



Ready or not:

How are schools responding to Artificial Intelligence?

Technical Appendix



Technical Appendix:

Ready or not: How are schools responding to Artificial Intelligence?

This technical appendix outlines ERO's approach to reviewing the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in New Zealand schools. It explains the questions we asked, who we engaged with, how we gathered information, and the methods we used to analyse, synthesise, and validate our findings.

This technical appendix sets out the methodology used for ERO's review of AI in schools. The full report, summary, and insights for primary and secondary schools are free for download from ERO's Evidence and Insights website: www.evidence.ero.govt.nz

This technical appendix is in four parts:

Part 1: Technical Notes – describes how we designed the project, the methods we used, and the sample we achieved.

Part 2: Data collection tools – provides the four survey tools we used for our surveys of school leaders, teachers, students, and parents and whānau.

Part 3: Regression models – details the regression models used in our report.

Part 4: Survey tables – these are in separate Excel workbooks and can be downloaded from ERO's Evidence and Insights website: www.evidence.ero.govt.nz.

Part 1: Technical Notes

Part 1 of the technical appendix includes detail on:

1. What we looked at
2. Who and how we asked
3. How we analysed
4. How we synthesised
5. How we checked
6. What the limitations are

1. What we looked at

a) Purpose of the review

Generative Artificial intelligence (AI) is becoming part of everyday school life for students, teachers, and leaders.

For this report, ERO wanted to understand what was happening in schools in terms of AI use, how these tools are being used by staff and students, the emerging impacts of these tools on teaching and learning, and what lessons we can learn from how schools are managing these impacts.

b) Review aims and questions

At the start of this project (Term 1, 2026), artificial intelligence was already being used in schools in New Zealand, but formal system level expectations were still emerging. To understand what this use looks like, we looked at six key questions:

1. How are teachers and leaders using AI?
2. How are teachers teaching and controlling how students use AI?
3. How are students using and learning about AI?
4. What are the challenges teachers and leaders face in using and regulating the use of AI?
5. What are the challenges students face when using AI?
6. What are the emerging impacts on teaching and learning?

c) Tool development

Our fieldwork tools, including interview guides and surveys were informed by:

- Ministry of Education and New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) guidelines for AI use in schools
- A review of local and international research highlighting the ways AI is being used in schools

Further questions were designed and tested by the ERO team to ensure internal consistency and clarity. Our survey tools were piloted with target participant groups and key informants, including our Youth Advisory Group comprising of secondary students.

2. Who and how we asked

To evaluate the use of AI in New Zealand schools within a wider context we applied a mixed-methods approach, drawing on evidence from different sources:

- a) New Zealand and international literature on the use of AI in schools
- b) Surveys of leaders, teachers, students, and parents and whānau
- c) Interviews and focus groups with leaders, teachers, students, parents and whānau, and key informants/experts.

a) New Zealand and international literature

AI is increasingly being used in education systems around the world, with governments and schools responding in different ways. We undertook a review of local and international literature to provide broader context around policy and practice. We examined three complementary areas. First was New Zealand's central guidance, including from the Ministry of Education and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). We also considered educational frameworks developed by sector organisations to support effective AI use in schools. Finally, we examined national and state-level departments in comparable international jurisdictions, including Australia, the UK, and Singapore. Together, these sources provided context for understanding the different approaches schools are taking, identifying common features of more deliberate and strategic management of AI, and considering where New Zealand sits within the wider global landscape.

A full list of references is found at the end of the main report.

b) Surveys

We designed and administered four online surveys for the following respondent groups:

- School leaders
- Teachers
- Students
- Parents and whānau

The surveys for teachers and leaders were similar except for some questions specifically tailored to their roles. The surveys for students and parents and whānau were also similar in design, with some tailored wording and additional questions specific to their experiences. Full surveys can be found in Part 2.

Survey sample design and data collection

The scope of our school survey was all English-medium state- or state-integrated schools in New Zealand. We used a census sampling approach where we emailed the survey links to all schools within scope for the project. We used the school office or principal email address and asked for the principal to pass on the surveys to all teachers, and to parents and whānau of children in Year 5-13. For students, we adopted a clustered sampling approach where schools were asked to forward the student survey to any two classes in Year 5-13 and for their teacher to set aside time in class (10 mins). Survey responses were collected online in Term 1 2026, from February to March. With this approach, we ended up with a convenience sample of those schools who chose to respond to the survey.

Before completing surveys, participants were also provided with information on the project, including how their responses would be used. Participants consented to the survey by continuing onto the questionnaire.

Survey sample characteristics

An overview of our achieved samples¹ are outlined below:

Table 1: Overview of achieved sample

Survey respondents	Achieved sample	Number of schools represented
Leaders	472	389
Teachers	859	237
Students	1587	105
Parents and whānau	889	134

School leaders

We received survey responses from 472 leaders from a total of 389 unique schools (300 Primary and Intermediate and 89 Secondary and Composite schools). The key characteristics of the leaders who responded to our survey are outlined below:

¹ Percentage breakdowns may not appear to sum to 100 percent due to rounding (to zero decimal places).

Table 2: Characteristics² of leaders who responded

School characteristics	Number	Percentage of sample ³
School type		
Primary & Intermediate	353	75%
Secondary	114	24%
Unknown	5	1%
Total	472	100%
Urban/Rural		
Urban	372	79%
Rural	95	20%
Unknown	5	1%
Total	472	100%
School size		
Large	206	44%
Medium	152	32%
Small	109	23%
Unknown	5	1%
Total	472	100%
Socioeconomic status (Equity Index)		
High socioeconomic (Fewer barriers)	158	34%
Middle socioeconomic (Moderate barriers)	213	45%
Low socioeconomic (More barriers)	96	20%
Unknown	5	1%
Total	472	100%

Note: The average number of responses per school was 1.2. No individual school contributed more than 1% of the total responses.

Teachers

We received survey responses from 859 teachers from a total of 237 unique schools (142 Primary and Intermediate and 95 Secondary and Composite schools).

Table 3: Characteristics of teachers who responded

² School characteristics are not available when a valid school name was not provided.

³ Percentages rounded to the closest whole number, therefore the listed numbers do not always add up to 100.

School characteristics	Number	Percent of sample
School type		
Primary & Intermediate	417	49%
Secondary	441	51%
Unknown	1	0%
Total	859	100%
Urban/Rural		
Urban	771	90%
Rural	87	10%
Unknown	1	0%
Total	859	100%
School size		
Large	499	58%
Medium	221	26%
Small	138	16%
Unknown	1	0%
Total	859	100%
Socioeconomic status (Equity Index)		
High socioeconomic (Fewer barriers)	330	38%
Middle socioeconomic (Moderate barriers)	424	49%
Low socioeconomic (More barriers)	104	12%
Unknown	1	0%
Total	859	100%

Note: The average number of responses per school was 3.6. One school (Secondary) contributed 39 responses (5% of the total sample).

Students

We received survey responses from 1587 students in 105 unique schools (75 Primary and Intermediate schools and 30 Secondary and Composite schools).

Table 4: Characteristics of students who responded

School characteristics	Number	Percent of sample
School type		
Primary & Intermediate	1004	63%
Secondary	561	35%

School characteristics	Number	Percent of sample
Unknown	22	1%
Total	1587	100%
Urban/Rural		
Urban	1512	95%
Rural	53	3%
Unknown	22	1%
Total	1587	100%
School size		
Large	1043	66%
Medium	268	17%
Small	254	16%
Unknown	22	1%
Total	1587	100%
Socioeconomic status (Equity Index)		
High socioeconomic (Fewer barriers)	837	53%
Middle socioeconomic (Moderate barriers)	548	35%
Low socioeconomic (More barriers)	180	11%
Unknown	22	0%
Total	1587	100%
Individual characteristics	Number	Percent of sample
Ethnicity⁴		
New Zealand European/Pākehā	850	54%
Asian	365	23%
Māori	272	17%
Pacific	128	8%
MELAA	88	6%
Gender		
Male	664	42%
Female	840	53%
Other gender or prefer not to say	83	5%

⁴ Respondents could select multiple ethnicities (or choose not to respond), so the total does not add to 100%.

Note: The mean number of responses per school was 15. However, response counts were unevenly distributed across participating schools, with 50% of all student responses originating from 14% of unique schools. The largest contributing schools provided 99 (6%), 85 (5%), and 59 (4%) responses respectively. This uneven distribution should be considered when assessing the representativeness of the sample and interpreting aggregate results

Parents and whānau

We received survey responses from 889 parents and whānau from 134 unique schools (86 Primary and Intermediate schools and 48 Secondary and Composite schools).

Table 5: Characteristics of parents and whānau who responded

School characteristics	Number	Percent of sample
School type		
Primary/Intermediate	400	45%
Secondary	489	55%
Total	889	100%
Area		
Urban	800	90%
Rural	89	10%
Total	889	100%
School size		
Large	575	65%
Medium	236	27%
Small	78	9%
Total	889	100%
Socioeconomic status (Equity Index)		
High socioeconomic (Fewer barriers)	547	51%
Middle socioeconomic (Moderate barriers)	329	37%
Low socioeconomic (More barriers)	103	12%
Total	889	100%
Individual characteristics (parents/whānau)	Number	Percent of sample
Ethnicity⁵		
New Zealand European/Pākehā	523	59%
Asian	170	19%
Māori	93	11%

⁵ Respondents could select multiple ethnicities (or choose not to respond), so the total does not add to 100%.

Pacific	61	7%
MELAA	25	3%
Gender		
Male	215	24%
Female	648	73%
Other gender or prefer not to say	26	3%

Note: The mean number of responses per school was 6.6. However, response counts were unevenly distributed across participating schools, with 55% of all parent and whānau responses originating from 5% of unique schools. The largest contributing schools provided 195 (22%), 84 (9%) and 61 (7%) responses respectively. This uneven distribution should be considered when assessing the representativeness of the sample and interpreting aggregate results

c) Interviews and Focus Groups

We undertook visits to case study schools to gather qualitative data on AI use in schools. Across 8 in-person case study school visits, we spoke to 24 school leaders, 33 teachers, and 64 students. In addition to this, we spoke to 8 parents and whānau across 2 online focus groups.

All interviews were conducted by two trained researchers. They were semi-structured interviews that typically lasted 45–60 minutes. Researchers made notes during the interviews, which were also recorded and transcribed for the purpose of analysis.

We also spoke to key informants to gain an understanding of the education sector use and experience of AI in schools.

Ethics

Informed consent

All participants were informed of the purpose of the evaluation before they agreed to participate in an interview. Participants were informed that:

- participation was voluntary
- their words may be included in reporting, but no identifying details would be shared
- interviews were not an evaluation of their school, and their school or provider would not be identified in the resulting national report
- their information was confidential and would be kept securely subject to the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982, Privacy Act 2020, and the Public Records Act 2005 on the release and retention of information.

Before interviewing, teachers, school leaders, students, and parents and whānau were sent a consent form with an information sheet on the project, and how their data will be used. Participants either signed their consent forms and sent them back prior to the interviews or signed a consent form at the start of their interview.

In interviews, all participants confirmed that they consented to being recorded and were reminded how their information may be used in the review.

Data storage

All data collected through interviews, surveys, and administrative sources will be stored digitally for two years following the full completion of the review. During this time, all data is password-protected, and access will be restricted to the project team.

3. How we analysed

This section details how we approached the analysis of our data, including

- a) Quantitative data analysis
- b) Qualitative data analysis

a) Quantitative data analysis

Before analysis, survey data was collected via the SurveyMonkey API and processed and cleaned in R. Analysis was conducted in R.

Our approach to analysis involved three key stages:

- Descriptive statistics to report on the distribution of survey responses.
- Inferential statistics to test for group differences.
- Regression analysis to examine key drivers of main outcomes of interest.

Descriptive statistics

We generated descriptive statistics to understand the views of school leaders, teachers, students, and parents and whānau. Throughout the report, we report the descriptive analysis results as follows.

Missing data across all surveys were excluded from the analysis. In some survey questions, we have a “don’t know” option to allow participants to indicate uncertainty. These responses were included in descriptive summaries and presented in graphs where relevant and meaningful. Survey responses were reported either using the original response option or grouped together as categories with the same sentiment (e.g. Very good and good) for ease of interpretation.

Numbers and percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number, except where rounding errors lead to incorrect totals (for example in graphs). In these instances, the numbers are rounded to minimise rounding error.

All descriptive results presented in the report are unweighted.

Definitions used in the report are based on categories from the Ministry of Education school directory:

School type

- Primary schools include contributing, full primary, and intermediate schools
- Secondary schools include all secondary and composite schools

Rurality

- Urban schools include large urban area, major urban area, medium urban area, and small urban area
- Rural schools include rural settlement and rural other

Socioeconomic level

- Schools in high socioeconomic communities are the schools with fewer barriers (EQI)
- Schools in moderate socioeconomic communities are the schools with moderate barriers (EQI)
- Schools in low socioeconomic communities are the schools with more barriers (EQI)

School size

- Very small + small (Primary: 1-100 students, Secondary: 1-400 students)
- Medium (Primary: 101-300 students, Secondary: 401-800)
- Large + Very large (Primary: 301+ students, Secondary: 801+ students)

Inferential statistics

To explore group differences and associations, inferential statistical tests were used. We used Chi-squared tests as our data was mainly categorical. We explored differences between both school-level characteristics (such as Equity Index group, school size, rural-urban, and school type - primary or secondary) and person-level characteristics (such as ethnicity and gender) with key outcome variables. All statistical tests were two-tailed, and results were considered statistically significant where $p \leq 0.01$. Only statistically significant differences are reported.

Regression analysis

To understand the relationships between AI use and key outcomes of interest we conducted logistic regression analyses. The regression models included factors that were identified in the design stage as theoretically relevant to the outcome, or that stood out as worthy of further investigation during qualitative data gathering or key informant interviews. These included variables that would likely influence our outcomes, as well as individual or school characteristics which we needed to account for to more accurately measure the influence of the key factors we were interested in.

For outcome variables, responses of “Don’t know” were categorised together with the ‘other’ outcome (with “No” if the outcome of interest was “Yes”). Outcome variables were always dichotomised as either “outcome occurring” or “outcome not occurring”. We recoded predictor (independent) variables into binary (i.e. yes/no, positive/negative responses) or broader categories to make the regression models more stable and the results easier to interpret. For most predictor variables, the “Not sure” responses were grouped with the lower end of the scale (i.e. “A little and a lot” vs “Not at all, very little, and not sure”). Results are reported as odds ratios, with significance levels indicated as: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$. All the outputs were rounded to two decimal places. Missing data for variables in the model was deleted without imputation, and the included number of observations in each final model is included in the regression tables in Part 3.

To control for school level context, we included the following variables derived from school level administrative data in all models:

- School type (primary/secondary)
- Rural/urban school
- Socioeconomic level (EQI groups)
- School size (small/medium/large)

Student regression models also include individual characteristics such as ethnicity and gender.

Regression models to explain relationships between AI use and effects on teaching:

Model 1

For changes in teacher's role, we conducted separate regression models on primary and secondary teachers to reflect the potentially different pattern of AI use and perceived impact for teachers in different school settings.

Outcome variable:

- Teachers responding that use of AI has made their job easier

Predictor variables (in addition to school-level demographic variables):

- How many years have you been teaching?
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Designing assessments
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Tailored teaching resources
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Admin
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Lesson planning
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Marking and feedback
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - Reporting to parents
- To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes? - In the classroom with students

Model 2

Increased time spent on ensuring authenticity was reported almost exclusively by teachers in secondary schools and therefore the regression was performed only on secondary teachers.

Outcome variable:

- Teachers responding that using AI has increased time spent on ensuring authenticity of student work due to AI use

Predictor variables (in addition to school-level demographic variables):

- How many years have you been teaching?
- How often do you come across students using AI inappropriately for schoolwork?

Regression models to explain impact of AI use on learning:

For impacts of AI on learning, we considered impacts reported by both students (3 a-c) and teachers (4 a-c, 5 a-c).

Models 3 a-c)

For impacts reported by students themselves, we only report results from secondary school students due to variable quality of responses from younger students.

Outcome variable:

Students responding that using AI has:

- 3 a) Increased and decreased student's critical thinking
- 3 b) Increased and decreased students' independent learning
- 3 c) Increased and decreased creative thinking

Predictor variables (in addition to school-level demographic variables):

- Ethnicity: Māori
- Ethnicity: Pacific Peoples
- Gender
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Writing essays
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Checking work
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Generating ideas
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Creating music or images
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Solving problems
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Understanding something in a way that works for you
- How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning? - Summarising documents

Models 4 a-c), 5 a-c)

For models exploring teachers' reports, we completed separate analysis for primary (4 a-c) and secondary (5 a-c) school teachers.

Outcome variable:

Teachers responding that using AI has:

- 4,5 a) Increased and decreased student's critical thinking
- 4,5 b) Increased and decreased students' independent learning
- 4,5 c) Increased and decreased students' creative thinking

Predictor variables (in addition to school-level demographic variables):

- How many years have you been teaching?
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Self-checking work
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Idea generation
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Creating music/images
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Problem solving
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Writing support
- Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent? - Increasing accessibility

b) Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data in our review were collected through:

- interviews with school leaders, teachers, students, and parents and whānau
- interviews with key informants
- free-text responses in our surveys, with the aim of collecting more detailed data on some issues, and to provide opportunities for participants to tell us things we might not know to ask about.

Case study schools were selected to include demographic spread across a range of characteristics, such as school type, size, region, and EQI. We intentionally selected schools that were in different stages of their AI journey (i.e. some schools had developed detailed AI policies with approaches for managing teaching, learning and assessment, while others were just at the beginning that process).

Qualitative data was analysed using a deductive approach, with a structured collation that allowed us to explore key themes while remaining closely aligned with our core research questions. This also allowed us to make meaningful comparisons across respondent groups.

We completed site visits at eight case study schools across the country and with different approaches to managing AI. This ensured we captured a diverse range of views from our focus groups with leaders, teachers, and students. To organise focus groups with parents and whānau, we sought expressions of interests through our surveys and then contacted those who indicated that they would like to participate.

4. How we synthesised

We used both quantitative and qualitative data to build a fuller picture of the themes we were exploring. The survey gave us breadth, showing how common certain experiences or views were across groups. The interviews and focus groups gave us depth, helping us understand the reasons behind those patterns and bringing people's voices into the findings.

We used a process of synthesis to bring these data sources together. Survey patterns were explored through interview notes and recordings to understand the underlying reasons. We also used regression analysis to identify predictive relationships in the survey data and then explored these in the qualitative data to assess how they played out in real-life contexts.

All quotes used in the report come from interviews, focus groups, or free-text survey responses, and were selected to illustrate key themes.

5. How we checked

The data in this report was subjected to a rigorous internal review and quality assurance process for both quantitative and qualitative data, and was carried out at multiple stages throughout the review process.

The research team discussed emerging themes and findings throughout the analysis and sense-making process. This ensured consistency and rigor and allowed for the triangulation of data and results, and enabled us to pick up on any gaps that warranted further investigation.

We then tested and refined the findings and recommendations with the Ministry of Education, representatives from the sector, and academic subject matter experts to ensure they were useful and practical.

6. What the limitations are

As with all research, there are some limitations to our methodology and scope.

In terms of scope, this research:

- Does not include data related to students in Year 0 – 4. This also extends to parents and whānau; we only sampled parents and whānau of children in Year 5-13.
- Does not report on individual AI tools or commercial products.

In terms of the data collection:

- Survey samples are broadly representative of the national characteristics for schools, with the leader sample corresponding most closely to the overall school population characteristics with 1.2 responses per school. Where some groups are proportionally underrepresented, sample sizes were mainly sufficient for robust between group comparisons. For student and parents and whānau surveys, we note that some schools are overrepresented in the sample and account for a large number of survey responses.

-
- School surveys: we sent the survey to all schools in scope to ensure maximum reach, and held the survey open for 3 weeks, with reminders to boost numbers. While we met our statistical minimums, we fell short of our ideal targets for response numbers.
 - Interviews: Since participation in our interviews was voluntary, we relied on schools having time to engage with our research team which may have resulted in some biases in our sample. To mitigate this, the research team offered a flexible approach to interviewing, enabling schools to participate when it was most suitable to their schedule.
 - Interviews: It is also possible participants provided socially desirable responses, or responses that reflected compliance expectations in the interviews. We mitigated this risk by ensuring that all data would be treated confidentially, not shared with ERO's school reviewers, and that no identifiable information would be disclosed in reporting.
 - Interview samples: The number of interview participants means that not all differences identified in survey data (for example between different school contexts) were able to be explored through our qualitative analysis. To mitigate this, where possible, we identified free-text survey responses that related to relevant findings. Where we could not identify patterns in our qualitative interview or free-text survey data, we did not provide detailed explanations for why the differences may have existed.

Part 2: Data collection tools

Part 2 presents the following surveys used for our review:

- a. Leader survey
- b. Teacher survey
- c. Students survey
- d. Parents and whānau survey

a) AI in schools – Leader survey

1. What region is the school you work at in? (Please tick one)

- Bay of Plenty, Waairiki
- Canterbury, Chatham Islands
- Hawke's Bay, Tairāwhiti
- Nelson, Marlborough, West Coast
- Otago, Southland
- Tai Tokerau
- Taranaki, Whanganui, Manawatū
- Auckland
- Waikato
- Wellington

2. What's your leadership role?

- Principal
- Deputy / assistant principal

3. Do you use AI in your work?

- Yes
- No

4. Why don't you use AI in your work?

5. To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent	Don't know
Drafting and refining communications					
Monitoring student achievement					
Monitoring attendance					
Monitoring teaching and learning					
Whole-school curriculum planning					
Timetabling					
Scheduling meetings					
Summarising information					
Generating school policies and guidance					
Creating learning resources					
Budgeting					

6. To what extent do you experience barriers to using AI tools?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent
Poor access to AI tools				
Don't know enough to use AI tools properly				

Not enough clear guidance				
AI tools cannot always do what I need				
AI tools not trustworthy/reliable enough				
Policy says staff are not allowed to use AI				

7. How useful is the Ministry of Education guidance on AI?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not at all useful
- I know this guidance exists but I have not looked at it
- I was not aware this guidance exists

8. [Secondary only] How useful is the NZQA guidance on AI use for assessments?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not at all useful
- I know this guidance exists but I have not looked at it
- I was not aware this guidance exists

9. Do teachers at your school use AI for their work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

10. If no, why don't your teachers use AI in their work?

11. To what extent do your teachers use AI for these purposes?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent	Don't know
Designing assessment					
Tailored teaching resources					
Admin					
Lesson planning					
Marking and feedback					
Reporting to parents					
In the classroom with students					

12. Does your school have the following policy (clear rules)?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Don't know
Policy for teacher use of AI for teaching				
Policy for teacher use of AI for non-teaching tasks				
Policy for teacher use of AI for assessment				
Policy for data privacy and security				

13. Does your school have the following guidance (support for how to use)?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Don't know
Guidance for teacher use of AI for teaching				
Guidance for teacher use of AI for non-teaching tasks				
Guidance for teacher use of AI for assessment				
Guidance for data privacy and security				

14. How useful is your school's current policy and/or guidance around teacher use of AI?

	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not at all useful	Don't know	Not applicable

Policy					
Guidance					

15. Please tell us why you chose this answer:

16. Do students in your school use AI for school work?

- Yes
- No

17. Does your school have rules for student use of AI?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Don't know
Rules for learning				
Rules for assessments/tests				
Individual teachers develop rules				

18. Does your school have guidance for student use of AI?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Don't know
Guidance for learning				
Guidance for assessments/tests				
Individual teachers develop guidance				

19. Does your school have any processes for follow-up with students who misuse AI for schoolwork? (Select all that apply)

- Conversation with student
- Student must re-do work
- Formal warning
- Parent/whānau contacted
- No established consequences
- Assessment marked not achieved (secondary only)
- Don't know
- Other

20. [Primary only] How confident are you that students are using AI appropriately for assessments and tests?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not at all confident
- Don't know
- Not applicable

21. [Secondary only] How confident are you that students are using AI appropriately?

	Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not at all confident	Don't know	Not applicable
For internal assessments					
For external assessments					

22. Is your school explicitly teaching students about AI?

- Yes
- No

23. How much is your school teaching students how to use AI appropriately for schoolwork at each year level?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not applicable
Year 5-6				
Year 7-8				
Year 9-10				
Year 11+				

24. How much are students being taught about AI use in the following ways?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Don't know
As part of the school formal curriculum				
Within individual subjects				
Through an explicit AI literacy programme				
Through instructions about school policies or values				
Through instructions about student assessment requirements				
Informally during classroom activities				

25. How much do you think AI use is impacting the following aspects of teaching at your school?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Don't know
The teacher role				
Teachers' workload/time use				
Making it easier for teachers to do their job				
Teachers' motivation or enjoyment of teaching				

26. Is there anything else about AI at school that you want to share with us?

b) AI in schools – Teacher survey

1. How many years have you been teaching?

- 0-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years

2. Did you receive your teaching qualification overseas?

- Yes
- No

3. How long have you been teaching in New Zealand?

- 0-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years

4. What region is the school you work at in?

- Bay of Plenty, Waairiki
- Canterbury, Chatham Islands
- Hawke's Bay, Tairāwhiti
- Nelson, Marlborough, West Coast
- Otago, Southland
- Tai Tokerau
- Taranaki, Whanganui, Manawatū
- Auckland
- Waikato
- Wellington

5. What year level(s) are you teaching this year? (Select all that apply)

- Year 0
- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3
- Year 4
- Year 5
- Year 6
- Year 7
- Year 8
- Year 9
- Year 10
- Year 11
- Year 12
- Year 13

6. Which learning area(s) do you teach? (Select all that apply)

- The Arts
- English
- Health and physical education
- Learning languages
- Mathematics and statistics
- Science
- Social sciences
- Technology
- Te Reo Māori

7. Do you use AI in your work?

- Yes
- No

8. Why don't you use AI in your work?

9. How confident are you with using AI in your work?

- Not at all confident
- Not very confident
- Quite confident
- Very confident
- Not sure

10. To what extent do you use AI in your work for these purposes?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent	Not sure
Designing assessments					
Tailored teaching resources					
Admin					
Lesson planning					
Marking and feedback					
Reporting to parents					
In the classroom with students					

11. In which subjects or learning areas are you using AI and to what extent?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent	I do not teach this subject	Not sure
The Arts						
English						

Health and physical education						
Learning languages						
Mathematics and statistics						
Science						
Social sciences						
Technology						
Te Reo Māori						

12. Does your school have policy (clear rules) for teachers' use of AI?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Not sure
Teaching				
Non-teaching tasks				
Assessment				

13. Does your school have guidance (support for how to use) for teachers' use of AI?

	Yes	We are developing this	No	Not sure
Teaching				
Non-teaching tasks				
Assessment				

14. How useful is your school's policy and/or guidance around teachers' use of AI?

	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not at all useful	Not sure	Not applicable
Policy					
Guidance					

15. Please tell us why you chose this answer.

16. How much do you think that use of AI is changing the role of the teacher?

- Not at all
- A little
- A lot

17. Please tell us why you chose this answer?

18. Has using AI impacted how easy or hard you find your job?

- Easier
- Harder
- No change
- Not sure

19. How has using AI impacted your motivation to teach?

- Increased
- No change
- Decreased
- Not sure

20. Has using AI increased or decreased the time you spend on the following activities?

	Increased	No change	Decreased	I do not use AI for this purpose
Designing assessment				
Tailored teaching resources				
Admin				
Lesson planning				

Marking and feedback				
Reporting to parents				
Ensuring authenticity of student work (due to use of AI)				

21. Are there other ways in which AI increases or decreases your workload?

22. To what extent do you experience barriers to using AI tools?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent
Poor access to AI tools				
Don't know enough to use AI tools properly				
Concern about how to use AI tools well				
Not enough clear guidance				
AI tools not trustworthy/reliable enough				
Other				

23. Do your students use AI in the following ways, and if so, to what extent?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent	Not sure
Self-checking work					
Idea generation					
Spelling and grammar					
Creating music/images					
Problem solving					
Writing support					
Increasing accessibility					
For assessments					

24. To what extent are you teaching students explicitly about AI?

- Not at all
- Very little
- Somewhat
- Great extent

25. To what extent are you teaching students how to use AI appropriately for schoolwork?

- Not at all
- Very little
- Somewhat
- Great extent

26. To what extent do you teach your students about AI use in the following ways?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Great extent
Curriculum area				
School AI literacy programme				
School values and policies				
Assessment requirements				
Informally during activities				
Other				

27. How useful are your school's rules for students using AI for schoolwork?

	Don't have rules	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not at all useful	Not sure
For learning					
For assessments/tests					

28. How frequently do you come across students misusing AI for schoolwork?

- Very frequently

- Frequently
- Somewhat frequently
- Not at all

29. How useful have you found the Ministry of Education guidance on AI use in schools?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not at all useful
- I know it exists but have not looked at it
- I was not aware it exists

30. [Primary only] How confident are you that students are using AI appropriately for assessments and tests?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not at all confident
- Not sure

31. [Secondary only] How useful have you found NZQA guidance on AI use for assessments?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not at all useful
- I know it exists but have not looked at it
- I was not aware it exists
- Not applicable

32. [Secondary only] How confident are you that students are using AI appropriately?

	Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not at all confident	Not sure
Internal assessments				
External assessments				

33. Overall, what impact do you think AI is having on students'

	Very negative impact	Somewhat negative impact	No impact	Somewhat positive impact	Very positive impact	Not sure
Creative thinking						
Personalised learning						
Critical thinking skills						
Motivation						
Progress						
Attendance						

34. Is there anything else about AI at school that you want to share with us?

c) AI in schools – Student survey

1. What region is your school in? (Please tick one)

- Bay of Plenty, Waikato
- Canterbury, Chatham Islands
- Hawke's Bay, Tairāwhiti
- Nelson, Marlborough, West Coast
- Otago, Southland
- Tai Tokerau
- Taranaki, Whanganui, Manawatu
- Auckland

- Waikato
- Wellington

2. What gender do you identify as?

- Female
- Male
- Another gender
- I'd prefer not to say

3. What ethnicity do you identify as? (Select all that apply)

- New Zealand European/Pākehā
- Māori
- Pacific Peoples
- Chinese
- Indian
- Other Asian
- Other European
- Middle Eastern
- Latin American
- African
- Southeast Asian
- I'd prefer not to say
- Other ethnicity (please specify)

4. Do you identify as disabled?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- I'd prefer not to say

5. Do you identify as neurodiverse?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
- I'd prefer not to say

6. Is English the language you use most at home?

- Yes
- No

7. What year-level are you in at school?

- Year 5
- Year 6
- Year 7
- Year 8
- Year 9
- Year 10
- Year 11
- Year 12
- Year 13

8. Would it be useful to learn how to use AI for schoolwork?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

9. How confident are you with using AI properly for schoolwork?

	Not at all confident	Not very confident	Quite confident	Very confident	Not sure
--	-------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------

Learning					
Assessments or tests					

10. Where are you learning about how to use AI?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not sure
At school				
At home (from parents/siblings/whānau)				
From my friends				
Teaching myself				

11. Do you like using AI for schoolwork?

- Don't like it
- Like it a little
- Like it a lot
- Not sure

12. Please tell us why you like using AI for schoolwork

13. Please tell us what makes using AI difficult for you?

14. How much are you using AI for schoolwork in the following subject areas?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not sure	I don't take this subject
English					
The Arts					
Health and PE					
Languages					
Maths					
Science					
Social Sciences					
Technology					
Te Reo Māori					

15. How much are you using AI in the following ways for learning?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not sure
Writing essays				
Checking work				
Generating ideas				
Help with spelling and grammar				
Creating music or images				
Solving problems				
Language support				
Understanding something in a way that works for you				
Finding information				
Summarising documents				
Organising a study or homework schedule				

16. How much are you using AI in the following ways for assessments or tests?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not sure
Writing essays				
Checking work (e.g. marking practice tests)				
Generating ideas				

Help with spelling and grammar				
Solving problems				
Language support				
Understanding something in a way that works for you				
Finding information				
Summarising documents				

17. Does your school have rules or guidance about how you can or can't use AI?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

18. How useful are your school's rules or guidance for student AI use for schoolwork?

	Not useful	A little useful	Very useful	Not sure
Learning				
Assessments and tests				

19. Have you ever used AI in ways you knew you shouldn't for schoolwork?

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Not sure
Learning				
Assessments or tests				

20. Have you ever been caught by a teacher using AI in ways you knew you shouldn't?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Not sure

21. How likely do you think it is that a student would get caught misusing AI at your school?

- Not likely
- Quite likely
- Very likely
- Not sure

22. Overall, do you think AI is changing your learning and how you feel about school?

	Making it worse	No change	Making it better	Not sure
Creative thinking				
Independent learning				
Learning in a group				
Critical thinking				
Writing skills				
Motivation to do schoolwork				
Attention to detail				
Progress in schoolwork				
Attendance at school				

23. Is there anything else about AI at school that you want to share with us?

d) AI in schools – Parent and Whānau survey

1. What region is your child's school in? (Please tick one)

- Bay of Plenty, Waikato
- Canterbury, Chatham Islands

- Hawke's Bay, Tairāwhiti
- Nelson, Marlborough, West Coast
- Otago, Southland
- Tai Tokerau
- Taranaki, Whanganui, Manawatū
- Auckland
- Waikato
- Wellington

2. What gender do you identify as?

- Female
- Male
- Another gender
- I'd prefer not to say

3. What ethnicity do you identify as? (Select all that apply)

- New Zealand European/Pākehā
- Māori
- Pacific Peoples
- Chinese
- Indian
- Other Asian
- Other European
- Middle Eastern
- Latin American
- African
- Southeast Asian
- I'd prefer not to say
- Other ethnicity (please specify)

4. Is English the language you use most at home?

- Yes
- No

5. Do you use AI tools or apps for work or personal use?

- No, not at all
- Sometimes
- Yes, a lot
- Not sure

6. How confident do you feel about using AI?

- Not at all confident
- Not very confident
- Quite confident
- Very confident
- Not sure

7. What year-level is your child in at school?

- Year 5
- Year 6
- Year 7
- Year 8
- Year 9
- Year 10
- Year 11
- Year 12
- Year 13

8. Does your child use AI for schoolwork?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

9. From what you know, how much is your child using AI in the following ways for schoolwork?

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Not sure
Writing essays				
Checking work (e.g. marking practice tests)				
Generating ideas				
Help with spelling and grammar				
Solving problems				
Language support (e.g. helping to understand or simplify text)				
Understanding something in a way that works for them				
Finding information				
Summarising documents				

10. How much support do you give your child at home with using AI for schoolwork?

- None at all
- A little
- A lot
- Not sure

11. Do you know how to support your child to use AI in the right way for schoolwork?

- Not at all
- A little
- A lot
- Not sure

12. Where else is your child learning to use AI for schoolwork? (Select all that apply)

- At school
- Siblings / whānau
- Friends
- Teaching themselves
- Other (please specify)

13. Does your child's school have rules or guidance about AI use for schoolwork?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

14. How useful are these rules or guidance in helping your child appropriately use AI for schoolwork?

- Not useful
- A little useful
- Very useful
- Not sure

15. Do you agree or disagree that your child should be able to use AI for schoolwork?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not sure

16. Do you agree or disagree that the school should be teaching your child about how AI works and how to use it?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure

How AI works					
How to use AI					
How to use AI appropriately for schoolwork					

17. Overall, do you think AI is changing how your child is learning and how they feel about school?

	Making it worse	No change	Making it better	Not sure
Creative thinking				
Independent learning				
Learning in a group				
Critical thinking				
Writing skills				
Motivation to do schoolwork				
Attention to detail				
Progress in schoolwork				
Attendance at school				

18. Is there anything else about AI at school that you want to share with us?

Part 3: Regression models

This part presents the regression results used in our report, including the following models:

- Model 1
- Model 2
- Model 3 a,b,c
- Model 4 a,b,c
- Model 5 a,b,c

Regression model 1

Table 6: Logistic regression model predicting whether teachers report that using AI has made their role easier.

	Primary		Secondary	
	Odds ratio	Confidence interval (95% CI)	Odds ratio	Confidence interval (95% CI)
AI use for different purposes ('Great extent' or 'somewhat')				
Designing assessments	0.83	0.44-1.56	1.84*	1.04-3.25
Tailoring teaching resources	2.31*	1.18-4.56	2.60*	1.19-6.05
Admin	0.70	0.38-1.27	1.63	0.92-2.89
Lesson planning	3.06***	1.64-5.78	1.78	0.99-3.22
Marking and feedback	1.57	0.72-3.52	1.29	0.64-2.61
Reporting to parents	1.64	0.87-3.14	1.00	0.52-1.90
In the classroom with students	0.86	0.45-1.65	1.42	0.79-2.56
Individual characteristics				
How many years have you been teaching? (vs 0-2 years)				

3-5 years	1.08	0.35-3.26	0.52	0.13-2.01
6-10 years	0.95	0.33-2.68	0.47	0.13-1.64
More than 10 years	0.87	0.34-2.09	0.47	0.15-1.41
School characteristics				
EQI (vs Fewer)				
Moderate	1.46	0.81-2.64	0.75	0.41-1.34
More	1.00	0.42-2.43	2.32	0.84-6.67
School size (vs small)				
Medium	4.14*	1.22-15.16	2.12	0.95-4.88
Large	5.19*	1.43-20.24	1.48	0.68-3.31
Rurality (vs urban)				
Rural	1.22	0.42-3.73	1.75	0.63-5.05
Observations (n)	302		295	

Note: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$.

Regression model 2

Table 7: Logistic regression model predicting whether teachers in secondary schools report that using AI has increased the time they spend on ensuring authenticity of student work.

	Odds ratio	Confidence interval (95%)
Coming across students using AI inappropriately (vs Never)		
Inappropriate use – Somewhat, frequently or very frequently	5.51***	2.45-12.83
Individual characteristics		
Teacher experience (vs 0-2 years)		
3-5 years	0.47	0.09-2.44
6-10 years	1.19	0.24-5.63

More than 10 years	1.84	0.43-7.24
School characteristics		
EQI (vs Fewer)		
Moderate	0.47	0.22-0.99
More	0.24*	0.08-0.75
School size (vs small)		
Medium	1.04	0.41-2.57
Large	0.81	0.31-1.99
Rurality (vs urban)		
Rural	0.51	0.17-1.50
Observations (n)	243	

Note: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$.

Regression model 3a), b), c)

Table 8: Logistic regression model predicting whether secondary students report positive and negative impacts of AI use on elements of their learning.

	a) Critical thinking		b) Independent thinking		c) Creative thinking	
	Better	Worse	Better	Worse	Better	Worse
	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>	<i>Odds ratio (95% CI)</i>
Use AI for different purposes (vs 'not at all')						
Writing essays	1.05 (0.59-1.88)	0.96 (0.58-1.57)	1.29 (0.79-2.09)	0.89 (0.50-1.56)	2.52** (1.46-4.41)	0.99 (0.60-1.62)
Checking work	2.48* (1.11-6.15)	0.63 (0.37-1.08)	2.75** (1.49-5.26)	0.46** (0.26-0.82)	1.87 (0.91-4.08)	0.71 (0.42-1.22)
Generating ideas	2.25* (1.09-4.96)	0.69 (0.42-1.15)	1.03 (0.59-1.78)	0.86 (0.48-1.52)	2.14* (1.10-4.38)	0.58* (0.35-0.97)
Creating music or images	1.19 (0.68-2.06)	0.57* (0.34-0.95)	1.02 (0.62-1.66)	0.75 (0.41-1.34)	1.58 (0.94-2.67)	0.60 (0.36-1.01)
Solving problems	1.88 (1.00-3.61)	0.76 (0.46-1.26)	2.87*** (1.73-4.84)	0.86 (0.48-1.52)	2.30** (1.27-4.27)	0.63 (0.38-1.04)
Understanding something in a way that works for you	1.24 (0.67-2.30)	1.22 (0.74-2.01)	1.48 (0.89-2.44)	0.57 (0.33-1.00)	1.29 (0.73-2.30)	1.26 (0.76-2.09)
Summarising documents	1.39 (0.73-2.69)	1.28 (0.77-2.15)	1.21 (0.72-2.04)	1.43 (0.80-2.59)	0.99 (0.55-1.82)	0.98 (0.59-1.64)
Individual characteristics						
Māori (vs not Māori)	1.63 (0.79-3.30)	0.41* (0.20-0.80)	0.94 (0.49-1.78)	0.45 (0.18-0.97)	1.32 (0.65-2.62)	0.55 (0.27-1.04)
Pacific Peoples (vs not Pacific Peoples)	1.34 (0.46-3.58)	1.82 (0.73-4.38)	2.03 (0.82-4.99)	0.67 (0.18-1.93)	1.11 (0.40-2.89)	1.82 (0.75-4.30)
Female (vs Male)	0.74	2.20**	0.80	1.79*	0.82	1.48

	(0.42-1.33)	(1.35-3.66)	(0.48-1.31)	(1.04-3.16)	(0.47-1.43)	(0.92-2.40)
School level characteristics						
EQI (vs Fewer)						
Moderate	1.61 (0.83-3.21)	1.02 (0.59-1.77)	1.08 (0.62-1.90)	1.34 (0.72-2.52)	1.08 (0.57-2.05)	1.92* (1.11-3.37)
More	1.18 (0.43-3.17)	0.74 (0.34-1.61)	0.84 (0.36-1.95)	1.25 (0.52-3.01)	1.16 (0.45-2.95)	1.04 (0.47-2.30)
School size (vs Small)						
Medium	1.24 (0.51-2.98)	0.87 (0.43-1.76)	1.10 (0.51-2.37)	0.76 (0.34-1.68)	1.26 (0.54-2.92)	0.76 (0.36-1.55)
Large	1.11 (0.56-2.21)	0.61 (0.35-1.07)	1.36 (0.75-2.46)	0.80 (0.43-1.49)	1.35 (0.70-2.64)	0.88 (0.50-1.52)
Rurality (vs Urban)						
Rural	0.32 (0.02-1.99)	1.01 (0.28-3.40)	1.86 (0.47-6.85)	1.22 (0.29-4.39)	3.93 (0.94-15.39)	1.13 (0.33-3.77)
Observations (n)	455	455	457	457	456	456

Note: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$.

Regression model 4 a), b), c)

Table 9: Logistic regression model predicting whether primary teachers report positive and negative impacts of AI use on elements of their students' learning.

	a) Critical thinking skills		b) Personalised learning		c) Creative thinking	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Student use of AI for different purposes (vs 'not at all' or 'not sure')						
Self-checking work	0.27 (0.06-1.06)	1.51 (0.51-4.61)	1.35 (0.43-4.16)	4.03 (0.80-24.60)	0.46 (0.13-1.55)	2.77 (0.91-9.19)

Idea generation	0.25* (0.06-0.82)	1.32 (0.58-3.01)	0.82 (0.35-1.84)	0.45 (0.11-1.57)	0.59 (0.22-1.51)	1.15 (0.49-2.67)
Creating music/images	1.70 (0.70-3.94)	0.66 (0.33-1.29)	2.28* (1.19-4.41)	0.52 (0.18-1.35)	2.81** (1.34-5.84)	0.47* (0.23-0.94)
Problem solving	10.36** (2.73-47.69)	0.41 (0.13-1.15)	1.25 (0.45-3.48)	8.07** (1.85-40.08)	3.21* (1.06-10.33)	0.60 (0.20-1.73)
Writing support	0.52 (0.14-1.72)	2.12 (0.87-5.30)	1.42 (0.58-3.48)	0.41 (0.07-1.81)	0.61 (0.20-1.70)	1.71 (0.68-4.35)
Increasing accessibility	6.06** (1.59-25.29)	1.26 (0.43-3.62)	1.68 (0.59-4.90)	0.33 (0.05-1.70)	3.15 (0.98-10.54)	0.73 (0.23-2.16)
Individual characteristics						
Teacher experience (vs 0-2 years)						
3-5 years	0.44 (0.07-2.42)	0.77 (0.30-1.94)	0.64 (0.24-1.73)	0.79 (0.23-2.70)	0.60 (0.16-2.13)	0.48 (0.19-1.23)
6-10 years	2.00 (0.58-8.21)	0.60 (0.24-1.43)	1.07 (0.44-2.67)	1.54 (0.53-4.84)	1.18 (0.41-3.62)	0.62 (0.25-1.48)
More than 10 years	1.47 (0.51-5.37)	0.56 (0.26-1.21)	0.92 (0.43-2.07)	0.82 (0.33-2.32)	1.03 (0.42-2.80)	0.51 (0.24-1.10)
School characteristics						
EQI (vs Fewer)						
Moderate	1.08 (0.53-2.22)	0.78 (0.47-1.29)	0.77 (0.46-1.29)	1.03 (0.51-2.04)	1.40 (0.75-2.63)	0.62 (0.37-1.03)
More	1.53 (0.54-4.14)	1.06 (0.48-2.30)	0.57 (0.24-1.28)	2.33 (0.94-5.70)	1.91 (0.77-4.67)	0.60 (0.27-1.31)
School size (vs Small)						
Medium	2.34 (0.55-12.63)	1.31 (0.42-4.30)	1.57 (0.50-5.34)	0.99 (0.23-4.65)	1.73 (0.46-7.68)	1.50 (0.49-4.83)
Large	1.20 (0.24-7.35)	2.58 (0.76-9.39)	1.91 (0.54-7.21)	1.04 (0.22-5.44)	1.25 (0.29-6.20)	2.06 (0.61-7.35)
Rurality (vs Urban)						
Rural	1.47 (0.42-4.82)	1.90 (0.70-5.20)	1.86 (0.68-5.19)	0.99 (0.23-3.67)	1.15 (0.36-3.52)	1.96 (0.74-5.32)
Observations (n)	335	335	334	334	335	335

Note: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$.

Regression model 5 a), b), c)

Table 10: Logistic regression model predicting whether secondary teachers report positive and negative impacts of AI use on elements of their students' learning.

	a) Critical thinking skills		b) Personalised learning		c) Creative thinking	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Student use of AI for different purposes (vs 'not at all' or 'not sure')						
Self-checking work	1.19 (0.48-3.10)	1.03 (0.53-2.00)	1.15 (0.64-2.05)	0.96 (0.52-1.79)	1.47 (0.68-3.27)	1.05 (0.56-1.94)
Idea generation	0.95 (0.28-3.14)	1.54 (0.73-3.29)	1.94* (1.03-3.69)	0.65 (0.33-1.28)	2.69* (1.10-6.76)	0.80 (0.40-1.58)
Creating music/images	1.53 (0.60-4.10)	0.77 (0.38-1.52)	1.01 (0.56-1.81)	0.84 (0.45-1.57)	1.26 (0.60-2.71)	1.06 (0.56-1.98)
Problem solving	6.98** (2.34-22.55)	0.35** (0.16-0.74)	1.41 (0.76-2.60)	0.94 (0.48-1.82)	1.59 (0.71-3.64)	0.63 (0.32-1.22)
Writing support	0.81 (0.28-2.37)	1.90 (0.94-3.90)	0.61 (0.32-1.14)	1.78 (0.92-3.48)	0.29** (0.12-0.68)	2.54** (1.32-5.01)
Increasing accessibility	0.54 (0.18-1.59)	1.13 (0.52-2.43)	1.81 (0.97-3.40)	0.93 (0.48-1.81)	1.38 (0.58-3.33)	0.82 (0.41-1.65)
Individual characteristics						

Teacher experience (vs 0-2 years)						
3-5 years	0.56 (0.00--)	0.60 (0.08-3.28)	0.57 (0.17-1.87)	2.40 (0.76-8.11)	1.66 (0.29-13.17)	0.54 (0.12-2.09)
6-10 years	5516648.49 (0.00--)	0.48 (0.07-2.26)	0.84 (0.28-2.53)	1.15 (0.38-3.62)	1.69 (0.34-12.73)	0.49 (0.12-1.71)
More than 10 years	13843881.58 (0.00--)	0.18* (0.03-0.68)	1.02 (0.39-2.68)	0.78 (0.30-2.18)	2.80 (0.72-18.66)	0.29* (0.08-0.85)
School characteristics						
EQI (vs Fewer)						
Moderate	0.79 (0.37-1.71)	0.82 (0.46-1.44)	1.36 (0.83-2.24)	0.64 (0.38-1.08)	1.37 (0.72-2.69)	0.68 (0.40-1.14)
More	1.01 (0.27-3.51)	0.52 (0.21-1.29)	1.18 (0.48-2.86)	0.26* (0.08-0.70)	1.96 (0.69-5.47)	0.41* (0.17-0.98)
School size (vs Small)						
Medium	0.60 (0.22-1.60)	0.98 (0.48-2.01)	1.27 (0.64-2.52)	0.63 (0.31-1.30)	0.53 (0.23-1.20)	1.37 (0.69-2.71)
Large	0.43 (0.17-1.13)	1.35 (0.64-2.80)	1.33 (0.67-2.61)	0.60 (0.30-1.23)	0.66 (0.30-1.47)	1.17 (0.58-2.31)
Rurality (vs Urban)						
Rural	0.14 (0.01-0.81)	0.66 (0.28-1.58)	0.45 (0.18-1.05)	1.22 (0.50-2.87)	1.06 (0.36-2.82)	0.55 (0.24-1.26)
Observations (n)	369	369	369	369	370	370

Note: $p < 0.05 = *$, $p < 0.01 = **$, $p < 0.001 = ***$.

Part 4: Survey tables

The Excel spreadsheets alongside this file contain tabular data of the survey responses used within the main report. Counts will not always sum up to our response total, as participants may drop out of the survey partway through. All responses are kept for questions they have answered. These be downloaded from ERO's Evidence and Insights website: www.evidence.ero.govt.nz