed, RSOs were more likely to want resources available in print only than online only. However, given the choice, they were most likely to want resources available in both print and digital formats; this allows for the highest degree of flexibility in usage and application.
2. Context

Background

The DfT have been working with EdComs since June 2010 to evaluate the primary THINK! Education resources. The evaluation was initially conceived in order to measure the success and impact of the primary programme against key performance indicators relating to awareness, uptake, quality, understanding, attitudes and behaviour. A staged methodology was designed to reflect the staged launch of the online resource. This ensured that each section – Early Years, Lower Primary, Upper Primary – of the resource could be evaluated a year after launch to allow the same amount of time for usage for each section.

Stage 1 was designed to gather feedback on the usage of Early Years and Upper Primary resources, while Stage 2 was designed to gather comparable feedback on the Lower Primary section of the resource in addition to broader, quantitative data on usage. The insights aggregated from both these stages of the evaluation were to provide the DfT with formative recommendations for the future direction of the programme as well as indicative conclusions about the impact it has had. This second objective was later on revised given the methodological scope of the study, and this is discussed further down.

Stage One comprised the following aspects:

- Five case study visits to Early Years settings to observe road safety resource usage. These included:
  - Observation of a road safety lesson, using DfT resources or other road safety resources used
  - Interview with staff members and session leaders
  - Follow up telephone interviews with staff members to assess any behaviour change

- Five case study visits to schools and out-of-school groups leading lessons with Upper Primary (7-11) aged children. These included:
  - Observation of a road safety lesson, using DfT resources or other road safety resources used
  - Interview with staff members and session leaders
  - Mini group discussions with children having taken part in the session
  - Follow up telephone interviews with staff members to assess any behaviour change

- Web analytics of online activity between May 2009 and October 2010

- Database analysis of all print copy requesters

An interim report addressing these objectives from Stage One of the evaluation was delivered in February 2011. However, the findings indicated
that there were a number of key issues to explore around uptake and usage of resources within the wider context of road safety education before a meaningful and robust assessment of the impact on knowledge, attitudes and behaviour could be carried out. The original methodology was based on a number of assumptions around how frequently and extensively road safety education is taught, as well as how easy it would be to identify resource users from existing requestor data. This affected how easy it was in practice to recruit robust research samples to provide feedback based on practical experience of having used the resources. It was also acknowledged that impact measurement was not feasible or within scope for this kind of formative evaluation, that was best designed to provide feedback on other more core objectives.

In light of this, the Stage Two methodology and objectives were revised and refined to focus on understanding key indicators relating to awareness, uptake and quality in addition to secondary objectives relating to the coordination of road safety education and the accessibility and preferences for digital versus hard-copy resources. In this way, it focussed on the original objectives that were still realistic to achieve in addition to substantiating insight from Stage One findings in relation to the practical application of road safety education. Stage Two was thus optimised to yield findings which add value to THINK! work and those involved in delivering road safety education more widely.

The two stages of the evaluation have therefore addressed different aspects of the evaluation: Stage One has primarily gathered qualitative feedback on the practical usage of the resources within different settings, and Stage Two has collected quantitative data around usage and uptake within the broader context of road safety education.

This report details findings from the second stage of research, building in qualitative Stage One findings where relevant to substantiate and consolidate evidence provided via statistical indications.
3. Objectives

Stage One findings indicated that road safety was being taught on an ad hoc and often unstructured basis. The initial set of objectives for Stage Two of the evaluation was therefore adjusted to gain further insight around quantifiable measures that will guide any future efforts to promote DfT THINK! Education resources to drive uptake.

The initial set of objectives was detailed in the Stage One report. The following set of objectives are those that were prioritised at Stage Two, based on those Stage One findings highlighted would be realistic to achieve. The first three relate to initial KPIs set by the DfT in relation to the THINK! Education strategy:

1. **Awareness of the resources** – how aware are schools, out-of-school groups and RSOs of the THINK! Education materials?
2. **The uptake of the resources** – how many resources have been ordered and the extent to which teachers and RSOs have used them with young people?
3. **The quality of materials produced** – how do those who have used the resources rate their usability, credibility and relevance, and how engaging are they for young people, teachers, out-of-school groups and RSOs?

In addition to these KPIs, the DfT also wanted to understand the impact the THINK! Education resource materials have had on delivery. Specifically, how they:

4. Have helped teachers, RSOs, and out-of-school group leaders to **deliver a coordinated approach** to child road safety education; this includes understanding how the THINK! resources fit within the wider context of other resources used.
5. Are integrated with **other THINK! road safety materials** to benefit from the brand as a trusted and recognised source of information.

In order to ensure the education materials are offered in the most cost effective way in the future, the evaluation also aimed to recommend how the **mix of online and offline materials should be configured in future.** This was done by exploring the following themes:

6. What **access** do users have to online versus print materials?
7. What are teachers’, out-of-school group leaders’ and RSOs’ **capacities for printing** resources in particular?
8. What are RSOs’ **preferences** for downloading/ordering materials?
9. What are the most desirable print materials RSOs would want to continue ordering?

These revisions to the objectives reflect a re-prioritisation of the original objectives according to what was deemed realistic to achieve given Stage One learnings. In addition, findings were incorporated that built on Stage One insight around how road safety is taught in situ, and the practical barriers and constraints that may impact on awareness and take-up of the THINK! Education resources. Objectives relating to impact on understanding, knowledge, attitudes and behaviour (original objectives 4, 5 and 6) were removed in favour of this more targeted approach, and in acknowledgement that these objectives were not feasible within the scope of the study. Broader understanding of the impact of the programme may be more easily and feasibly gained once contextual knowledge has been captured, and will require further, more extensive longitudinal research. These objectives are intended to inform the future direction of the programme and how to market the materials to encourage the highest level of take-up.

In addition to this change in emphasis for the evaluation as a whole, Stage Two objectives were refined further based on adjustments to the agreed methodology. This resulted in the following objectives being removed:

9. What are users’ expectations of online versus print materials?

10. How does the extent of the current THINK! Education offline provision compare to other education programmes?
4. Methodology

4.1 Overview of methodology

Research was carried out during the Spring Term of the academic year 2010/11. This was a year after the launch of the Lower Primary and RSO resources, and around 18 months after the launch of the EYFS and Upper Primary resources. Prior to the research six waves of promotional activity had been carried out, and the site had been promoted on sites including Free Teaching Resources and TES Connect.

There were three elements to this stage of the evaluation, which allowed specific objectives to be addressed according to audience. The three elements were:

- Online survey with teachers and out-of-school group leaders – conducted between 22nd March and 11th April 2011
- Online RSO survey – conducted between 25th March and 13th April 2011
- Requester database and website analysis conducted in April 2011, based on data collected since the launch of the resources in May 2009

To put this into context with the marketing activity, e-mail shots and mailers were sent out to primary schools on the following dates:

- 27th April 2009 (Mailer)
- 10th June 2009 (E-mail)
- 1st October 2009 (E-mail)
- 9th March 2010 (Mailer)
- 9th November 2010 (E-mail)
- 17th March 2011 (E-mail)

Each survey addressed the full set of objectives according to audience group. The requester database and website traffic data analysis addressed objective 2 relating to the uptake of the resources, and has been used to compare perceptions of usage to actual uptake.

Each of these elements are rationalised and described in the following subsections.

4.2 Online survey with potential users (school teachers and out-of-school group leaders)

This element of the evaluation was designed to provide quantitative data on how teachers approach road safety, which resources and materials they use
to facilitate this and how the DfT THINK! Education resources fit with their approach. It aimed to gather data from teachers and out-of-school group leaders in relation to each of the nine objectives set out for Stage Two.

In order to capture a robust picture of how road safety is taught in schools and out-of-school groups across England, and where DfT’s offer fits within this, a decision was made to survey a sample that is broader than just those who have used the THINK! Education materials. Surveying the general market audience rather than focussing only on specific users enabled us to gain a clear picture of the drivers and, importantly, barriers to using THINK! Education resources.

An online methodology was suggested to reach this sample for several reasons:
- An online methodology is a cost-effective way to reach a sample of this size across England.
- This methodology allowed us to capture as large a sample as possible as several routes are open to us (email, pop-up box, static link),
  - Respondents could complete the survey at a time that suits them.
  - Respondents were also able to forward survey links to the most relevant person in their setting, meaning a more accurate sample could be achieved.

**Approach**
The survey took around fifteen minutes to complete and was distributed via a number of routes. This enabled us to capture responses from those who deliver road safety education to children within school or out-of-school settings, but who were not road safety intermediaries such as RSOs, Police or Fire officers.

The following routes were used to administer the survey:
- An email with a survey link to school email addresses in England
- An email with a survey link sent to out-of-school groups via association bodies e.g. OOSA
- A static survey link on the home page of the site
- A survey link on the site via a managed pop-up box

**The questionnaire**
Basic information in relation to the type of setting was captured at the start of the questionnaire for analysis purposes. The following question areas were then addressed:
- Level and nature of road safety teaching
- Resources used and support accessed
- Involvement of parents and other intermediaries
- Awareness of THINK! Education resources
• Experiences/ usage of THINK! Education resources
• Perceptions of THINK! Education resources:
• Drivers/ barriers to use
• Access to online materials
• Capacity for printing
• Marketing requirements

All respondents were offered the chance to be rewarded with a cash incentive for completing the survey, in order to help boost response rates.

Survey administration
Surveys administered by email were sent out via a link within an email sent out to all primary schools in England, via data provided by the Education Company. To capture the out-of-school group audience, we asked member organisations to send out the survey link to their contacts.

To provide extra exposure to the survey and ensure the widest possible reach, including other out-of-school groups or children’s centres, a survey link was also be placed in strategic places on the website and made highly visible to attract click-throughs. A pop-up function also provided a link to the same survey when users visited specific pages, such as the Teachers’ page and out-of-school leaders’ page.

4.3 Online survey with RSOs

Outputs
The Road Safety Officer (RSO) survey was designed to examine the perceived quality of the THINK! Education resources by RSOs, as well as to explore how RSOs have used them and integrated them with any other road safety resources they may use.

This survey was designed around the following objectives:
1. Awareness of the resources
2. The uptake of the resources (to be complemented by database and web traffic analysis)
3. The quality of the materials produced
4. Coordinated delivery approach
5. Integration with other materials
6. Access to online versus print materials
7. Capacity for printing resources
8. Preferences for downloading/ ordering materials
9. Most desirable print materials
Rationale
This element of the research aimed to provide a full understanding of the relevance of THINK! Education resources to RSO’s practice and to shed light on how the materials are being practically implemented by these intermediaries. It also aimed to look at the extent to which schools and other settings play a role in this. Key drivers and barriers to usage were also explored for the first time with this audience.

Approach
The online survey was around 15 minutes long and distributed by email to RSOs that DfT had identified through previous research work conducted in April 2010. It was also posted as a link on the THINK! Education site itself, and was sent out to all Road Safety GB RSO contacts.

The questionnaire
The survey contained questions relating to the following areas:
- Type of setting visited
- Resources used and support accessed
- Level of coordination with schools/ settings
- Awareness of THINK! Education resources
- Experiences/ usage of THINK! Education resources
- Perceptions of THINK! Education resources:
  - Drivers/ barriers to use
  - Access to online resources
  - Capacity and preferences for print materials
  - Future resource needs
  - Marketing requirements

4.4 Requestor analysis
Analyses of requestor databases and website activity were carried out. Print requests being placed between the dates of 1 April 2009 and 31 March 2011, while internet activity between 1 April 2009 and 30 April 2011 was examined (excluding November 2009). These dates represent the extent of the data available at the time of analysis.

This analysis aimed to answer the following specific questions in relation to usage of the THINK! Education resources:
- How do most-requested print resources relate to the most-viewed web pages?
- How do key dates e.g. marketing activity, school term dates relate to volume of print requests and website visits?
- Where does the web traffic come from?
- Who is ordering the most materials and in what quantity?

4.4.1 Database analysis
As was the case with Stage One, a change in the method of data capture in July 2010 resulted in two separate databases relating to print requests being
combined into one to be analysed. Media codes were missing from many entries relating to orders made while the original data capture tool was in use, making it impossible to identify the requestor type for some orders. Therefore, analysis by group type has only been possible since July 2010.

However, for orders made since then, the database was analysed according to volume of request, type of requestor and date of order through the use of pivot tables in Excel. This analysis was then compared as far as possible with download volumes from the website, and implications towards the bigger picture of the resource’s success have been identified where appropriate.

4.4.2 Website analysis
Activity on the website was analysed using traffic data collected via the Google Analytics tool. In particular, data on site and page visits over time were observed. Particular areas of the site registering the highest levels of activity were also examined in more detail.

As was noted in Stage One of the research, during November 2009 an error occurred in the data capture of the web statistics. For this reason, all data relating to November 2009 has been removed from the website analysis.

For the first few weeks following the launch of the secondary site, data on visits to the secondary and primary sites was combined. It was not possible to separate out overall site visit data during this time and so this was also taken into account during the analysis of website traffic data.
5. Sample Profile

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders

A total of 548 school teachers and out-of-school group leaders took part in the online survey, conducted from the 22 March to the 11 April. All respondents who took part were required to teach or be involved in road safety education sessions with children.

A total of 18,422 invitations were sent for the teacher and group leader survey. Links and a ‘pop up’ box were also added to the DfT THINK! Education website, which resulted in 81 of the total 548 completes.

Figure 5.1 (Q1) Respondent type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School teacher</td>
<td>488 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school group leader</td>
<td>60 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents to the online survey were school teachers (89%), with around one in ten (11%) who were leaders of out-of-school groups.

Respondents were asked to confirm which age groups they worked with:

Figure 5.2 (Q2) Which age group(s) do you currently work with?
Base: All (548) (Multiselect)
Around half of the teachers / out-of-school group leaders claimed to currently work with each of the relevant age groups (from 45% to 56%). School teachers were more likely to work with children aged under five years, whilst group leaders were more likely to work with children aged 6 to 10 or over 11 years old. This provides useful insight for contextualising resource usage.

A high proportion of overlap was seen in the age groups that respondents worked with. While we may have expected this for out-of-school group leaders, this could be seen as more surprising in relation to school teachers, who are likely to mainly teach one class. However, we know that school teachers are likely to be involved with a number of different classes and age groups through a variety of different activities, such as whole school assemblies, extra-curricular clubs and specialist subject teaching where relevant across the school. This may explain the degree of overlap observed among this sample.

As we were interested to survey only those who worked with children aged 11 or under, the 7% of respondents who claimed to work with children above this age also worked with children in one or more of the other age categories.

Road Safety Officers
A total of 90 Road Safety Officers (RSOs) took part in the online survey, conducted from the 25th March to the 13th April.

A total of 49 invitations were sent to RSOs, with 13 completes achieved from these invitations. A further 77 completes were achieved through help from the DfT – including a cascaded email among RSOs and publicity via Road Safety Great Britain.

Respondents were first asked whether or not their role included duties or responsibilities in relation to child road safety. To take part in the survey, every respondent (100%) had to state that their role did include some proportion of this.

All RSOs who had road safety education as part of their role were then asked to indicate the proportion of their role that this comprised.

**Figure 5.3 (Q2) What proportion of your job does road safety education make up?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base: All (90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For most RSOs, child road safety was in fact the majority of their work. Three in four (74%) of those who responded to our survey said that work relating to child road safety made up over 50% of their job. Only 2% said that this made up less than a quarter of their work.

Road Safety Officers were then asked to indicate which settings they had visited to teach road safety education sessions, and which they had visited to supply resources to. Those who had not taken part in any road safety sessions, nor supplied resources to any of the listed settings (including other) were screened out of the survey at this point.

**Figure 5.4 (Q3/6) Within the last 12 months, have you personally taught or been involved in the delivery of road safety education in any of the following settings?/ Within the last 12 months have you visited any of the following settings to supply road safety education resources?**

Base: All (90) (Multiselect)

RSOs were most likely to be carrying out their work with children of primary age (90% had taught in primary schools and 83% had given them materials). Slightly fewer have worked in a secondary school (70% had taught there and 56% had supplied resources), and fewer again had worked with children of pre-school age (62% had taught in a children’s centre and 56% given out resources). This indicates that RSOs are involved in road safety education across a wide range of settings.

They were also generally more likely to have taught in schools than to have just supplied them with resources. The exception to this rule is in nurseries,
where seven in ten (69%) had supplied resources but only six in ten had taught (59%).
Main Findings

6.1 Approach to road safety

This section examines contextual data around the general approach taken to road safety education in schools and out-of-school groups. This will provide a backdrop to findings specifically relevant to THINK! Education resources throughout further sections of the report.

The general approach to planning and delivering road safety education was explored, as well as attitudes and behaviours around sourcing resources for this.

Key Findings

- Group leaders were most likely to have overall responsibility themselves for road safety education in their organisation, while the PSHE co-ordinator was most likely to have this responsibility in schools.
- School teachers were most likely to teach road safety as part of their school’s PSHE curriculum, while out-of-school group leaders tended to cover road safety in relation to specific badges.
- Out-of-school group leaders were most likely to have been involved in just one road safety session over the last year. School teachers were most likely to have been involved in two or five or more.
- The vast majority of RSOs who were involved in road safety sessions claimed to have been involved with more than 15 sessions in the last year.
- Visits from road safety professionals were very popular among teachers and group leaders. Over nine in ten teachers and out-of-school group leaders claimed to have used or plan to use a visit as part of their road safety education.
- Road safety professionals play a key role in the provision of resources for teachers and group leaders.

6.1.1 General Approach

School teachers and out-of-school group leaders were first asked who holds overall responsibility for road safety where they work. Figure 6.1.1A illustrates the results.
Just 3% of respondents were unsure who had overall responsibility for road safety education in their school or out-of-school group, which indicates that, for most, it was well communicated as a clear part of somebody’s role within the organisation. However, what is clear is that there was no one role that was consistently responsible for road safety across the sample. This could be seen to present challenges in terms of targeting marketing materials for awareness, however the research suggests that one of the most effective ways to raise awareness among teachers is through RSOs, who are the key intermediary who supply them with resources.

However, school teachers were most likely to claim that their school’s Head of PSHE or PSHE co-ordinator had overall responsibility for road safety education in their school (37%), with three in ten claiming that this was part of their head teacher’s remit (30%). This indicates that these teachers would be the most appropriate target for marketing communications to schools.

Over two thirds (65%) of out-of-school group leaders indicated that the group leader had overall responsibility for planning road safety education, clearly indicating this is the key audience to market to within this group. However, out-of-school leaders were significantly more likely than school teachers to
claim that nobody held this responsibility (12% vs. 2%). This suggests that the organisation of this topic is approached in a less systematic or planned way among out-of-school groups and that there may therefore be a more individualised approach to the topic in these settings compared to schools. This was borne out also at Stage One where this behaviour was observed within the case study visits made.

Teachers were asked how road safety education was planned into teaching at their school. Figure 6.1.1B below illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.1.1B (Q8a) How is road safety generally taught within your school?**  
Base: All school teachers (488) (Multiselect)

- It is part of our PSH(C)E curriculum: 79%
- It is covered in whole school assemblies: 64%
- Road safety teaching is planned out in advance: 46%
- Road safety education is covered when the topic arises: 45%
- We have a road safety week, where it is the main focus of a number of activities: 30%
- It is covered as part of other subjects e.g. literacy: 27%

Around eight in ten (79%) school teachers claimed that road safety was part of their school’s PSHCE curriculum, and indeed, for the majority of cases, road safety teaching was approached as a discrete subject – only one quarter (27%) covered the topic as part of other subjects. This supports the fact that PSHE coordinators are most likely to be responsible for ensuring it is covered. However, it was also a topic covered as a whole-school issue - two thirds (64%) covered the subject in whole school assemblies and three in ten (30%) covered it as part of a road safety week.

Approaches to planning road safety education appeared varied. Just less than half (46%) claimed to plan their teaching of this topic in advance, while a similar number (45%) claimed to cover the topic when it arose. This suggests
that there is a need for resources that can be implemented quickly and without planning, as well as resources that can be incorporated into longer term planning. Qualitative findings at Stage One suggested that the THINK! Education resources have been effectively designed for this level of adaptability.

Out-of-school group leaders were asked a similar question in relation to their out-of-school group. Figure 6.1.1C illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.1.1C (Q8b) How is road safety generally covered within your out-of-school group?**
Base: All group leaders (60) (Multiselect)

![Chart illustrating how road safety is generally covered](chart)

Among out-of-school group leaders, road safety was generally covered in relation to specific badges (68%), and in some cases (38%) it was consistently covered from a planned list. This echoes qualitative observations from Stage One, where out-of-school group leaders would cover road safety specifically to work towards a badge, often on a 2-3 year rotation.

However, this chart clearly indicates that this is not the only way road safety education is fitted into sessions. For a minority (22%) it was covered on an ad hoc basis as the subject arose. From Stage One findings, we can infer this to be during trips out, for example.

Time of year is also a crucial element of road safety education to understand in planning any future promotion of the THINK! Education resources. Figure 6.1.1D illustrates the most likely times of year for road safety to be covered according to teachers and out-of-school group leaders.
Figure 6.1.1D (Q4) When is road safety usually covered in your school/out-of-school group?
Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders (548) (Multiselect)

No clear time of year emerged as most popular to cover road safety education, with all terms receiving at least a third of ratings overall. However, teachers were significantly more likely to select ‘autumn term’ than ‘spring term’ (40% vs. 32%). As Road Safety Week takes place in schools during the autumn term, it may be the reason for this.

Conversely, time of year appeared to be less important in out-of-school groups. Group leaders were most likely to select that there was ‘no set time of year’ that road safety was usually covered (70%). This suggests that teachers were more likely to plan for road safety education than out-of-school group leaders, an insight already alluded to in relation to who has responsibility for road safety education within the organisation (cf. Fig 6.1.1A).

Similarly to teachers and out-of-school group leaders, RSOs were asked about the time of year they would most likely be involved in road safety education visits. Figure 6.1.1E demonstrates the findings.
Figure 6.1.1E (Q5/8) When do you usually tend to teach or get involved in the delivery of road safety education sessions/ provide these resources?
Base: All RSOs (90) / All RSOs who have supplied resources over the last 12 months (79) (Multiselect)

Interestingly, RSOs mostly felt there was no set time of year for them to get involved in the delivery of road safety education in schools, with each term receiving relatively even ratings. This is probably because their job means they are conducting similar work throughout the year, but it does highlight a difference in perception regarding the most likely time to cover road safety education compared to teachers. This may hold implications for the level of collaboration between teachers and RSOs in the delivery of road safety education. The extent of collaboration seen to occur will be more fully explored in section 6.4.

Respondents were then asked about the extent to which road safety was covered, to understand the potential for THINK! Education materials specifically to be used across more than one session. Figure 6.1.1F below illustrates the number of sessions teachers and out-of-school group leaders were likely to run on road safety education in the last year.
Out-of-school group leaders were significantly more likely than school teachers to have been involved in just one road safety session over the last year (37% vs. 16%) or not to have been involved in any (13% vs. 4%). This indicates that any resources used need to be deliverable in one-off sessions.

School teachers were significantly more likely to have been involved in two sessions (26% vs. 13%) or five or more (25% vs. 10%) sessions compared to out-of-school group leaders. This reinforces the insight that road safety is dealt with more systematically in schools than out-of-school groups, and suggests that resources used by schools need to offer the potential to be built upon in more than one lesson.

A similar question was asked of RSOs along with a question about the amount of times they visited the same establishment, to understand the extent to which relationships with schools have been built. Figures 6.1.1G and 6.1.1H below illustrate these results.
Figure 6.1.1G (Q4/7) How many education sessions on road safety have you led or been involved in? How many times have you visited schools or children's centres to supply road safety education resources over the last 12 months?
Base: All who have been involved in delivering road safety education/supplying resources over the last 12 months (89/82)

For those who gave road safety sessions, or who supplied road safety materials, this tended to be something they did regularly. The vast majority claimed to have done this more than 15 times in the last year.
Figure 6.1.1H (Q28) Thinking about the Early Years settings or Primary Schools that you have visited over the last 12 months, how many times did you generally visit the same school or setting?

Base: All who have been involved in the delivery of road safety education in schools or children’s centres during the last 12 months (89)

For around half of RSOs who had been involved in road safety education in schools or children’s centres over the last year, each school was only visited once (47%). As we have seen above, the majority of RSOs indicated that they had undertaken more than 15 visits over the last year (cf. Fig. 6.1.1G), and so this suggests that they may be visiting over fifteen different establishments within this time.

It was rare for RSOs to be visiting the same establishment more than three times. However, 16% claimed to have done this, indicating that some RSOs are building relationships with schools and children’s centres. This is potentially something to be further investigated in order to understand how the THINK! Education resources could be used to encourage this further. Section 6.4 looks in more detail at the extent to which road safety education is coordinated between teachers and RSOs.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked to indicate the extent to which their road safety sessions were practical or classroom-based. Figure 6.1.1I illustrates the results.
When asked to identify the proportion of road safety sessions that teachers and out-of-school group leaders thought were practical or classroom based, a preference for classroom based activity could be seen. Interestingly, no differences between school teachers and out-of-school group leaders were observed on this measure.

These findings indicate the importance of providing classroom-based resources for road safety, and therefore illustrate that the THINK! Education resources are designed to meet a real need in line with current practices both within schools and out-of-school groups.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were then asked about the road safety topics that felt most relevant for the children they work with. These topics were taken from those covered within THINK! Education resources although not explicitly linked to this source at this stage. Figure 6.1.1J illustrates the findings.
Figure 6.1.1J (Q9) Which of the following road safety topics would be most relevant for the age of children that you work with?
Base: All teachers and out-of-school leaders (548) (Multiselect)

As illustrated above, ‘Crossing the road carefully’ and ‘the Green Cross Code’ were the most frequently selected topics by both teachers and out-of-school group leaders. No respondents selected ‘none’ indicating that all teachers and group leaders felt that at least one of the topics was relevant to the children they worked with.

Overall, school teachers and out-of-school group leaders tended to provide similar answers. However, significant differences were noted for the categories ‘stop look and listen’ and ‘the green cross code’, where group leaders were more likely to select these topics than school teachers. All group leaders felt that these two topics were relevant for the children they worked with. At Stage One, these topics were observed being covered by these groups as they were relevant to what children needed to know to gain a badge, but were also seen to be useful practical knowledge to be applied when out on trips.

Some differences could be seen in the topics that respondents felt would be most relevant for the age of children that they worked with, when analysed by Key Stage. Those who worked with Key Stage One children were more likely
than those who worked with Key Stage Two to select ‘how to behave near traffic’ (93% vs. 88%) and those who worked with children in the Early Years/Foundation Stage or Key Stage One were more likely than those who worked with older children to select ‘stop, look and listen’ (94% in EYFS or KS1 vs. 85% KS2). Similarly, those who worked with Key Stage Two children were more likely than those who worked with younger children to select ‘cycle safety’ as a relevant topic (90% KS2, vs. 71% KS1 and 73% EYFS). This indicates that respondents appeared to see some modules as particularly suitable for certain age groups and again echoes Stage One findings in relation to this. At Stage One it was observed that, as children got older, teachers and out-of-school group leaders felt that key road safety messages, such as ‘stop, look, listen’ were already well engrained and as such, they would seek messages that could be perceived as new to the children to engage them more easily in the topic. Cycle safety was observed as more popular at Key Stage Two, for example, and particularly in Years 5 and 6 (Transition) as children started to gain more independence and prepare for moving up to secondary school.

In a similar vein, RSOs were asked to identify the topics that they tended to cover with children aged under five (EYFS) and those aged five to eleven (Primary). Figure 6.1.1K indicates the findings.
Figure 6.1.1K (Q9 + 10) Thinking about road safety education sessions that you have taught in the last 12 months with children aged (under 5/5 – 11), which of the following road safety topics did you tend to cover most often?

Base: All RSOs involved in delivering road safety education in the last 12 months (89) (Multiselect)

When working with school-aged children, RSOs were more likely to cover the Green Cross Code than they were with children aged under 5. Similarly to teachers and out-of-school group leaders, RSOs working with children under 5 also preferred to teach more basic topics such as 'stop look and listen' (47%), in-car safety (43%), how to behave near traffic (38%) and crossing the road carefully (35%). They were also more likely to teach cycle safety to older children (39% aged 5 to 11 vs. 2% with under 5s). The level of consistency in subjects covered across the resource's audiences indicates that there is potential for RSOs to coordinate delivery with teachers and out-of-school group leaders at a topic level.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked which types of resources they had previously used to deliver road safety lessons, in order to provide context to the usage of THINK! Education resources. Figure 6.1.1L illustrates the responses.
The most common resource that respondents had used to aid their road safety education sessions was a visit from a road safety professional (e.g. road safety officers, police, fire and rescue). Around eight in ten (79%) claimed to have done this, although school teachers were significantly more likely to have done so than out-of-school group leaders (84% vs. 42% respectively).

Options involving technology or use of the internet, such as websites, video clips, interactive whiteboard activities and IT facilities, were more popular among school teachers, while group leaders were more likely to use worksheets (including professionally produced worksheets, those respondents had made themselves and homework sheets). This consolidates Stage One findings where it was observed that out-of-school groups have a preference for hard-copy materials due to the facilities they have available to them, and we also know this to be the case from other research we have conducted. Section 6.5 explores preferences for format and access to technology in more detail.

School teachers were also more likely to use newsletters or resources for parents compared to out-of-school leaders (52% vs. 28%). This reflects the fact that teachers may be more likely to establish a closer relationship with the children’s parents throughout the course of the school year. It was also
observed in Stage One that very little parental engagement was undertaken in out-of-school groups compared to schools in general, not just in relation to road safety. Parental engagement is a priority for schools and so is a more relevant means for delivery for teachers than out-of-school group leaders. The extent of parental engagement in road safety education is explored more specifically in section 6.4.

As well as being asked which resources respondents had previously used, they were also asked which they planned to use if they had not yet done so. Figure 6.1.1M shows the cumulative results.

**Figure 6.1.1M (Q10) Which of the following resources have you used to aid your road safety education sessions?**

Base: All teachers/ out-of-school group leaders (548) (Multiselect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Have used</th>
<th>Have not used but plan to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit from a road safety professional</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roleplay and drama</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised outing ('trip') with the children</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Clips</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally produced worksheets</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters or other resources for parents</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive whiteboard activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Props, costumes or toys</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT facilities (e.g. an ICT suite)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and worksheets I have made myself</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework sheets</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical activities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account those who had not yet included a visit from a road safety professional but planned to do so, use of this resource stood at 92%. This indicates that teachers are dependent on visits from professionals to deliver road safety education. Posters also proved popular – 77% of respondents either had used or planned to use these in their road safety teaching. This is perhaps less surprising as posters are a quick and easy resource to use in any setting. However, they do not necessarily require input from the teacher themselves.
The same question was asked of RSOs to understand the types of resources they are likely to use. Figure 6.1.1N below illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.1.1N (Q12) Which of the following resources have you used yourself, and/or plan to use, to teach road safety?**

Base: All RSOs (90) (Multiselect)

Most RSOs had used all of the resources that they appeared interested in using. Only up to 4% of RSOs planned to introduce an individual resource into their teaching that they had not previously used.

As with the topics that were seen to be of interest, there was a certain degree of consistency between the types of resources RSOs liked to use and those used by teachers and out-of-school leaders. Posters, roleplay and drama and websites were popular with RSOs and teachers and out-of-school group leaders (cf. Fig. 6.1.1M). Musical activities (20%) and homework sheets (34%) were less common for all audiences, despite being more popular with RSOs than with teachers and out-of-school groups.

However, of particular interest is the difference in popularity for worksheets and activities they had made themselves. This was one of the most popular resource types for RSOs (78%), while teachers and out-of-school group leaders cited this significantly less often than professionally produced resources (cf. Fig. 6.1.1M). This indicates a preference among RSOs for creating their own resources compared to teachers and out-of-school group leaders, and compared to using professionally produced resources. Picking
up and using the THINK! Education materials may well represent a bigger culture shift compared to current practices among this audience than it does among others.

6.1.2 Sourcing Road Safety Resources

How road safety resources are sourced is an important behaviour to understand in developing an effective strategy for THINK! Education within the context of the general approach taken to road safety education. Respondents were therefore asked questions relating to this issue.

Figure 6.1.2A illustrates how teachers and out-of-school group leaders approached the sourcing of road safety education materials.

Figure 6.1.2A (Q13) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about road safety education in your school/ out-of-school group?
Base: All teachers/ out-of-school leaders who have used road safety resources (533)

Respondents appeared to use a mixture of old and new road safety education resources. Almost three quarters (73%) agreed that people in their school or group tended to share the same road safety resources, which echoes qualitative findings from Stage One. However, a similar number (69%) agreed that they looked for new resources last time they covered this topic,
which bodes well for the awareness of THINK! Education resources, provided the correct marketing channels are used.

The majority of respondents felt that they received sufficient resources and advice from road safety professionals (76%). One third (35%) strongly agreed that this was the case and a further four in ten (41%) slightly agreed. This highlights again the importance of RSOs’ role in road safety education, as well as the potential for coordination and collaboration between teachers and RSOs.

Reassuringly, around seven in ten (71%) said that they knew which organisations produced the resources that they use. This suggests that there is strong potential for extending the reach and awareness levels for THINK! Education resources through brand recognition. Indeed, Stage One highlighted that the strong brand awareness of the THINK! campaign was a positive point for the awareness of the THINK! Education materials, although this must be managed carefully to avoid confusion with other resources that incorporate the THINK! logo (e.g. ones produced by local authorities).

Teachers and out-of-school leaders were then asked how they had obtained the resources they had used most recently. Findings are presented in Figure 6.1.2B below.
Figure 6.1.2B (Q14) Thinking about road safety resources that you have used in the last 12 months, how did you obtain these resources?
Base: All teachers/ out-of-school leaders who have used road safety resources (533) (Multiselect)

Among those who claimed to use road safety resources, they were most likely to have been obtained through being given to them by a road safety professional who had visited their school (63%). A similar proportion (60%) claimed that resources they had used in the last 12 months had been sent to them by a road safety professional. This is due to the significant proportion of teachers in particular who laid claim to this; significantly fewer out-of-school group leaders sourced their resources in the same way, unsurprisingly. This reinforces the important role that road safety professionals have in supporting the delivery of road safety education in schools through supplying resources alone.

However, other substantial differences could be seen between school teachers and out-of-school group leaders. Teachers were also significantly more likely to say that resources were passed to them by a colleague (24%) or that the resources they had used were third party resources that their school already stocked (37%). This is unsurprising given other findings within the survey that suggest a more coordinated approach to road safety education in schools and a more individualised approach from out-of-school group leaders.

Out-of-school group leaders appeared more proactive in their methods of obtaining resources and were more likely than school teachers to make their
own resources (39% vs. 24%) or to search for and order them themselves (76% vs. 32%). This is in line with Stage One observations and again may indicate a less systematic approach taken in out-of-school groups compared to schools.

RSO’s were then asked how they obtained their road safety education resources, as demonstrated in Figure 6.1.2C.

**Figure 6.1.2C (Q14) In the last 12 months, have you obtained any road safety education resources in the following ways?**

*Base: All RSOs (90) (Multiselect)*

- **Produced by myself / my local authority / multi agency partnership**: 82%
- **Found and ordered them myself through the THINK! road safety professional catalogue**: 79%
- **Passed on by a road safety officer colleague**: 57%
- **Found and ordered them myself through an independent provider (e.g. CAPT, RAC, BRAKE)**: 56%
- **Supplied by another road safety professional**: 51%
- **Found and ordered them myself through Road Safety GB website**: 37%
- **Sent to me unsolicited by an independent provider**: 26%
- **Other**: 3%
- **I Haven't obtained any resources in last 12 months**: 1%

The most common ways of getting hold of resources were either for the RSO to produce it themselves or through their local authority/multi-agency partnership (82%), or for them to have ordered something from the THINK! catalogue (79%). This was the most popular branded resource and indicates the strength of the campaign among this audience.

However, resources were also shared between professionals in around half of cases which indicate, as with teachers, that these individuals do not act in silo when it comes to sourcing road safety education material. Word-of-mouth is therefore an important factor to consider in awareness, and appears to play a bigger role than direct marketing among this group. Awareness of the THINK! Education resources more specifically is explored in section 6.2.

With this in mind, respondents were asked about specific resource providers and types of provider. Figure 6.1.2D illustrates how teachers and out-of-
school leaders had previously come across road safety resources, and whether they had used these.

**Figure 6.1.2D (Q16a) Have you ever personally received / used road safety resources from the following types of organisations:**
Base: All teachers/ out-of-school leaders (548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial provider</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were most likely to have received road safety resources from their local authority (66%), with just under half who had personally received road safety resources from a charity (45%) and only one in five (21%) who had received resources from a commercial provider.

School teachers were more likely than out-of-school group leaders to claim to have received resources from each of the three types of organisation and were also significantly more likely to claim not to know whether they had received resources from commercial providers. This suggests that school teachers do not clearly distinguish resources provided by commercial organisations from other resources that they are sent or given. This is a trend commonly observed by teachers, and certainly observed at Stage One of this evaluation given the volume of resources available to them.

Similar figures can be seen relating to the proportion of respondents who had personally used road safety resources from each type of organisation. Respondents were most likely to have used local authority resources (68%), followed by charity resources (46%) and were least likely to have used resources produced by a commercial provider (18%).
School teachers were more likely to claim to have used resources from all three types of organisation and were again more likely to be unsure regarding whether they had used resources from commercial providers (27% vs. 15% out-of-school group leaders.)

A slightly higher proportion of respondents claimed to have used local authority or charity resources than to have personally received them. This difference is not large enough to be significant but it reinforces the fact that resources are shared within establishments, and therefore passed on by colleagues rather than the publishing organisation itself. It also indicates a very strong likely conversion rate from receiving to using resources from these sources.

Conversely, fewer commercial resources had been used than received (18% vs. 21%) on an overall level. Again, this difference is small and not statistically significant, but seems to indicate that teachers and out-of-school group leaders are selective in their use of resources from commercial providers.

Respondents were then asked about specific resource providers they may have sourced materials from. Figure 6.1.2E illustrates responses from teachers and out-of-school leaders.
There was a significant difference in the proportion of out-of-school leaders who had used THINK! Education resources compared to teachers, and indeed, these were the most popular materials among this audience. Other THINK! resources were also popular with out-of-school group leaders while school teachers were more likely to have sourced resources via their Local Authority or Cycle Training UK.

It should be noted, however, that these results may include an element of misattribution, as it may be difficult for out-of-school group leaders and teachers to differentiate between THINK! Education resources and other resources carrying the THINK! logo (for example, a local authority providing their own resources that carry the THINK! logo).

This reinforces messages from Stage One where there was a high awareness of the THINK! campaign and so this was where out-of-school group leaders went first to look for support in delivering road safety education; the above-the-line brand therefore reinforces the education programme. Conversely, Stage One indicated that a broader range of resources were sent to teachers compared to out-of-school group leaders and so they may be less likely to be aware of THINK! Education resources within the full competitive set.

RSOs were also asked about the providers of resources they had used. Figure 6.1.2F illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.1.2E (Q17) Have you used road safety resources from any of the following providers in the last 12 months?**

Base: All teachers and out-of-school leaders (548) (Multiselect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School teachers (488)</th>
<th>Out-of-school group leaders (60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THINK Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Training UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake (Road Safety Charity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other THINK resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Accident Prevention Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RSOs were most likely to have obtained resources produced by THINK! (81%) or by their Local Authority or multi-agency partnership (71%), which is unsurprising based on previous responses and further consolidates the strength of the THINK! campaign within this audience.

In line with other findings amongst teachers and out-of-school group leaders, which indicated that commercial providers were less popular, the RAC was also the least popular provider on the list among RSOs.

These figures indicate that RSOs are much more aware of the source of the resources they use to teach road safety to children than teachers and out-of-school groups were, with only 1% claiming not to know where the materials they had obtained had come from. This highlights this audience as key in acting as ambassadors for the THINK! Education materials.

However, in order to understand more about the role RSOs played in informing others about road safety resources, and thus their potential for acting as ambassadors for the THINK! Education materials, this sample was asked about whether they recommended road safety education resources to others. Figure 6.1.2G illustrates the findings.
Almost all of the RSOs we spoke to had recommended road safety resources at some stage – only 2% said that they had never done this. Most commonly they had recommended something to a teacher (96%), but around three quarters had recommended resources to parents (77%), out of school group leaders (76%), other RSOs (73%) or other road safety professionals (73%). This clearly sets them out to be very strong potential ambassadors for the THINK! Education resources.
6.2 Awareness

Having gathered data around the general approach to road safety education, a key section of the online questionnaires measured respondents’ awareness of THINK! Education online resources. Respondents were first shown an image of the THINK! Education website and asked whether they had visited the site before the day of the survey. This ensured that they were thinking about the THINK! Education resources specifically, rather than other resources they may have used with the THINK! branding.

Key Findings

- Group leaders were significantly more likely to have visited the THINK! Education website than teachers, possibly due to a more competitive resource market for teachers.
- Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were most likely to have first heard about the THINK! Education website through a search engine.
- For teachers, recommendation from a road safety professional was the second most popular source of awareness.
- The THINK! Education site was well known among RSOs. Almost all RSOs had visited the THINK! Education site before taking part in the survey, with most claiming to have heard of it through the parent THINK! campaign website.
- Differences were seen in the aspects of the site that the three audiences were most aware of. RSO’s and out-of-school group leaders were most likely to be aware of the THINK! Education posters while teachers were most aware of the site’s lesson ideas.

Figure 6.2A illustrates prior awareness of the THINK! Education website among teachers, out-of-school group leaders and RSOs.
Figure 6.2A (Q18/Q17) Have you ever visited the THINK! Education website before today? (This hosts a suite of online and print education resources: Early Years and Upper Primary were launched in April 2009 and Lower Primary in February 2010)

Base: All teachers (488), out-of-school group leaders (60), and RSOs (90)

Interestingly, group leaders were significantly more likely to have visited the site than teachers (68% vs. 39%), which mirrors findings within section 6.1.2 above. This reflects the fact that teachers are more likely to have access to a very wide range of resources, resulting in a more competitive resource market. As has already been alluded to, group leaders were also likely to have a high general awareness of the THINK! campaign as opposed to other organisations that may have produced resources, and Stage One findings suggested that they were likely to proactively go here to source road safety resources.

RSOs demonstrated very high awareness of the site, with 96% claiming to have visited it before taking part in the survey. Only 4% said they had not visited it and none selected “don’t know”. This consolidates the evidence that RSOs are more aware than other audiences of where the resources they use come from, observed in section 6.1.2 above. This is unsurprising given the more focussed remit of RSOs compared to these other audiences.

Respondents were then asked how they first heard about the THINK! Education resources. Figure 6.2B illustrates the findings for teachers and out-of-school group leaders.
Figure 6.2B (Q19a) Where did you first hear about the THINK! Education website?
Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders who have visited the THINK! Education website (230) (Multiselect)

Respondents were most likely to have first heard about the THINK! Education website through a search engine (53%) and this was especially the case for out-of-school group leaders (76% vs. 49% school teachers), which consolidates previous findings indicating that out-of-school group leaders are more proactive.

For teachers, the important role of RSOs or other road safety professionals in raising awareness of resources was again highlighted here; recommendation from a road safety professional was the second most popular source of awareness, and significantly higher than for out-of-school leaders (26% vs 12%). Teachers were also more likely than group leaders to have heard about the website through advertising, i.e. from direct mail (13% vs. 0%) or through a promotional email (25% vs. 5%), reflecting the marketing strategy aimed at this audience.

Figure 6.2C below illustrates the findings to the same question put to RSOs. Different pre-codes were set for this question to be more relevant to this audience so the results are not directly comparable with those from teachers and out-of-school group leaders. However, some interesting differences can be seen in terms of how RSOs have heard about THINK! Education compared to other audiences.
Figure 6.2C (Q18) Where did you first hear about the ‘THINK! Education’ website?
Base: All RSOs who have visited the THINK! Education website (86) (Multiselect)

The most common way for RSOs to have come across the THINK! Education site was via the parent THINK! campaign website (63%), reinforcing evidence of the strong role of the wider campaign in raising awareness of the education offer. Colleague recommendation was also a prominent factor (34%), as were references from the Road Safety GB website (29%) which we have already seen to play a role generally in the sourcing or road safety resources for this audience.

Significantly fewer RSOs claimed to have found the THINK! Education materials via internet searches compared to other audiences (8%), which again is in line with findings around how well RSOs know resource providers; they were more likely to have gone directly to the THINK! site to find the resources than conducted a general internet search. Awareness via promotional emails and direct mail was also low, but given the high awareness of this group via other means it would appear this may not be a relevant marketing strategy to use with this audience.

Google Analytics data¹ has provided insight around how actual traffic to the website arrived there between April 2009 and April 2011². Three key channels

---

¹ NB that Google Analytics data refers to all visitors to the THINK! Education primary website, not just those who are teachers, out of school leaders or RSOs
were identified as those through which web users have arrived at the THINK! Education site. These are:

- Direct traffic - visits from people who clicked a bookmark or who typed the site URL directly into their browser
- Referring Sites - visits from people who clicked to the site from another site
- Search Engines - visits from people who clicked to the site from a search engine results page

Figure 6.2D shows a breakdown of the proportion of visits to the site by their channel source.

**Figure 6.2D: Proportion of site visits by source**

![Figure 6.2D: Proportion of site visits by source](image)

Source: Google analytics April 09 – April 11 (excluding Nov 09)

This data indicates that referring sites, i.e. sites hosting a link to the THINK! Education site, were the biggest source of site traffic, although this was not mentioned explicitly by respondents via the survey. Of the visits that came through such a referral, by far the most popular route was via the Tales of the Road site. This demonstrates the strength of the link between the above-the-line children’s campaign and the education strategy.

---

2 NB: data relating to November 2009 has been removed from the Google Analytics database due to a technical error during this month.
Figure 6.2E below illustrates the top ten referral sites according to Google Analytics data.

**Figure 6.2E: Top 10 referral sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Site</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talesoftheroad.direct.gov.uk</td>
<td>35,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>britishcouncil.org</td>
<td>3,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-teaching-resources.co.uk</td>
<td>3,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct.gov.uk</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brake.org.uk</td>
<td>2,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadsafetygb.org.uk</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>google.co.uk</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think.dft.gov.uk</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girlguiding.org.uk</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillsworkshop.org</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics April 09 – April 11 (excluding Nov 09)

Road Safety GB, mentioned by 29% of RSOs in the survey, was the sixth most popular referral site overall, validating the RSOs’ claim that this was a key source of awareness.

It is also encouraging that free-teaching-resources.co.uk remains amongst the most popular referral sites as it continues to validate the investment in placing a link on this site. We know this to be a key source for teachers in finding resources relating to a diverse range of subjects.

Girlguiding.org.uk also remains in the top 10 referral sites, which suggests this is a popular route for out-of-school groups. This is an important channel to maintain given the prevalence of proactive searching among this audience, who may use their association website as a key port of call.

As Figure 6.2D demonstrated, almost a third (32.9%) of visits were via search engines, and this was also highlighted as a key route to awareness by teachers and out-of-school group leaders within the survey (cf Fig. 6.2B). Within these engines, visitors to the site had typed a range of search terms. Figure 6.2F below illustrates the most popular search terms and highlights the variation in those used.
Figure 6.2F: Search terms used

Source: Google analytics April 09 – April 11 (excluding Nov 09)

The most popular search terms were ‘road safety’ (searches for which accounted for 5,962 visits), ‘think education’ (4,636 visits), and ‘think’ (2,952 visits). This reiterates the strength of the THINK! brand in awareness of the THINK! Education resources, as indicative findings pointed to at Stage One, and as other findings within the survey have also supported. These search terms are important to note when developing a strategy for search engine optimisation as they will help users to be directed to the site according to the most relevant key terms.

Having established the level of awareness of the site and routes to access, respondents were asked about specific materials they knew of, to understand the extent of familiarity in more detail. Figure 6.2G demonstrates the responses for teachers and out-of-school group leaders.
Figure 6.2G (Q20) Which of the following THINK! Education resources available through the THINK! Education website are you aware of (this excludes other THINK! branded resources that you may have received elsewhere)?

Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders who have visited the THINK! Education website (230) (Multiselect)

A good spread of awareness was seen across all THINK! Education resources, which provides encouraging evidence for the extent to which users know about all the materials available.

School teachers were significantly more likely than out-of-school group leaders to be aware of lesson ideas (77% vs. 51%), which is as to be expected due to the targeting of these materials. Conversely, group leaders were significantly more likely to be aware of out-of-school group leader booklets (68% vs. 26%) than teachers. This suggests that the resources are effectively targeting their intended audiences.

However, interestingly, out-of-school group leaders were also more aware of posters than teachers were (83% vs. 67%). This is surprising as we know posters to be a much-used resource in the classroom as they present a useful stimulus for discussion and reminder of key messages. What this indicates is that out-of-school groups are perhaps more aware in general of
the print resources available that they can easily build into sessions they lead, due to the need to be less reliant on digital resources.

The same question was asked of RSOs. Figure 6.2H illustrates their responses.

**Figure 6.2H (Q20a) Which of the following resources available through the THINK! Education website are you aware of?**

Base: All RSOs who have visited the THINK! Education website (86) (Multiselect)

Awareness of individual materials available via the THINK! Education site was high among all RSOs. At the lower end of the scale, there is potentially room to increase awareness around extension activities (63%), home-link sheets (62%) and introductory notes (60%); however, the lower awareness of these resources may be indicative of how RSOs lead sessions with pupils, and these are indeed arguably materials that are primarily aimed at the teacher audience.

Awareness of THINK! Education resources was therefore high across all samples. However, in order to provide insight into the best way to promote road safety resources to teachers and out-of-school group leaders, these respondents were asked to say how they would most like to hear about new resources, Figure 6.2I below illustrates the results.
When asked how they would prefer to hear about new road safety resources, school teachers appeared keen to find out via email (65%) or a road safety professional (64%) and over half preferred to find out through a leaflet delivered to their school (55%). These reflect the ways in which teachers claimed to already find out about road safety resources.

Out-of-school group leaders were significantly less likely to prefer to find out via a road safety professional (45% vs. 66%), due to the fact they are much less likely to work with these intermediaries for road safety education delivery. However, like teachers, this audience also claimed to want to find out about new resources by email (70%) or direct mail in the form of a leaflet (52%). This indicates a key potential route to raising awareness further among this group, particularly in relation to resources specifically designed for out-of-school group leaders, especially as a third were not aware of the out-of-school leader booklet.

The roles of professional organisations in raising awareness of road safety resources were seen to differ among teachers and group leaders. While two fifths of group leaders (42%) were keen to hear about resources through a professional organisation associated with their group, only one fifth (19%) of teachers were keen to hear about these through an organisation associated
with teaching. It may be that teachers preferred to receive more targeted information (e.g. by email) due to the large volume of information they were likely to be exposed to in more general publications, such as TES, or to do with the extent to which they use these publications for resource awareness.

To provide further insight around this point, teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked about the preferred time of year for marketing road safety resources. Figure 6.2J illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.2J (Q32) When would you say is the best time of year to receive information about new road safety resources?**

Base: All teachers and out-of-school groups (548)

Autumn term was the time of year most likely to be deemed the best for receiving information about road safety resources overall. Teachers were significantly more likely than out-of-school group leaders to choose this time of year, however, with out-of-school group leaders stating no preference.

Although teachers indicated earlier in the survey that there was no particular term that road safety education would necessarily be covered, their preference for receiving marketing in the autumn term is probably due to the fact that they will be starting a new school year with new children and also possibly due to the occurrence of Road Safety Week in this term. We know that teachers are likely to plan their scheme of work for the year at the beginning of the year, and this would seem to suggest that they are also most likely to earmark resources to be used at this point too. This therefore
supports the evidence for road safety education being more systematically planned in schools than in out-of-school groups.

6.3 Uptake of resources

This section of the report explores the uptake of THINK! Education resources, based on findings from both the quantitative surveys and the website analysis. The number of website visits and page views is explored, in addition to which particular resources are being requested.

There were different responses from teachers, RSOs and out-of-school group leaders when they were asked whether or not they had used the THINK! Education website before. Almost all RSO’s had (96%), but fewer out of school leaders (68%) and less than half of teachers (39%) had done so. The following website traffic data provides further information regarding how much the resources have been used overall.

Key Findings

- Overall, the THINK! Education website averaged over 200 visitors a day and in the two years prior to April 2011, it was visited over 190,000 times by over 150,000 unique visitors.
- Peaks and troughs in the number of visitors to the site tended to correlate to school term-times and holiday time, with a substantial peak in November 2010 (around Road Safety Week).
- The pupil pages were the most popular area of the site in terms of page views.
- PDF files were significantly more viewed than media files on the site, with the ‘traffic poster’ and the ‘Tales of the Road’ resource most commonly viewed.
- School staff and out of school groups were responsible for the highest number of requests for print resources while RSOs ordered the greatest volume of printed resources from the site.
- Teachers were significantly more likely to have used the following THINK! Education resources compared to out-of-school group leaders:
  - Online games/ interactive activities
  - Online clips
  - Curriculum links
- Group leaders were significantly more likely to have used the following THINK! Education resources compared to teachers:
  - Worksheets
  - Introductory notes
  - Group leader booklets
  - Other THINK! Education resources
- Lack of time was the main reason that teachers claimed not to have used THINK! Education resources while group leaders were most likely to claim that they did not have access to an internet connection.
Among those RSOs who were aware of certain *THINK! Education* resources but had not yet used them, the most common reason was that they preferred using other resources, suggesting that habit may be important.

Overall, the website averaged over 200 visitors a day. In the period from April 2009 until April 2011, the DfT *THINK! Education* website was visited over 190,000 times by over 150,000 unique visitors. This equates to over 2 million page views overall.³

**Figure 6.3A: Visitors, visits and page views, April 2009 – April 2011 (excluding November 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Daily average</th>
<th>Weekly Average</th>
<th>Monthly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique visitors</strong></td>
<td>151,079</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>5,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits</strong></td>
<td>193,817</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>8,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page views</strong></td>
<td>2,068,375</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>20,081</td>
<td>86,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics April 09 – April 11 (excluding Nov 09)

When they were asked if there was a specific time of year that they were most likely to deal with road safety, the most common response from RSOs, teachers and out of school leaders was that there was no set time for this. Using Google analytics data, we were also able to see whether there was a specific time of year that the *THINK! Education* primary website has been visited.

³ NB: the Google Analytics data in this report excludes data relating to website traffic during November 2009 due to a technical error in the data collection.
The peaks and troughs in the graph tend to correlate to school term-times and holiday time. During the term there is a marked increase in the amount of visits and visitors to the website. A similar pattern is also visible when the data is examined on a weekly level – on weekdays the number of visits is higher than at weekends. This is wholly to be expected and indicates the site has been used, as intended, primarily within education environments i.e. not within children’s leisure time. However, in general, there has been a fairly steady flow of traffic to the site throughout the academic year.

There is one very clear peak on the chart. The top three weeks for both the number of unique site visitors and the number of site visits, or views, were the weeks commencing 7th November 2010 (43,915 views; 2,988 visitors), 14th November 2010 (49,629 views; 3,017 visitors) and 21st November 2010 (82,994 views; 5,063 visitors). These were the three weeks which preceded Road Safety Week 2010, which is a clear indicator of the powerful effect that this week can have in terms of driving interest in the site. Indeed, teachers did note a slight preference for the autumn term for teaching road safety, while preferences for other periods in the academic year were relatively equal, and this data consolidates this.

The website data also allowed us to see which areas of the website were most well used. All groups in the survey said that they were likely to have
used posters, worksheets and lesson ideas, and the teachers and out-of-
school leaders also mentioned having used online games.

On the website as a whole, however, the pupil pages were the most popular
in terms of page views with 1,090,488 views. This is in contrast to 522,933
views for the teachers pages and 118,107 for the parents pages. The
explanation for this is that teachers will often plan their lessons via accessing
pupil pages on online resources so that they can see directly what activities
are available.

Figure 6.3C below displays the percentage share of each category and
illustrates the popularity of the pupils pages.

Figure 6.3C: Breakdown of page view by area

Within the pupil section, data was also analysed to understand which
particular area was the most visited. Figure 6.3D below illustrates that the
Upper Primary (Aged 7-11) pages were the most popular, taking over half of
all pupil area visits. These pages received 585,411 views compared to
343,767 and 132,518 page views for the Lower Primary (Aged 5-7) and Early
Years (Aged 3-5) pages respectively.

Note figures don’t add up to total page views due to existence of some pages not in these
categories, for example ‘Contact us’ and ‘Availability’
The web analytics demonstrated that PDF files were significantly more viewed than media files on the site. The data for the volume of page views by resource type shows that the PDF files were viewed 74,670 times compared to 14,214 views of the media files. This is in line with what could be expected in light of the Stage One observation visits, where teachers with no access to the internet in their classroom had accessed and downloaded PDF files prior to lessons.

Figure 6.3E below displays the top 15 media and PDF files by page views. This data shows the relative popularity of the PDF resources over the media files. The majority of PDF files accessed were relevant to Early Years or Lower Primary activities, while the media files were more likely to be relevant to Upper Primary.
Figure 6.3E: Top 15 most viewed media and PDF files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media file</th>
<th>Page views</th>
<th>PDF file</th>
<th>Page views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerr's-story</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>traffic_poster.pdf</td>
<td>10,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmin's-story</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>tales_of_the_road.pdf</td>
<td>9,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safest-place</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>crossing_the_road_poster.pdf</td>
<td>7,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha's-story</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>colour_me_bright.pdf</td>
<td>6,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snakes-and-hazards</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>traffic_lights_poster.pdf</td>
<td>6,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-safely</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>green_is_for_go.pdf</td>
<td>6,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr-lumpys</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_1_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>5,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir's-story</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>zebra_crossing_poster.pdf</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what's-coming-next</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_2_theme_2.pdf</td>
<td>4,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crash-scene</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>activitysheet_1_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>4,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_1_theme_2.pdf</td>
<td>4,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be-bright-be-seen</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>activitysheet_2_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop-look-listen</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>story_stay_close_klara.pdf</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavement</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_2_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look-all-around</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_4_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>3,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics April 09 – April 11 (excluding Nov 09)

A range of PDF resources were accessed with the most popular resources being the ‘traffic poster’ and the ‘Tales of the Road’ resource, in line with other findings across both stages of the evaluation. Of the media files viewed over the time period, the top three files; Kerr’s Story, Yasmin’s Story and Safest Place (part of the Codebreaker game) remained the same as we had seen in the previous period at Stage One.

The online surveys examined the use of THINK! Education printed materials that had been ordered through the website. Figure 6.3F illustrates the findings among teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources.
Figure 6.3F (Q29) Have you ever used printed materials ordered through the THINK! Education website? (by printed, we mean published materials, not ones that you have printed out yourself)
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173)

Around three in ten (28%) teachers and out-of-school group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources had used printed materials ordered through the website. Out-of-school group leaders were significantly more likely than teachers to have done so (65% vs. 20% school teachers). This may be because teachers tended to show a preference towards resources involving technology compared to out-of-school group leaders or may be because teachers were more likely to receive resources from a variety of sources including road safety professionals, colleagues and those that their school already stocked (see figure 6.1.2B Q14). If resources were passed to teachers, they may not be able to identify where they had been ordered from originally (which may explain why the figure for ‘not sure’ is directionally, although not significantly, higher for teachers than group leaders).

Figure 6.3G illustrates the response given when teachers and group leaders were asked who had ordered these printed resources from the THINK! Education website.
The majority of teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education printed materials had not ordered them themselves (58%). This may indicate the extent to which resources are shared between colleagues and may also relate to the finding that road safety resources were often provided by Road Safety Officers.

Although the base sizes for school teachers (29) and out-of-school group leaders (20) are too small to be statistically compared, it is worth noting that all of the group leaders answered yes to this question – compared to 19 of the 29 school teachers, indicating that group leaders appear much more likely to order their own resources. This consolidates earlier evidence suggesting out-of-school-group leaders are more proactive in their resource sourcing than teachers.

In addition, findings from Stage One indicated that teachers were often unsure regarding who had ordered the resources or could not remember doing it, which is further evidenced here by the relatively large proportion of respondents (all teachers) who did not know if they had ordered the print resources or not.

The print request database allows us to see in more detail the proportion of the total requests made by various groups. Figure 6.3H illustrates how many orders were placed by each key group, and how many total documents they ordered. This data has been analysed between the dates of July 2010 and March 2011 only, as user group information was not collected on print requests prior to this period.
As could be expected, school staff and out of school groups were responsible for the highest number of requests for print resources, with 30% of the total number of requests placed by schools and 17% by out of school groups.

However, in terms of volume of resources ordered, RSOs ordered the most, accounting for almost half (46.2%) of all the resources ordered. This could be attributed to the fact that they work across several schools and so would order copies for each of the schools they visited (which we know to be potentially more than 15). The schools themselves by contrast, only ordered 6% of all resources by volume, and out of school groups only 4%.

It is also interesting to observe the volume of requests on a resource level to understand which have been the most popular both in terms of volume and in terms of individual requests. Between May 2009 and March 2011, the total volume of resources requested was dominated by a small number of booklet resources, with the top five resources accounting for 94% of all the resources requested - *Tales of the Road – A Highway Code, Road Safety Matters – Upper Primary Parents Booklet, Road Safety Matters – Early Years Parents Booklet, Road Safety Matters – Lower Primary Parents Booklet* and *Journey Planner*. Interestingly, *Journey Planner* was the second most popular resource between November 2010 and April 2011 (i.e. since the Stage One evaluation report period). This resource was launched after the other top resources and so this indicates it may well continue to gain popularity in print requests as it becomes more established.

For each of these resources, the average order placed asked for between 106 and 187 copies. Figure 6.3I illustrates the results across all resources.
Table 6.3I: Count and quantity of hard copy resources requested, May 2009 – March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>% of volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tales of the Road - A Highway Code</td>
<td>1,515,487</td>
<td>8,776</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Early Years Parents Booklet</td>
<td>477,815</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Upper Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>427,384</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>169.1</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Lower Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>155,483</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Planner</td>
<td>97,094</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>187.4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Colour Me Brightly Activity Sheet</td>
<td>27,272</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Green Man Colouring Activity Sheet</td>
<td>26,887</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Pedestrian Crossing The Road Poster</td>
<td>23,882</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Puffin Crossing Poster</td>
<td>23,795</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Zebra Crossing Poster</td>
<td>13,128</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Early Years and Primary Schools</td>
<td>12,617</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Busy Traffic Poster</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Leaders Notes</td>
<td>4,984</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Country Poster</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Town Poster</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers’ Pack</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Poster LP - A2 Poster</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers’ Notes</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers’ Notes</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Secondary Schools</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers’ Pack - Crossing the Road</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Cycle Safety</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers’ Pack</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack In-Car Safety</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers’ Notes</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>2,832,922</td>
<td>37,906</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfT Requestor Database, May 2009 – March 2011
Given the small proportion of the total resources which were ordered by schools and out of school groups, it cannot be assumed that those resources which were most popular overall were also most popular in these groups. Figure 6.3J (overleaf) displays a breakdown of which resources were ordered by which groups between the period of July 2010 and March 2011. Overall, the most popular resource was the same in each of the three groups. They were all most likely to have ordered *Tales of the Road*.

There were a couple of resources which schools and out of school groups were more likely to order than other groups. The table shows that schools ordered proportionally more of the Road Safety Matters packs and that out-of-school groups, unsurprisingly, ordered proportionally more of the Out-of-School Leaders’ packs. The out-of-school groups also ordered proportionally more of the Lower Primary Road Safety Matters books, but fewer of the Early Years and Upper Primary versions than most other groups.

As RSOs make up such a large proportion of the total population, it is perhaps not surprising that the resources they ordered tended to be similar to the resources ordered in total.
Figure 6.3J: Breakdown of quantity of resources accessed by type of resource and user group, between 10\textsuperscript{th} July 2010 and March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Road Safety Officer</th>
<th>Police/fire/armed forces</th>
<th>Other Road Safety</th>
<th>School staff</th>
<th>DfT</th>
<th>General public</th>
<th>Other education</th>
<th>Out of school groups</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tales of the Road - A Highway Code</td>
<td>228,885</td>
<td>67,128</td>
<td>57,482</td>
<td>25,123</td>
<td>70,261</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>12,948</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>476,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Lower Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>34,760</td>
<td>13,660</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>11,241</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>10,505</td>
<td>96,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Upper Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>52,090</td>
<td>19,653</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>10,259</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>101,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Early Years Parents Booklet</td>
<td>45,788</td>
<td>16,314</td>
<td>14,027</td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>4,954</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>97,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Planner</td>
<td>45,305</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>96,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Early Years and Primary Schools</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>5,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Colour Me Brightly Activity Sheet</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Green Man Colouring Activity Sheet</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Puffin Crossing Poster</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Zebra Crossing Poster</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Pedestrian Crossing The Road Poster</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Leaders Notes</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Country Poster</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Title</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Quantities</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Town Poster</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Busy Traffic Poster</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Secondary Schools</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Poster LP - A2 Poster</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Pack - Crossing the Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Cycle Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack In-Car Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>418,830</td>
<td>135,781</td>
<td>98,863</td>
<td>57,177</td>
<td>99,625</td>
<td>31,696</td>
<td>32,840</td>
<td>32,301</td>
<td>907,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfT contacts database July 2010 – March 2011
The quantitative survey also asked RSOs who had visited the website to identify which, if any, print resources they had ordered. Figure 6.3K below shows the findings.

**Figure 6.3K (Q32) Which of the following printed materials have you ever ordered from the THINK! Education website?**

Base: All who have visited the THINK! Education website (86) (Multiselect)

- **Tales of the Road (children’s highway code booklets)**: 86%
- **Posters**: 73%
- **Parents’ booklets**: 64%
- **Road safety education guides**: 60%
- **Teachers packs**: 55%
- **Out-of-school groups - Leaders’ notes**: 48%
- **Teachers notes**: 40%
- **Crossroads Teachers’ manuals**: 38%
- **Journey planners**: 28%
- **None of these**: 10%

RSOs who had accessed the THINK! Education website were likely to have ordered at least some of the printed resources (90% said that they had ordered one or more). As was seen in the website analytics, most often they had ordered booklets (86% had ordered the Tales of the Road, and 64% the parents’ booklets) or posters (73% had ordered these).

The least regularly ordered resources according to RSOs themselves, were the teachers’ notes (40%), Crossroads teachers’ manuals (38%) and the journey planners (28%). This seems slightly at odds with the website analytics, which indicated that journey planners were fairly popular.

The quantitative survey also asked road safety officers to identify which resources they had used, from those available through the THINK! Education
website (regardless of whether they had ordered them themselves). Figure 6.3L illustrates their responses.

Figure 6.3L (Q20b) Which of the following resources available through the THINK! Education website have you used to aid your teaching of road safety?
Base: All RSOs who have visited the THINK! Education website (86) (Multiselect)

As inferred by the high number of THINK! Education resources accessed by RSOs, those who had visited the THINK! Education website had generally used one or more of the resources available there (79%) to help with their road safety teaching. They were most likely to have used the site’s posters (64%) and worksheets (50%). Most of the more commonly used resources were those same resources that RSOs also told us they knew best (posters, worksheets, lesson ideas and teacher booklets) (see figure 6.2H).

Equally, those resources which were least commonly used were also the ones which RSOs were less likely to have heard of – extension activities (used by 19% of RSOs), home-link sheets (used by 15%) and introductory notes (used by 13%). This therefore confirms, perhaps unsurprisingly, that these resources are perceived as less relevant to this audience.

The pattern of use among teachers and out-of-school group leaders was somewhat different to that shown among RSOs. The results for teachers and group leaders are shown in figure 6.3M below:
Figure 6.3M (Q20) Which of the following *THINK! Education* resources available through the *THINK! Education* website have you used to aid your teaching of road safety (this excludes other *THINK!* branded resources that you may have received elsewhere)?

Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have visited the *THINK! Education* website (230) (Multiselect)

Three quarters of teachers and group leaders who had visited the site claimed to have used one or more of the listed resources.

Although online games, worksheets, lesson ideas, posters and online clips appeared most likely to be used among teachers and out-of-school group leaders, some differences could be seen in the types of *THINK! Education* resources used between the two groups:

Teachers were significantly more likely to have used: (Teachers vs. Out-of-school group leaders)
- Online games/ interactive activities (51% vs. 15%)
- Online clips (42% vs. 17%)
- Curriculum links (21% vs. 7%)

Group leaders were significantly more likely to have used
- Worksheets (59% vs. 37%)
- Introductory notes (34% vs. 14%)
- Group leader booklets (54% vs. 4%)
- Other *THINK! Education* resources (7% vs. 1%).
This is indicative of the most relevant resources for these audiences and the facilities available to them in lessons.

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they had used the THINK! Education resources in the last year. Figure 6.3N illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.3N (Q21) In how many of your road safety education sessions have you used the THINK! Education resources, over the last 12 months?**

Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173)

Teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources were most likely to have used them in two lessons over the last twelve months (26% selected this option), with seven in ten (69%) having used them in between one and three sessions.

There were no significant differences between school leaders and out-of-school group leaders in the number of lessons these resources were used in. However, although the base for out-of-school group leaders was small for this question (31) it is interesting that the greatest proportion (35%) indicated that they had only used the THINK! Education resources once over the last 12 months. This may be because road safety education is covered less frequently among out-of-school group leaders.

Figure 6.3O indicates which age groups the THINK! Education resources have been used with among teachers and group leaders.
Figure 6.3O (Q26) Which age group(s) have you used THINK! Education resources with?
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173) (Multiselect)

Those who had used the THINK! Education resources appeared most likely to have used them with children aged 7 to 8 (53%), although this was mainly driven by out-of-school group leaders – almost nine in ten (87%) had used the THINK! Education resources with this age group.

Group leaders were significantly more likely to have used the resources with children aged 6 to 10 or over 11 years, but this may reflect the fact that out-of-school group leaders are more likely to work with children of a variety of ages, compared to school teachers who are more likely to work with a certain age group or key stage.

RSOs were then asked how many sessions they had used THINK! Education resources in over the last year. Figure 6.3P illustrates this.
RSOs who had used *THINK! Education* resources were most likely to have used these resources more than 15 times – the maximum answer that we allowed at this question. This was also the most popular response when RSOs were asked about the number of visits that they made. This suggests that they may have used them at each visit.

The next most common response to this question however, was to say that they had not used them in any sessions.

Although low base sizes meant that none of the differences between use with older or younger children were *significant*, some interesting indicative differences could still be seen. For example it appeared that RSOs may have been more likely to use *THINK! Education* resources more often with Primary
school-aged children, than with younger children. Four in ten (40%) said they had used these more than 15 times with 5 – 11 year olds, compared to just 29% who said they had used them that often with under 5s.

There were some respondents who had chosen not to use resources despite being aware of them. Figure 6.3Q illustrates reasons for this among teachers and group leaders.

**Figure 6.3Q (Q23)** You told us that you are aware of the below THINK! Education resources, but have not used them. Please tell us why you have not used these THINK! Education resources.
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who are aware of but have not used any THINK! Education resources (103) (Base amended during fieldwork) (Multiselect)

An encouraging response was seen among teachers and group leaders who were aware of THINK! Education resources but had not used them. The main reasons that these respondents had not used the resources appeared to be mainly logistical – with teachers most likely to cite lack of time (58% vs. 28% group leaders) and group leaders most likely to claim that they do not have access to an internet connection (44% vs. 1% school teachers). Some of the ‘other’ reasons respondents gave also related to problems with internet access or computer access at particular venues.

---

5 The base for this question was originally all those who were aware of one or more resources and had not used any. This was changed during fieldwork to those who were aware of any individual THINK! Education resource that they had not used (in order to achieve a higher sample of responses).
Note: While the base for school teachers for this question is fairly reliable (85 people), the number of out-of-school group leaders who answered this question was very low (18) meaning that statistical comparisons (i.e. significance testing) cannot be carried out and the comparisons above between teachers and out-of-school group leaders should be treated as indicative only.

Figure 6.3R illustrates RSOs’ reasons for not using THINK! Education resources they were aware of.

**Figure 6.3R (Q22) You told us that you are aware of THINK! Education resources, but have not used them. Please tell us why you have not used these THINK! Education resources**

Base: All RSOs who are aware of but have not used any individual THINK! Education resource (76) (Multiselect)

Among those RSOs who were aware of certain THINK! Education resources but had not yet used them, there was no overriding reason for why this would be. The most common response was to say that they preferred using other resources (38%), suggesting that habit may play a large role here.

Time also seemed to be of concern, with around one in four RSOs saying that they had not had time to look at them (28%).

Nearly one in three (28%) also felt that there were other reasons which meant that they had not used THINK! Education resources, which were not listed on
the questionnaire. This suggests that individual preference may be a key factor in RSOs’ decision to use the resources or not.

6.4 Coordination and integration of THINK! Resources

This section of the report explores how road safety teaching is coordinated among teachers, out-of-school group leaders and RSOs, including how parents are involved. We also explore how the THINK! Education resources are used within road safety sessions.

Key Findings

- The findings from school teachers and out-of-school group leaders indicated a high level of co-ordination with road safety professionals in terms of what is covered and visit integration into school planning.
- Teachers and out-of-school group leaders who had used a visit from a road safety professional, tended to feel that they usually watched the visit and that knew what content would be covered.
- The majority of teachers and out-of-school group leaders who had used a visit from a road safety professional claimed to always/mostly hold a follow up session with their class or group.
- RSOs appeared not to think that teachers were actively involved in their visits. Less than one third claimed that the teachers actively contributed during the session always or most of the time.
- Including road safety information in letters home was the most popular way for teachers and out-of-school group leaders to involve parents in road safety education. The most popular usage of the THINK! Education site among RSOs was to keep their own knowledge up to date, suggesting that more could be done to encourage RSOs to use the resources in the planning or delivery of road safety sessions.
- Very few teachers and group leaders tended to just use one THINK! Education resource in isolation, suggesting that the resources are regularly integrated with other resources in road safety teaching.
- RSOs who had used THINK! Education resources were more likely to use them in combination with resources from another source than they were to use only resources produced by THINK! Education.

6.4.1 Coordination

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked how they usually worked with road safety intermediaries if they came in to deliver a session on road safety. Figure 6.4.1A below illustrates the results.
Among those who had used a visit from a road safety professional (e.g. road safety officers, police, fire and rescue) to aid their road safety education sessions, 87% claimed to watch the visit all or most of the time. An equally high proportion (88%) also claimed that they always or mostly knew what content would be covered, with eight in ten (80%) claiming to always/mostly hold a follow up session with their class/group. This suggests a high level of co-ordination between teachers / group leaders and road safety professionals, in terms of awareness of content and integration of the visit into school planning.

Although most respondents claimed to be aware of the content that would be covered during these sessions, only around half (54%) claimed to always or mostly actively contribute during the session, suggesting that the level of coordination between the teacher and road safety professional during the sessions is less high.

Contrary to what was suggested through the Stage One findings, the results for this question do suggest some level of coordination between road safety...
professionals and teachers. However, the proportion who claimed that road safety professionals always (57%) or mostly (34%) brought their own resources (as well as the number of teachers/group leaders who claim to actively contribute during sessions) indicates that there is perhaps less coordination in the materials used within the sessions themselves.

Figure 6.4.1B illustrates the extent of collaboration between schools and RSOs from the RSOs’ perspective.

Figure 6.4.1B (Q11) Thinking about the Primary Schools and Early Years settings that you have taught in within the last 12 months, please let us know how often each of the below situations generally occur:
Base: All RSOs who have worked with children aged 11 or under (84)

Most RSOs (74%) claimed that in the past 12 months they had always taken their own resources with them when they were going to teach lessons, with almost a quarter claiming that they did this most of the time (23%). Similar results were seen in the teachers’/group leaders survey, where around nine in ten (91%) claimed that road safety professionals brought resources with them during visits.

In terms of teacher input, the most common involvement was for the teacher to watch the session (80% of those who worked with under 11s said that this happened always or most of the time in the past year). Only 27% reported that teachers actively contributed always or most of the time. Teachers appeared to view themselves as more involved in these types of sessions – results from the teachers’ and group leaders’ survey showed that over half...
(54%) felt that they actively contributed all or most of the time during road safety professionals’ visits.

Discussion with teachers about how to plan the sessions was less common. Only one in three RSOs (32%) said that in the last year they had pre-visit meetings with the teacher always or most of the time. This figure was slightly higher among teachers and group leaders, where 46% claimed that this meeting always or mostly took place. One in three RSOs (31%) claimed that this rarely happened, and 12% that it never happened.

Similarly only 15% of RSOs said that in the past year teachers had always or mostly suggested topics that they would like to be covered during the sessions. As around half of teachers / out-of-school group leaders claimed to always know what was covered during the sessions, it may be that this knowledge is retrospective (i.e. they watch the session), rather than being involved in planning this in advance.

Given that teachers and out-of-school group leaders were commenting on all road safety professionals (i.e. not just RSOs) it may be that a higher level of input was given to those professionals who do not visit schools as often as RSOs, such as police or firemen, which would explain the apparent discrepancy here between RSO and teacher/ group leader results. However, this cannot be conclusively inferred from the survey alone.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were also asked about the extent to which they involved parents in road safety education. Figure 6.4.1C illustrates the findings.
Figure 6.4.1C (Q12) In which of the following ways, if any, do you involve parents in road safety education?
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders (548) (Multiselect)

Including road safety information in letters home was the most popular way for respondents to involve parents in road safety education (73%), with school teachers significantly more likely to do this than out-of-school group leaders (77% vs. 42%). This may be because teachers are more likely to send letters home anyway (regardless of topic) or could be related to scheduled letters that are sent out across the school (e.g. road safety week information). Less than half of respondents (46%) claimed to encourage parents to carry out road safety activities with their children and only one in five (19%) talked to parents about road safety issues.

Very few respondents stated that they hold separate sessions for parents on road safety (3%) and these only happened in schools. This may be because teachers have greater opportunities to become familiar with parents throughout the course of the school year, which may in turn facilitate the potential to hold parents’ sessions such as these.

Around one in six (16%) did not use any of the stated methods of involving parents in road safety education. Out-of-school group leaders were
significantly more likely to claim that they had not used any of the listed methods (38% vs. 13% school teachers). These findings are in line with expectations, given the observations in Stage One around parental engagement, and again suggest that the DfT resources are meeting needs in line with current practices for example, via the homelink sheets.

6.4.2 Integration

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked how they had most used the THINK! Education site. Results are illustrated in Figure 6.4.2A below.

Figure 6.4.2A (Q19b) Do you use the THINK! Education website most for...
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have visited the THINK! Education website (230)

Among teachers and group leaders who had visited the THINK! Education website, one third (33%) claimed to use the site for planning, improving their own knowledge and as part of a session, equally.

Differences could be seen in the use of the site between school teachers and out-of-school group leaders. While school teachers were more likely to use the site as part of a session (32% vs. 2%), group leaders were more likely to
use the site as part of their planning (56% vs. 24%). This is likely to be related to the fact that only 13% of group leaders claimed to always have access to the internet during education sessions, and indeed Stage One found that none of the observed out-of-school sessions had easy access to a computer or the internet.

RSOs were asked a similar questions relating to what they used the site most for. Figure 6.4.2B illustrates the findings.

**Figure 6.4.2B (Q19) Do you use the THINK! Education website most for…**

*Base: All RSOs who have visited the THINK! Education website (86)*

Of those RSOs who had visited the THINK! Education website before, almost half (47%) said that they used the site equally much for planning school road safety sessions, keeping their own knowledge up to date and as part of road safety education sessions. Interestingly, of those who did choose one reason in particular, they most commonly said that they used the site for keeping their own knowledge up to date (27%). This makes this the most popular usage for the THINK! Education site amongst RSOs, and suggests that more could be done to encourage RSOs to use the resources either to contribute to the planning or delivery of the road safety sessions in schools.

Figure 6.4.2C below indicates the different audience sizes that teachers and out-of-school group leaders had used the THINK! Education resources with.
Figure 6.4.2C (Q25) In which of the following ways have you used THINK! Education resources?
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173) (Multiselect)

Teachers and group leaders who had used the THINK! Education resources were most likely to have used them with the whole class or group (94%), although school teachers were significantly more likely than out-of-school group leaders to have done so (96% vs. 84%). Stage One findings indicated that out-of-school groups often split the children by age e.g. Cubs and Beavers, which might explain why group leaders were less likely to use the resources with the whole group.

Around one in four (39%) respondents who had used the resources had used them with small groups and just less than one in ten (9%) had used them one-to-one with individual children. This suggests that THINK! Education resources have been used in a fairly typical fashion in relation to how teachers and out-of-school leaders would normally cover road safety education, as explored earlier on in this report.

RSOs were asked a similar question, relating to their use of the THINK! Education resources with children aged under five, or five to eleven years. The findings are illustrated in Figure 6.4.2D below.
Figure 6.4.2D (Q25 + 27) Thinking about the teaching sessions that you led with children aged (under 5/5 to 11), in which of the following ways did you use THINK! Education resources?

Base: RSOs who led road safety education sessions with children aged under 5 in the last 12 months (43) / 5 to 11 in the last 12 months (55) (Multiselect)

RSOs who had used the resources with children during the past 12 months had generally done so with the whole class or group (this was the case for 82% of RSOs who had taught children aged 5 to 11, and 67% of RSOs who had taught children aged under 5). Although it appears that whole class use of the resources was more common with children under five, it should be noted that due to relatively small base sizes, this difference is directional rather than significant.

Just under half had also used them in small groups (44% said so for each age group), but it was rare for them to have been used one-to-one with individual children. Only 12% who had worked with under 5s and 11% who had worked with 5 – 11s had used them in that way. This pattern of use mirrored that seen in the teachers’ survey, although more teachers claimed to use the resource with the whole class (96%).

It is unclear whether this pattern is because lessons are generally structured around whole class presentations, or because this is what the resources are most suitable for.
Figure 6.4.2E illustrates how teachers and out-of-school group leaders integrated the THINK! Education resources within other road safety resources.

Figure 6.4.2E (Q27) Which of these statements best describes your use of THINK! Education resources, when teaching a typical lesson on Road Safety:
Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>School teachers (142)</th>
<th>Out-of-school group leaders (31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tend to use a combination of my own resources and THINK! Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to use a combination of THINK Education resources and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety resources produced by other organisations</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to use a combination of 2 or more THINK Education resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together (e.g. a video clip and a worksheet)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to use just one THINK Education resource (e.g. one video clip)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, only 6% of teachers and group leaders who had used THINK! Education resources claimed that they tend to just use one THINK! Education resource in isolation. This suggests that THINK! Education resources are regularly integrated with other resources in road safety teaching.

The pattern of use was similar for school teachers and out-of-school group leaders, with the largest group - around half - (48% overall) claiming to use a combination of their own resources and THINK! Education resources. Only around one in ten (11%) used two or more THINK! Education resources together without any other resources, suggesting that THINK! Education resources are far more likely to be integrated with other resources than with themselves.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders who used 2 or more THINK! Education resources together were asked to indicate an example of their use. Figure 6.4.2F shows some of the comments that respondents wrote in response.
Figure 6.4.2F (Q28) We are interested to know how you use THINK! Education Resources in combination with each other. Please describe an example of how you have used more than one THINK! Resource in a road safety session. (e.g. showing a poster on a smart board, followed up with worksheets)
Base: All who had used 2 or more THINK! Education resources together (19) (open question)

I have used video clips and then used a follow up worksheet to ensure learning and understanding
(School teacher)

used Kerr’s story followed by drama activities suggested and worksheet
(School teacher)

We watched the videos and played the games. They then wrote their own poems in the style of the TV adverts.
(School teacher)

Worksheets combined with posters and lesson plans with games for younger children
(Out-of-school group leader)

As the number of teachers and group leaders who had used 2 or more THINK! Education resources in combination was low, very few respondents provided more detail regarding how they did so. Some examples of responses are provided above – and refer to a range of ways that the resources have been incorporated together. They indicate that there does not appear to be a typical method for integrating these resources – rather teachers and group leaders appear to use the resources in rather individualised ways.

A table demonstrating the various resources used by respondents is shown below (NB. Only 6 of the 19 relevant respondents opted to provide an answer at this question)
Figure 6.4.2G Combinations of resources shown in verbatim responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Resources used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>video clips, worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>game, worksheet, talk or game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>story, drama, worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>video clips, games, poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>whiteboard intro, worksheets, individual laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>worksheets, poster, lesson plans, games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table demonstrates that resources were used in a number of different ways. However, worksheets appeared to be a resource commonly used in conjunction with other THINK! Education resources, such as video clips, games, posters, stories and drama.

We also asked Road Safety Officers how they integrated THINK! Education resources into their teaching. Figure 6.4.2H below illustrates the findings.

Figure 6.4.2H (Q29) Which of these statements best describes your use of THINK! Education resources, when teaching a typical lesson on Road Safety in the following settings

Base: All RSOs who have used THINK! Resources (68)

![Chart showing the use of THINK! Education resources]

As seen with teachers and group leaders, RSOs who had used THINK! Education resources were more likely to use them in combination with resources from another source (either their own resources or those produced
by other organisations) than they were to use only resources produced by THINK! Education.

The most common way that THINK! Education resources were used was for RSOs to combine them with their own resources. Over one third (37%) of RSOs said that they did this in Early Years settings, and almost half (49%) used them in this way in primary settings, indicating that a substantial proportion of RSOs have a bank of their own resources that they draw upon. Only around one in twenty said that they tended to use just one THINK! Education resource when teaching a typical lesson on road safety (6% in Early Years setting and 4% in Primary settings).

Figure 6.4.2I illustrates the responses given by RSOs regarding how they have used THINK! Education resources together.

Figure 6.4.2I (Q30) We are interested to know how you use THINK! Education Resources in combination with each other. Please describe an example of how you have used more than one THINK Resource in a road safety session.6

Base: All RSOs who have used more than one THINK! Resource (29) NB raw figures shown as low base sizes. (open question)

---

6 NB. These verbatim have been charted as raw figures rather than percentages due to a low base size (29). The equivalent question for RSOs achieved too few responses to chart, so examples of responses have been presented as verbatim comments at Figure 6.4.2F.
Among those RSOs who had used more than one THINK! Education resource (and it should be pointed out that this is a small number, only 29) there were two most common ways in which resources were used together. The first of these was to use posters or visual aids during the session, and to follow this up by giving out notes for parents (9 respondents) and the second was to adapt the resources into their own lesson plans (also 9 respondents). However, it is interesting to note that there was quite a variety in terms of responses given, indicating that RSOs tend to have quite individualised ways of combining the THINK! Resources. It may therefore be useful for the DfT to suggest different combinations of resources more explicitly to this target group.

6.5 Quality

This section of the report examines perceptions of quality relating to THINK! Education resources and factors that influence resource use. This is explored both in relation to the current resources and also suggested improvements.

Key Findings

- The three most important factors (in order of significance) influencing road safety resource choice for teachers were quality, recommendation by a road safety professional and the resources being cost free.
- The three most important factors for out-of-school group leaders were quality, that the resources were cost free and recommendation by a road safety professional.
- For RSOs, the three most important factors were quality, that the resources were cost free and knowing what organisation produced the resource.
- THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders, with the majority of users claiming them to be high quality (90%) or easy to use (89%).
- RSOs were most likely to give maximum marks for the resources being appropriate for the age group that they are aimed at and high quality but were less positive regarding how engaging the resources are.
- Among teachers and group leaders who were aware of the THINK! Education resources but had not used them, the factors most likely to encourage their use were: the provision of more off-line activities, promotional information on the benefits of using the materials and training on the materials included.
- Among RSOs who were aware of the THINK! Education resources but had not used them, the factor most likely to encourage their use was promotional information on the benefits of using THINK! Education resources.
In the quantitative survey, respondents were asked to rate the importance of a variety of factors when deciding which road safety resources to use. Figure 6.5A illustrates the results for school teachers and out-of-school group leaders.

**Figure 6.5A (Q15) How important are the following factors, in determining which road safety resources you use? Where 5 is ‘very important’ and 1 is ‘not at all important’**

Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used road safety resources (533)

- **The quality of the materials**: 84% rated this factor as important (4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5), with 11% rating it as very important (5). Only 1% rated it as not at all important (1).
- **The resources are recommended by a road safety professional**: 61% rated this factor as important (4 or 5), with 22% rating it as very important (5). 12% rated it as not at all important (1).
- **The resources are cost-free**: 53% rated this factor as important (4 or 5), with 24% rating it as very important (5). 17% rated it as not at all important (1).
- **That I don’t have to spend time sourcing / ordering them**: 28% rated this factor as important (4 or 5), with 26% rating it as very important (5). 28% rated it as not at all important (1).
- **That the school / group already uses them / has copies**: 18% rated this factor as important (4 or 5), with 21% rating it as very important (5). 31% rated it as not at all important (1).

The most important determining factor for which road safety resources respondents chose to use was quality – 96% of teachers and group leaders who had used road safety resources rated this factor four or five out of five in terms of importance. Recommendation was also seen to be a key factor, with over eight in ten (83%) rating it a four or a five, and cost was also of substantial importance to respondents (77% rated this four or five out of five). The ranking of these three factors may suggest a possibility that teachers and group leaders would pay for the resources, if they were deemed high quality and reputable enough; however, we know from Stage One and from other research undertaken in schools that free resources are always well appreciated, and this can make the demands on quality lower.

Convenience seemed to be less influential in determining which road safety resources were used. Just over half (54%) rated not having to spend time sourcing or ordering resources as four or five out of five, while less than four
in ten (38%) rated four or five out of five for the importance that the school or group already used the resource or had copies. This indicates that teachers and out-of-school group leaders are happy to use different resources to the ones they have previously used, if the quality is high enough.

Some differences could be seen in the priorities of teachers and out-of-school group leaders. Group leaders were significantly more likely to state that it was important that the resources were cost free (91% vs. 75% school teachers rated this 4 or 5 out of 5). School teachers were significantly more likely than group leaders to rate four or five out of five for importance that the school already used the resources / had copies (40% vs. 24 of group leaders) or that they did not have to spend time sourcing them (56% vs. 35%). Convenience is clearly a high priority for teachers – which has implications for the types of resources that they are likely to use, and also the way that they are made available.

RSOs were also asked to rate the importance of various factors, when considering their selection of road safety resource. Figure 6.5B illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.5B (Q16) How important are the following factors, in determining which road safety resources you use?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>5-Very important</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1-Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the materials</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resources are cost-free</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing what organisation has produced the resource</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the school/organisation I am working in already uses them / has copies</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I don’t have to spend time sourcing / ordering them</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important factor for RSOs when considering which road safety resources to use was that they were high quality (85% said that this was very
important). This was also the factor deemed most important by school teachers and group leaders.

Cost was another important factor in RSOs’ choice of road safety resources. Over half (54%) rated the fact that resources were cost-free five out of five in terms of importance. This was a similar result to that seen regarding school teachers (51% rated resources being cost-free five out of five in terms of importance), and was deemed of higher importance to out-of-school group leaders (74%).

Time was seen to be less of an issue for RSOs than for teachers. Four in ten (39%) rated four or five out of five for the option ‘that I don’t have to spend time sourcing/ordering them’, compared to 56% of school teachers (and 35% of out-of-school group leaders). This is possibly because their job is more focussed on road safety alone than either teachers or out-of-school groups.

The origin of resources was considered to be important by over three in five RSOs (63% rated this four or five). It may be that RSOs are using the origin of resources as a proxy for their quality. Given the high awareness and usage of the THINK! Education resources so far amongst this sample, this further supports evidence regarding the credibility gained through the brand provenance of these resources.

Respondents were then asked to rate the THINK! Education resources on a number of key attributes. Figure 6.5C illustrates how teachers and out-of-school group leaders rated the THINK! Education resources.

**Figure 6.5C (Q22) How would you rate the THINK! Education resources you have used against the following criteria – where 5 is the highest rating and 1 is the lowest rating**

**Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who have used THINK! Education resources (173)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for the children I teach</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets curriculum needs</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders. Around nine in ten felt that the resources were high quality (90%) or easy to use (89%). Over one third of those who had used the resources rated them 5 out of 5 for each of the attributes (from 35% for ‘meets curriculum needs’ to 46% for ‘high quality’). The area least likely to be rated 4 or 5 out of 5 was ‘appropriate for the children I teach’ – however, over eight in ten (82%) THINK! Education resource users still gave ratings 4 or 5 to the attribute.

Very few differences were seen in the ratings provided by school teachers and out-of-school group leaders, providing encouraging information that the resources are effectively meeting the differing needs of both groups. The main differences were the proportion that used the resources rating 4/5 out of 5 for them meeting curriculum needs (87% of school teachers compared to 65% of out-of-school group leaders) – this is likely due to the lack of a structured curriculum for out-of-school group leaders in comparison to teachers.

We asked RSOs a similar suite of questions, in order to assess their feelings on the resources which are currently available. Figure 6.5D illustrates RSOs’ feelings towards the quality of the resources.

Figure 6.5D (Q21) How would you rate those THINK! Education resources you have used against the following criteria
Base: All RSOs who have used any THINK! Education resources (68)

![Figure 6.5D](image-url)

The THINK! Education resources were generally well regarded by RSOs who had used them. Against each of the criteria we asked about, at least six out of ten rated them as either 4 or 5 out of 5.
RSOs were most likely to give maximum marks for the resources being appropriate for the age group that they are aimed at (40% rated it 5 out of 5) and high quality (38% rated it 5 out of 5). The least positive response came when they were asked to rate how engaging the resources are - only 26% rated this attribute 5 out of 5. As only less than one in five (18%) RSOs always have access to the internet during education sessions, it may be that some of the resources that could be deemed most engaging (e.g. online clips and games) are seldom used by RSOs and therefore not included in this rating. However, even on this measure, the balance of responses was certainly positive overall.

RSOs were asked to consider how they best thought the THINK! Education materials could be improved. The results are shown in Figure 6.5E below.

Figure 6.5E (Q31) How do you think the THINK Education resources that you have used could be improved?
Base: All RSOs who have used the THINK! Education website to aid their teaching of road safety (43) (Open question)

- More practical resources / printed materials / activity workbooks / stickers: 35%
- Needs to be kept updated / it's a bit outdated: 16%
- Make them easier to order / greater availability / better promoted: 16%
- The old Hedgehog resources were better: 14%
- They are a bit negative / depressing / frightening / needs a more positive message: 12%
- Make them clearer / simpler / give more explanation / colour code them: 9%
- More downloadable resources / interactive / smart board activities: 7%
- More games / fun activities / make them brighter / more colourful: 5%
- We have developed our own resources in line with the curriculum: 5%
- Make them more life like / practical / more real life information: 5%
- More variety: 2%
- None needed / they are excellent: 9%
- Others: 5%
increase the amount of practical resources that were available, which was mentioned by 35% of this small group.

There were also suggestions from some respondents that the resources needed to be better kept updated (16%), that they needed to be easier to order (16%) or that the old Hedgehog resources were better (14%). A further 12% thought that the current resources needed to be a bit more positive. These are interesting findings given the recent launch of the resources, and the online ordering process, which have aimed to bring the resources up to date and make them more relevant and easier to order. This highlights the extent to which familiarity with the resources may play a role on perceptions; it may be interesting to track these perceptions once the new resources have had time to bed down and become more familiar.

Those who were aware of but had chosen not to use the resources were asked what might encourage them to use them. The results for teachers and out-of-school group leaders are demonstrated in Figure 6.5F.

Figure 6.5F (Q24) Which of the following would encourage you to use the below THINK! Education resources?

Base: All teachers / out-of-school group leaders who are aware of but have not used any THINK! Education resources (103)
(Base amended during fieldwork from those who had not used any THINK! Education resources to those who were aware of but had not used specific resources) (Multiselect)

Overall, the provision of more off-line activities was seen to be the factor most likely to encourage teachers and group leaders who were aware of THINK!
*Education* resources but had not used them to do so (36%). Promotional information on the benefits of using the materials was also seen as an encouraging factor among three in ten (30%) of these respondents. This is therefore something to be considered in any future promotional activity.

Among the sample of school teachers, the most likely way to encourage them to use the resources was through communicating the benefits more clearly via promotional information (34%). This raises an important point to inform the DfT’s marketing strategy – promotional material should not just tell schools about the existence of the resources, but provide credible examples of the ways the *THINK! Education* resources could benefit them and their pupils. For example, this could be through the flexibility of the materials, their quality or their ease of use, all substantiated via research and testing.

Although the base for out-of-school group leaders is again too small to enable statistical comparisons, it is interesting to note a directional difference between the number of group leaders and school teachers who felt that off line activities would be an encouraging factor. Almost three quarters of the very small sample of group leaders selected this option, compared to around three in ten (28%) school teachers. This is in line with other findings in the research, as only one quarter (23%) of group leaders claimed to always have access to a computer during education sessions and just 13% of group leaders claimed to always have access to the internet during these sessions. However, given the large selection of off-line activities suggested in the out-of-school leaders booklet, this request may also be founded in the lack of information this audience had on the materials focussed at them. Promotional activity targeted specifically at this audience may therefore be beneficial to address issues of misperception.

Like teachers and out-of-school group leaders, RSOs were also asked how they could best be encouraged to use the resources. Figure 6.5G illustrates the findings.
Figure 6.5G (Q23) Which of the following would encourage you to use the below THINK! Education resources?

All RSOs who are aware of but have not used any THINK! Education resource (76) (Multiselect)

Again, there was no single factor which would convince RSOs who were aware of THINK! Education resources but had not used them, to start using them. The most popular response, given by one in three of these RSOs (33%) was that they wanted promotional information on what the benefits of using THINK! Education resources would be. This is similar to findings among teachers and out-of-school group leaders and suggests that the USPs of THINK! Education have not been as clearly communicated in the promotional material as they could have been, particularly within the competitive context of other road safety resources. However, as this research took place only shortly after the launch of a new stakeholder toolkit which would not yet have had time to become established; this resource may now have begun to help address this issue.

Around one in four RSOs also felt that each of the following changes would encourage them to start using these THINK! Education resources:

- Clearer links to the curriculum (26%)
- Training on the materials which are included (25%)
- Better support from the DfT in using the resources (25%)
- And including more off-line activities (22%)

These are all elements that could be considered by the DfT, particularly in relation to training and support.
6.6 Access to facilities and preferences for format

In order to inform any future activity to promote and evolve the THINK! Education resources, a secondary objective of the evaluation was to understand the level of access users had to technological facilities, as well as preferences for printing or downloading resources. These objectives are addressed within this final section.

Key Findings

- Around nine in ten teachers claimed to always have access to a computer during education sessions compared to just under one quarter of group leaders.
- Teachers were more likely than group leaders to regularly carry out activities that involved IT, such as using the internet as part of or to prepare for sessions.
- The proportion of group leaders and RSOs using the internet to prepare for sessions was higher than the amount using the internet during sessions likely due to their lack of access during sessions.
- Only around four in ten RSOs claimed to regularly use IT facilities as part of sessions.
- Black and white printing was seen to be more commonly used by teachers and out-of-school group leaders than colour printing, holding implications for the design of THINK! Education resources.

Teachers and out-of-school group leaders were asked about their habits in terms of resourcing the road safety sessions they lead. Figure 6.6A below illustrates the results.
Figure 6.6A (Q34) Which of the following do you think that you regularly do, as part of your role as a teacher/out-of-school group leader? (again, this is in relation to your work more generally, not just in relation to road safety)

Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders (548)

Teachers were more likely than group leaders to regularly carry out listed activities that involved IT, such as using the internet as part of sessions (86% vs. 12%), using the internet to prepare for sessions (91% vs. 82%) and using IT facilities as part of sessions (86% vs. 12%). This indicates the kind of facilities more readily available to teachers in schools compared to out-of-school group leaders.

The difference between school teachers and group leaders using the internet to prepare for or during education sessions was quite stark. While the proportion of teachers carrying out these internet-based activities was similar for both, the proportion of group leaders using the internet to prepare for sessions was far higher than the amount using the internet during sessions (82% vs. 12%) likely due to their lack of access during sessions. This would suggest that, should they be using THINK! Education resources, they are likely to visit the site to prepare for their session, then use the activity ideas without access to the internet in the sessions themselves. The current suite of activities aimed at out-of-school leaders has been designed to accommodate this usage.
A similar set of statements were provided to RSOs for comment. Figure 6.6.B below illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.6B (Q36) Which of the following do you think that you regularly do?**

**Base: All RSOs (90) (Multiselect)**

- Provide resources for children to take home: 71%
- Print out black and white worksheets/posters myself to use with a class/group: 57%
- Use the internet to prepare for sessions: 54%
- Print out colour worksheets/posters myself to use with a class/group: 40%
- Use IT facilities (e.g. an ICT suite) as part of sessions: 39%
- Use printed worksheets supplied by a third party with a class/group: 37%
- Use the internet as part of sessions: 13%
- None of these: 4%

Most RSOs regularly provided resources for children to take home as part of their road safety sessions (71%). The resources that they took to the lessons though, were more likely to be printed in black and white (57%) than colour (40%). This indicates a greater propensity to print in black and white than in colour.

Less than half (39%) said that they had regularly used IT facilities as part of sessions, and only around one in eight (13%) had used the internet as part of sessions. Again, this may well be representative of their respective availabilities to RSOs during sessions.

As with out-of-school group leaders, the internet was more commonly used by RSOs during the planning of sessions rather than the delivery, and this is likely to be to do with the level of access they had to the internet while delivering sessions.
In relation to how sessions are run and the types of support and resources teachers and out-of-school group leaders tended to use, Figure 6.6C provides some further insight.

**Figure 6.6C (Q33)** We are interested to know about your access to and use of general resources and equipment (i.e. not just in relation to road safety). Please let us know how often you are able to do the following:

*‘Within my classroom or out-of-school group…’*

Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders (548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can print in black and white whenever I need to</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to a computer during education sessions</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the internet during education sessions</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can print out however many copies I need</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can print in colour whenever I need to</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around nine in ten (91%) respondents claimed that they were always able to print in black and white whenever they needed to, within their classroom or group. This figure was significantly higher for school teachers – 93% of them claimed they were always able to do this, compared to three quarters (75%) of out-of-school group leaders.

Colour printing was the facility least likely to be always available to respondents. Just six in ten (59%) claimed that they could always do this, with out-of-school group leaders significantly more likely than school teachers to claim that they could never do this (12% vs. 2%). All printable materials such as worksheets should therefore continue to be designed with black-and-white printing in mind to ensure the resources are as easily accessible as possible. Other printable materials more reliant on colour, such as posters, may be perceived as less suitable for printing and should therefore be prioritised in terms of available-to-order print resources.
The option to print out however many copies were required was always available to six in ten respondents (60%), meaning that printable worksheets are probably well received amongst most. However, again group leaders were more likely to claim that this is never an option for them (12% vs. 1% school teachers). At Stage One, it was observed that group leaders would often have to find their own means of printing out resources, for example at work or at home, which is why this was more difficult for them. The current THINK! Education offer, by including a downloadable booklet with suggestions for easy-to-resource activities for out-of-school group leaders therefore appears to be in line with need for teachers and out-of-school group leaders.

A similar question was then asked of RSOs. Figure 6.6D below illustrates the results.

**Figure 6.6D (Q35) Please let us know how often you are able to do the following during road safety sessions in schools**

Base: All RSOs (90)

Most RSOs said that they always or sometimes had enough printed resources to be able to give out one copy per child (77%). However, it is worth noting that there were around one in five (20%) who did not have enough copies to be able to do this.
Mostly, the RSOs themselves provided the resources which were used in the road safety sessions. For 84% of RSOs, they had always or sometimes brought along resources that they had printed themselves, and 81% had always or sometimes brought along resources that they had ordered through the THINK! catalogue. It was uncommon for schools to help out RSOs by printing resources – only 13% said that this happened always or sometimes. This suggests, as interim findings at Stage One indicated, that there may be little coordination between RSOs and school teachers in relation to the activities and/or resources that are used for road safety sessions. We know that printing facilities in schools can be limited and so printing things out on behalf of a visiting RSO may require forward planning for many schools, that may not be taking place.

RSOs also generally could not rely on computer or internet access during education sessions. Though half said that computer access was sometimes available, only 18% said that this was always the case. Similarly, though one in three (34%) said that they sometimes had access to the internet, less than one in ten (7%) said that they always do. Given that RSOs were often only visiting each setting once, it is possible that they may not know what facilities are available to them before they visit unless they plan ahead. It may be worth, therefore, considering including tips about planning their visit within resources targeted at them.

Teachers and out-of-school leaders were then asked about their access to computers during education sessions. Access to computers was available to 84% of respondents, with very significant differences between teachers and out-of-school group leaders, as illustrated in Figure 6.6E below:
Figure 6.6E (Q33) How often do you have access to a computer during education sessions within your classroom or out-of-school group?
Base: All teachers and out-of-school group leaders (548)

Around nine in ten (91%) teachers claimed to always have this access compared to around one quarter (23%) of group leaders. This confirms qualitative findings around computer access during Stage One, and again supports the current balance of digital and non-digital activities targeted at schools and out-of-school groups.

A similar pattern could also be seen for the proportion of respondents who had access to the internet during education sessions. While eight in ten (81%) claimed to always have access in their classroom or out-of-school group, large differences could be seen in access figures between teachers and group leaders. Nine in ten (90%) teachers claimed to always have this access, while just 13% of group leaders claimed that this was the case. Moreover, seven in ten (70%) group leaders claimed that they never had access to the internet in their education sessions, compared to just 1% of teachers, holding clear implications for the types of resources that the two groups would be able to use. Again, the current format for THINK! Education resources for each of these groups appears to meet needs according to the level of computer and internet access they are likely to have.

We also asked Road Safety Officers about the kind of access to resources that they have when leading sessions in schools or early-years settings. This is illustrated in Figure 6.6F below.
Figure 6.6F (Q34) We are interested to know about your access to and use of general resources and equipment. Please let us know how often you are able to do the following within your organisation.
Base: All RSOs (90)

RSOs were almost always able to access computers and the internet within their organisation, but access to a range of printing options was sometimes more limited. This supports previous insights that, while many could not rely on computer and internet access while visiting schools and children’s centres, many would access the THINK! Education resources to plan their road safety sessions prior to their visit, even though they could not necessarily always print off what they needed. Given the limited access to printing provided by the schools also, this does indicate that relying on deliverers to be able to print resources off the website may limit the reach of THINK! Education resources.
In relation to preferences for print materials versus online downloads, it is possible to look at the comparison between PDF views and the equivalent online views over time. This is shown in Figure 6.6G.

**Figure 6.6G: Comparison of the timeline of paper copy requests and PDF page views between May 2009 and March 2011**

![Graph comparing paper requests and PDF views](image)


This clearly indicates that pdf views have been more popular overall than print requests. However, print requests have remained more stable over time, though peaks and troughs in requests made and pages viewed do correspond to each other and relative key dates such as school holidays and Road Safety Week 2010.

In relation to their ordering preferences, RSOs were specifically asked whether they would prefer to access resources online or via print, as this group make up the biggest audience for print requests based on volume of order. Figure 6.6H illustrates the results.
Figure 6.6H (Q33) The following materials are available to download or order in print format from the THINK! Education website. How would you prefer these resources to be made available?
Base: All (90)

Perhaps unsurprisingly, RSOs were most likely to want all of the THINK! Education print resources available both in print and online – this clearly offers the highest degree of flexibility of usage.

However, in general, they would prefer to see print resources offered as print-only to online-only. This corresponds to the fact that many cannot access the internet within sessions and cannot necessarily print off large amounts of materials to take with them. Resources available as print-only would therefore mean they were more likely to be able to use them in all sessions, provided enough copies could be ordered and received.
7. Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Approach to road safety

Road safety is a relevant topic taught throughout the academic year, according to the requirements of the curriculum or out-of-school association badges. In terms of areas for resource provision, the main road safety topic that teachers and out of school leaders thought was relevant – across all age groups – was crossing the road safely, with pedestrian safety seen as equally important for Key Stage One children and traffic recognition seen as the least relevant topic for all three stages. RSOs were more likely to give a more equal rating to all topics, suggesting that – as might be expected - they cover a broader range of aspects relating to road safety.

A variety of resources are used by teachers, out-of-school group leaders and RSOs to cover the topic, with RSOs playing a particularly important role in schools. A more systematic approach appears to be taken in school compared to out-of-school groups, but findings from Stage One suggest that this does not necessarily equate to a wholly coordinated approach to teaching road safety, and there may not necessarily be a clear whole-school approach to covering the topic.

Within schools, resources are often pooled and shared, while out-of-school group leaders take a more proactive, ad hoc approach to resourcing. This has implications for THINK! Education resources as teachers are arguably less likely to seek out new resources. The role of RSOs should therefore be maximised to help promote the THINK! Education resources and extend reach within schools as these individuals are considered as trusted advisors regarding road safety resources.

7.2 Awareness of THINK! Education resources

THINK! Education resources were well known among RSOs, and the strength of the THINK! campaign brand meant that it was the best-known road safety resource among out-of-school leaders.

However, while awareness levels were also encouraging among teachers, they were much lower than for other audiences. This audience has probably been affected by the volume of competing road safety materials marketed at them. This highlights the potential for awareness to be raised via a marketing strategy that pinpoints the benefits and key USPs of the resources. Stage One findings provided useful insights as to some of the key benefits that could be brought to teachers’ attention, such as flexibility, curriculum fit, ease
of use and quality of materials. However, Stage Two has also highlighted the importance of the role of RSOs in boosting awareness and uptake of resources, and it may therefore be valuable to target marketing activity specifically at this group, as well as channelling it through them, encouraging them to make active recommendations to teachers during school visits.

The Autumn term emerged as the most preferable time of year to market new resources, but given the relevance of road safety teaching throughout the academic year, a strategy should be developed that aims to maintain awareness throughout each term. Email notices and paper flyers could be a useful route to take, but it will be important that these are targeted at the correct people and sent to named contacts as far as possible. Head teachers and PSHE coordinators appear to be the most relevant contacts within schools. RSOs also present a key group to leverage in order to raise awareness within schools.

The THINK! campaign has proven very effective in raising awareness among out-of-school groups, but a targeted marketing campaign aimed at this audience would be important to ensure that the resources available within the THINK! Education campaign are clearly distinguished from those associated with the THINK! media campaign. Stage One highlighted this as a potential issue and, given the importance of the parent brand for directing website traffic at this second stage, recommendations around monitoring the distinction between the two campaigns hold true.

Stage Two of the research has also highlighted that internet searching is key to finding the DfT THINK! Education website among teachers and group leaders. It is therefore important that effective search engine optimisation is taken into account, to encourage use of the site and ensure it is returned in as many searches as possible.

7.3 Uptake of THINK! Education resources

From April 2009 until April 2011, the DfT THINK! Education website was visited over 190,000 times by over 150,000 unique visitors, with PDF files significantly more likely to be viewed than media files. Most of those in all three groups who had visited the site had used or ordered at least one of the available resources. This indicates a very positive conversion rate from visiting to using.

RSOs were responsible for the largest volume of print requests from the website, and those who had used THINK! Education resources were likely to have done so more than 15 times within the last year. Although RSOs are currently allowed to order higher numbers of resources than teachers or group leaders, lifting restrictions altogether on their resource orders would help to support their high demand. If cost implications mean that restrictions on resource orders cannot be lifted, clear, open communication with RSOs
about the restrictions should help to ensure that RSOs feel that their needs are being taken into consideration.

Teachers, group leaders and RSOs tended to use different types of THINK! Education resources, with teachers most likely to use online activities, while RSOs and group leaders were more likely to use printed resources. This is in line with expectations given the facilities available to these groups – and should be taken into account in resource design and marketing. As was seen in Stage One, respondents tended to use THINK! Education resources with whole classes/groups (which could be deemed as the most convenient way to use them in schools and groups). This emphasises the flexible, adaptable nature of the resources.

However, while many RSOs used the resources for a variety of reasons, the most popular single reason to use them was to improve their own knowledge. This suggests that there are still some communication issues to be addressed to encourage them to use the resources as part of their planning and delivery of road safety sessions. The new Stakeholder Toolkit for RSOs may go some way to address this issue, and as the resources become more embedded, RSOs’ confidence in using them in the classroom is likely to increase. This would be an interesting trend to observe in order to ensure the resources attain the highest reach possible.

As could be expected both from observing order volumes and from understanding the different remits of each audience group, teachers and group leaders had not used the THINK! Education resources as often as RSOs, within the last year. Among those who had, there was evidence of some repeated usage, with a quarter of teachers and group leaders using them twice in the last 12 months. The main reasons that teachers and group leaders had not used THINK! Education resources were logistical, relating to a lack of time or internet connection. It is therefore important that resource finding is made as fast and easy as possible for teachers, and also that resources are available that take into account the fact that some groups may not always have access to the internet during education sessions. Where these are already available (e.g. the facility to burn films to disk), this should be made as clear and easy-to-find as possible on the website.

7.4 Coordination and integration of THINK! Education resources

Coordination
A relatively high level of co-ordination appears to occur between teachers and road safety professionals, in terms of teachers’ awareness of content covered and integration of the visit into school planning. However, the level of coordination during the sessions appears less high, although this may be addressed as the Stakeholder Toolkit increases to be taken up. Uptake and effectiveness of this most recently launched element of the resources should be monitored in order to fully understand its role and effectiveness.
To facilitate greater levels of coordination during education sessions, the website sections for teachers and RSOs could include suggestions of ways to work with each other. For example, lesson plans could clearly indicate ways to include both teachers and RSOs in the session. Encouraging pre-visit meetings would also help to build coordination, as teachers would therefore be made more aware of what content would be covered and could plan to be more involved, rather than taking a more ‘reactive’ stance to the content delivered by the RSO by simply following this up in subsequent sessions. Building this level of support into the resources moving forward could help establish a stronger USP within the market.

It was found that out-of-school leaders rarely engaged external agents to help them deliver road safety education. The benefits of including these visits could therefore be made more explicit to this group, in order to encourage them to include visits from road safety professionals in the future. The DfT can also help RSOs to play a key role in this, by encouraging communication with out-of-school groups and suggesting these visits in marketing communications.

**Integration**

Use of the THINK! Education website is integrated into all stages of road safety education, including planning, improving knowledge and delivery. The THINK! Education resources were most commonly used in combination with respondents’ own resources, emphasising the resources’ versatility, which is also key to its appeal.

To encourage teachers, group leaders and RSOs to use THINK! Education resources in combination with each other, the DfT could include case studies and examples of ways that the resources can be combined and integrated on the website. It may also be useful to communicate directly with PSHE coordinators within schools, to emphasise the ‘completeness’ of the THINK! Education offer. By encouraging PSHE coordinators to become ambassadors for the resources within their school, we would hope that use of the resources would become more widespread and comprehensive among teachers – rather than the resources being used to ‘plug the gaps’ left by teachers’ own resources.

**7.5 Quality of THINK! Education resources**

THINK! Education resources were viewed very positively by teachers and group leaders, with the vast majority finding them high quality or easy to use. RSOs were most likely to give maximum marks for the resources being appropriate for the age group that they are aimed at and high quality. As quality was seen as the most important factor in the selection of road safety resources among all three groups, this should be kept in mind in considering any future development of the resources.
Convenience was seen to be a particularly important factor in teachers’ selection of road safety resources, so it is especially important that ease of use is emphasised in marketing messages with this group.

Likely due to the facilities that they have access to during education sessions, teachers and group leaders were more likely than RSOs to perceive the resources as engaging. To build upon RSOs perceptions, it is therefore important that interactive, off-line activities (which could be perceived as more engaging) are clearly signposted on the site. (For example, the ability to download films to disk). Innovative approaches should also be emphasised in correspondence and lesson plans for this group, providing them with off-line ways to make the THINK! Education resources as engaging as possible. For example, using music or role play in addition to more traditional posters and worksheets.

7.6 Access to facilities and preferences for format

The level of access respondents had to printing and computers varied according to audience. Teachers were more likely to have access to a computer and the internet during sessions than out-of-school leaders, suggesting the correct balance of digital versus paper resources aimed at these different audiences.

In general, a preference for printing in black and white was demonstrated by all audiences. This is unsurprising given the expense of printing in colour, but colour printing was also less available to respondents. All printable materials provided within the THINK! Education site should therefore continue to be designed with this in mind.

RSOs would normally bring all the resources they needed with them to sessions in schools and children’s centres, and claimed that they could not always rely on internet or computer access in sessions. Likewise, they were not always able to print copies of everything they needed for a visit. This is likely to affect the kind of activity they carry out with pupils in schools. One solution for this would be to encourage pre-visit meetings with teachers and RSOs. During these meetings, RSOs would be able to find out what technology would be available to them during the session and could also provide the teacher with advance information regarding any copies or printing that the school may be able to assist with.