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This paper presents a dataset concerning the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and home confinement on the educational community and families, and the possibilities and opportunities for the return to schools. Data were collected through an online based cross-sectional survey between June 29, 2020 and July 12, 2020 in Spain. A total of 7,305 people who had children in their care during the COVID-19 crisis and the home-confinement period responded to the survey. The survey contained items concerning (i) socio-demographic information, (ii) conciliation of work, personal and family life during confinement, (iii) the impact of the pandemic on the respondent’s family, and (iv) the respondents’ opinion on their child(ren)’s return to school. Data were analysed...
using Stata (version 14) and are represented as frequencies and percentages based on responses to the entire survey. Researchers can use the dataset to analyse how home confinement impacted people with children in their care. Additionally, government authorities and education policymakers can use the data to ensure that schools respond to parents’ main concerns in a pandemic context, as well as to be prepared to implement appropriate protocols in possible future similar crisis.
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### Specifications Table

| Subject | Education |
| --- | --- |
| Specific subject area | Consequences of the COVID-19 and home confinement on the educational community and families |
| Type of data | Primary data, tables |
| How data were acquired | Survey data were gathered using an online survey platform (google forms). The questionnaire is provided as a supplementary file |
| Data format | Raw. Analysed. Filtered (descriptive statistics) |
| Parameters for data collection | The survey data were obtained from 7305 respondents living in Spain who had children in their care during the COVID-19 crisis and the home confinement period |
| Description of data collection | The data were obtained through an online questionnaire shared via e-mail, social networks (Instagram and Twitter) and WhatsApp |
| Data source location | Country: Spain |
| Data accessibility | Repository name: Mendeley |
| Direct URL to data | https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/kbv3j3h3k/2 |

### Value of the Data

- These data provide information on the consequences of the COVID-19 crisis and the home confinement period on the educational community and families, which is important for understanding the home confinement impact at a personal and family level. Additionally, the dataset provides information on parents’ views on the return to school after the period of confinement.
- During the COVID-19 crisis, especially at the beginning, many workers, both in private companies and in the public sector, were forced to telework from home. Teleworking had been an option demanded for years by the main unions and had been presented in several electoral programs. However, the nature of the COVID-19 crisis meant that, during the lockdown in Spain from March to June, schools were closed and parents had to deal with parenting and working at home at the same time. The data from this study show how difficult this situation was and how parents with young children especially suffered the consequences of house confinement during this period. Researchers can use the dataset to analyse how home confinement impacted people with children in their care. Additionally, the authorities can benefit from these data to ensure that schools respond to parents’ main concerns in a pandemic context, as well as to be prepared to implement appropriate protocols in possible future similar crisis.
- Other researchers around the world can use these data to conduct cross-cultural comparisons, examining similarities and differences in the consequences of home confinement on families with children across the world. Of course, in order to be able to carry out these analyses, it would be necessary to undertake a joint analysis with qualitative information in order to contextualise the data appropriately and make relevant comparisons.
• The dataset enables subgroups comparison based on sociodemographic characteristics (e.g.,
gender, place of living, work situation, schooling stage of the child or children).

1. Data Description

The period of home confinement experienced in most countries in the first half of 2020 as a
consequence of the COVID-19 health crisis has had psychological consequences for a large part of
the population [1,2]. Moreover, expectations about their future have also been analysed in [3,4].
In this sense, children and adolescents have been one of the most affected population groups,
as the closure of schools significantly altered their social and educational life [5]. Additionally,
previous studies suggested that the confinement has had a great impact on the health-related
behaviours of children [6,7]. Likewise, parents have been struggling to combine their jobs with
the care of their children, as has been analysed for Canada in [8].

In view of this, this dataset provides relevant information on the consequences of the COVID-
19 home confinement, ordered by the Spanish government between the 15th of March and the
21st of June, on the educational community and families and on the possibilities and oppor-
tunities for the return to schools. The survey involved 7,305 respondents living in Spain who
had children in their care during the COVID-19 crisis and the home confinement period. The
questionnaire and variables codebook are provided as a supplementary file.

The data include four major groups of variables. A first group of variables (A) refers to 16
items related to individual and family sociodemographic characteristics, including information
on the gender of the respondent, place of current residence, characteristics of the living unit,
work situation, schooling stage of the child or children, school ownership, and special educa-
tional needs. Table 1 shows the distribution of responses for all variables included in group (A).

A second group of variables (B) refers to 19 items that measured the conciliation during the
home confinement period including information on paid workload, housework, time spent help-
ing children with homework, and time available for other activities such as sports or talking to
friends. Table 2 shows the distribution of responses for all variables included in group (B).

Thirdly, a group of 34 variables (C) measured the consequences of the pandemic at a personal
and family level for the respondent, paying special attention to how the pandemic had affected
the child or children in their care. Figs. 1–3 show the distribution of responses for all variables
included in group (C).

Finally, (D) 43 items measured aspects directly related to children’s education and the return
to school. Respondents were asked, for example, what they thought their children missed the
most and what main challenges they identified for the return to school in September. Table 3
and Figs. 4–7 show the distribution of responses for all variables included in group (D).

1 Although this is the total number of participants, we find a lower number of responses in some of the questions
as some respondents left the answers to these questions blank. Nevertheless, the percentage of missing values for the
variables that present this problem is minimal (maximum of 4%).
Table 1
Distribution of responses in relation to socio-demographic variables (A).

| Variable                                      | Freq (n) | % / Mean |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| **Gender**                                    |          |          |
| Male                                          | 600      | 8.23%    |
| Female                                        | 6,686    | 91.77%   |
| **Autonomous Community of residence**         |          |          |
| Andalucía                                     | 535      | 7.32%    |
| Aragón                                        | 159      | 2.18%    |
| Asturias                                      | 124      | 1.70%    |
| Canarias                                      | 150      | 2.05%    |
| Cantabria                                     | 67       | 0.92%    |
| Castilla la Mancha                           | 223      | 3.05%    |
| Castilla y León                              | 234      | 3.20%    |
| Cataluña                                      | 715      | 9.79%    |
| Ceuta                                        | 6        | 0.08%    |
| Comunidad Valenciana                         | 3,125    | 42.78%   |
| Extremadura                                   | 57       | 0.78%    |
| Galicia                                      | 212      | 2.90%    |
| Islas Baleares                               | 86       | 1.18%    |
| La Rioja                                     | 31       | 0.42%    |
| Madrid                                       | 1,173    | 16.06%   |
| Melilla                                      | 4        | 0.05%    |
| Murcia                                       | 104      | 1.42%    |
| Navarra                                      | 64       | 0.88%    |
| País Vasco                                    | 235      | 3.22%    |
| **Kind of place of current residence**        |          |          |
| Rural                                        | 1,027    | 14.45%   |
| Small Town                                   | 1,805    | 25.40%   |
| Big City                                     | 4,273    | 60.14%   |
| **Local Income**                             | 3,094    | 25,961.87|
| **Ownership of child/children’s educational establishment** | | |
| Publically-funded private                    | 1,810    | 24.78%   |
| Private                                      | 937      | 12.83%   |
| Public                                       | 4,558    | 62.40%   |
| **Living unit during confinement**            |          |          |
| One adult person with a minor or minors in care | 699 | 9.57%    |
| Two adults with a minor or minors in their care | 6,262 | 85.72%   |
| More than two adults with a minor or minors in their care | 344 | 4.71%    |
| **Family in charge of dependent persons**     |          |          |
| No                                           | 6,829    | 93.48%   |
| Yes                                          | 476      | 6.52%    |
| **Respondent worked during confinement**      |          |          |
| No                                           | 2,526    | 34.58%   |
| Yes                                          | 4,779    | 65.42%   |
| **Worked during confinement (other adult in the family)** | | |
| No                                           | 1,292    | 18.69%   |
| Yes                                          | 5,621    | 81.31%   |

(continued on next page)
Table 1 (continued)

| Variable | Freq (n) | % / Mean |
|----------|----------|----------|
| Child/Children in first cycle of Early Childhood Education (0 to 2 years) | | |
| No | 4,415 | 60.44% |
| Yes | 2,89 | 39.56% |
| Child/Children in second cycle of Early Childhood Education (3 to 5 years) | | |
| No | 3,713 | 50.83% |
| Yes | 3,592 | 49.17% |
| Child/Children in Primary Education (6 to 12 years) | | |
| No | 4,368 | 59.79% |
| Yes | 2,937 | 40.21% |
| Child/Children in Secondary Education (12 to 16 years) | | |
| No | 6,628 | 90.73% |
| Yes | 677 | 9.27% |
| Child/Children in Baccalaureate (16 to 18 years) | | |
| No | 7,194 | 98.48% |
| Yes | 111 | 1.52% |
| Child/Children in Vocational Education | | |
| No | 7,276 | 99.60% |
| Yes | 29 | 0.40% |
| Child/Children with special educational needs | | |
| No | 6,878 | 94.15% |
| Yes | 427 | 5.85% |

Fig. 1. Distribution of responses in relation to the consequences of the pandemic for the family and the children: positive impact (C).
| Variable                                      | Freq (n) | %    |
|----------------------------------------------|----------|------|
| **Workload changed**                         |          |      |
| No, I have worked the same hours             | 1,435    | 19.90% |
| Yes, I have lost my job                      | 882      | 12.23% |
| Yes, I have worked more hours                | 2,307    | 32.00% |
| Yes, I worked less than usual                | 1,079    | 14.97% |
| Yes, I have voluntarily asked for a reduction| 254      | 3.52%  |
| Yes, I have voluntarily resigned from my job | 217      | 3.01%  |
| I work solely to care my family              | 1,036    | 14.37% |
| **More housework and care work**             |          |      |
| No                                           | 586      | 8.03%  |
| Maybe                                        | 440      | 6.03%  |
| Yes                                          | 6,269    | 85.94% |
| **I have slept**                             |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 155      | 2.14%  |
| Less than before                             | 3,917    | 54.01% |
| As before                                    | 2,240    | 30.88% |
| More than before                             | 941      | 12.97% |
| **I had leisure time**                       |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 2,509    | 34.55% |
| Less than before                             | 3,231    | 44.50% |
| As before                                    | 615      | 8.47%  |
| More than before                             | 906      | 12.48% |
| **I played sports**                          |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 2,934    | 40.40% |
| Less than before                             | 2,185    | 30.08% |
| As before                                    | 1,140    | 15.70% |
| More than before                             | 1,004    | 13.82% |
| **I talked to my friends**                   |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 422      | 5.81%  |
| Less than before                             | 3,407    | 46.88% |
| As before                                    | 1,960    | 26.97% |
| More than before                             | 1,478    | 20.34% |
| **I have been in touch with my extended family** |        |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 699      | 9.61%  |
| Less than before                             | 2,332    | 32.05% |
| As before                                    | 2,479    | 34.07% |
| More than before                             | 1,766    | 24.27% |
| **I remembered things from the past**        |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 517      | 7.13%  |
| Less than before                             | 485      | 6.69%  |
| As before                                    | 2,747    | 37.87% |
| More than before                             | 3,505    | 48.32% |
| **I made decisions about the future**        |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 1,066    | 14.71% |
| Less than before                             | 852      | 11.75% |
| As before                                    | 2,699    | 37.24% |
| More than before                             | 2,631    | 36.30% |
| **I had sex**                                |          |      |
| I have not been able to                      | 1,248    | 17.30% |
| Less than before                             | 2,294    | 31.80% |
| As before                                    | 2,952    | 40.93% |
| More than before                             | 719      | 9.97%  |
| **Problems reconciling**                     |          |      |
| No                                           | 1,526    | 21.11% |
| Maybe                                        | 861      | 11.91% |
| Yes                                          | 4,843    | 66.98% |
| **Domestic and care help**                   |          |      |
| No                                           | 5,850    | 80.24% |
| Yes                                          | 111      | 1.52%  |
| I prefer not to answer                       | 1,330    | 18.24% |

(continued on next page)
Table 2 (continued)

| Variable                                              | Freq (n) | %     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| **Started day tired**                                 |          |       |
| No                                                    | 1,209    | 16.55%|
| Maybe                                                 | 668      | 9.14% |
| Yes                                                   | 5,428    | 74.31%|
| **Time off**                                          |          |       |
| No                                                    | 4,109    | 57.26%|
| Occasionally                                          | 1,731    | 24.12%|
| Yes                                                   | 1,336    | 18.62%|
| **Interrupted working day to take care of children** |          |       |
| No                                                    | 2,055    | 29.09%|
| Yes                                                   | 5,009    | 70.91%|
| **If yes to interrupted, how often**                  |          |       |
| Occasionally                                          | 835      | 16.21%|
| Several times during the working day                  | 2,269    | 44.22%|
| Several times an hour                                 | 2,027    | 39.50%|
| **Hours accompanying children in schoolwork**         |          |       |
| I do not have time for it                             | 591      | 8.35% |
| 1-2 hours per day                                     | 3,895    | 55.01%|
| 3-5 hours per day                                     | 1,670    | 23.59%|
| All day                                               | 924      | 13.05%|
| **Shared electronic devices with children**           |          |       |
| No                                                    | 2,408    | 33.23%|
| Yes                                                   | 4,838    | 66.77%|
| **Delayed bedtime or brought forward wake-up time**   |          |       |
| No                                                    | 2,448    | 34.13%|
| Yes                                                   | 4,725    | 65.87%|

Fig. 2. Distribution of responses in relation to the consequences of the pandemic for the family and the children: negative impact (C).
**Fig. 3.** Distribution of responses in relation to the consequences of the pandemic for the family and the children: child/children behaviour (C).

| Issue                                                                 | No (%)   | Yes (%)  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Little contact with friends                                           | 21.5%    | 78.5%    |
| Too much exposure to screens                                          | 29.3%    | 70.7%    |
| Boredom                                                               | 46.3%    | 53.7%    |
| Too little physical activity                                          | 46.4%    | 53.6%    |
| Irritability                                                          | 48.7%    | 51.3%    |
| Decreased interest in leaving home                                    | 51.8%    | 48.2%    |
| Decreased interest friendship                                         | 65.9%    | 34.1%    |
| Irregular sleep patterns                                              | 69.3%    | 30.7%    |
| Frustration                                                           | 77.6%    | 22.4%    |
| Insufficient personal space at home                                   | 78.8%    | 21.2%    |
| Fear of becoming infected                                             | 81.7%    | 18.3%    |
| Unhealthy diet                                                        | 85.9%    | 14.1%    |
| Exposure to inadequate info                                           | 91.7%    | 8.3%     |
| Introspection                                                         | 93.7%    | 6.3%     |
| No variation in these patterns                                        | 98.0%    | 2.0%     |

**Fig. 4.** Distribution of responses in relation to education and return to school: child/children missed (D).

- **Missed being with their friends**: 12.54% (No), 87.46% (Yes)
- **Missed playing outside and doing physical activity**: 22.98% (No), 77.02% (Yes)
- **Missed having teachers close to them**: 51.25% (No), 48.75% (Yes)
- **Missed experiences out of parents’ sight**: 62.55% (No), 37.42% (Yes)
- **Missed feeling attached to a group and future**: 70.64% (No), 29.36% (Yes)
- **Missed learning more instrumental contents**: 90.03% (No), 9.97% (Yes)
- **Missed face-to-face examinations**: 97.00% (No), 3.00% (Yes)
Table 3
Distribution of responses in relation to education and return to school (D).

| Variable                                                   | Freq (n) | %   |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|
| **Ability to help child/children with online education**   |          |     |
| None                                                       | 205      | 2.92%|
| A little                                                   | 1,363    | 19.39%|
| Enough                                                     | 3,288    | 46.77%|
| A lot                                                      | 2,174    | 30.92%|
| **Exchanged words or met with child/children’s teachers** |          |     |
| Never                                                      | 956      | 13.26%|
| Occasionally                                               | 3,984    | 55.27%|
| Weekly                                                     | 1,814    | 25.17%|
| Daily                                                      | 454      | 6.30%|
| **Involved in parents groups in child/children's class**   |          |     |
| I have not had time for it                                 | 684      | 9.55%|
| Less than before                                           | 1,102    | 15.38%|
| As Before                                                  | 3,880    | 54.16%|
| More than before                                           | 1,497    | 20.90%|
| **Talked to other parents about return to school in September** |          |     |
| Never                                                      | 1,381    | 19.02%|
| Occasionally                                               | 4,554    | 62.71%|
| Weekly                                                     | 1,049    | 14.45%|
| Daily                                                      | 278      | 3.83%|
| **If school fees, alternatives to avoid paying**           |          |     |
| No                                                         | 1,201    | 22.12%|
| Yes                                                        | 4,229    | 77.88%|
| **Collaboration of families: important role in return to school** |          |     |
| No                                                         | 146      | 2.01%|
| I do not know                                              | 1,076    | 14.79%|
| Yes                                                        | 6,051    | 83.20%|
| **Complement teaching with other activities outside the school** |          |     |
| No                                                         | 769      | 10.69%|
| Maybe                                                      | 2,127    | 29.52%|
| Yes                                                        | 4,309    | 59.81%|

![Fig. 5. Distribution of responses in relation to education and return to school: challenge in school (D).](image_url)
### Fig. 6. Distribution of responses in relation to education and return to school: level of priority (D).

| Level of priority: development of socialization | 84.01% | 13.58% | 2.41% |
| Level of priority: emotional learning | 79.51% | 16.67% | 3.82% |
| Level of priority: promotion of autonomy | 71.91% | 25.13% | 3.96% |
| Level of priority: transmission of academic content | 52.27% | 40.90% | 6.83% |
| Level of priority: custody for children | 41.53% | 38.29% | 20.18% |

### Fig. 7. Distribution of responses in relation to education and return to school: school space (D).

**School space to guarantee measures**
- nearby public facilities: 47.80% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- gymnasium: 42.33% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- porch or shaded areas: 45.60% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- dining room: 51.95% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- assembly hall: 55.41% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- parks: 58.74% (Yes), 27.95% (Maybe), 24.25% (No), 57.07% (Yes), 45.40% (Maybe), 48.05% (No), 54.43% (Yes), 45.57% (Maybe), 44.59% (No), 58.74% (Yes), 41.26% (Maybe), 24.25% (No)
- other spaces: 77.51% (Yes), 22.49% (No), 22.49% (Yes), 79.82% (Maybe), 22.49% (No), 22.49% (Yes), 79.82% (Maybe), 22.49% (No), 22.49% (Yes), 79.82% (Maybe), 22.49% (No)
- barracks in the school yard: 80.64% (Yes), 19.36% (No), 19.36% (Yes), 82.45% (Maybe), 17.55% (No), 17.55% (Yes), 82.45% (Maybe), 17.55% (No), 17.55% (Yes), 82.45% (Maybe), 17.55% (No)
- streets and squares: 87.45% (Yes), 11.92% (No), 11.92% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No)
- plots: 88.08% (Yes), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.08% (Maybe), 11.43% (No)
- none: 88.57% (Yes), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.57% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.57% (Maybe), 11.43% (No), 11.43% (Yes), 88.57% (Maybe), 11.43% (No)
- other spaces: 89.84% (Yes), 0.16% (No), 0.16% (Yes), 89.84% (Maybe), 0.16% (No), 0.16% (Yes), 89.84% (Maybe), 0.16% (No), 0.16% (Yes), 89.84% (Maybe), 0.16% (No)
2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

The survey was developed in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic and adopted a descriptive online cross-sectional survey design to assess the consequences of the COVID-19 home confinement on the educational community and families, and to explore parents’ views on their children’s return to school. A total of 7305 participants living in Spain who had children in their care during the COVID-19 crisis and the home-confinement period responded to the survey from June 29, 2020 to July 12, 2020.

In order to collect and manage the data, the following steps were followed: (1) definition of the research objectives; (2) design of the questionnaire; (3) questionnaire pilot testing (validity, reliability, repeatability); (4) dissemination of the questionnaire; (5) collection and organisation of the data; and (6) interpretation of the information obtained. The questionnaire designed consisted of closed-ended question types (multiple-choice, “yes” or “no” and skip logic) and was created in two languages (Spanish and Valencian) using google forms. The link generated was shared by email to schools, on social networks (Instagram and Twitter) and via WhatsApp. The collected data were exported to Excel spreadsheets and data were analysed using the Stata software.

As regards the structure of the questionnaire, it consisted of a total of 50 questions and five sections: (1) the first section presented general information for the respondent on the purpose and functioning of the survey; (2) the second section asked 9 questions related to socio-demographic information of the respondents; (3) section three presented 19 questions on the conciliation of work, personal and family life during confinement; (4) in section four, 5 questions asked about the impact of the pandemic on the respondent’s family; and (5) finally, in Section 5, 17 questions asked about the respondents’ opinion on their child(ren)’s return to school.

In the process of designing, conducting and analyzing the survey, checks were carried out on the validity and reliability of the survey data. The first requirement that was considered is that of content validity to ensure the adequacy to the research objectives, which was analysed together with the other two key determinants in the development of any research: the resources (material, economic and human) and the time available to carry it out. As is often the case, in order to assess this type of validity, expert judgement was used to carry out an assessment by people qualified in the subject [9]. The expert panel consisted of 10 experts: 2 sociologists, 4 school teachers, 2 experts in education and 2 experts in quantitative methodologies. The evaluation was carried out in three rounds in which each of them evaluated the survey, making proposals for modifications so that once they had been integrated into a new questionnaire, they were again submitted to the judges for evaluation. All of them were given the questionnaire and a document to evaluate the following aspects: coverage of the proposed objectives with the questions included in the questionnaire, detection of redundant items, appropriateness of the language, order of the questions, appropriateness of the scales and response time.

Along with this analysis of adequacy to the objectives, the external validity and internal consistency of the survey were taken into consideration [10]. With respect to external validity, that which affects the possible generalizability of the survey results, we worked on the representativeness of the sample, i.e., the extent to which the sample has been able to represent, on a small scale, the variety of units that make up the study population.

In order to justify external validity, it is first necessary to explain the data collection process. Data collection mechanisms had to be selected to strike a balance between the possibility of finding a sufficient number of responses in the designed strata and also a balance between them. Procedures based on exhaustive lists of potential participants were discarded, which, while allowing for good sampling control, were not feasible due to the impossibility of having such lists. The alternative of using “snowball” mechanisms using contacts in schools and social networks was envisaged as a way of obtaining a sufficiently large sample, although it was expected to be unbalanced between strata. This was indeed the case, obtaining a sample of 7,305 responses, but with a strong imbalance between strata. Although it is well known that the most efficient sampling design is to use a probabilistic procedure with random selection of respondents, for
the reasons already described this was not possible in our study. Instead, we resorted to non-probabilistic techniques that provide good results in situations with sufficiently large sample sizes and adequate weighting to balance the final estimates. Therefore, it was very important to carefully choose the variables that would generate the strata in the study population. After a review of the literature and discussion with the same group of experts who participated in the revision of the questionnaire, it was determined that the non-observable variable that most conditioned the results was the socio-economic level of the families. The inclusion of direct questions in the questionnaire on this aspect, such as the level of studies, type of work, salary, etc., presented obvious difficulties linked to the response rate in these questions and the reliability of the answers. Therefore, we looked for variables that could be included in the questionnaire that would indirectly reflect this issue. It was considered that the variables geographical location and school ownership could together provide overall information on socio-economic status.

Therefore, to correct for imbalances in the sample profiles after data collection, a weighting factor was generated and strata were considered based on the combination of the information regarding the geographical location and school ownership. For each of the strata, sample sizes were compared with population sizes. Weighting values were calculated by dividing the population proportion by the sample proportion for each stratum and an upper bound of 3 was set to avoid over-representation of minority groups. Each individual was assigned the weighting value corresponding to the strata to which he or she belonged. It is important to note that the descriptive results presented in this paper have been obtained without using the weighting factor.

Finally, as for the internal consistency of the questionnaire, the possibility of using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was ruled out. Instead, comparative statistical analyses were carried out between descriptive summary values and association between variables obtained by breaking down the sample into 6 subsamples obtained randomly from the overall sample. The individuals in each sub-sample were randomly selected in such a way as to maintain the proportions of the two key control variables considered, which were the autonomous community and the ownership of the school. The results showed acceptable stability in the results obtained between the subsamples.
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