Teacher Stress Coping Strategies: 

Implications for Schools

Ian McKay
B.Ed., M.Ed.St. (Tas.)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Tasmania
I certify that this thesis does not contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other higher degree or graduate diploma in any tertiary institution and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis does not contain material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Ian McKay
Acknowledgements

I express sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Bevis Yaxley, for the constructive advice, assistance and moral support which he has so freely provided. His sympathetic understanding at all times and in all aspects of the study, his ability to comprehend personal difficulties, and his munificent companionship serve as an inspiring example for all my future endeavours.

My thanks are also extended to both Professor Phillip Hughes and Dr. Brian Caldwell who, with great patience and encouragement, generously contributed their time during various stages of the research.

The friendship, stimulation and support received from other staff and post-graduate students is gratefully acknowledged. I am particularly indebted to Mr. Stan Tomaszycki for his unstinting assistance with technical matters.

Words cannot fully express my appreciation of the love, care, and consideration which have been extended by my mother, Nellie, and sisters, Barbara and Janet.
Abstract

This research examines the interdependence between schools' profiles of education, teacher stress and the coping strategies that teachers use. Education profiles are considered in terms of schools' effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support and vision factors. The stress profile comprises the sources, intensities, and frequencies of stress experienced by teachers. The coping profile is constructed by categorising and determining the success or otherwise of the strategies teachers employ when they encounter difficulties associated with their work. School profiles encompass the education, stress and coping profiles. Comparisons are made between the profiles of nine randomly-selected schools within the Tasmanian Department of Education and the Arts.

An analysis of other research into stress and coping in the U.S.A., U.K., Canada, and Australia focuses on the research methodologies used in those studies and the means by which data was obtained.

The research design for this study incorporates a between-method verification of data and is based upon the non-directional null hypothesis that there is no interdependence between a school's education, stress, and coping profiles. It is a null hypothesis in that it implies that:
• the coping strategies employed by teachers do not significantly differ from one school to another, regardless of the schools' stress and education profiles;
• a school's education profile is independent of the sources, intensities and frequencies of stress experienced by teachers; and
• the frequency and intensity of stress experienced is not reflected in the coping strategies teachers use.

The limitations and assumptions of the current research are also described with acknowledgement of problems that arise in ascertaining the reliability of responses deriving from, and the validity of questions contained within, research instruments.

Data have been obtained by means of observations; diaries; individual interviews with school principals, assistant principals, and teachers; group interviews with students; and questionnaires.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis are used when comparing school profiles and in ascertaining the extent of interdependence between education, stress and coping profiles.

It has been ascertained that a school's education profile can be compared with those of other schools, that there is a correlation between stress sources and education profiles and that stress frequencies and intensities differ between schools. It has also been found that, although there is a degree of similarity across schools in the coping strategies employed, there is a significant distinction between the strategy efficacies as adjudged by teachers in the various schools.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The purposes of this chapter are to explain the nature of the research, to provide an outline of the environment in which the study will be undertaken, and to describe the organisation of the thesis.

Overview

This chapter describes an approach to research into the interdependence of schools' education profiles, stress profiles and profiles of coping strategies used by teachers. An outline of the Tasmanian education system and its administration identifies the wide range of educational institutions within the State. Although the research instruments were designed for any State or private school, information described in this thesis is drawn from Tasmanian government high schools. The schools are undergoing considerable change which, according to the literature, influences the degree of stress experienced by teachers.

The conceptual framework serves as the foundation for the research. A description of the principal factors is followed by a statement of the objectives of the research, significance of the study, and the approach taken. The limitations and assumptions of the current research are also described. As a considerable amount of confidential information was volunteered by teachers, neither teachers nor schools are identified by actual names.

A timetable of visits to the nine schools involved in the study is provided. The chapter concludes with brief details of the organisation of the thesis.

The education system

The Australian education system bears similarities to that of the United Kingdom, on which it is historically based, and has been influenced by the educational thinking, systems, and approaches of Canada and the United States of America. There are, however, differences between the Australian and other systems and between the various State systems within Australia.

It is compulsory for all Tasmanian children from seven to sixteen years of age to attend school. Schools in Tasmania are administered by either private institutions, such
as for church schools with a 1989 enrolment of approximately 22.4% of the State's student population, or the State government-administered Department of Education and the Arts. To reduce the number of 'intervening variables' such as the influence of private school boards and differences in school organisation, only government schools are examined in this research.

The Department of Education and the Arts assumes responsibility for various types of schools including special schools for physically or intellectually handicapped children, kindergartens, infant and primary schools, district high schools, high schools, senior secondary colleges, and Adult Education establishments.

From about the age of four, children may attend kindergarten. Primary schools cater for children from the ages of six to eleven years and comprise grades 1 to 6. In most instances, primary schools have a student enrolment considerably lower than that of the high schools to which children transfer on completing grade 6. Clusters of four or five primary schools 'feed' each high school. Students attending high schools range between twelve and sixteen years of age and are in grades 7 to 10. Progress through grades is dependent upon children's ages.

There are, however, exceptions to these arrangements. Those children who live in the more remote areas enrol at district high schools which mostly cater for students from kindergarten to grade 10. In three district high schools, students can continue studies to grade 12.

At the end of their grade 10 year, students may either continue their education at a district high school or senior secondary college to qualify for entrance to a university or college of advanced education, seek employment, or attend one of the technical colleges where a considerable number of students study on a part-time basis through apprenticeship schemes. On leaving school or secondary college, students receive the Tasmanian Certificate of Education on which is listed the subjects they have studied.

Tasmanian government schools are administered as three regions, the north-west, the north, and the south. Each has its separate regional office with a director and superintendent who supervise the work of schools, subject consultants, guidance officers, social workers, welfare officers, speech pathologist, professional development officer, recreation personnel and maintenance gangs.

The instruments designed for the study can be used in any Tasmanian school. However, for the purposes of further reducing the number of factors that could influence
results and of obtaining a sharper focus, preliminary questionnaire items concerning teachers' positions on the promotion ladder and the subjects that they teach were amended to apply exclusively to high schools. Other instruments used in the study remain unaltered.

High school organisation

There are ten high schools in the north-west region, ten in the north, and fourteen in the south. The Department's head office, in the State's capital city of Hobart, is also in the southern region. With the exception of two schools in the south, one for boys and the other for girls, Tasmanian high schools are co-educational.

Due to the confidentiality of information received from the schools, pseudonyms have been adopted. In this study, nine schools participated: Laggan, Mull, Reay, and Wyvis in the north-west; Portree and Raassay in the northern region; and Nairn, Newtyle, and Rona in the south. Figure 1-1 illustrates the administrative regions in Tasmania.
Each school in the study has a teaching staff comprising a principal, assistant principal(s), senior masters and mistresses, head teachers, and teachers. The number of staff members is proportional to the student enrolment. The smallest school with 316 students, Mull High, has a principal, one assistant principal, four senior staff members, six head teachers, and fourteen teachers. The largest school, Reay High, has 750 students, a principal, three assistant principals, eight senior staff, twelve head teachers, and twenty seven teachers. The student enrolment and teachers appointed to each of the schools are listed in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>STUDENTS ENROLLED</th>
<th>STAFF NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. Student enrolments and teaching staff.

All high schools are comprehensive in that a number of optional subjects are offered to students. The basic subjects of English, social science, mathematics, and science are compulsory for all students. Most optional subjects are taken by grade seven students with a decrease in the number of subjects taken over the four years. Grade seven students undertake studies in ten or eleven subjects whereas grade ten students are involved with seven or eight. Included among optional subjects, that is, those that students can elect to study, are advanced science, advanced maths, languages, commercial subjects, music, home economics, manual arts, computer studies or information technology, physical education, speech and drama, and visual arts. Other subjects including Indonesian, Japanese, and automotive engineering are available in the larger schools.
Schools have various timetable structures with six, seven, or eight periods in the day. Some schools have a cyclical timetable of six or seven days, the advantages and disadvantages of which are many, the most obvious being that a subject does not have a fixed time such as the last period on a Friday afternoon. Approximately two-fifths of the school week is devoted to basic subjects with the remainder apportioned to the options.

Subjects may be studied at three different levels. Level 1 subjects have a lower academic orientation with an average of 15% of students working at this level. Level 2 subjects are undertaken by approximately 52% of students. Subjects at Level 3 standard, designed for those with higher intellectual abilities, are taken by approximately 33% of students. The Schools Certificate, issued to grade 10 students in previous years, is being replaced by the Tasmanian Certificate of Education. The latest available complete details of Schools Certificate subject results are for the 1988 school year. Results obtained by sample schools' students in six Schools Certificate subjects may be seen in Appendix 1.1.

The essence of a school

In this study, the school is considered to comprise not only buildings and grounds but also people closely associated with the school's educational offering, in particular, students, teachers, and administrative staff. The school is considered not as an inanimate object but as a blending of people, be they the youngest grade seven student or the teacher who is about to retire because of age. The activities associated with the school's programs, whether they take place within or outside the school buildings, are an integral part of a school.

While teachers are the focus of this thesis, it is recognised that they are a minority within the school. Nevertheless, the school's educational quality is influenced by characteristics of the associations between students and teaching staff, among teachers, and between students, teachers and parents. In almost all instances, whenever the term 'school' is used within this research, it refers not to an inert construction of brick, wood and metal but to an active group of people with the central purpose of cooperatively working together in communicating knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes.

A statement of the problem

The education system in Tasmania is undergoing considerable change involving students, teachers, school administration, parents, and the wider community. The changes are associated with certification procedures, student assessment, curricula, staffing
structures, and the administration of schools. Many consider that major changes produce feelings of uncertainty which, in turn, provide additional pressures for those within the profession and increase the likelihood of stress (Blase, 1984; Drucker, 1981; Hosking and Reid, 1985; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Ketts de Vries, 1988; Kottkamp and Travlos, 1986; Macpherson, 1985).

With the additional work load necessitated by the changes, it is perhaps timely to ascertain the effects that teacher stress has on the education provided by schools.

The conceptual framework

Miles and Huberman (1984:28), described the use of "bins" to assist in building a conceptual framework. In each bin are placed the elements thought to be associated with the main concepts. "When we assign a label to a bin, we may or may not know how all the contents of the bin fit together, or how this bin relates to another one." The "labels" placed on the bins to determine the principal factors to be examined in this research are the school's educational offering, stress, discrete coping, and management practices. The contents of each bin are depicted in Figure 1-2.

![Figure 1-2. The bins used for constructing the conceptual framework.](image-url)
Continued focusing reduced the number of principal factors to three, those being the school's educational offering, the stress experienced by teachers, and the means by which teachers deal with that stress. It was found that elements in the bin labelled 'management practices' were contained within the other three factors. To clarify the approach to the study, the factors were grouped as profiles, namely, the school's education, stress, and coping profiles. The profiles, when combined, comprise the school profile. The lines connecting the bins, illustrated in Figure 1.2, convey the impression that the relationships between factors are bilateral rather than multifarious. As the principal factors are thought to overlap without a clear delineation, Figure 1.3 is considered to be a closer representation of the conceptual framework of this research.

The education profile

The purpose of examining the literature on excellence in education is to facilitate the development of instruments for constructing education profiles. The contributing factors
of effectiveness, equity, support, flexibility, vision, efficiency, and quality control and the interrelationships of these factors are considered to be an integral part of the study. The schools' education profiles focus on these factors and will be constructed by analysing responses from a questionnaire, interview and observation schedules, and diaries.

The stress profile

The stress profile will comprise the sources, intensities and frequencies of stress. The profile will be obtained by analysing and categorising teachers' responses to items contained in interview schedules and a questionnaire. Additional information will be sought through observations of teachers and pupils within the school milieu. The questionnaire invites respondents to rate, on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'never' to 'constantly', the frequency of encountering eighty nine possible sources of difficulty within the teaching profession. Respondents may add other problems or sources of stress. A measure of stress intensity is obtained from responses to interview and questionnaire items requesting teachers to describe their feelings about the source of their greatest difficulty. Similar items appear in each of the questionnaire's organisation, administration, academic program, students, parents, teachers, professional status, and personal categories.

The coping profile

The coping profile will be constructed by ascertaining the strategies teachers use when encountering difficulties associated with their work and by categorising and determining the success of those strategies.

The coping profile will be based on analyses and categorisation of teachers' responses to questions contained in an interview schedule and a questionnaire. The questionnaire, for example, asks respondents to indicate which of nineteen listed strategies they use when countering the effects of the greatest difficulty in each of the eight categories. Respondents may also add any other strategy they may use. A measure of coping effectiveness is obtained from respondents' ratings, on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'ineffective' to 'highly effective', of the strategies they use most to control their feelings or to alter the source of difficulty.
Other elements

There are a number of elements that may have some bearing on the principal factors. These elements include the person’s length of teaching service, the subject or area of the school in which the person teaches, position on the career ladder, the number of years that the person has occupied the position, gender, any illness that the person has experienced during the previous twelve months, the person’s encounter with stress in private life, and the teacher’s age. Data collected on these aspects from each of the schools appear in Appendix 1-2. Other elements may become evident during the course of gathering data and how these affect the principal factors will need to be considered.

The school profile

When data have been accumulated through the research instruments, profiles on education, stress, and coping will be constructed which, in combination, forms the school profile. Comparisons will be made between school profiles of the nine randomly-selected state high schools.

The research objective

The major objective of this research is to examine the interdependence between profiles of education, teacher stress, and coping strategies. Emanating from this objective are the following subsidiary aims:

• to identify factors that will enable the construction of education profiles,
• to identify concepts and variables that are important in understanding and explaining stress and coping,
• to determine the frequency of stress experienced by teachers,
• to investigate teachers’ perceptions of the intensity of stress experienced in the profession,
• to ascertain the identifiability and efficacy of the discrete coping strategies teachers use, and
• to compare school profiles.

Significance of the study

According to Fergusson (1984), because of its effects in teaching and the consequent implications for school systems, research into teacher stress requires immediate attention.
However, extensive computer searches through the University of Tasmania library, using descriptors including school effectiveness, administration, climate, management, educational excellence, stress, coping, and burnout, did not reveal any study in the English language that examines the interdependence between a school's educational offering, teacher stress, and coping profiles.

If it is found that there is an interdependence between profiles, there could be significant implications for school leadership and educational improvement. Within the limitations of this thesis, those implications are speculative but may include the introduction of stress management courses in teacher training syllabuses; closer examination of school management procedures, school climate, and leadership strategies, styles, and location; and major changes to the promotion system, school curricula, and teaching pedagogy.

The approach

The study deals with a set of factors that may interact with one another and focuses on an investigation of this interaction. The research examines the proposition that education, stress, and coping profiles are independent of, or have no discernible dependence on, each other. The study cannot take the form of 'experimental research', as described by Davis (1981) or Levine and Elzey (1968), as there are no clearly defined 'dependent' or independent' variables nor can variables be 'manipulated' by the researcher. It is based upon the non-directional null hypothesis that there is not an interdependence between a school's education, stress, and coping profiles. It is non-directional in that it does not specify the direction of expected differences or relationships (Levine and Elzey, 1968). It is a null hypothesis in that it implies:

- that the coping strategies employed by teachers will not significantly differ from one school to another, regardless of the schools' stress and education profiles;
- that a school's education profile is independent of the intensity and frequency of stress experienced by teachers; and
- that the intensity of stress teachers experience is not reflected in the coping strategies they use.
Research questions

Arising from the principal objective are a number of questions that provide direction for the general development of the research. The research questions are as follows.

• Do education profiles differ between schools?
• Do stress sources, frequencies, and intensities differ between schools?
• Do the coping strategies that teachers use differ from one school to another?

If the response to each of the above questions is affirmative, other questions will need to be examined.

• In what ways do education profiles differ between schools?
• In what ways do stress sources, frequencies, and intensities differ between schools?
• In what ways do coping strategies differ?

A third set of questions follows from the above.

• Why do stress sources, frequencies, and intensities differ between schools?
• Why do coping strategy usage and efficacies differ?
• Is there an interdependence between a school's education, stress, and coping profiles?
• If an interdependence of profiles exists, what form does it take?

Assumptions and limitations

The following assumptions apply to this study. It is presumed that:

• stress, even if at a low level, is experienced in schools. The stress literature has given some attention to those vocations with high stress profiles. As an example, Hunter (1977:122) wrote: "Air traffic control, surgery, and teaching are probably three of the most potentially stressful occupations in the world".
• differences in education profiles will be indicated between the schools included in the study. This assumption is based on factors such as different geographical locations of schools, size of student and teacher populations, types of school administration, and community influences and participation;
• staff will be disposed to provide information about their schools and themselves that may, at times, be considered of a personal and confidential nature. Although schools have been randomly-selected, teachers' approval is necessary before the study of their school can commence. The data may also more accurately reflect respondents' beliefs if teachers
participate on their own volition; and
• sufficient review of literature has yielded material, the major principles of which will be generalisable to the extent that it will provide some validity to the study. The instruments used in the other studies described in this thesis have been validated for those conditions in which they were applied. The instruments to be used in this study have drawn on criteria incorporated in those of previous studies. Additional items have been included to confirm the validity of questions and the reliability of responses.

A number of limitations also apply to this study. The major areas of concern are:
• the difficulty of objectively measuring all aspects of a school’s education profile. There are items within the observation schedule that call for subjective responses. However, cross-referencing with other instruments should provide an indication of the reliability of those responses. While some aspects of a school’s educational offering are not measured, all schools involved in the study will be measured on the same basis, using identical instruments;
• the validity in Tasmanian schools of the literature on stress. The literature on previous studies into teacher stress has indicated the principles incorporated in the methodology of this study; and
• the identifiability of discrete coping strategies. A number of coping strategies have been included in the questionnaire. However, if other strategies are used, provision has been made for respondents to describe them.

Schools visited

Following preparation of the instruments for gathering data, a letter seeking approval to conduct research in schools was sent to head office administration staff of the Tasmanian Department of Education and the Arts on 2nd February, 1990. Approval was obtained on the 20th March, 1990. Letters were posted to school principals over the next two days, inviting their schools to participate in the research. A copy of one of the form letters, with the school’s name altered, is in Appendix 1.3. Where principals requested further information, correspondence similar to that of Appendix 1.4 was forwarded.

The dates of visiting schools are Raasay - 9th to 12th April, Laggan - 23rd to 27th
April, Wyvis - 30th April to 4th May, Reay - 7th to 11th May, Nairn - 14th to 18th May, Mull - 21st to 25th May, Newtyle - 18th to 22nd June, Portree - 25th to 29th June, and Rona - 2nd to 6th July, 1990. A copy of a letter confirming the date and offering further details is in Appendix 1-5.

The first reports were sent to schools as soon as possible after they were visited. A report was sent to Raasay on 20th April; Laggan, Wyvis, Reay reports were posted on the 15th May; Nairn and Mull reports were completed on 8th June; and Newtyle, Portree, and Rona schools' reports were posted on 10th July, 1990. A second group of letters, a sample of which appears in Appendix 1-6, was also sent to schools. The format of each letter, however, varied according to schools' education profiles.

A third set of reports, similar to the first but with the addition of the combined means of sample schools, was completed on 27th July, 1990. A copy of the covering letter appears in Appendix 1-7. As with the first letter, the name of the school is altered to maintain anonymity. Apart from the name changes, the reports in Appendix 6-7 are identical to those received by schools.

In the meantime, information about the sample schools was obtained from a research project directed by Professor Phillip Hughes of the University of Tasmania. Appendix 1-8 presents data on the number of schools' grade 10 students proceeding to grade 12 and completing their senior secondary college studies. Two year-groups are included, one from the 1981 year ten group, and the other from the 1986 tenth grade students. Appendix 1-9 contains information about the results of 14-year old students' literacy and numeracy tests; student retention from grade 10 to grade 12 with comparisons of aggregates drawn from all high schools, district high schools, and private schools; and the socioeconomic background of communities in which the sample schools are situated.

**Organisation of chapters**

In this chapter, the Tasmanian education system has been briefly explained. Although the research instruments are designed to gather information from any type of school, Tasmanian government high schools were singled out to reduce the number of incidental elements that could bear on the findings of this study.

The conceptual framework illustrates a possible interdependence between the school's education, stress, and coping profiles. The central point of the research is to ascertain what interdependence, if any, exists between the three profiles. The instruments
for gathering data are questionnaires; student, teacher, assistant principal, and principal interview schedules; observation schedules; and diaries.

Due to the paucity of research into the possibility of the existence of an interdependence between profiles, the findings of this study may be highly significant.

The principal questions around which this research is approached are accompanied by an outline of the associated assumptions and limitations. Details are given of schools visited with reports on findings in those schools.

A review of literature, the principles of which serve as a foundation for constructing schools' education profiles, is presented in Chapter 2. The dominant factors emerging from the literature appear to be effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support, and vision. A number of items within the research instruments refer to elements of each factor. Reliability is ascertainable by triangulation, that is, by comparing responses across instruments, and also by cross-referencing responses within instruments.

Chapter 3 contains a review of literature on the two other principal factors of stress and coping. Motivation, arousal and stress are differentiated. The psychophysiological effects of stress are described with details of the effects that stress has on performance.

Stress management can involve an interventionist using procedures such as rational emotive therapy, chemotherapy, stress inoculation training, and problem-solving therapy. This study, however, focuses mostly on the strategies teachers use to handle difficulties encountered in their profession. Discrete strategies, which do not involve an interventionist, may be either direct action or palliative. Direct action strategies attempt to change the form of, or the individual's interactions with, the stress source whereas palliative strategies centre on attempts to alleviate negative feelings arising from difficulties.

The methodology of the study is described in Chapter 4. The methodologies employed in other research into stress are examined before determining the path that is to be taken in this study. The work of researchers such as Ratsoy and Friesen (1985), Kottkamp and Travlos (1986), and Seidman and Zager (1987) is outlined. Means of ascertaining validity and methods of confirming reliability of responses are discussed with details of the procedures for constructing and trialling instruments, and for selecting teachers and students for interviews.
To depict the type of information obtainable from the research methodology, Chapter 5 is devoted to findings common to all schools. A new school, Midpoint High, is created for the purpose of presenting a comprehensive overview of frequently occurring elements within the three profiles. The results depicted in Figures 5.1 to 5.4, although compiled from consolidated findings of all schools, illustrate the format of the first reports referred to on page 13. The reports were addressed to school principals and contained only the results obtained from their schools.

Chapter 6 contains comparisons of individual schools with Midpoint High. Prominence is given to those schools rated highest and lowest in each category of the three profiles. Responses to questionnaire items are presented in three ways - by categories as they appear in the questionnaire, by rearranging the order of responses to questions derived from education profile categories, and by categories according to a statistical factor analysis. Responses to research questions centering on the feasibility of comparing school profiles and how schools' stress and coping profiles differ are specified in this chapter.

Reasons why profiles differ are advanced in Chapter 7. Explanations are related to the literature reviews of Chapters 2 and 3 and are compared with the findings of other research into the related areas of education, stress, and coping. The chapter contains summaries of major findings and concludes with generalisations drawn from those findings.
The purpose of this chapter is to determine those factors that could be used in constructing schools' education profiles. The literature on educational excellence is examined with the objective of devising an operational definition of excellence in the educational setting.

Overview
During the 1980s, a number of reports were compiled with the aim of improving education in American schools. The so-called 'excellence' reports, while not without their research methodological problems, provide a number of recommendations for raising educational standards. Whilst it is accepted that mere implementation of major findings may not necessarily improve school standards, the factors deriving from the associated literature provide a foundation for constructing school education profiles. The major issues arising from the reports are the influences that school goals, leadership, climate, teaching practices, student assessment, and curricula have on educational excellence.

Explanations of the terms excellence, effectiveness, equity, flexibility, efficiency, support, vision and quality control are provided to establish a basis for discussing schools' educational offerings. The question of whether or not excellence involves all students or merely an elite of the more intellectually capable students is examined.

Elements that are important in bringing about school improvement are discussed in the light of recommendations of the 'excellence' reports. The chapter concludes with a summary of factors involved in schools achieving their fundamental purposes and an attempt to determine a working definition of an excellent school.

Contributing factors
Excellence has been referred to as the state or quality of being exceptionally good, to be of extreme merit or to be superior to others in all respects (Wilkes, 1979). Factors identified as contributing to excellence in education are effectiveness, equity, support, flexibility, vision, efficiency, and quality control. The following descriptions are drawn from literature related to educational excellence.

In striving for excellence, effectiveness is closely involved. Generally, effectiveness can be considered as the capability to produce an appropriate result in the attempt to
Educational excellence

achieve one's purposes. However, the meaning of the word in the education setting is more far-reaching. In this context, to be effective may be viewed as producing a 'striking impression' (Wilkes, 1979) in achieving and maintaining high standards set by the school.

Equity involves impartiality in the education of each individual student. It embraces the unbiased consideration of all within the school and expresses the principle of treating all students as equals.

A school's success is dependent on support, whether it be financial, material, or human. Although support may be difficult to measure in terms of human resources, it is demonstrated, for example, at a time of declining student enrolments where parents have the capacity to choose the school their children attend.

Flexibility, the state of willingness to examine new ideas, to listen to the opinions of others, to try different ways of teaching, and to discuss other types of organisational practice, is an ingredient of excellence. Without a high degree of flexibility, the school may simply perpetuate past practices which, in the longer term, could be deleterious to students' future well-being.

Vision is the determination of the school's future possibilities and the selection of the most appropriate educational purposes and objectives. In instituting a vision, the leader looks beyond the daily routines and focuses on issues considered important in achieving the vision's realisation. The skills and knowledge of determining appropriate strategies to attain the vision, of setting clear goals, and inspiring others to share that vision have been cited as characteristics of an educational leader.

Efficiency, the quality of being competent, has the fundamental aspect of economy in achieving particular outcomes. Efficiency in education is related to the ratio of input and outcomes in terms of high standards in teaching and learning. If physical or mental energy is misdirected, the quality of outcome is likely to be proportionately lower than when a clear indication is given of where attention should be focused.

Quality control entails examination of the processes involved in determining the effectiveness of school programs. General test results, school policies and the total staff and student performance are implicated in the appraisal of quality.

The contributing factors are represented in Figure 2-1. In illustrating the relationships between factors discussed in this chapter, only part of the sphere is employed. Other factors are described in Chapter 6. As the factors are considered of somewhat equal importance, they could be placed in any position within the sphere.
In discussing elements for constructing schools' education profiles, a number of reports compiled during the early 1980s and the views of others who have written on similar aspects of education are examined.

**The 'excellence' reports**

**Origins**

The formulation of educational objectives to ensure minimum competence appears to have been an outcome of the "back to basics" movement during the 1970s. Concern over the efficiency of American school systems was raised when, despite massive injections of funds into special education projects, students' performance in basic tests and in other activities declined (Duke, 1987). For example, one could question the use of learning design in architecture or chordal sequences in music when mathematical foundations are, at best, hazy. As a consequence of the concern for minimum competency, a number of reports were prepared in endeavours to arrest the decline and to improve standards of education. The Boyer report *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (1983), the *Action for Excellence* report (1983), *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983), Adler's *Paideia Proposal* (1982), Goodlad's *A Place Called School* (1984), and Sizer's *Horace's Compromise* (1984) are among those indicating a strong relationship between education and the future of society.
Recommendations

A number of recommendations from the reports served as a basis for the reform measures adopted by several American states. "Many reports went further to tie the quality of instruction to the nature of school organisation and leadership" (Duke, 1987:4). Discussing the significance of equity in terms of access, curriculum, language, teacher-student interaction, learning styles, testing, and staffing, Grant and Sleeter (1985:149) considered that: "Many recommendations centred on opening school and classroom doors to all students to give them physical access to the best instructional and material resources available". Tracking, racial and sexual segregation were also considered. The reports have been criticised on a number of grounds including equity, derivations and ethnicity.

Table 2.1 contains a summary of major recommendations from four of these reports, namely, Goodlad’s *A Place Called School*, Adler’s *The Paideia Proposal*, Boyer’s *High School*, and the Education Commission of the States’ report *Action for Excellence*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *A Place Called School*  
(Goodlad) | A more active involvement of students in learning.  
A minimum of 25 hours' teaching for each student per week.  
Initiate mentor programs.  
Mastery learning basis for learning.  
Improve teaching skills.  
Continuously monitor student progress.  
A greater emphasis should be placed on student cooperation |
| *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*  
(Boyer) | Higher expectations for teachers and students.  
Teaching styles should have greater variety.  
Students should be more actively involved in learning.  
Less reliance should be placed on textbooks.  
Classes which require writing should have fewer students. |
| *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*  
(Adler) | High academic standards for *all* students.  
A more active involvement of students in learning.  
Attain a balance between information dissemination, coaching, and Socratic learning. |
| *Action for Excellence*  
(Education Commission) | More homework should be given to students.  
Class sizes should be smaller.  
Increase the use of technology in classrooms.  
Frequently test student skill development. |

Table 2.1. Report recommendations  
(after Duke, 1987:4)
Criticisms of the reports

Grant and Sleeter (1985:149) criticised the reports on the grounds of equity: "To recommend quality for all without recommending the elimination of differentiated education may result in a continuation of these practices". Closely related with equity are language problems inherent in multiculturalism. Criticism has also been levelled at the reports on the basis of a rejection of ethnicity. The concept of a multilingual society and "bilingualism's contribution to the self-esteem, improved achievement, and interest in school of students whose home language is not English" had, according to Grant and Sleeter, (1985:151) been overlooked by most reports.

Podemski's criticism (1985:163) concerned the issue that most recommendations were not based on research or theory. As an example, the report, A Nation at Risk, resulted from discussion between members of a presidential commission. "Even the recommendations found in the Boyer and Sizer reports on the status of high schools were based merely on survey research and some on-site interviews as well as the informed wisdom of their authors." Hunter (1985:156) criticised the reports on similar grounds:

As these reports stand, they are inadequate at best and, in some cases, seriously flawed as blueprints for reform of schooling. They will not provide the needed guidance for ensuring that all children receive a quality education. It appears that the proposal for doing that ... has not yet appeared in print.

Research findings

A major statement contained in the reports is that the two overall goals of school reform are "to raise the quality of teaching and learning in schools, and to do so for all students - to provide equity" (Hunter, 1985:148). Among the recommendations that research has indicated as being valid are those of the Paideia Proposal, which stressed that practices should be modelled by the principal, the Action for Excellence report which urged principals to directly supervise morale, discipline and academic standards, thus serving as an educational leader, High School, which argued that teacher selection and rewards should be controlled more closely by the principal, whilst A Place Called School suggested that educational leadership should also be exercised by experienced teachers (Duke, 1987).

Interpretation of the term 'educational excellence' depends upon the stance which one assumes when viewing it. It may, therefore, be helpful to examine in greater detail those elements considered to comprise, or contribute towards, excellence.

Other elements including accountability, personnel management, interpersonal relationships, pedagogy, and school climate could be considered as discrete aspects.
However, they appear to be embraced by the factors of effectiveness, equity, support, flexibility, vision, efficiency, and quality control.

Factors contributing to excellence

Effectiveness

Although effectiveness is sometimes considered synonymous with excellence, it is suggested that excellence is dependent upon effectiveness as a characteristic which must be present if education of the highest standard is an objective. Effectiveness generally refers to the impact of management, preparation and delivery on a school's educational standards. However, as Duke (1987:5) pointed out, there are wider connotations: "Close on the heels of ... research on teacher effectiveness came a series of studies on school effectiveness ... [focusing] on a wide assortment of school characteristics". These qualities included comparisons of increasing and decreasing school enrolments, and differences in pedagogy, school organisation and leadership styles.

Describing effective schools, Edmonds (1982:128) indicated that effective schools have some common characteristics. Notwithstanding, "two important caveats exist: Researchers do not yet know whether these characteristics are the cause of instructional effectiveness; nor have the characteristics been ranked."

According to Edmonds (1982) and Cohen (1982), research has suggested that effective schools have the characteristics summarised in Table 2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EDMONDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>COHEN</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong educational leadership by the principal.</td>
<td>Strong administrative leadership by the school principal, especially in educational matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and widely understood educational goals.</td>
<td>School-wide emphasis on the attainment of basic skills and agreement among professional staff that education is the primary goal of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe and orderly school climate that is conducive to teaching and learning.</td>
<td>An orderly, though flexible, school climate that facilitates education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with high expectations for students' success.</td>
<td>Teachers' expectations that students can achieve high levels of education, regardless of pupils' backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent monitoring of student achievement as the basis for program evaluation.</td>
<td>A system of monitoring and assessing the performance of students in relation to educational goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2. Characteristics of effective schools.
(Edmonds, 1982 and Cohen, 1982)
While systems of supervision and evaluation focus on determining minimum standards of teaching, in Duke's view (1987:133), "meaningful distinctions are not drawn between novice and experienced teachers, elementary and secondary teachers, or teachers of different subjects". However, there does not appear to be a close correlation of variables such as teacher attributes (education, intelligence level, experience) and class composition (size, facilities) with levels of student achievement. Marsh (1988) concluded that those variables that appear to be much more closely related with achievement are the amount of time spent on a learning task and the degree to which learning activities are structured.

Effectiveness is closely related with, strongly influences, and creates greater "productivity" of which a basic requirement is support from the participant, the individual who is to "produce". Principals are supportive of teachers in effective schools (Levine and Stark, 1981). Drucker (1981) indicated the necessity for human resource productivity in which "people are assigned where the potential for results is, and not where their skill and knowledge cannot produce results no matter how well they work". This requires knowledge of an individual's strengths and appointment to a position where strengths can be utilised: "It requires that they are assigned to opportunities, and those opportunities that are right for them" (Drucker 1980:26). Snyder and Anderson (1986:192) discussed the work of Rutherford (1979:29) and found that where teachers can work together as members of a team, major benefits arise: "Despite various concerns (such as time management, changed relationships with students and interteam relationships) teachers tend to support it because it is effective for them and their students".

With respect to monitoring student discipline, Glenn and Taylor (1981) saw the need for a supportive atmosphere. Where programmes are seen to be effective, a natural reaction is to support those programmes. An effective school possesses a manifest of human resources, employs those resources in appropriate fields, produces support in human terms from such employment and thus raises "productivity" - the inculcation of knowledge, skills and values, that is, the standard of education.

Glenn and Taylor (1981) described the relationship between quality and effectiveness and pointed out that quality is a product of effective management. Wilson (1988) also linked effectiveness with quality, defining the latter as the "capacity to deliver ... the optimum curriculum to the individual learner". Citing the White Paper (Department of Education and Science, 1983), Wilson added that effective teaching is "the major single determinant of the quality of education" (Wilson, 1988:ix). Judgements of
Effective teaching will "reflect the extent to which the principles of collecting evidence ... have been observed, the training provided to those who make judgements and their skill (and motivation) in weighing up and interpreting the available evidence" (Wilson, 1988:26-7).

The relationships between effectiveness and other factors in the sphere of excellence which have been discussed in this section are represented in Figure 2.2.
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**Figure 2.2. Effectiveness in the sphere of excellence.**

In summary, the literature points out that excellent schools possess highly effective management systems that are understood by all who are associated with the school, produce an atmosphere conducive to the highest quality of teaching and learning, account for differences among groups and individuals, and provide personal or group support when required. The effectiveness of management systems is reflected by the level of support received from those within the school; the overall standard of education; the climate in terms task orientation, peer cohesion, involvement, clarity and support; staff professionalism; achievement of objectives; and, ultimately, the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes held by students on leaving school.
Equity

Following the Sputnik launch, emphasis shifted from concentration on the "top 15 percent" (Conant, 1959) to achieving higher standards for all and increasing opportunities for disadvantaged youth. In the United States, increased expenditure during the 1960s provided an abundance of facilities to improve the lot of the disadvantaged: "Money was provided for everything from teacher training to reading labs, multicultural curricula to bilingual education" (Duke, 1987:3). Triggered by declining enrolments during the 1970s and abetted by an almost exclusive focus on ensuring minimum competence rather than increasing the opportunities for all, public dissatisfaction with the education system grew from a 'zephyr to a gale'.

The sole objective of achieving minimum competence led to a questioning of the viability of an education system founded on this principle. "If standards are set so low that all children are likely to attain them, we surely cannot confer the title of 'excellence' to these lower standards" (Marsh, 1988:8). There appears to be a dichotomy between equity and excellence. Marsh added: "If the term 'excellence' means achievement of very high standards, then presumably only a minor proportion of the total school population can ever attain them".

The 1980s has seen a general movement from emphasising minimum competence to concentrating on individual learning styles and attempting to cater for all students within an heterogeneous grouping structure. It is generally held that equality of opportunity should be central to the aims of all educational systems. "Few themes have gripped the imagination ... so intently as the discovery of talent in unexpected places - the slum child who shows scientific genius, the frail youngster who develops athletic skills, the poor boy who becomes a captain of industry" (Gardner, 1984:24).

Egalitarianism, however, can be taken to undesirable extremes if equality of outcome is a primary goal. The striving for uniformity of outcome from the wide range of intellectual abilities among a school's student body could be catastrophic for both students and the state of education. "Carried far enough, it means the end of that striving for excellence that has produced history's greatest achievements" (Gardner, 1984:30). Individuals are not endowed with the same natural talents, levels of intelligence, motivation, and qualities of character. It follows that they will be unequal in their achievements. If education is aimed solely at common standards, it could lead to a stifling
of achievement among those students with higher intellectual abilities and an increasing frustration among the less able. Mediocrity would breed further mediocrity. An exclusive focus on individual achievement could also be deleterious in outcome as it may lead to a desire to subjugate others, to misuse power and to exploit those who are less fortunate. "In its extreme forms, emphasis on individual performance destroys cooperative endeavour and can lead to something close to the law of the jungle: let those who can, survive; let others go under". On the other hand, an environment that "provides freedom and incentives for energetic action, the striving, the zeal and zest that are so often released in individual performance" will help to create conditions which are "conducive to excellence and creativity" (Gardner, 1984:35).

The literature has indicated that students who receive greater positive interaction with teachers are more likely to perform well. However, many students, notably those from the 'lower' social classes, are less likely to receive such positive interaction. Teachers require support and encouragement to ensure that students who need it receive a greater share of time and additional assistance. Duke (1987:209) framed a number of diagnostic questions including those of classroom resource management: "Is instructional time allocated to curriculum content and to individual students in ways that promote school goals and equity?" If equitable teaching practices are emphasised, greater support, from not only the student body but also parents and the community, could be forthcoming. The literature also suggests that assumption of responsibility for equity ensures a higher quality of education for not only the "top 15 percent" but for all students.

Excellence embraces a commitment to learning, a tapping of the talents of each individual, the expression of "literary, artistic or spiritual impulses" (Gardner, 1984) and the building of the motivation to explore, achieve and enlarge understanding. As Snyder and Anderson (1986:490) pointed out, collaborative control practices contribute towards accomplishing these goals: "With a control function, selected targets can be realized". Therefore, the aspiration for equity will directly impinge on the recognition of this factor by the school's system of quality control.

The desires of a free society encompass two major, although perhaps contradictory, considerations - that all should be permitted to perform to the best of their abilities and to be rewarded according to their merits, and that all should be treated equally.

The relationships between equity and other education factors are represented in Figure 2:3.
As support is required for equity, in turn, equity produces and impels support. This is analogous with a musician who, having tentatively interpreted a composition in a particular manner, directs attention towards the composer's intentions. By further developing the interpretation, not only may the full intentions of the composer be realised but also the performer's own 'mark' adds further quality to the piece.

Support

Although there is a tendency to think of support in terms of fiscal resources only, in the educational context it also embraces human, physical, social and psychological factors.

Citing theories of the "needs-press climate", Silver (1983:216) described the development press of "fulfillment of psychological growth" which, it was argued, greatly assists school effectiveness. The development press is related to dimensions of climate: "intellectual climate, achievement standards, practicalness, supportiveness, and orderliness". Silver (1983:227) associated effectiveness with support: "School environments that support the gratification of [experienced practicing teachers'] needs would be satisfying", thus influencing the school's intellectual climate. Stern (1970) believed that a strong development press represented a highly desirable educational
climate. The supportiveness press was described as "a social force to respect the integrity of individuals while at the same time gratifying their dependency needs" (Silver, 1983:211). Where a supportiveness press is dominant in an organisation, there is greater emphasis on:

- tolerance as opposed to dominance,
- objectivity as opposed to projectivity,
- affiliation, conjunctivity, as opposed to disjunctivity,
- supplication as opposed to autonomy,
- blame avoidance as opposed to aggression,
- harm avoidance as opposed to risk taking,
- and nurturance. (Silver, 1983:212)

Support, encouragement and motivation assist in achieving effectiveness. Moreover, knowledge and experience of what has happened in the past shapes the direction of, and amount of effort put into, future endeavours. These factors are particularly relevant to attaining school goals. A teacher who strives for excellence and receives support in the form of extrinsic or intrinsic rewards is often motivated to intensify future endeavours. In discussing the 'systems' approach to organisational theory, Silver (1983:373) remarked: "It is readily apparent that the feedback the organisation receives regarding its productivity and efficiency will serve to modify the rules, mandates, job descriptions and other bureaucratic information inputs to the system".

Snyder and Anderson (1986:494) held that greater staff support is "integrally linked to control redistribution in schools. ... Workers who have a greater sense of control in their organizations are more positively disposed to their supervisors". Quality control is influenced by the pertinent characteristics and quantity of support that teachers receive in their daily routines. This usually results in reciprocation which further enhances school quality.

Meyer (1980) saw the school organisation as possessing an "exoskeletal" structure in that its effectiveness is strongly influenced by external forces such as parent and community support, and departmental regulation. Holt (1987:109) described school administration as a system in which "institutional conformity is much more important for effectiveness than is technical instructional efficacy or technical innovation: the real technology of the system lies in its institutional exoskeleton, not in organisational machinery".

Pearce (1986) furnished criteria by which schools in the United Kingdom are evaluated. Among them is a criterion for climate: "They [Her Majesty's Inspectors] view a supportive and reassuring climate of good order as significant, not only for the personal and social education of the pupils, but for the delivery of an effective curriculum" (Wilson, 1988:33). School inspectors in the United Kingdom were described as having "very
sensitive antennae" for the types of relationships existing between teachers, teacher and class, and between pupils.

Parents' support for the school and their appraisal of teaching quality was described by Wilson (1988:40):

Parents ... display a wide range of attitudes to education, but as a group, their expectations are rising. They are more sophisticated and expect better quality information about the objectives of the school programme, the rationale for curriculum policies ..., the resources being used, and the results ... being achieved. ... Parents voting with their feet can, of course, reflect school stereotyping. But this simply highlights the public relations challenge facing a headteacher who wants to convince parents that the school he runs offers better value than one that has a supposedly 'better' reputation.

The relationships between support and other factors are illustrated in Figure 2-4.
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Parental and community support can stimulate greater striving for quality and effectiveness. This indicates that programmes should be equitable, relevant, and acceptable to those to whom they are directed and to the wider community. According to the literature, the quality and quantity of support within a school is directly related to the school's climate. Support of a practical, logical, appropriate and informed nature encourages, motivates and strengthens each individual's endeavours in the quest for
excellence. Adaptability to change, an acceptance of reality, and flexibility in approach are inherent in felicitous support.

Flexibility

As with other organisations, a school exists in a variety of environmental conditions and circumstances. The more obvious external forces are changing technology, departmental regulations, demographic patterns, and politics. However, as Snyder and Anderson (1986:41) noted, "the survival needs of adapting to the society and achieving goals are especially problematic for schools". A compliant attitude to new regulations, a resistance to involvement in new or different ideas, and a difficulty in effecting changes leading to school improvement are causes for concern. Brieschke (1983), as cited by Duke (1987:244), found that "some teachers act as guardians of existing organizational norms" and can be relied upon to "view any proposed change as a threat" to the established ways of doing things. Others may consider any proposal for change as being a "vote of no confidence" in the belief that, if the school was operating well, change would be unnecessary. Organisational flexibility assists in securing effectiveness in teaching and quality of learning, the primary aims of education. Schmuck et al. (1977) noted that the core of the school's capacity for self-renewal is to possess active formal and informal discussion groups and processes. Teaching and learning undergo continuous adaptation where a school is to "respond successfully to its students, who reflect a changing society" (Snyder and Anderson, 1986:41).

Morrish's (1976:60-68) identification of factors inhibiting school flexibility remain relevant, despite the passing of time. Following Havelock's (1973) classification, Morrish delineated influences deleterious to school effectiveness as confused goals, lack of tangible rewards for innovation, uniformity of procedural approaches, school monopolism, naïveté and low investment in research and development, low financial investment, difficulties in diagnosing weaknesses, problems in validly measuring outcomes, emphasis on accountability to present commitments, low investment in organisational and personal development, lack of entrepreneurial models and skills, and psychological passivity among staff.

Organisational flexibility extends to all those within the organisation and is associated with the individual's needs and values. However, there is a distinction between school improvement and staff development. The former is concerned with changing curricula, rules, and organisation, whereas the latter focuses on people's
attitudes, behaviour, knowledge, and understanding. This relationship was indicated by Duke (1987:162): "Teachers may have to change in order for schools to improve". Conversely, "schools may have to change in order for teachers to improve".

Ownership of change is dependent on the participation of all intended users in various stages of planning. Planning should include methods of implementation and feedback for renewal purposes (Snyder and Anderson, 1986). One of the tasks of coordination lies in creating "opportunities for staff members to voice their feelings about proposed innovations. School leaders are more likely to win support for change by acknowledging the legitimacy of these feelings than by pretending they do not exist" (Duke, 1987:244). Miles (1988:5) supported the concept of ownership and applicability: "The content of a program is not sufficient to predict successful improvement. Even the best programs can go awry if not well planned, locally owned, aligned to the local setting, and well implemented".

From a growing body of research into teacher effectiveness, Sparks (1983:66) identified a number of underlying threads in the literature on the delivery of staff development services:

Develop in teachers a philosophical acceptance of the new practices by presenting research and a rationale for the effectiveness of the techniques. Allow teachers to express doubts about or objections to the recommended methods in small groups. Let the teachers convince the resisting teacher of the usefulness of the practices through "testimonies" of their use and effectiveness.

Miles (1988:6) indicated a similar vein of thought: "The most effective improvement programs include well-implemented processes of change, with well thought out and planned specific change projects. Content without process, or process without content is not enough". Duke (1987:175) expressed the necessity for a convincing rationale and considered it a key component of a staff development plan. An outcome of planning is a decrease in resistance to change: "A carefully crafted rationale often can justify the need for change without discrediting or embarrassing those for whom it is intended". Sparks (1983:68) included another common finding from research into staff development:

Help teachers grow in their self-confidence and competence through encouraging them to try only one or two new practices after each workshop. Diagnosis of teacher strengths and weakness can help a trainer suggest changes that are likely to be successful - and, thus, reinforce future efforts to change.
The literature on staff development indicates that success is, to a large extent, dependent on the principal's active participation in programme initiation, guidance and support.

Snyder and Anderson (1986) suggested that flexibility extends to the composition of groups within the school and that differences in group structures will lead to greater productivity. Specialised "ongoing processes" require stable or more permanent staff groupings whereas allocation could be temporary for short-term tasks involving the whole school. Whether groups are temporary or permanent, the recommended size of groups is from five to seven members as consensus is more readily obtained, individuals are directly involved with a consequent increase in satisfaction, and the group leader does not need to be as directive as for a large group (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). Snyder and Anderson (1986:41) added that organisational growth strategies should be designed in such a way as to direct the school's focus onto goal orientation and to respond significantly to pressures.

Snyder and Anderson (1986) suggested three types of operational control systems to decrease reliance on maintaining past practices and increase flexibility in assessing, developing, and initiating new approaches.

1. For constant operations over time such as student behaviour management, the homeostatic approach provides feedback on performance within defined task parameters. It focuses on established policies and aims at providing smooth operations.

2. For describing "real time results" of events such as assessing current student learning opportunities, the adaptive feedback is useful for tasks with flexible parameters where the focus is on current conditions and is directed towards refining practices.

3. In preparing for change, the feedforward approach is recommended for tasks without fixed parameters and in which control direction is guided by short- or long-range planning mechanisms such as initiating a new student achievement recording system. It prepares the school for the future by prior planning for change. The control cycle includes goals and action plans, implementation practices and results, and evaluation.

Miles (1988:9) provided guidelines for the implementation of change and indicated a necessity to consider a number of implications before change is introduced:

1. Aim for global, comprehensive goals - and expect to work adaptively toward reaching them, as you proceed.

2. Include a range of objectives ... but worry more about careful planning, ownership and implementation than whether objectives are perfectly "right".

3. Not all program elements need to be planned in advance. It is useful to allow a program to evolve. ... Of course, there may be certain program elements that should be implemented with fidelity.
4. Take a careful look at the intended change program [and aim for a] balance between content and process elements.
5. Don't expect to be free of external influence over the program. But that does not imply passivity at the school level.

The relationships between flexibility and other factors discussed in this section are represented in Figure 2-5.

![Figure 2-5. Flexibility in the sphere of excellence.](image)

The ability to examine change without bias is considered an integral part of effective management. Staff may need to be encouraged to share the perception that in order to remain effective, new ideas, different teaching methods, developments in the community composition, and other forms of change should not be viewed with suspicion or considered threatening but could suggest means by which improvement may occur within the school context. Forms of change should be appraised with the prospect of increasing learning effectiveness, of encouraging interest in the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and of aspiring to the highest level of student accomplishment. A vision needs to be sufficiently flexible so that it may be acceptable to, and shared by, all within the school and its environment. A vision possessing this property may thus evoke a corresponding attitudinal flexibility from those within the school.
Vision

A vision has been described as "a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organisation ... a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organisation, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985:89). Starratt (1988:3) wrote of vision as being founded on "those deep, core meanings about human life, its dignity, grandeur, beauty, value". It is concerned with human values of:

freedom, honour, selflessness, altruism, loyalty, devotion ... to some community, integrity and dignity of the person, equality, peace and harmony among peoples, the rule of law, the elevation of reason and civility, wisdom, self governance, courage, character, a perfect performance, creative expression.

Successful change requires a "shareable and shared vision of what the school could look like". A relevant and purposeful vision provides direction and is a "driving power for change, and criteria for steering and choosing" (Miles, 1987:12). In composition, a vision has the property of being able to be shared by others for, whilst it may provide rumination for the originator, an unshared vision is otherwise of little use. A vision also considers the environment in which it is to be instituted. Where large-scale organisational changes are contemplated, the ownership of vision is of some importance as it provides an "umbrella over short-term objectives" (Miles, 1987:12). In researching five urban high schools in eastern U.S.A., Miles reported that a general vision greatly assisted multi-goal programs.

Generalisations reflecting recent advances in knowledge about school leadership were offered by Caldwell (1987:3). In his view, a vision needs to be communicated to others as "communication of vision requires communication of meaning". An illustration was offered: " 'Community' is [a] metaphor for school; [the] principal rewards related teacher activities". The involvement of those associated with the school - members of the community, teachers, parents and students - assists in framing and institutionalising a vision acceptable to them. An external agency cannot compel a school to accept a vision. Similarly, a vision will be unsuccessful if foisted on staff by the school principal. Starratt (1988:6) added: "Principals who propose their vision of education and impose that on staff, students and parents will not be able to exercise leadership within that community. The vision must be composed, shared and owned by the majority of the community".

Greater effectiveness may be obtained when the objectives of a change process are clear to all participants: "People managing improvement projects usually do have hopes for their schools, as well as usual rules of thumb about change. Relevance can be enhanced
by reflecting on such hopes and rules of thumb, and making them explicit" (Miles, 1987:12). It follows that a vision will encompass change procedures.

Enlarging on the proposal that goals should be clear to all, Duke (1987) stated that a leader's effectiveness is dependent upon two critical factors:
• the possession of, and ability to articulate, a vision of effective schooling because it "helps teachers see how their individual contributions relate to the world around them" (p. 291); and
• the skill to allocate time efficiently to increase the likelihood of realising the vision as it "helps direct attention to deeper issues of personal and professional meaning, issues which are bound to influence the quality of leaders' lives and the lives of those around them" (pp. 11-12).

Whilst a vision may be all-embracing for one school, another may be guided by a different perception for the future. A vision is discrete in its nature: "While it is important for school leaders to have some vision of what teaching and schooling should look like, no one vision will be universally appropriate" (Duke, 1987:146). A vision encompasses not only future directions but also change processes and influences of external forces involved in its implementation: "Given the type of change contemplated, what will be the general game plan or strategy for getting there? ... A vision needs to be congruent with central office assumptions - or buffered from external intervention" (Miles, 1987:12). Roueche and Baker (1986), as cited by Caldwell (1987), similarly stressed the necessity for planning. In their study of 154 schools that participated in the United States' 1983 National School Recognition Program, it was found that the process of change usually included preferred approaches to teaching and learning and to the management of change. "As with vision related to outcomes, preferences in terms of process reflect different values and beliefs held by the teacher" (Caldwell, 1987:13).

There is a relationship between vision and flexibility alluded to in the literature. According to Miles (1987:7), two necessary preconditions for fulfilling a vision are the exercise of promoting that vision and the requirement that staff must not only be sufficiently flexible to be willing to "buy" a shared set of goals but also that flexibility is enhanced through possessing a vision: "Having a vision leads indirectly to good implementation by creating an enthusiasm that increases willingness and initiative". Starratt (1988) emphasised that the power of leadership comes not from legal authority but from a vision shared and owned by others. Such a vision "draws on and focuses the
collective energy of the members of that community ... which nonetheless expresses the community's dreams for itself". To be inflexible, by Starratt's definition (1988:6), is not to share a common vision:

The energy and enthusiasm of the staff and students tends, when unfocused by a community purpose, to follow individualistic, self-serving goals. These frequently lead to tensions, arguments over scarce resources, defensive behaviour, unhealthy competition, a focus on external rewards.

Caldwell (1987:14) pointed out that a vision should be flexible in itself as "different assumptions, values and beliefs [including] the nature of humankind; the purpose of schooling; the roles of government, family and church in schooling; approaches to teaching and learning; and approaches to management of change" are reflected in all its aspects.

Adaptability, which some consider to be synonymous with flexibility, is an essential element for school effectiveness during times of hardship. It is to this that Duke (1987:216) alluded when indicating that, especially in difficult times, the capacity to inspire is a valuable aspect of leadership: "School leaders must be made aware of the value of vision in helping staff members find meaning in their work during times of tight budgets and lost resources". Issues of volition are central to forming a vision. Miles (1987) saw the main obstacles as "fear and uncertainty about the future ... coupled with self-doubt and hesitancy about leading, committing oneself, 'being out in front'". Problems arise where the work environment is seen as inflexible: "Weak visions occur when the present structures and procedures are taken as given, rather than as alterable" (Miles, 1987:12-13).

Some appear to believe that a vision is too 'precious', esoteric or abstruse to be of practical use. This, perhaps, may be the case where the vision is not applicable to anyone other than the originator. The pointlessness of this type of limitation was noted by Starratt (1988:4): "Our vision of education, then, if it's to be anything more than a mouthing of prescribed platitudes about schools, must be grounded in those meanings we consider basic to human life". Those meanings or values include equity, effectiveness and efficiency. Another generalisation arising from the educational excellence literature was indicated by Caldwell (1987:3): "Issues of value - 'what ought to be' - are central to leadership". The appendant illustration, the "principal has [a] strong commitment to equity in terms of access to schooling", directly associates vision with the value of equity, a factor contributing to excellence. "The principal ... is thus challenged to envisage the
future of his or her school. 'What will my school be like in ten years when the organisation and curriculum is indeed flexible enough to cater for the needs, abilities and interests of all students?' (Caldwell, 1987:5). In a similar vein, Starratt (1988:10) described dramatic consciousness as "the abiding awareness of the significance behind the ordinary events of everyday life" and emphasised that the principal and "collectively the school community is deciding not only the quality of life it will pursue in the present, but also is creating itself as the society of the future". Duke (1987:62) also considered equity as central to a vision: "The vision of teaching ... goes beyond instructional technique to encompass all types of interaction between teachers and learners; it values respect for human beings over concern for efficiency and effectiveness".

Quality teaching involves motivation centred on teachers' capacity to "promote academic achievement by stimulating the interest of students and by communicating their own caring to them" (Duke, 1987:62). The principal's "dramatic consciousness" is embedded in a vision wherein the school strives to "release human creativity, to build community among an increasingly pluralistic population, to advance the cause of science, or human laws, or the preservation of the natural environment". Both vision and dramatic consciousness lead the principal to "call the rest of the community to attend to the significance of their everyday choices" (Starratt, 1988:14).

The need for a vision is further ordained by the obligation to create a purposeful environment that pervades school organisation, where a "long term vision of the future permits program evaluation - program evolution that is always purposive, but reflects growth of activities, rather than actively 'cutting back' or implicitly limiting implementation" (Miles, 1987:7). Due to the diversity of personal skill, knowledge, interests and behaviours within an organisation, a vision encompasses quality control as a management function which "orders diversity and ensures that organizational goals are accomplished" (Snyder and Anderson, 1986:489).

The skills required in forming a vision were indicated by Miles (1987:13) as comprising "invention and design, accompanied by strong collaborative ability. Clear communication, encouraging others to dream, and developing shared ownership are especially crucial".

The relationships between vision and other factors in the sphere of excellence are illustrated in Figure 2-6.
A vision is a conceptualisation of the future. It is founded on reality, considers and accounts for the environment, is applicable to a particular organisation, and aims to critically improve the present state of affairs. Its effectiveness is dependent on its shareability. Therefore, it needs to be communicable to others. It may be illustrated by signs, tokens or the establishment of tradition, and focuses on school culture, organisation, climate, and pedagogy either discretely or in combination. A vision is endemic to a school and may be inappropriate if transplanted to another.

Any contemplated change is considered in light of the vision. Time is set aside for reflection on meaning and determining paths to be taken to achieve that vision. A vision is malleable and permits necessary change without losing sight of the overall school purpose. When combined, the two factors of reflection and tractability lead to greater effectiveness, induce flexibility when considering developments, change or innovation, and focus attention on equity. These result in a 'product' of higher quality and greater predisposition for attaining excellence. A common vision tends to meld staff as a cohesive group, brings about a sense of propriety in the utilisation of resources and ensures that financial, material or human resources are not wasted but are, on all occasions, applied in a highly efficient manner.
Efficiency

Efficiency was viewed by Silver (1983) as referring to "the cost effectiveness of the organization's operations". Efficiency in business is the attainment of the highest quality product from the lowest capital investment. In the educational arena, efficiency could be considered "in terms of the per pupil expenditure in relation to the students' learning outcomes" (Silver, 1983:25). Duke (1987:15) concurred with this definition: "To think of goal feasibility is to reflect, in part, on the cost included in achieving a goal. If leaders' effectiveness is somehow linked to goal attainment, then efficiency relates to goal attainment per cost unit". Quality of learning is, to an extent, dependent on efficiency in terms of financial expenditure, time on task, effort expended and the participant's ability. The words 'to an extent' are of considerable importance and will be further discussed in this section. If costs are maintained while goal attainment is increased, or if the attainment of goals is maintained at the same level while costs decrease, efficiency is thought to have improved.

Sizer (1984) suggested that coaching is, perhaps, the most efficient means of increasing the quality of education. Concerning the efficient attainment of objectives, Sizer (1984:211) wrote:

If effectiveness, productivity, and the avoidance of waste are important ends, an analysis of our practices would start at the base of the existing hierarchy, at the triangle of student, teachers and the subject they confront together. The primary question would be, How can adolescents be assisted in learning most efficiently?

Referring to educational organisation, Sizer (1984:221) pointed out that "the best we educational planners can do is to create the most likely conditions for them [schools] to flourish, and then get out of their way". Silver (1983:25) considered indicators of organisational efficiency as "cost per unit of output for a given period and amount of idle or slack resources per time period". There appears to be some difficulty in equating efficiency to the educational organisation setting as Silver (1983) could not locate any relevant research literature directly pertaining to the variable of efficiency. However, research carried out by Miskel, Fevurly and Stewart (1979) may be applicable as it "indicated that teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of their schools were positively related to formalization, in terms of the presence of general rules for teachers, and to complexity, in terms of teachers' involvement in professional activities" (Silver, 1983:40).

Educational efficiency, according to axiomatic theory, is associated with greater formalisation, centralisation, and stratification, and lower complexity and thus lower job
satisfaction and 'adaptiveness'. Briefly, axiomatic theory posits that the way people interrelate within an organisation (the means) determines the outcomes for which the organisation is constructed (the ends); the ends, however, may influence the means. Hage (1965) specified four properties constituting the means: complexity - the range of employee specialisations, centralisation - the level where decisions are made, formalisation - the scope of variation within jobs, and stratification - the number of different job levels (the career structure). Organisational ends were also specified: flexibility - responsiveness to change, production - quality and quantity of outputs, efficiency - cost-effectiveness, and job satisfaction - the worker's attitude to the job. Hage (1965:96) proposed seven axioms that form the theory:

1. The higher the centralisation, the higher the production.
2. The higher the formalization, the higher the efficiency.
3. The higher the centralization, the higher the formalization.
4. The higher the stratification, the lower the job satisfaction.
5. The higher the stratification, the higher the production.
6. The higher the stratification, the lower the adaptiveness.
7. The higher the complexity, the lower the centralization.

From these axioms, Hage derived 21 corollaries, of which the following relate to school efficiency:

- The higher the centralization, the higher the efficiency.
- The higher the formalization, the higher the production.
- The higher the stratification, the lower the complexity.
- The higher the efficiency, the lower the complexity.
- The higher the efficiency, the lower the job satisfaction.
- The higher the efficiency, the lower the adaptiveness.

The above axioms and corollaries implicit in school efficiency are represented in Figure 2.7.

![Diagram showing relationships between organisational means and ends](adapted from Silver, 1983:26-43)
As with all other contributing factors included in the sphere of excellence, balanced relationships exist between efficiency and effectiveness, between efficiency and quality, and between efficiency and support. This is illustrated in the apparent argument between efficiency and job satisfaction as they are applied to the axiomatic theory in which "efficiency and production are considered to be positively related to each other ... and their association with similar structural attributes is congruent with this relationship". On the other hand, it was emphasised that "these two outcomes are thought to be inversely related to employees' job satisfaction" (Silver, 1983:42). The point is that axiomatic theory is simply theory, which infers that it has not been validated by research. In fact, it was pointed out that there is a variance of Hage's corollaries with research: "These corollaries are contradictory to some research findings and other theoretical propositions that maintain that productivity is positively related to employee satisfaction" (Hage, 1965:96). Regardless of whether or not research validates the theory, it is possible that if the drive for efficiency is taken to its extremes, the possible benefits could well be outweighed by the resulting disadvantages of a lack of quality, effectiveness and, eventually, support.

Efficiency does not bear a relationship with finances only. Other factors are involved, including the management of time, human resources, materials, the work environment and quality control. March (1978:223) presented guidelines for educating school administrators that accounted for a number of related variables. Among the guidelines for "leadership outcome goals" were:

- Develop and implement effective models/modes of instructional delivery that best utilize time, staff, advanced technologies, community resources, and financial means to maximize student outcomes.

- Skillfully manage system operations and facilities to enhance student learning.

Associated competencies were also proposed in the guidelines which included the "skills for goal accomplishment":

- Allocating human, material and financial resources to efficiently and accountably assure successful student learning. This competency includes the following -
  a. facilities planning, maintenance, and operation;
  b. financial planning and cash flow management;
  c. personnel administration;
  d. administering pupil personnel services and categorical programs;
  e. knowledge of legal concepts, regulations, and codes for school operation; and
  f. use of analytical techniques and management.
The relationships between efficiency and other factors discussed in this section are illustrated in Figure 2.8.

![Figure 2.8. Efficiency in the sphere of excellence.](image)

There is a relationship between efficiency and effectiveness as competent and prudent management of human and material resources result in higher 'productivity' or quality of learning. The focus of efficiency, as in other factors inherent in excellence, lies in the formal or informal teaching and learning that takes place. A balance between factors contributing to excellence is considered necessary as an overemphasis on the one can lead to a neglect of the other. For example, if efficiency is considered to be the most important aspect of a school's organisation, it is possible that the resultant greater complexity, lower job satisfaction and lower productivity will lead to the point where the school's major purpose, the students' education, is overlooked. The balance requires astuteness of control; knowledge of requirements, necessities, wants and desires; and full comprehension of, and clear and comprehensive belief in, the school's principles and objectives. The degree of support obtainable and advanced from within an organisation correlates with the quantity and quality of satisfaction gained from attending the institution, and is, as has been intimated, closely related to the quality of learning within the school's environment.
Quality Control

Those who have examined the general characteristics of quality and, in particular, how it applies to education, have stated difficulties in arriving at a specific definition of the term. As an example, Hughes (1988:7) expressed the problem in this manner: "Even when used in terms of the simplest subject, 'quality' is an elusive idea", and, "Quality in education is an even more diffuse idea." It appears that what is considered as quality is dependent upon the aspect from which it is examined. Hughes continued: "One view will value highly academic preparation ... another will emphasise the needs for skills ... another will emphasise social graces and communication skills. By the very nature of the concept of education, quality is a multidimensional idea". The O.E.C.D. (1987) report acknowledged the diversity of interpretation and concluded that definitions of quality "are crucially determined by educational aims". Additionally, it is "how the curriculum is defined, planned, implemented and evaluated [which] ultimately determines the quality of education that is provided" (Caldwell, 1988:71).

A further point arising from the literature is that while there may be some indication as to what quality in education might be, its interpretation differs from one person to another. There is, therefore, a requirement for the school to attain a commonality of purpose. By its very nature, an articulated vision directly impinges on the school's effectiveness, and, due to its characteristic of diversity, quality education will have a direct bearing on a school achieving its goals in an efficient manner.

A number of studies have reported a direct association between in-built procedures for maintaining quality teaching and a school's effectiveness (Duke, 1987, Snyder and Anderson, 1986, Hughes, 1988, and Wilson, 1988). In discussing assessment of teaching quality, Duke (1987:107) indicated the relationship between quality control and vision: "No matter how sound the procedures are for supervising and evaluating teachers, they are unlikely to contribute much to instructional improvement if they are unsupported by a coherent vision of good teaching practice". The necessity for maintaining quality was also pointed out by Jackson et al. (1983:66), who indicated that in effective schools, principals "monitor[ed] more carefully to see that the curriculum actually met the achievement goals of the schools". Duke (1987:220) outlined four major functions of quality control:

- To determine whether, in the process of achieving school goals, undesirable by-products also are achieved [sic].
- To provide information relevant to the promotion, retention, and remediation of individual students.
To determine whether special programs and projects have been implemented as originally intended.

To assess whether resources are being used efficiently and effectively.

It can be seen from these functions that it is not only the principal who is, or should be, involved in quality control. As Snyder and Anderson (1986:493) remarked: "No longer is the principal the holder of all management power, decision making, and responsibility for tasks; these functions are dispersed and shared among many groups within the school organization". As suggested by Drucker (1981), successful corporations involved employees in groups with one of the express purposes being the maintenance of quality in production. These groups, or "quality circles", provide a focus wherein personal goals can be aligned with group goals. Snyder and Anderson (1986:497) wrote of a similar feature in successful schools: "Teachers in effective schools tend to work in the context of a group. Each teacher defines personal goals and action plans as they relate to team (and task force) goals, responsibilities, and also to personal growth needs".

While quality control also "involves overseeing the assessment of student performance, evaluating curriculum and programs, [and] assessing school effectiveness" (Duke, 1987:219), in times of turbulence, the maintenance of quality, whilst being an important factor in itself, is not the only relevant task. Assessing staff development requirements, implementing ideas for ameliorating performance, and monitoring school improvement point to a need to look for means for increasing 'production' quality in the future and imply an acceptance of some forms of innovation. In an excellent school, these responsibilities are shared among staff through a distribution of control that generates a "sense of involvement and creativity ... in school-wide functions, and ultimately in decisions that affect individual instruction" (Snyder and Anderson, 1986:493).

Morrish (1978) advised caution in accepting innovation for its own sake. Factors inherent in an innovation that bear on its adoption include its proven quality, its durability, cost, complexity and its communicability. Indicators such as "reliability, validity, generality, internal consistency", utility, suitability and durability require consideration. "The profitability of any particular innovation may be judged from the point of view of educational quality, administrative efficiency, the psychological satisfaction derived by pupils and teacher and so on" (Morrish, 1978:80). Holt (1987:141) also warned against a wholesale acceptance of innovation without thoroughly examining its qualities. It was pointed out that "it is essential to develop a curriculum in a school's publics" while maintaining those considerations, detailed in a previous section of this
chapter, which Meyer (1980) emphasised. "Hence traditional school subjects must be reconsidered and reshaped so as to become means to our ends-in-view rather than ends in themselves."

Davis (1981:23) suggested means for evaluating change or innovation: "At a time when change appears to be inevitable and some responsibility has been devolved to the school level, teachers should be encouraged to raise their understanding of curriculum processes, provisions, and outcomes". Questions such as does this change improve the curriculum?, what are the improvements?, what part(s) of the present curriculum must be omitted? and how does this change, affect or influence the schools vision? are particularly relevant when contemplating change. Figure 2.9 suggests a method of "relating and comparing significant aspects of curriculum evaluation" (Davis, 1981:18). It illustrates four quadrants with two dimensions, the first dimension extending from a human performance emphasis to educational provision, whilst the second dimension extends from an emphasis on functional control to human understanding. The arrows indicate the movement from one emphasis to another.

Snyder and Anderson (1986:493) held that a number of regulatory mechanisms may be necessary to ensure performance towards, and maintenance of, objectives. They suggested that "multilayered controls" were advantageous for self-correction, "that is, individuals,
teams, team leaders, specialists, and principals all need to assess their own progress regularly". Feedback for those within an organisation has been stated as being beneficial to performance. If feedback is openly available from many sources and coupled with "feedforward procedures for correcting and applauding progress", it will be of advantage not only for the individual but also for the overall health of the school.

The relationships between quality control and other factors are represented in Figure 2-10.

Hughes (1988:8) wrote of the issues arising from an examination of quality:

- Quality of education is a matter of the emphasis we put on different aims.
- The idea inevitably involves value decisions.
- The concept ... will always involve controversy, particularly with respect to public education.
- The controversy involves striking a balance between a number of requirements:
  - Local - global requirements
  - Leadership - participation
  - Continuity - change
  - Choice - commonality.

While quality control maintains effective teaching, a primary requirement is to
comprehend that which constitutes quality and effectiveness. To this end, Duke's (1987) model provides lucid and comprehensive guidelines. All within the organisation need to be involved in maintaining quality. Associations formed within the school can assist. Clear lines of communication, readily available feedback and feedforward, and an openness to the ideas of others facilitate the perpetuation of quality. It is considered that, where envisioned, change should be evaluated in the light of how it will improve existing conditions.

Above all, the guidance of, and continual reference to, a common vision will help to maintain balance between control and innovation, individual and group needs, and commonality and diversity.

An examination of excellence and contributing factors raises questions of how schools might be changed. Marsh (1988:8) cautioned that "the goals and actions implied in these terms are different from those concerned with the process of school improvement, although there is some overlap between 'effectiveness' studies and 'school improvement' studies".

School improvement

Miles and Ekholm (1985) defined school improvement as a: "systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions ... with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively."

Problem recognition is seen as an important element of school improvement. If problems are not visible, it does not necessarily imply that they do not exist. Effectiveness can be improved only if staff are able to recognise the shortcomings of the school and are motivated to finding solutions for them. It follows that, if change is to be achieved, the desire for improvement is a prerequisite. A high level of commitment is necessary as examination of current practices in the light of what is achievable requires considerable time, perseverance and collaboration (Marsh, 1988). A number of other factors are involved in processes of school improvement. Without the principal's inclination and motivation, change cannot proceed smoothly, if at all. Building on the commitment of staff and assessing the value of external agents such as consultants and other trained personnel are important strategies. The characteristics of any innovation, for example, its advantages and compatibility, need to be known and understood. Change implies a necessity for comprehension and continuing staff development activities (Berman and McLaughlin, 1977; Crandall et al., 1982).

Caldwell (1987) described school-based management and collaborative decision-
making as imperatives for school improvement. Collaborative decision making involves working effectively with others, implying that leaders not only know "how to work effectively with people, they must understand the technical side of operations too". School leaders must also possess "a working knowledge of instruction, curriculum, and evaluation as well as group dynamics, management practices, and school law" (Duke, 1987:6). Studies of outstanding schools have furnished evidence of school-site management where staff have considerable responsibility and authority in determining means to increase academic performance. This requires greater autonomy in curricular decision-making and allocation of resources. Furthermore, in Duke's (1987:5) examination of planning, implementing, and evaluating innovation, it was noted that "where leaders devoted time and energy to involving members of the school community in planning changes, and where they provided recognition to teachers and set appropriate expectations, schools were more likely to experience productive change".

Sergiovanni (1984) indicated administrative actions applied in competent schools, including "technical leadership [involving administrators'] attempts to effectively plan, organize, coordinate and schedule organizational activities". Qualities for achieving excellence were described as "human leadership [in] which the administrator emphasises morale building and participatory decision making". Above all, it is the quality of education not only offered to students but inwardly received by them which determines a school's excellence. This involves "educational leadership [in] which the administrator manages instruction-related processes such as curriculum development, supervision, and staff development".

Through the principal's pivotal position, time on task and lesson preparation can be influenced considerably. Edmonds (1982), Cohen (1982) and Mangieri (1985) considered the position as a centre-pin to school effectiveness and the principal's distinguishing qualities as a primary characteristic.

The principal's leadership

Snyder and Anderson (1986:17) delineated areas where an effective principal uses discretion:

- monitoring what happens in the school,
- protecting the school from uncertainties,
- adapting policies to school needs,
- realizing personal goals,
- acquiring power relative to the larger system,
- adapting the reward system of the district to school needs, and
- protecting the school from interference in its instructional endeavours.
An educational leader is one who responds to impressions gained from regular and systematic visits to classrooms (Edmonds, 1979). The principal of a successful school has a clear view of the school's central purpose and communicates this to others. Effective principals coordinate, discuss, and advise on teaching methodology while, in the opinion of Cohen and Miller (1980), the ineffective principal does none of these. Additionally, "effective principals offer rewards, resources, and personal interaction with teachers in exchange for compliance and acceptance of a joint responsibility for instructional outcomes" (Bossert et al., 1981:5).

The principal occupies a central position in guiding teaching and learning in the school. Boyer (1985:32) referred not only to pedagogy but also to deciphering "society's confusion about objectives", formulating goals, freeing up the 'paralysis' of the politicisation of school boards, calculating the ability of the school to find the means to ends and to accomplish those ends, and having an input into the preparation and professional development of principals: "The time has come to recognize that excellence in education will be accomplished not only by experts on leave from Mount Olympus but by teachers in the classroom who urgently need more support, not more paperwork or more regulation".

The principal of an excellent school has the authority to provide that support. Further responsibilities of the position lie in the encouragement of leadership among staff: "Teachers are the solution, not the problem. They must be given not only more responsibilities but more authority as well" (Boyer, 1985:33). Morris et al. (1981), and Everard and Morris (1990) indicated similar responsibilities in the principal's position.

An analysis of studies of effective principals, conducted by Croghan et al. (1983), led to a list of competencies within the following categories.

- Purpose and direction - proactive orientation, decisiveness, commitment to mission.
- Cognitive skills - interpersonal search, information search, concept formation, conceptual flexibility.
- Consensus management - managing interaction, persuasiveness, concern for image, tactical adaptability.
- Quality enhancement - achievement motivation, management control, developmental orientation.
- Organisation - organisational ability, delegation.
- Communication - self-presentation, written communication, organisational sensitivity.

The diversity of interpretations of values of excellence, equity and effectiveness may give rise to conflict. Management of conflict is "as much part of the principal's rôle as
Educational excellence

it will be of leaders at local, state and national levels" (Caldwell, 1987:7). Examples of contentious issues were given:

The value of excellence, conceived in terms of high levels of achievement in a relatively narrow range of academic studies, may conflict with the value of equity, conceived in terms of access to a range of educational programs for all students, regardless of social and economic circumstance. Alternatively, substantial investment in resources in efforts to attain excellence and equity might conflict with the value of efficiency.

In most instances, the principal's responsibilities include the establishment of school goals that are applicable to the particular characteristics of the school and its environment.

Goals

When formulating school goals, recognition that activities "should be based upon the student-as-a-worker" and that students themselves are responsible for their own learning should be paramount (Beare et al., 1989).

Means by which school goals may be formulated and communicated to others were indicated by Allen (1985). Although referring specifically to the American elementary school, the principles may be applied to other environments to promote understanding and acceptance of school goals. Formal verbal means include faculty meetings, parent organisation meetings (including board meetings), and talks with various groups. Formal written communication can be effected through letters to parents, memoranda to staff, student reports, school newsletters, student newspapers and magazines, information request forms, homework papers and flyers or brochures. Informal methods include "hall talks" - conversations in corridors, staffrooms etc., spontaneous conferences, and teacher-generated "happy/sad" notes. "No effective organization can operate in isolation from the community it serves, and no effective school can operate without adequate resources" (Allen, 1985:47). Further means of goal communication are the vitally important factors of reading and listening to the views of others.

School goals form a general back-drop to a subject's aims and objectives, indicating the requirement for clarity if effective teaching is to occur. Clarity is assisted by simplicity. School goals that emphasise "mastery learning of a clearly defined syllabus" (Beare et al., 1989) and that apply to all students provide a simple and direct focus. Duke (1987:67) added: "By deciding on objectives and assessment procedures in advance, teachers are more likely to provide instruction that is focused and clear". The importance of goal
discussion, decision making and communication permeates the daily routine of the effective school yet, as was suggested by Boyer (1985:20), due to the pressure of procedural matters in the daily running of the school, little thought is actually given to goals: "When asked about objectives, principals respond with such platitudes as: 'to develop school spirit', ... or 'improve students opportunities in life'. Too few articulate as one principal did: I'd like us to challenge our pupils to think".

Beare et al. (1989) stressed that schools should have an intellectual focus: "Schools cannot be all things to all people; essentially they exist to help people develop their minds". Podemski (1985:168) also emphasised the necessity for the clarity of school goals: "Schools are normative organizations which must rely on the internalization of goals, the legitimate use of authority, and the manipulation of symbols, as means of controlling and directing the behaviour of participants".

The literature on excellence in education concluded that scholarship must be the primary goal and that all other goals should be compatible with, and subservient to, that goal (Dwyer, 1984).

The degree of 'internalization of goals' is largely consistent with the prevailing spirit of the school and should centre on the facilitation of learning.

Climate

A school embodying the aura of "unanxious expectation, trust and decency" provides a climate conducive to quality learning and teaching (Beare et al., 1989). A model for creating an effective school was tendered by Purkey and Smith (1985). The model includes the element of developing school culture through collaborative planning and collegial relationships. Duke (1987:68) similarly offered a model for teacher effectiveness focusing on a caring environment that consists of respect for students, acceptance and support, recognition of student progress and valuing student differences: "Without the sense that they are being cared for, many students may be unable to take full advantage of learning opportunities".

The aspect of equity in the school climate was referred to by Hunter (1985:154):

It appears as though the reports expect teachers to offer a quality education to all students without expecting that they be taught about relationships between cultural diversity and schooling, or taught skills and attitudes that help combat racist, classist, handicapist, and sexist practices in schools.

The Teacher Education Conference Board (1981:3) indicated that climate is
influenced by teachers' collective effectiveness which may be greater among them when they possess a "variety of strong features than when all are moderately competent in everything". Beare et al. (1989) stressed that each staff member should be committed to what the school stands for and that these "generalist responsibilities" are of greater impact than any subject specialisation.

Teaching

The tendency to restrict the range of strategies employed in some classrooms was addressed by the 'excellence' reports. Sizer (1984) paid particular attention to the way students learn and recommended that teachers recognise and employ more diverse educational strategies. Grant and Sleeter (1985:153) criticised the reports because of a paucity of recommendations addressing deficiencies in teachers' awareness of their own behaviour patterns: "It is naïve to assume that teachers hold high expectations for all and treat all in a way that ensures equal access to instruction ... without making recommendations designed to sensitize teachers to stereotypes and patterns in their behavior".

Talented teachers possess "subject matter expertise, communications skills, pedagogical abilities ... sound judgment" (Duke, 1987:67), and a clear focus on lesson content and educational objectives. Planning needs to consider students' individual differences. Three reports stressed that students require more time to learn. However, there is some question as to how this could be achieved. Three possibilities were suggested - greater time on task in the classroom, lengthening the school day, or increasing the school year.

Teaching involves more than handling student discipline. An essential ingredient of professional practice is that teachers possess a "repertoire of instructional strategies" (Duke, 1987:68) to assist students in grasping the lesson's objectives. Effective teachers ensure that students have access to the resources necessary for the subject's study, including writing material and books of an appropriate level. Students' progress should be frequently checked so that they receive feedback on their performance: "Through classroom questions, homework, tests, and one-to-one contacts, teachers can determine on a regular basis whether students are understanding lesson material and mastering essential objectives" (Duke, 1987:69).

A model of teaching excellence, depicted in Figure 2-11, indicates that teachers require skills in planning, teaching, managing, monitoring progress, providing clinical assistance, and caring for students.
Clinical assistance may be necessary in handling individual students' needs. A knowledge of the student's family background and school history can help. Further information may be obtained from parents whose assistance in remedial and coaching strategies could be enlisted. Duke (1987:69) pointed out that "the quality of help [required] depends on the accuracy of the original diagnosis and the ability of regular teachers to make appropriate adjustment in classroom instruction".

Beare et al. (1989) stated that teaching and learning should be personalised. By reducing class sizes to a number where teachers can personally identify with students, recognition of an individual student's problems is facilitated.

**Student assessment**

The primary purposes of student assessment are to inform students of their progress in learning and to indicate areas requiring reinforcement or remedial attention. Assessment also informs the teacher of the success of pedagogical methods. Although reasons for
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reporting assessments are to provide feedback to the student and to indicate the student's progress to parents, over the longer period the former is considerably more important. In most instances, success provides an impetus for further endeavour and it is the spurring of motivation that should be a major goal of assessment. Gardner (1984:77) explained it thus: "If we are concerned with the full development of our young people we must give attention to those motivational factors that lead people to level off short of their full ceiling". Accurate and comprehensive assessments provide insight into those factors and "if we learn how to salvage any respectable fraction of these [motivational factors], we will have unlocked a great storehouse of talent".

Difficulties can be experienced with standardised tests as they were advocated in the 'excellence' reports. Problems lie in the teacher's ability to determine that which is considered to be of most worth, achievement tests may adversely affect handicapped students' results, and standardised tests have for "too long served as a way to retain the advantages of middle-class ... students" (Grant and Sleeter, 1985:152).

An excellent school requires students to demonstrate that they have mastered the course (Beare et al., 1989). It is only by so doing that qualifications gained by the students can have any meaning or bear any significance.

The curriculum

Most reports recommended a thorough examination of schools' curricula to eliminate "inessentials" (without defining those inessentials) and a concentration on traditional academic subjects. Maths and science were stressed as requiring greater attention with additional emphasis on English, languages, and the social sciences. Most reports underlined the development of thinking skills. Sizer (1984) stated that learning should begin with the experience and interests of the pupils. The appropriateness of the curriculum to the learner was also mentioned by Mangieri (1985:33) who saw the necessity for an amalgam of learning, not a programme for "winners" and another for "losers", and for a clear vision, a 'social contract': "This means ... discovering the importance of critical thinking through centrality of language and a core curriculum that is not only national but global".

Whilst not arguing for complete integration of the curriculum, Cohen (1983) indicated that excellent schools have a curriculum featuring a close coupling of subject syllabuses thus providing for greater cohesion of learning units. Additionally, the
curriculum of an excellent school is clearly measured in terms of student performance, is more closely defined in its overall objectives, and is interwoven with school goals. Penick and Yager (1983:9) stated that for programmes advancing the concept of "science as inquiry", the following criteria determine excellence.

- Teachers who value inquiry, encourage such an orientation, and possess such skills themselves.
- Classrooms in which science objects and events focus on investigation.
- Curricula and units of instruction that give attention to science processes.
- Teachers who act as role models in debating issues, admitting errors, examining values, and confronting their own ignorance.
- Instruction that focuses on exploration rather than on coverage.

Conclusion

Factors contributing to excellence

Excellence connotes an "unlimited potential for growth" (Duke, 1987:67). It embraces effectiveness, equity, efficiency, flexibility, support, and vision and contains relevant structural quality controls. Excellence requires leadership; programme planning, development and guidance; expectations of high performance; a belief that all students can attain and master basic skills and knowledge; control over curriculum, school functioning and programme staff; strong support from staff; a positive climate; support services; acceptance of responsibility for the achievement of all students; and close links with the community.

Gardner (1984:76) pointed out that: "Some people have greatness thrust upon them. Very few have excellence thrust upon them. They achieve it. All excellence involves discipline and tenacity of purpose".

Eight general conditions were cited by Mangieri (1985:1) as necessary for the attainment of excellence in education:

1. a rigorous curriculum,
2. competent teachers,
3. effectiveness characteristics,
4. testing to prove the students have learned essentials,
5. meaningful citizen support and positive parental involvement,
6. adequate financing,
7. strong discipline, and
8. commitment to traditional values.
The school is primarily accountable to students as they are, or should be, the focus of education. It is, therefore, mandatory that they receive the best learning and teaching programme of which the school is capable. An efficient school addresses effectiveness and equity, does not allow for wastage in financial and material resources, and positively views time as a most valued commodity. A school is, secondarily, accountable to the community that provides the finances enabling the school to open its doors. Where parents and the community are involved in organisational planning, it is suggested that the problem of accountability to external bodies is no longer a separate issue as they are closely associated with many aspects of school life.

The commitment of all staff and students to the school aims is necessary. An indication of commitment is the extent to which teachers give of their free time (Snyder and Anderson, 1986). The characteristics that distinguish an excellent school from a merely effective school are the clarity of its vision and the extent to which it is shared by those associated with the school. An excellent school is one with a clear and vital mission. It is important that teachers, students, parents and the community participate in, know, understand and accept the key values of the school. This requires an internalisation of goals, a legitimate use of authority, and the manipulation of symbols (Podemski, 1985). Schools that develop a sense of 'community' do not rely on coercive power alone. This requires a moral order which entails deference to authority, a natural and omnipresent caring for others, appreciation of their sensitivities and dispositions, mutual confidence, and the undeviating application of criteria which characterise acceptable behavior.

Symbolic meanings need to be relevant to the school environment. This implies that they are, in many instances, unique. The prime leadership activity associated with the cultural force include creating symbolic meaning through which key values of the school are identified, thereby "establishing a unique identity for the school with which both those within and outside the school can relate" (Podemski, 1985:169). Sergiovanni (1984:9) extended activities to include: "socializing new members to the culture, telling stories and maintaining or reinforcing myths, traditions and beliefs, ... developing and displaying a system of symbols over time, and rewarding those who reflect this culture".

The relationships between factors contributing towards excellence are portrayed in Figure 2-12.
The concept of excellence

The concept of excellence encompasses the following characteristics:

- **Effectiveness** - involving educational leadership, goal acceptance, a climate for learning, high expectations, and continuous evaluation.
- **Efficiency** - in which all material and human resources are utilised in an appropriate manner.
- **Equity** - all students are treated equally. Each is provided the same opportunities regardless of sex, ethnicity or socioeconomic background.
- **Flexibility** - the school's capacity to accurately analyse the benefits of change and to know when to implement change to improve its performance.
- **Quality control** - in which the school ensures that teaching and learning are maintained at the highest possible standard.
- **Support** - from all concerned with the school and its aims.
- **Vision** - which, while encompassing all other factors, provides the drive and energy to strive for the highest standards of which the individual and the school are capable.

The above contributing factors are taken into account in the following definition of an excellent school.
An excellent school is one with a clear vision that is accepted by all and which permeates the daily routine and individual thoughts of all in their striving for effective and equitable teaching and learning. Supported by adequate and efficiently utilised personal, community and material resources, the school achieves outstanding success through a flexible attitude towards different ways of doing things, a high level of motivation, a concentration of purpose, and the mutual understanding that, whilst aiming for common goals, all participants are individuals.

A conceptual analysis containing definitions and variables related to the concepts described in this chapter is presented in Appendix 2-1. The variables presented in the table are included as items in instruments for gathering data to construct education profiles of schools included in the sample.

The following chapter contains a review of literature associated with teacher stress and the coping strategies used when stressful situations are encountered. The material contained in Chapter 3 forms a basis for compiling schools' stress and coping profiles.
The purpose of this chapter is to determine those factors contained in the literature which could be used in constructing school stress and coping profiles. Key concepts, characteristics, outcomes of stress and means of managing stress will be investigated.

Overview

The chapter consists of two sections. The first provides clarification of key concepts with a detailed discussion of stress and its effects on the individual. Factors associated with stress including changing demographic patterns, advances in technology, employment, and social organisation are considered. The characteristics of stress and their relationship with physiological and psychological performance are discussed.

The second section examines the nature of coping strategies and identifies common and clinical means of dealing with stress. Clinical stress control involves the intervention of a professional practitioner. Other methods of dealing with stress do not directly involve professional treatment and are discrete in that the person who experiences anxiety attempts to handle the problem. These strategies may be direct-action, in which the individual seeks to alter the environment, or palliative, in which the individual attempts to alter feelings received from the environment. Relaxation, social skills, and individual assertiveness affect the manner that the strategy, perceived as the most appropriate, is selected. The success of this choice is related to the manner of strategy selection in future stressful circumstances. Strong influences are exerted on coping efficacy by the social environment which include interactions with others at work or elsewhere.

Key concepts

Many different words have been used to describe an individual's reaction to, and interaction with, the environment. Positive responses include motivation, activation, stimulus, arousal, and drive. They are positive in that they are characterised by a striving for situational improvement, moving in a direction which is beneficial to the individual or the environment or both. They also tend to be constructive rather than sceptical in quality. Negative responses may include anxiety, ego threat, tenseness, and
fear (Broadhurst, 1959). They are negative in that, in most instances, they tend towards destructive elements within the individual or the person's interactions with the environment. Unfortunately, many of the terms have created confusion as they are often applied to the various interpretations of stress. Furthermore, there is not a clear delineation of the range of each term and many investigators have interpreted the one as being synonymous with another.

King et al. (1987) wrote of four fundamentally discrete reactions depicting stress. While the first three are considered to correspond with stress, the fourth is the most apposite description of the stress response:

- an unpleasant feeling or threatening situation, often called a "noxious stimulus" by researchers,
- a requirement to perform, succeed, or overcome the situation,
- a feeling within the individual that the situation may be difficult or impossible to overcome, and
- an emotional response consequent to the difficulty.

Stress is a term which has long been used in engineering. In an endeavour to provide the study of human stress with some form of scientific credibility, the similarities have, perhaps, been belaboured and this has led to some misuse of terms. Strain in engineering generally refers to the amount of change or distortion which occurs in an object upon which stress forces are applied. The same, however, does not hold true in the psychological sense in which stress refers to an emotional response; it is "a psychological problem which requires psychological understanding" (King et al., 1987:9). Stress measurement in engineering may be a relatively simple matter when applied to pressure units but the psychological response measurement has provided investigators with complex difficulties for many years.

Stress arises from doubts about an individual's internally perceived capacity to cope which, as King et al. (1987:4) described it, is "a state of unacceptable divergence between perceived demands and capabilities to adapt". Stress is a negative reaction to a demand calling upon a person to act in order to maintain integrity and preserve well-being. The individual's skill and knowledge and, in some instances, external professional assistance may be required to handle the situation (Howard, 1984).

The notion that stress is a negative response was clearly indicated by King et al. (1987:3): "Stress is a negative emotional experience which results from negative thoughts about our environment". Stress refers specifically to disruptive levels of a negative mood arising from the individual's reaction with the environment. Therefore, the ideas
inherent in statements such as 'stress is a necessary part of life', or that 'all demands placed upon an individual create stress', are not fully acceptable as legitimate interpretations of the word. King et al. (1987) believed that the term should be reserved for a stronger negative impulse, which, in most recent studies, has been applied to its structure.

Arousal is an independent emotion or mood state which does not necessarily change because of the presence of stress (Mackay et al., 1978). Message (1986) looked towards the end-point or outcome of arousal and added that anxiety is also a form of arousal: "When you wrestle with a situation your arousal is high". This is a valid interpretation of arousal - the actual initial energy created to handle a problem or situation. Anxiety may not necessarily be included at this stage. In Message's opinion, anxiety arises when "the arousal reaches such a level that you start to panic. When you panic your energy is wasted and you become ineffective". In this chapter, anxiety is viewed as a level of stress. In defining anxiety, Message (1986:15) indicated that "the physical symptoms of anxiety are the same as those of acute stress".

Burnout, a term which appears to be more widely accepted outside than within the field of clinical psychology, is considered to refer to an outcome of stress (Cherniss, 1980; Edelwich and Brodsky, 1980; Applebaum, 1981; Seidman and Zager, 1987; Gmelch, 1988). Seidman and Zager (1987:27), for example, defined teacher burnout as "a negative pattern of responding to stressful teaching events, to students, and to teaching as a career as well as a perception that there is a lack of administrative support", whilst Gmelch (1988:3) wrote of burnout as "an advanced result of stress". It appears that burnout is an outcome of excessive, continuous, or prolonged continual stress.

Researchers have generally referred to coping as the process of handling the stressful situation (Howard, 1984; Ratsoy and Friesen, 1985; Blase, 1986; Wilkinson, 1988). Howard (1984:8) described coping as "an active effort to either do something about the source of stress or to lessen its symptoms". Coping methods may take various forms and strategies but may be identified as pertaining to two broad groups:

- direct action, which are concerned with changing the source of stress, and
- palliative, which aim to reduce the disruptive feelings arising from the interaction.

According to Howard (1984:8), in many instances it is difficult to disentangle coping and adapting. Adapting can be considered as a passive acceptance of, or an habituation to, the source of stress: "Adaptation is simply becoming used to the stressor, with no apparent effort to do so". Lazarus and Folkman (1984) also contended that a difference exists
between coping strategies and "automatized adaptive behavior". They provided the analogy of driving a car which, while being taught, is seen as a series of separate functions that become automatic movements as experience is gained. If coping includes those automatic responses to problems, the distinction between coping and adapting becomes confused. The underlying principle is that coping is not automatic but "is a subset of adaptational activities that involves effort" (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984:130). Depression can be an outcome of faulty coping or adaptation, and is an "all-too-frequent experience of our times" (Howard, 1984:13). The symptoms are a sense of hopelessness, lack of interest in surroundings, slow and ponderous speech, little effort at communication, and slow movements. It is seen by some as not coping with encountered problems. However, as also indicated by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), it is not so much a matter of not coping but of the faulty selection of coping strategies.

In summary, an individual may respond to the environment either positively, in the sense of attempting to improve a situation, or negatively, which produces feelings such as tension, fear, or stress. Human stress is a form of negative emotional response arising from a perceived difficulty whereas stress in engineering refers to forces causing physical distortion. The analogy between stress in humans and in engineering is overused. Human stress emanates from an apprehension about contending with a threat or an apparent threat for example, to livelihood. Stress is not considered to be synonymous with arousal. It necessarily calls on a person to respond in either of two ways - by adapting to the changed environment or by attempting to cope. The former refers to a passive compliance whereas the latter requires an individual to be actively involved in change.

Factors associated with stress

Due to the accessibility of newspapers, television, advertising and other forms of communication, changes occurring in the environment appear to be more noticeable today than in times past. The magnitude of those changes also appears to be greater than at any other time in history. Society is changing; beliefs, rules and modes appear to be more and more transient. Advances in technology, especially in the field of communications, in the biosciences, community housing, education, and transportation have altered life-styles to what could be viewed as an alarming degree. The increasing multiculturalism of local communities requires greater adaptation on the part of the individual with an adoption of new ways of living (Howard, 1984).
Selye (1980:29), however, indicated that stress in daily life is not a new phenomenon. Our cavemen ancestors, even if they did not know the word, must have known stress. "They must have noticed that many symptoms [of stress] occurred when facing dangers like a hungry-looking sabre-tooth tiger or a marauding band of humans" which could have led them to feel the oppressive influences of alarm, sickness, tiredness, and discontent. A wide range of physical ailments, lack of energy, tension headaches, insomnia, and restlessness can arise from the unpleasant feelings emanating from continued exposure to demanding situations.

Stress can arise from internal factors. Howard (1984:4) explained by providing the examples of "guilt, loneliness or simply the feeling of too-few rewarding events in life", which produce feelings of pressure upon an individual if continued over a period of time.

An unpleasant mental state can emanate from boredom, an easily recognised condition arising when too few demands are made of the individual. "Interestingly enough, a low level of demand relative to the resources also stresses the body" (Colliver and Farnell, 1983:3). Correlations exist between the individual's level of ability, occupational demands, and the degree of boredom experienced. Czikszentmihalyi (1975) described these relationships: "When a person is bombarded with demands which he or she feels unable to meet, a state of anxiety exists". This is the commonly-accepted view of stress. "When the demands for action are fewer, but still more than what the person feels capable of handling, the state of experience is one of worry." In this, Czikszentmihalyi has indicated the variable of experienced level of stress. Where demands and handling capacity are balanced, stress is not normally experienced unless caused by pathological factors. "Finally, a person with great skills and few opportunities for applying them will pass from the state of boredom again into that of anxiety" (Czikszentmihalyi, 1975:50). King et al. (1987) referred to the long-lasting effects of stress experienced by prisoners-of-war in years past when, due to confinement and lack of stimulus for mental exercise, a sense of powerlessness was paramount. Similar feelings are experienced by many who are presently unemployed. It normally follows that the greater the degree of ability possessed by the individual, the earlier will be felt the stress resulting from boredom. The duration of the jobless period is likewise associated with the severity of stress symptoms (Fryer and Warr, 1984). Rôle conflict can arise through the divergence between the societal moré that
all who can work should have a job. The person's inability to obtain work is a further aggravation to stability between the person and the environment.

Kottkamp and Travlos (1986) considered that stress arises from rôle ambiguity, rôle conflict, rôle overload and powerlessness. Rôle ambiguity was described as the receipt of inadequate information about expectations when executing tasks and has been linked with job dissatisfaction, anxiety and poor production (Kahn et al., 1964), lower self-esteem (Margolis et al., 1974), and depression and resentment (Caplan and Jones, 1975). Rôle conflict occurs when an individual receives incompatible work demands. It is the degree of perceived discord between required rôle behaviours and is related to job dissatisfaction, a sense of futility, low self-esteem and job-related tension (Kahn et al. 1964). Rôle overload describes a work quantity greater than that which a person perceives can be completed in a given time. Rôle overload leads to low job satisfaction, poor interpersonal skills (Kraut, 1965), absenteeism, low levels of motivation, and low participation (French and Caplan, 1973). Powerlessness is said to occur when there is a lack of control over sought outcomes. It is related to job dissatisfaction (Shepard, 1972), poor performance, tardiness (Cummings and Manring, 1977), low self-esteem, and anxiety (Gilbert and Mangelsdorff, 1979).

The effects of exposure to stress and the sapping of mental energy or 'cognitive fatigue' from a prolonged high level of arousal lead to similar reductions in general performance (Cohen and Spacapan, 1978). This points to a requirement for stress analysis and the delineation of its characteristics.

The nature of stress

Lewis (1980:14) indicated that the following have been considered as stress characteristics:

a. normal, such as a student taking an examination, or pathological. "An 'anxiety neurosis' or 'anxiety state' is ex vi termini, pathological",

b. mild or severe,

c. mainly detrimental to thought and action, or in some respects, advantageous,

d. episodic or persistent (chronic),

e. due to physical disease, for example, delirium tremens, or psychogenic,

f. either accompanying other features of mental disorder, as in melancholia, or alone,
The opinion has been expressed that these criteria are insufficiently precise for recognising stress or anxiety states. Discussing the difficulties of defining stress, Lewis (1980:14) indicated the following criteria:

1. It is an emotional state, with the subjectively experienced quality of fear or a closely related emotion (terror, horror, alarm, fright, panic, trepidation, dread, scare). It should, for example, be different in its specific quality from anger.

2. The emotion is unpleasant.

3. It is directed towards the future. This is implicit in the feeling that there is a threat of some kind, an impending danger.

4. There is either no recognisable threat, or the threat is, by reasonable standards, quite out of proportion to the emotion it seemingly provokes.

5. There are subjective bodily discomforts during the period of anxiety. The sense of constriction in the chest, tightness in the throat, difficulty in breathing, and weakness in the legs are conspicuous.

6. There are manifest bodily disturbances. Some of these are functions normally under voluntary control (e.g. running in panic, agitation, screaming, sudden defaecation); others are functions not wholly or at all under voluntary control. Of these phenomena there are many varieties e.g. dryness of mouth, sweating, horripilation, tremor, vomiting, palpitation, giddiness, abdominal pain: and others, physiological and biochemical, that can be detected with appropriate methods of investigation.

Excessive stress can be detrimental to mental and physical processes and may be accompanied by some form of mental disorder such as depression. Stress may affect "perception, memory, judgement and other cognitive abilities" (Lewis, 1980:15). It is suggested that with additional adjectival qualification, the word fear could be substituted for anxiety. To this end, fear would express the extreme doubt arising from an individual's perception of the lack of ability to cope.

Fenichel (1945) stated that anxiety is the core of neurotic conflict. Similarly, Linton (1956) suggested that any primary drive frustration resulted in neurosis. Tan (1980) supported the concept and likened the emotional life of human beings to their physical life. As pain is the outcome of injury or disease, so anxiety is a type of psychological pain resulting from a conflict of drives and impulses.
Stress and arousal differentiation

Arousal is another term which is often confused with stress and a failure to distinguish one from the other has persisted. Message (1986:6) interpreted arousal as synonymous with stress: "Where there is no stress there is no life. Stress is tied up as much with challenge and excitement as with anxiety and depression"; and, later: "Wherever people live and work, there must be some stress. Stress is arousal: when we are aroused to respond or act we experience stress". Similarly, stress is thought to be both positive and negative, the terms 'eustress' describing the former and 'distress' the latter (Gmelch, 1988; Gmelch and Thomas, 1989). Gmelch (1988:4) justified this notion with the statement: "Failure is stressful, but so is success. Both work and play can be stressful and the balance must be present". It is, perhaps, interesting to note that, apart from the brief passages in Gmelch's articles, one from which this quotation is derived, there is a far greater concentration on the negative characteristics of stress. Contrary to the opinions expressed by Message, Gmelch, and Gmelch and Thomas, it is suggested that greater clarification may be obtained by viewing stress as a negative emotion associated with doubts about the efficacy of coping and regarding arousal as positive in that it is related to the organisation or mustering of resources to meet a given situation.

Coping is similar to arousal in that it also refers to a mustering of the required resources. Coping is a positive response to demand. The psychological state of arousal coexists with physiological changes. In support of this notion, King et al. (1987:15) stated: "The results of arousal are ... found in psychological assessment, physiological changes, and behavioural or performance indices". It was further pointed out that stress is not equivalent to arousal, "although both may be altered if a person sees a demand". Because of the association between stress and arousal, both require measurement in the study of performance and mood. The interactions between performance and mood make it more difficult for the researcher to understand the effects of stress if arousal is not assessed. Explanation was also provided that research results support the hypothesis that stress and arousal should be considered as separate states, the one having a deleterious effect on performance whilst the other enhances performance. "If we confound these two moods, measure neither, and ignore task difficulty, then we might come up with an apparent result of an inverted U relationship [Figure 3-1] between something and performance" (King et al., 1987:9).
Howard (1984:6) considered that there are "optimal" amounts of stress: "If a stress level is too great, performance diminishes ... and at lower levels, there may not be enough motivation to perform well". The Yerkes-Dodson hypothesis illustrates the concept that as stress increases, performance improves but, as stress continues to increase, performance declines. King et al. (1987:11) explained the hypothesis thus: "The inverted U hypothesis suggests that the best performance occurs when a person is under a medium level of stress. Too little, or too much, results in poor performance". The Yerkes-Dodson hypothesis appears to apply to a number of different situations and that it is not only a human trait but is exhibited in animals as well (Howard, 1984).

The hypothesis has been regarded by a number of researchers as a law. However, as King et al. (1987) have indicated, it is not a rule or a binding force or statement as there are individuals to whom the principle appears not to hold. Some who consistently show high level stress symptoms may display an equally high level of arousal but for the greater percentage of the population, stress and arousal are discrete factors.

There appears to be similar and considerable confusion involving interpretations of motivation, arousal and stress. Excessive motivation or arousal may lead to stress but it does not necessarily follow that either motivation or arousal are stressful. In fact, the Yerkes-Dodson hypothesis was considered by King et al. (1987:24) as detrimental to stress research as it has "served only to prevent useful predictions being made in the domain". People with a high degree of stress do not necessarily have a correspondingly high level of motivation - they may appear lifeless and feel as though they have no remaining resources. When distinguishing between stimulus and stress, Howard (1984) provided a direction on whether or not stress should be viewed as a negative response (Figure 3-2).
Howard (1984:37) explained that there is "an optimum level of stimulus change for each of us. Too little [negative] is stressful [also negative] and too much [positive] is stressful. Again there seem to be wide individual differences in regard to the optimum point".

King et al. (1987) contended that performance will generally be maintained at a higher level when the degree of stress is low. It should be noted that they did not argue for a complete removal of stress but maintained that as stress intensity increases, the level of performance decreases. As with the Yerkes-Dodson hypothesis, this is not a law as there are individuals to whom the principle appears not to hold. Some who show high level stress symptoms may also display equally high levels of performance.

Figure 3-3 may be a more appropriate representation of the meaning of stress as depicted by King et al. (1987).
The major reactions to stress were summarised by Howard (1984) as the three f’s: fright, flight, and fight. Fright is the initial response which may range from a slight change stimulus to a major catastrophic alarm, flight is the primary urge to avoid the conflict which comes about through tackling the cause, and to fight the source brings into play many psychological and physiological changes within the person who is subjected to the initial fright. It must, however, be emphasised that these reactions refer to the first three stages of stress. The fourth stage, the emotional reaction, is the crucial factor of stress whereas the other stages are more properly considered as arousal.

Physiological measurement

Performance in normal humans is affected by elevated levels of stress. It appears that there is an inverse correlation between performance and stress: the higher the stress level, the worse is the performance. Gross and Mastenbrook (1980:22) remarked: "The compounded effects of high levels of anxiety together with high memory load were ... found to impair performance on logical problem solving tasks". Very high levels of stress bring about changes in almost all physiological functions including the heart rate and its correlates, urine content, blood chemistry, and skin resistance.

Stressors produce a number of symptoms which Selye (1980) called the general adaptation syndrome. Reaction to stressors falls into three stages:
1. alarm, the sensation caused by exposure to the event. Adrenaline flows, the heart rate increases, blood flows at a greater rate to muscles, and there is a decrease in the digestive processes;
2. resistance, when there is an attempt to physically do something about the stress source; and
3. exhaustion, which is the outcome of unalleviated stress. The symptoms appear to be the same as for the alarm stage but there is little which the body can do to relieve them.

Table 3.1 lists the effects a stressor may have on a number of biological "markers" together with the sampling method used. Care is necessary when interpreting biochemical analyses because, although valid for the physiological disturbance, they do not necessarily imply that the events alone cause these changes. The reactions shown in the table do not appear to account for the extraneous variable of sample procurement which could be a source of stress in itself. Factors other than stress may produce similar symptoms. Nevertheless, sufficient levels of stress produce the changes.
Table 3-1. Biochemical changes resulting from demand.
(King et al., 1987:39)

King et al. (1987:40) received encouragement from investigators who are "beginning to incorporate psychological measurements" as well as the physiological. Under controlled laboratory experimental situations, there is difficulty in relating experiences to the real world. Therefore, the results "can add little if anything to our understanding of how stress develops and how it affects our performance".

Lader (1980) provided greater detail concerning physiological changes, touching not only on biochemical factors but also on other physical reactions which, in some instances, may be outcomes of biochemical changes. The psychophysiological measures and physiological changes occurring in stressed states are summarised in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Psychophysiological measures and changes occurring in stressed states.
(Lader, 1980:60-81)
Stress can be measured in terms of physiological reactions to a demand. However, clinical data could be skewed due to a remoteness from daily life. Psychological measurement, in combination with the physiological, indicate many of the individual's reactions to stress but it cannot always accurately predict the individual's attitude to, and perception of, a situation and, consequently, the degree of stress experienced. These factors are related to the type of stress management most appropriate for the individual and the circumstances under which stress occurs.

Summary

Stress can be envisaged as consisting of four major elements: a noxious stimulus, a requirement to perform, a perception of difficulty, and an emotional response.

The analogy between stress in engineering and in humans has, in some cases, been taken to the extreme where interpretation of the latter appears illogical. Human stress refers to disruptive reactions and negative mood states resulting from doubts about the ability to cope. Faulty coping methods can lead to depression in which continued pressure produces a further inability to promote any positive feeling, the result of which may, in some instances, lead the individual to seek final release.

The Yerkes-Dodson hypothesis was formed on the idea that there is an optimal level of stress that produces performance of a high standard. However, arousal and stress, assumed by a number of researchers to refer to similar states are, for clarity and ease of analysis, better considered as separate entities. Arousal is a positive drive associated with a mustering of resources to meet the requirement to perform. Stress, however, is a negative impulse arising from an overtaxing of mental resources produced through arousal. Conversely, underdemand or boredom may also produce stress.

Stress may be temporary or persistent, mild or severe, accompanied by other psychological problems or discrete, detrimental or advantageous. It may affect, or leave untouched, memory and perception.

A major cause of stress is the seemingly ever-increasing change occurring in daily life. External demands may produce ambiguity where there is inadequate information about expectations, conflict between the individual's needs and external demands, an overload wherein the individual perceives the task to be greater than internal resources, and a perception of powerlessness to change a situation or the source of stress.

Reactions to stress were considered by earlier researchers to include alarm, an avoidance impulse, and the mustering of resources. Although loosely associated with
stress in past years, the emotional response is now considered the true determinant of the degree of stress. Physiological reactions to stress include changes in body chemistry that can be evinced by blood or urine sampling. Other measurements involve the peripheral, somatic and central systems as well as the neuroendocrine. These measures indicate the problems that can arise when exposure to stress is of an extensive and extended nature.

A conceptual analysis containing definitions and sample variables of the concepts discussed in the first section of this chapter is presented in Appendix 3-1. The variables form a foundation for instruments designed to construct school stress profiles.

**Stress management**

How the individual handles the emotional response arising from a feeling of difficulty on facing an unpleasant feeling or threatening situation is generally referred to as the coping method or technique. There are a number of different techniques for dealing with difficulties arising from an individual's interaction with the environment. Coping may involve the utilisation of one or more of these techniques. When it is not possible to resolve the problem, an anxiety state could appear "in its naked, unmodified form" (Burrows and Davies, 1980:133), which is, according to Linton (1956), the essence of neuroses. In most instances, individuals have the capacity to mentally modify an unsettling or painful event by using mechanisms that change the appearance or impact of an event. The choice of strategy is dependent on a number of variables including the nature of the event, the threat that the event poses, the individual's experience in similar situations, the type of family upbringing, and the personal make-up or modes of response, most of which reflect the individual's personality (Burrows and Davies, 1980). The actual choice of technique may not be a conscious decision and appears to be, in many instances, a subconscious reaction or response.

Although appertaining to personality, the ability to cope is not simply a matter of some instinctive characteristic. From research studies of people who have experienced stressful situations, the ability to cope successfully is seen as a developed set of skills. Howard (1984:x), for example, pointed out that these people "have certain mental attitudes, and they know how to yield to and get used to the inevitable". The skills also appear to be learnable.
There is general agreement among theorists that differences in the manner that individuals respond to environmental circumstances depend on the person's interpretation of the situation, that is, that "stress is caused by the way we think about ourselves and our environment" (King et al., 1987:73). As excessive stress has a deleterious effect on performance, the clinical management of stress is concerned with altering the effects of the response to stress. The following section on clinical stress control is included to provide further explanation of forms of stress and to indicate various interventionist roles.

**Clinical stress control**

Among the different theories of clinical control are Rational Emotive Therapy, the talking procedure, chemotherapy, stress inoculation training, problem-solving therapy, self-instruction training, and attribution retraining, all of which involve intervention of some kind, that is, the individual is assisted in times of stress by some other person who is usually a practising psychiatrist or psychologist.

**Rational emotive therapy**

Rational Emotive Therapy, propounded by Ellis (1962), is formulated on the hypothesis that refutation of irrational beliefs may assist individuals in coping with the environment. The theoretical framework and therapeutic practice was prepared following an examination of the effectiveness of classical psychoanalytic methods. Ellis noted that patients tended to resist techniques of dream analysis and free association and that it was necessary for them to remain under psychiatric care for considerable amounts of time. The lasting benefits of psychoanalysis was also questioned which led Ellis to believe that the personal insight assumed to be gained from this method was not durable.

According to Ellis' ABC model, activating experiences or events affect (A) the person's belief (B) systems which produce consequences (C) or neurotic symptoms. The therapy aims at identifying the irrational beliefs thought to be the cause of the emotional disturbance and assumes that in every person's way of thinking, assessment, and behaviour, some minimal or extensive form of irrationality exists (Dobson, 1988). "The task is always the same: to overcome negative thinking processes which convince the patient that he or she cannot 'cope' and to rebuild robust defences" (King et al., 1987:16). "At the core of RET [Rational Emotive Therapy] is the assumption that human thinking and emotion are significantly interrelated" (Dobson, 1988:13).
The following list of irrational beliefs, based upon Ellis' experience, is drawn from Rational Emotive Therapy writings (King et al., 1987:76). The list is included as it assists by providing insight into the forms of thought processes that become a source of stress. Where appropriate, the problems Message (1986:27-28) described as arising from the irrational belief are indicated in italics:

• I must be loved and approved of by everybody.  
  *Resulting problem: demand for approval.*

• When people behave unfairly they must be punished: "They" should not be allowed to do that.  
  *Resulting problem: blame-proneness.*

• It's awful when things are not the way I'd like them to be.

• I should be very anxious about events that are uncertain or potentially dangerous.  
  *Resulting problem: sense of helplessness.*

• I am not worthwhile unless I am competent, adequate, and achieving things. I absolutely must succeed this time.  
  *Resulting problem: Unrealistically high self-expectations.*

• I have got to find the perfect solution to this problem.  
  *Resulting problem: perfectionism.*

• The world should be fair and just: I deserve better treatment.  
  *Resulting problem: emotional unpredictability and irresponsibility.*

• I should be comfortable and without pain at all times: I shouldn't be upset at this time.

• I must be going crazy.

• It is easier to try to avoid life's difficulties.  
  *Resulting problem: avoidance and procrastination.*

• I need someone strong to depend upon at all times: Other people should take care of me.  
  *Resulting problem: dependence.*

• Emotional misery comes from external pressures.

• My past is the cause of my present problems, and so there is nothing I can do about things: Because I have failed in the past I will always continue to fail.  
  *Resulting problem: anxious overconcern.*

In developing the work of Ellis, Walen et al. (1980) grouped questions that could be asked during therapy. They include prompts such as where is the proof? how do you know? why must you? why is that an untrue statement? how could that be so terrible? and, as long as you believe that, how will you feel?
King et al. (1987:79) pointed out that activities such as regularly jogging long distances around city blocks do not assist individuals in coming to terms with stress: "From the Rational Emotive Therapy point of view, there appears to be little in an exercise program that will add to a person's ability to dispute irrational stress-producing beliefs". While a sense of achievement may be gained, physical exertion offers only a short respite and does little to reduce stress as the individual's concerns soon return after the exercise.

Rational Emotive Therapy assumes that to maintain emotional health, the individual should constantly return to questioning basic beliefs and their rationality (Dobson et al., 1988). It was further pointed out that, although much has been written about the therapy, little research has been carried out into its validity and utility. However, Kendall and Bemis (1983) noted that some "objective empirical scrutiny" is being undertaken.

Rational Emotive Therapy provides a means of focusing the individual's attention on logical thinking patterns. Another therapy, the talking procedure, is designed to assist the individual in focusing on the construction of a stressful problem.

The talking procedure

The talking procedure enables a second person to provide a "release valve" for an individual who is encountering difficulties with the environment. It differs from Rational Emotive Therapy, which concentrates on the individual's internal thought processes, by being external to the individual, that is, it directs attention to the problem itself. King et al. (1987) pointed out that stress interferes with a person's abilities to concentrate and it is important, therefore, that the talking procedure should not be exhausting through overtaxing the individual's resources. Short sessions were strongly recommended. As concentration is affected, instead of highlighting the advantages of the therapy's applications, long sessions often result in pointing out the individual's inability to concentrate which, when recognised, will only add to distress. Further evidence of this belief was provided by Abraham (1982) who considered that intensive psychotherapy can produce neuroses of a long-term nature, whereas short and direct interventions, accompanied by a rapid resumption of normal duties, lead to few long-term problems.

Despite the evidence favouring direct intervention, King et al. (1987:79) remarked that the need is mostly ignored by unions and the legal profession when dealing with instances of work-related stress and its consequences upon, for example, ambulance officers,
Coping with stress

The growing frequency of long-term problems in these professions, often re-labelled as 'burnout' provides ample evidence that a 'new' approach based upon established stress management procedures is required.

If intervention and assistance are not accessible in earlier stages, long-term stress problems may require the therapist to resort to prescribing drugs to support the individual in his or her endeavours to come to terms with the environment.

Chemotherapy

When used as the sole therapy, the hypnotic drugs such as the oxazepams (of which Serepax is a well-known trade name) or the diazepams (for example, Valium), or the antidepressants of the doxepin variety (for example, Deptran) do not greatly assist the individual in coping with stress. Whilst they may offer temporary relief through sleep or by altering the body chemistry connected with chronic depression, in the longer term chemotherapy should be used in combination with other treatment such as psychotherapy or environmental change. King et al. (1987) stated that despite chemotherapy's ability to reduce the experience of stress, the individual's attitudes and interactions with the environment virtually remain unchanged. It was suggested, however, that the use of chemotherapy alone may be justifiable when a person is likely to undergo an isolated instance of a threatening event such as dental surgery.

A problem frequently encountered in chemotherapy is an inherent inclination towards habituation. Particular attention should be given to control unless otherwise considered completely necessary, instances of which are somewhat rare. Treatment of this nature does not change the general tendency of an individual to experience stress for, as has been stated, the administration of drugs does not alter the person's 'habitual processes for evaluating life events in a negative way' (King et al., 1987:85).

While chemotherapy is used mostly in the recovery period following long periods of intense stress, Meichenbaum (1977) believed that, to prevent long-term problems, the intensity of stress can be reduced by exposing the individual to prior experience in similar but less stressful situations. As the principle involved is somewhat akin to certain practices in pathology, the therapy has become known as stress inoculation training.

Stress inoculation training

During the 1970s, Meichenbaum concentrated his attentions on the concept of stress inoculation training, a multicomponent coping-skills approach, as a means of reducing the
effects of stress on the individual. Prior to Meichenbaum's work, Orne (1965) explained that the biological notion of immunisation provides a model to enable an individual to be "resistant" to stressful experiences. It has been suggested that providing prior experiences, albeit only mildly stressful experiences that the individual can master in a psychological sense, enables a build-up of tolerance to a future stressful experience of greater intensity (Dobson and Block, 1988). "It would seem that one can markedly affect an individual's tolerance of stress by manipulating his beliefs about his performance in the situation ... and his feeling that he can control his own behavior" (Orne, 1965:316).

Meichenbaum (1977:148-9) developed the following set of therapy guidelines for a "coping-skills treatment program".

- Coping strategies are complex and require flexibility. Any "coping-skills training approach should be flexible enough to incorporate a variety of cognitive and behavioral strategies that can be differentially employed."
- Training should be directed towards each individual as the use of a 'blanket' approach is ineffective. "It is necessary for any training technique to be sensitive to individual differences, cultural differences and situational differences."
- All available information relevant to treatment should be utilised in the training programme. "To be effective, information should stimulate mental rehearsal ... which may 'short circuit' the experience of stress or reduce its aftereffects."
- During training, exposure to events less threatening than that which is expected to occur have a "beneficial effect."

Janis and Mann's (1977) work on appraisal-based theory gives some attention to the consideration that emotion interferes with the search for information in the decision-making process. On the topic of preparation by exposure to less-difficult circumstances, Janis and Mann (1977:156) indicated that research evidence points towards the conclusion that "emotional inoculation applied just before or just after commitment to a new course of action reduces the impact of subsequent negative feedback" and that emotional inoculation may be generalisable to "all types of consequential decisions". On the other hand, Dobson and Block (1988:23) pointed out that, whilst many have regarded inoculation training as a promising approach to developing coping skills, there is a "need for empirical investigations to demonstrate the utility" of multicomponent treatment programmes. It also appears that the underlying principles require further validatory research.

Stress inoculation training is concerned with preparing the individual to cope with anticipated problems with the environment. Another therapy, also related to the
environment but from a different standpoint, is problem-solving therapy. As in most coping strategies, it involves manipulating either the environment or the individual's attitudes.

**Problem-solving therapy**

The subject of expediting behavioural change occupied the thoughts of D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971). Their work centred on the idea of internal control training which later became known as problem-solving therapy. The major thrust of the therapy is that of coaching individuals to act as their own therapist. The therapy's rationale was described by D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971:109): "General [coping] effectiveness may be most efficiently facilitated by training individuals in general procedures or skills which would allow them to deal independently with critical problematic situations that confront them in day-to-day living". According to the protagonists, the necessity for psychological treatment arising from ineffective coping techniques which, in turn, produce emotional or behavioural disorders would, to a large extent, be reduced by problem-solving therapy. The personal and social adjustment required in handling stressful situations would also become less demanding.

D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971) referred to problem-solving therapy as "an overt or cognitive process that makes available a variety of effective response alternatives for coping". The therapy "increases the likelihood of selecting the most effective response available" (Dobson, 1988:24). Five stages of the problem-solving process were identified:

- general orientation or 'set',
- problem definition and formulation,
- generation of alternatives,
- decision making, and
- verification.

Dobson added: "Training in problem solving involves teaching clients these basic skills and guiding their application in actual problem situations".

The "turtle" technique, devised and developed by Robin, Schneider and Dolnick (1974-6), was directed towards emotionally disturbed primary school children. The technique consists of four parts:

1. withdrawing from the environment, or the "turtle" response;
2. exercising relaxation skills whilst in the "turtle" attitude;
3. examining consequences of various alternative solutions to the problem through having
been taught problem-solving; and

4. according social rewards to the child's peers for assistance in maintaining the child's response.

Blechman et al. (1976) used a game format to involve parents in a child's problem-solving training. The board game components include identifying problems, gathering relevant information, generating alternatives, choosing a specific alternative, and outcome evaluation (which was similarly categorised by Goldfried and Davison, 1976). The technique appears to be "capable of altering behavior but the altered patterns do not seem to generalize to real-world settings" (Braswell and Kendall, 1988:180).

Following the success of Sarason and Ganzer (1973) in an earlier intervention project with institutionalised delinquents, Sarason and Sarason (1981) administered a problem-solving package to a group of high school students who were at risk of 'dropping out'. The package, based on a "practical approach to solving problems", drew on modelling procedures. Groups of four students were formed which contained two 'models' who demonstrated positive and negative approaches to problems. The others were then required to rôle-play the same situations. The programme appeared to be successful as "fewer absences, low rates of tardiness, and few referrals for disciplinary action" tended to be displayed by the experimental group after a 12-month follow-up (Braswell and Kendall, 1988:178).

Benefits of the therapy were outlined by Dobson (1988:24), who considered it likely that "the flexibility and pragmatism of [problem-solving] approaches will continue to attract the attention of clinicians in search of comprehensive treatment approaches". Behavioural change can be generated with some qualified generalised transfer to daily life. Howard and Kendall (1987) encouraged evaluation of the relationship of peer involvement and further exploration of gains arising from parental involvement.

An extension of problem-solving training is self-instruction training which utilises some of the principles of the former as part of the process.

Self-instruction training

Self-instruction training aims to develop the individual's thinking processes and is becoming a common treatment for children. It consists of training children to guide themselves in problem solving by verbal self-instruction. Braswell and Kendall (1988:182) explained: "Self-instructional training programs with children are usually directed towards providing the child with a thinking strategy - not what to think, but how to
Two major types of training exist - noninteractive, which follows the Mischel and Patterson (1976) model wherein the clinician simply informs the child of the method of solving a problem, and interactive, which is based on the Luria (1961) model wherein the clinician's modelling of self-instruction progresses from stating instructions while the child carries out the task, practice by the child in verbalising self-instruction, to practice in covert self-instruction.

According to Braswell and Kendall (1988), self-instruction training is capable of some generalisation when combined with related cognitive and behavioural procedures. It has demonstrated use for improving reading, maths, and writing skills, and is beginning to be used effectively in training mentally retarded children and those who are experiencing fears and anxieties.

Another coping skill discussed by Braswell and Kendall (1988) is that of attribution retraining where examination of achievement may assist the individual to overcome anxiety.

Attribution retraining

The notion that "success breeds success" appears to be the foundation for attribution retraining. Braswell and Kendall (1988:192) enlarged on the subject: "Most efforts at attribution retraining attempt to create a training environment in which the child learns to take more individual credit for his or her achievements, thus encouraging the child's experience in positive control and/or self-efficacy."

Training is successful with those who had not applied their existing knowledge to new problem-solving situations (Schunk, 1983). It is to this group that attribution retraining should be directed as, according to Pearl (1985), in these instances it is a matter not of poor academic performance but of maladaptive attributions.

While the effects of attribution retraining have been focused and specific, it appears that behavioural persistence at problem-solving tasks may be improved by changing attributional beliefs (Braswell and Kendall, 1988).

Rational Emotive Therapy, chemotherapy, stress inoculation training and other procedures described herein require the intervention of a trained person in assisting the individual to cope with stress. Most problems in daily life are faced without clinical assistance and involve the use of discrete coping strategies.
Discrete coping strategies

Unlike clinical techniques facilitated by an interventionist, individual coping techniques are those used in daily encounters with possible stress-producing problems. Their usages are mostly dependent upon the person's individual characteristics.

Lazarus (1976) classified individual coping techniques as belonging to either of two basic categories - direct-action or palliative.

Direct-action techniques

Direct-action strategies centre on modifying the transaction between the individual and the environment or changing the environment itself. Four direct-action strategies have been delineated.

Avoidance

As the word 'avoidance' implies, the individual withdraws from the source and attempts to keep away from it on all future occasions. Citing the work of Freud (1936), Janis and Mann (1977:98) considered it likely that "negative incentives" induce avoidance impulses that "remain unconscious because of repression and other defense mechanisms, which protect the person from anxiety, guilt, shame, or other painful effects". Howard (1984:18) provided examples: "People learn to avoid dangerous parts of town, persons they dislike or find tedious, and stressful situations". In a similar vein, Dunham (1989) wrote of teachers' and students' avoidance by absenting themselves from school. Howard (1984) observed that most animals used avoidance strategies to a considerable extent. The method has at least three inherent difficulties: as contact with a threat is not provided, little if anything of value can be learned about it; continued avoidance is self-perpetuating; and the benefits of stress inoculation are negated.

Aggression

Modification of the stress source involves destruction, injury or restriction when strategies of aggression are employed. Dunham (1989) suggested that the seemingly simple matter of individuals attempting to make known their feelings and opinions indicates a possible manifestation of the strategy of aggression. Confronting the source with the intention of eliminating it, a development of the aggression strategy, contrasts with the avoidance strategy. Janis and Mann (1977), however, related the two strategies and suggested that individuals who were inclined to display aggressive behaviour often took an apparently more positive step by postponing their action at a time when it was felt that they did not possess complete knowledge of the situation or that their thinking was
distorted. However, when no other strategy seems appropriate, "society uses aggression as the final back-up means of dealing with threats to it, if not by capital punishment then at least by long-term imprisonment" (Howard, 1984:18). An advanced form of this strategy occurs when the stressor is considered to be insurmountable, in which instance, the aggression may be turned against other objects or people, or even against oneself.

Preparation

When individuals anticipate powerful stressors, they may take steps to prepare themselves for the event. An example of the strategy is "by learning my job in more detail" (Dunham, 1989:121). Howard (1984:19) described the strategy as an individual's attempt to gather all the available information about what could happen and to use this knowledge in planning ways to reduce the level of stress experienced in the situation. Janis and Mann (1977:158) indicated the advantage of preparation: "The dampening effect of forethought about an unfavorable consequence stems from the fact that the anticipated event comes as no surprise when it materializes and the person has prepared himself to cope with it". Stress inoculation training is based on principles similar to this coping strategy. Dunham (1989) suggested another dimension to this strategy when relaxation skills are related with preparation. Actions such as "forcing myself to take rests before I get tired", "going on a course", "when away from work trying to make sure that I have a good time wherever I go", or "moving away from the situation completely for a time until the stress has been reduced" prepare the individual for further stress. However, the two latter strategies are more palliative than direct-action in nature. An example of preparation on a wider scale is the organisation of orientation days, a generally widespread procedure to reduce the impact on the child of the transition from primary to high school or, at a later age, from school to university. It involves groups of students from each of the feeder schools spending time in the new institution towards the end of the year prior to transfer.

Apathy

The effects of uncontrollable or extreme situations may be countered by an individual's apparent apathy or absence of emotion. "One does nothing, has a blank uncaring state of mind when confronted with very stressful and inescapable circumstances" (Howard, 1984:19) or, to put it in words similar to those of Dunham (1989), one 'switches off'. All transaction with the environment is suspended. The strategy is an augmentation of one of the "bolstering tactics", referred to by Janis and Mann (1977:92) as "exaggerating the
remoteness of the action commitment", wherein the known negative repercussions of a decision are disregarded by surmising that action is not required within the near future. According to Howard (1984), this direct-action strategy is akin to a state of deep depression in which a person finds difficulty in moving and does little to initiate any opposition in the belief that such activities would be completely ineffectual.

Palliative techniques differ from direct-action strategies in that the former aim to reduce negative feelings arising from a stressful event.

Palliative techniques

Palliative techniques do not attempt to influence the source of stress but, in an attempt to ease stressful symptoms, the manner of thought and physiological reactions are changed. What Lazarus (1976) described as palliative could be extended to drug usage, adage repetition, alcohol, religion, fantasy, humour, and ideologies such as existentialism, Marxism and psychoanalysis. Howard (1984) included in the category of palliative strategies the defence mechanisms of repression, detachment, sublimation, denial, rationalisation, projection, reaction formation, selective perception, identification, finding meaning in adversity, and dehumanisation.

Repression

The repression strategy involves subjugating or banishing painful incidents or facts from the conscious mind. Dunham (1989:122-3) provided a number of illustrations of this strategy: "setting aside a certain amount of time during the evenings and at weekends when I refuse to do anything connected with school", trying not to think about the problem, tending to "block out work when I get home and [refusing] to talk about it", "going on a course", "trying to make sure that I have a good time wherever I go", "involving myself with my family and my own circle of friends when I am not working", and trying to "get out as much as possible on the weekend - going for walks, to the museum, to see a film". Janis and Mann (1977:92) considered the strategy to go beyond the moment that the source of stress is encountered: "Conflict is minimized by denying the aversive character of whatever bad consequences will follow". Lazarus (1976) pointed out that if the strategy is overused, the individual may begin to lose contact with reality, resulting in the appearance of one who is very naïve and out-of-touch with peers.

Detachment

By disengaging from emotional connection with a stressful situation, by 'accepting the problem', by seemingly "trying to come to terms with each individual situation"
(Dunham, 1989:121), or by being indifferent towards the environment, individuals attempt to deal with their feelings by disregarding them. Howard (1984) suggested that individuals might consider the difficulty as not being their personal problem or, perhaps, that they do not really care what happens. However, complete detachment may be difficult to achieve: "The fact remains that human beings, programmed as they are with emotions and unconscious motives as well as with cognitive abilities, seldom can approximate a state of detached affectlessness" (Janis and Mann, 1977:45).

Sublimation

Having received the impression that a task is too difficult to complete or that a problem is insurmountable, the individual abandons it and seeks another to tackle. Energy is thereby directed into areas where there may be greater possibilities of success. As an example, Dunham (1989:122) advanced: "At home I try to relax by doing something which gives a simple sense of achievement and success, e.g. baking, knitting, gardening, etc.". Sublimation becomes a problem if it is overused as little, if anything, of real worth to the individual will be achieved.

Denial

Denial is often used as a primary means when facing what is one of the most stressful experiences the individual has encountered. Holmes and Rahe (1967) considered the death of a spouse as an example of an event of this magnitude (see Table 3-3). According to Janis and Mann (1977), the strategy minimises conflict by refuting the distasteful quality of whatever damaging outcomes arise. Howard (1984:25) asserted that, although denial is usually maladaptive, it is not always the case as it can be an adaptive stress reducer: "In some instances of disasters or significant losses, denial may help a person weather the initial [sic.] trauma".

Rationalisation

In the process of preserving self-esteem, reactions may be justified by what the individual sees as plausible reasons despite the presence of inconvenient facts indicating otherwise. Janis and Mann (1977) considered that in rationalising, the decision maker decreases the importance of the negative consequences which produce hesitancy or conflict about the risks involved. As examples of the rationalisation strategy, Dunham (1989:121) proposed: "Trying to think that I am only human and can make mistakes" and "I now admit my limits more easily than when I first became a teacher" while Howard (1984) indicated that of a student who, having received a failure, may consider that the examiner, the test paper or the task had been unfair rather than contemplating his or her own lack of preparation or ability.
Projection

Howard's explanation (1984:25) of the projection strategy, that the individual "deals with unacceptable, stress-inducing thoughts by ascribing them to others", and that "a person particularly hostile to others might tell himself that everyone is hostile to him", at first appears to contradict the psychological basis that projection is "the belief that others share one's subjective mental life" or "the process of projecting one's own hidden desires or impulses" (Wilkes, 1979:1169). However, the focus of the strategy lies in the belief that others possess common feelings, that the individual "denies that he personally wants to do what he is agreeing to do" (Janis and Mann, 1977:93). The belief is exaggerated to the extent that individuals no longer consider that they originated those feelings.

Reaction formation

The reaction formation strategy, used on occasion to achieve a favourable outcome, is brought into play when the effective overt action contrasts with the individual's perceptions. "Meeting people who are totally unconnected with teaching" is one such reaction, described as a commonly-used coping strategy by Dunham (1989:122). However, it is thought that there is a more intense compensation for countering the effects of stress. Howard (1984:26) explained: "Here a person has an unacceptable thought or impulse and does his or her best to think or act just the opposite". The example of Shakespeare's "Methinks the lady doth protest too much" further clarifies the strategy.

Selective perception

The selective perception strategy employs a sifting process in which apparently beneficial aspects of a situation are accepted whilst all others appearing harmful to the individual's self-esteem are minimised or disregarded. According to Janis and Mann (1977:91), exaggerating favourable consequences is an obvious bolstering tactic in decision making so that one is able to "convince oneself that the most attractive alternative is well worth the costs and risks involved".

Identification

If one is subjected to aggression and is unable to find any suitable defence or counteraction, the individual may identify with the persecutor by taking on similar characteristics and behaviour. The person may 'shut himself in his office' (Dunham, 1989) or act in other ways contrary to the person's normal sociability. In so doing, the individual attempts to avoid "the pain of self-disapproval for violating internalized moral
standards" (Janis and Mann, 1977:8-9). The strategy could be dominant when a worker emulates an overbearing supervisor.

**Finding meaning in adversity**

Silver and Wortman (1980) indicated the strategy of finding meaning in adversity by citing studies of parents who, having pondered the reason why they should bear the sad misfortune of their child's death, take a broader view and consider that the child's suffering will assist physicians' understanding of how to handle the illness in other children. Howard (1984:27) wrote further of the strategy: "People learn to see reasons for the most senseless, difficult and capricious of circumstances". The Book of Job in the Old Testament illustrates a well-known example of the strategy.

**Dehumanisation**

The dehumanisation strategy may be employed when an individual, usually acting under orders from a person of higher position power, is required to carry out an unpleasant task that has a detrimental or injurious effect on others. The individual mentally strips the victims of human characteristics and thinks of them only as objects, thereby making the task easier to execute. Janis and Mann (1977:93) suggested that the decision maker builds up "a case that he is forced to take the action by the requirements of the organization he is serving". Howard (1984:27) added that the "moral qualms most of us are socialized to feel get pushed into the background". The use of this strategy appears to occur on a widespread scale on the front lines in times of war.

**Externalisation**

A strategy involving someone other than the individual experiencing stress is that of externalisation. It was not indicated by Howard (1984) as a discrete coping strategy, probably due to the condition that a second party is implicated. The strategy involves communication between two people or parties about the difficulties faced by one. Dunham (1989) considered that the individual is likely to seek those with whom there is an empathy so that "by talking over the stressful situation with my husband/wife/family" or "by talking about it, usually with colleagues at school", the person may reduce the depth of the stressful experience and thereby lessen its effects. The externalisation strategy has a degree of propinquity with the "Talking Procedure", mentioned in the section on clinical stress control. However, externalisation differs from the talking procedure in that the former does not involve the services of a professional interventionist.

There are associated skills which are integral to those coping skills for controlling stress reactions briefly mentioned above. The importance of these skills lies in assisting the individual to develop the ability to cope with the environment.
Other coping skills

The skills of relaxation, social skills and assertiveness training are not normally viewed as separate coping techniques but as subsidiary to clinical and discrete coping strategies, whether direct-action or palliative.

Relaxation skills

In 1971, Goldfried refined the proposition, originated by Jacobson (1938), that the relaxation coping skill is an active component of "systematic desensitization". The associated instructional procedures distinguish the skill as active rather than passive. Robin et al. (1974) incorporated the skill as a part of the "turtle" technique. Training in the skill consists of three main stages:

i. it is explained to the individual that relaxation is an active and voluntary skill;
ii. discrimination of arousal sensations are taught; and
iii. the sensations are then analysed as cues to reduce tension. "Such cues can be utilized across a wide variety of situations, both targeted and nontargeted" (Hamberger and Lohr, 1984:199).

The passive "reciprocal inhibition" (Hamberger and Lohr, 1984) procedure maintains a hierarchical structure and, when anxiety is experienced, attempts at relaxation are intended to dispel the entire structure. This alternation between countenancing and disregarding the hierarchical entity continues until the entity is acceptable without anxiety to the individual. The active relaxation coping skill, on the other hand, is founded not on the discrimination of a hierarchy applicable to a specific problem but on the discernment of cues that are generalisable. Furthermore, the active skill does not possess the reciprocity of the passive alternation but is built on analysis of the particular part or parts that provide the arousal cues with the attempt then being confined to relaxing only those parts away.

Goldfried and Trier (1974) researched the relative efficacies of the passive and active relaxation coping skills and concluded that the latter appeared to be more effective. The reasons for its greater effectiveness are not fully distinguishable due to lack of control over extraneous variables. It appears that active relaxation is more effective if both techniques are continually used after initial training. The finding is supported by Deffenbacher and Snyder (1976). Hamberger and Lohr (1984:202) added: "It appears that the entire active-coping package, including rationale and procedure, is maximally effective in efficiently reducing targeted anxiety and increasing performance in stressful situations".
Social skills training

A problem with the measurement of social skills is that there is no generally agreed-upon definition of what social skills actually are. Nevertheless, measurement of social skills was attempted by Libet and Lewinsohn (1973), who examined the variables of "activity level, interpersonal range in a group situation, rate of positive reactions emitted, and action latency in relation to others" (Hamberger and Lohr, 1984:208).

Lewinsohn and Shaffer (1971) suggested that a deficiency in social skills is linked with depressive behaviours: "Lack of social skills presumably results in low rates of activity and verbal behavior. Depressive behaviors then may emerge that are themselves reinforced and maintained via positive reinforcement in the form of sympathy and attention" (Hamberger and Lohr, 1984:208).

Curran (1977) hypothesised that heterosocial and heterosexual anxiety are associated with conditioned anxiety, erroneous evaluation of a person's own behaviour (which is allied to Ellis' identification of irrational beliefs), and that deficient skills cause anxiety.

Assertiveness training

Assertive behaviour was defined by Lange and Jakubowski (1976) as direct, honest, and appropriate expressions of thoughts, feelings, desires, and needs. Hamberger and Lohr (1984:215) described assertiveness training as focusing on the "development of skills needed to cope with stressful stimuli".

All results from research into assertiveness training indicate the necessity for delineation of individual characteristics and analysis of situations. Due to this requirement, Hamberger and Lohr (1984:217) added that treatment in assertiveness training must likewise be "tailored to such situation- and performance-specific goals".

Research of effectiveness comparisons of a number of the strategies so far mentioned has been carried out, particularly in the recognition and utilisation of possible alternatives in technique selection.

Coping strategy efficacies

DeRubeis and Beck (1988) found that when individuals were asked to recognise the coping strategies they should have used in various situations, the strategy could be perceived without difficulty. In many instances, however, the strategy they actually implemented was not that which was later determined as being appropriate, especially if
the individual had been through a course of cognitive therapy. Due to this divergence, DeRubeis and Beck (1988:301) urged the formulation of a method that would require the individual to produce during the event, rather than merely recognise after the event, the appropriate cognitive coping skill. "Such measures would need to employ a free response format and a system that turns those free responses into [the more appropriate] coping strategies".

The strategies many people use become habitual and resistant to change. Howard (1984) indicated that the reason for this immutability derives from the development of stereotypical thinking or behaviour originated by an individual's pattern of adjustment to current levels of stress and the capability of accepting stress in the future. Because the adjustment may work to some extent and as it 'buys them peace', the individual may maintain the preference for only a small number of coping strategies.

In a study of 2300 adults in Chicago, Pearlin and Schooler (1978) found that a variety of coping techniques were used at different times and that the better educated and wealthier persons were more likely to possess a wider range of techniques which they were able to effectively implement. Another study carried out by Folkman and Lazarus (1980) found that of 100 middle-aged Americans, most favoured direct-action coping strategies when it was felt that something could be done to alter the environment. They resorted to palliative strategies when action appeared to be futile. In approximately 98 percent of reportings, both direct-action and palliative strategies were used simultaneously. The sample group used a range of techniques and applied different strategies to various situations with the quantity of direct-action or palliative strategies being dependent upon situational variables.

Holmes and Rahe (1967) compiled a scale to measure the adjustment a person undertakes in various life events which, presumably, is related to stress factors (Table 3.3). Each life event is given a score in life-change units. A total is gained by adding together mean values for the events in which one has participated, having multiplied each by the number of occurrences. Holmes and Rahe added: "The higher your final score, the more change you are undergoing and theoretically the more susceptible you are to ailments". Means of reducing stress were suggested - become familiar with the value of each change, recognise an event and think about adjusting to it, anticipate changes and plan for them before they occur, and try to pace yourself and not hurry.
Coping with stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN VALUE</th>
<th>LIFE EVENT</th>
<th>MEAN VALUE</th>
<th>LIFE EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Death of spouse</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Trouble with in-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Outstanding personal achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Marital separation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wife starting or leaving outside job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Detention in an institution</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Start or end of formal schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Death of family member</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Change in living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Major injury or illness</td>
<td></td>
<td>(new house, renovations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Revision of personal habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(dress, manners, associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Marital reconciliation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Trouble with the boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Major change in health</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Major change in working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Change in behaviour of family member</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Change in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Change to new school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sexual difficulties</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Major change in type and/or amount of recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Major business readjustment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Major change in church activities (less or more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gaining new member in household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Major change in financial state</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Major change in social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Death of close friend</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Taking out a minor loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Change to a different time of work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Major change in sleeping habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Major change in number of arguments with spouse (less or more)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Major change in frequency of family get-togethers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Taking out a loan for a major purpose</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Major change in eating habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Foreclosure of mortgage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Major change in work responsibilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Son or daughter leaving home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Minor violations of the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(parking tickets etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. The social readjustment rating scale.

(Holmes and Rahe, 1967)

The table is an "interesting guide to the stress of life events and how much we may at present be suffering" (Holmes and Rahe, 1967:45). Howard (1984) pointed out that it does not account for differences between individuals. Some people thrive on higher scores, some on small scores. In addition, the table does not allow for a decrease in stress from an event of a lower score, such as obtaining a bridging loan to pay for oppressive bills.

Bandura (1977) argued that basic human motivation arises from the need to master our environment. Therefore, the most suitable selection of coping techniques is important as it determines whether one will attempt to cope with a stressor. Mastery of the environment or the individual's feelings towards the environment may affect future endeavours to cope and this, consequently, influences future performance.
Coping and the social environment

In discussing an individual's adjustment to the social environment, Howard (1984) cited two major concerns.

1. The difficulty some people experience in relating well with others in social circumstances provides a source of stress. The individual may not be inclined or have the mental vivacity to interact with others. Lack of social skills may also inhibit interaction. Poor social climates with family or among fellow workers can thus provide a continual and severe source of stress. Due to poor climate, necessities such as negotiating problems with others or finding a partner in life may not be met. "And of course, as just about everyone eventually learns, one's advancement in life (especially in one's job) depends critically on how well a person gets on with his superiors, also a task that requires developed social skills" (Howard, 1984:75). The prospect of lack of promotion opportunities for the person's remaining working life may be so demoralising as to be a constant stressor.

2. Without the support and approval of others and convivial bonhomie, individuals may strongly feel cut off from the social world. Lack of contact with a range of social interactions can be stressful as has been found by many who are elderly. "A large number of studies have shown that being entrenched in a sound network of family, friends and colleagues" provides some insulation against stress whereas those who do not have such a network "seem to be more susceptible to a range of stress-related ailments" (op. cit.).

Social networks

Since the beginning of the 1970s, the relevance of "network theory" has received attention. A social network refers to the contacts an individual has with other people. Howard (1984:78) discussed the concept and the relationships of social networks with coping. Networks are considered to be important for two major reasons:

1. "Most of us need others to give our lives any meaning." The psychological stimulation received from others produces happiness in many instances, particularly where it is considered that the individual can identify with others' ideas and behaviour.

2. "A social network with at least some ties (or even just one close confidant) appears to buffer, insulate against stress." Berkman and Syme (1979) found a reciprocity between network type and size, and mortality rate. Gottlieb (1981) concluded that those individuals with good emotional support recovered more rapidly from illness. According to Eaton (1978), the stress of life events have greater impact on people living alone or with a lower social contact.
Three networks are illustrated in Figure 3-4. Those whom the individual knows and with whom he or she interacts are shown by a line to a node, the node representing each person. Howard (1984:76) explained: "At the centre of each is ego, whose network each is. If the two points are connected by a line, then the two people know and sometimes interact with each other". It can be seen that others within the network may also interact and this is also shown by a similar connecting line.
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Figure 3-4. Three hypothetical networks.
(Howard, 1984:76)

It is, of course, customary for some to know the central individual without being connected in any way with others in the network (Example A). Example B depicts a bipolar network where the people in one group are in close contact with others in that group whilst those in a second group also interact with each other. However, it is quite
possible for those in one group not to know any of those people in another. Example C is a close-knit network wherein all individuals know each other. All nodes are linked and there are few, if any, connections outside the group. A religious sect or a primitive tribe could be depicted by such a social network.

Connections between individuals may be single or multiplex, describing the level of interaction. A single connection may exist between employees who may talk about work-related matters only. A multiplex connection exists where two individuals interact at many different levels.

Connections may also be supportive, neutral or negative. A supportive connection is an interaction where one individual sustains another in matters such as finance or advice, or with physical or psychological assistance. A negative connection is one where individuals may be antagonistic towards each other. A neutral connection is one which is neither strongly supportive nor negative.

Supportive connections, whether single or multiplex, are important in an individual's occupation as not only does the worker's livelihood depend on such a network but there are also implications for the organisation.

Reducing stress in the workplace

Three beliefs which can allay stress in the workplace, cited by King et al. (1987), may be paraphrased as "it can't happen to me", "the boss will help", and "my workmates are all behind me, we are all in this together". If these beliefs are eroded, stress may result in lack of confidence in oneself and supervisors, and poor work practices. It is necessary, therefore, to consider how erosion can occur.

Retrenchment, industrial accidents, and removal of workers from favoured positions create anxiety, anger and, perhaps, hostility which may lead the employee to think "it might happen to me". Tension emanating from these events result in low productivity and high absentee rates through "stress, distractions in concentration, and increased industrial accidents ... It is not just a prediction, it is a fact" (King et al., 1987:110).

The supervisor's leadership can assist in maintaining the belief that "the boss will help". King et al. (1987) suggested that regular appearances of supervisors at difficult times or places will sustain morale. Other factors enhancing the employees' perception that more expert assistance will be available when required are a supervisor's aura of success, not simply being "one of the boys", and supervisors' indications of knowing employees and their tasks or problems.
The third belief, peer cohesion, is clearly in evidence in industrial action. In this instance, "the community of fellow workers is most important in preventing worker anxiety" (King et al., 1987:111).

From the viewpoint of organisational management, three major strategies were indicated by Hamberger and Lohr (1984):
1. maximise employee control of organisational decision making,
2. implement structural changes within the organisation to reduce or eliminate job-related stressors, and
3. accept responsibility for stress prevention and health promotion.

Applebaum (1981) suggested that increased participation at all levels in the decision-making process with subsequent feedback produces greater subjective feelings of control and more relevant feedback which, in turn, reduces stress levels. While data to support the position are not provided, Applebaum reported that the procedures "were utilized in various sections of health-care-institution management, as well as other sectors of business" (Hamberger and Lohr, 1984:224).

Cherniss (1980) and Applebaum (1981) both advocated the belief that changing the organisation's structure could eliminate or reduce the burnout phenomenon. However, structural change is often difficult to achieve due to logistical and political factors and, perhaps, dogged bureaucratic resistance. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) recommended that, in the interim, the employee should be taught discrimination skills for determining events or situations that are uncontrollable, and adaptive skills for handling feelings of helplessness arising from uncontrollable events.

Matarazzo (1980) emphasised the necessity for the organisation to embrace principles of health promotion psychology. However, Hamberger and Lohr (1984:227) pointed out that research in stress prevention is only in its infancy. Very little fully-researched information is available concerning techniques and theory adequacy: "These are areas of research that remain a challenge to the psychology of stress and stress management as the concept of stress and stressor parameters become increasingly refined and data based".

**Summary**

Coping is the utilisation of strategies to handle problems encountered with the environment. The ability to cope is a developed set of skills (Howard, 1984). Strategies have been categorised as two distinguishable forms - direct-action and palliative.
The way a person responds to the environment is dependent upon the person's disposition (King et al., 1987). Interpretations of a situation can markedly differ from one individual to another. One person may thrive in a difficult circumstance whilst another may find that it depletes mental resources. Clinical management is directed towards the latter with the purpose of altering the person's outlook.

A number of theories of clinical stress control have been suggested. Rational Emotive Therapy (Ellis, 1962) focuses on identifying irrational beliefs and replacing them with logical reality, thus altering the perceived status of activating experiences and their consequent symptoms.

Assistance has been obtained from the ability to discuss problems with a therapist. The talking procedure intervention, focusing on a problem or set of problems, should be direct, relevant, and of a short-term nature.

Chemotherapy is a valuable aid in enabling an individual to cope with stress when previous encounters have been debilitating to the extent that the person is unable to function properly. However, chemotherapy should be used in conjunction with other treatments with careful attention given to the propensity for habituation and to the contraindications of the various drugs.

Stress Inoculation Training (Meichenbaum, 1977) is directed towards preparing for a particularly stressful circumstance by exposing the individual to previous similar but less stressful events.

Problem-solving therapy (D'Zurilla and Goldfried, 1971), centering on training individuals to cope with "critical problematic situations", is founded on the assumption that most difficulties can be overcome by problem recognition and analysis, searching for alternatives and determining the most suitable response, and efficacy evaluation of the chosen strategy.

Self-instruction training is based upon not what to think but how to assess a situation. The non-interactive approach is formed on the work of Mischel and Patterson (1976) while the interactive technique centres on the Luria (1961) model.

Attribution retraining is concerned with encouraging the individual to take credit for achievement. Wortman (Silver and Wortman, 1980) found that control over outcomes was not necessarily a critical variable but that failure should not always be fully attributed to personal properties.

Direct-action strategies, aimed at changing the stress source, include avoidance,
aggression, preparation and apathy. Palliative strategies are employed when an individual attempts to alter feelings arising from stressful circumstances. Palliative strategies include repressing incidents from the mind, disengaging from emotional connection, redirecting resources, denying that an event has occurred, rationalisation, ascribing stress-inducing thoughts to others, attempting to act in contrast to impulses, accepting only convenient facts, identifying with a persecutor, attempting to find meaning in adversity, and removing human characteristics from a person who is to suffer harm.

In conjunction with the strategies so far described, other skills assist in successfully overcoming difficulties within individuals and in their relationships with the environment. They include relaxation of the active type which focuses on a particular part of a problem and of the passive type which accepts without analysing, social skills training in which greater interaction with the social environment is sought, and assertiveness training which centres on developing coping abilities.

Selection of the appropriate strategy for a particular circumstance is not always an easy matter at the time of encounter. The choice of strategy may also become inflexible. A method of training a person to utilise the most suitable strategy during an event was, therefore, urged by DeRubes and Beck (1988).

An individual's difficulty in relating well with others or a severance from social interaction may lead to stress-related problems. Howard (1984) described social networks and provided evidence that a complex network with supportive social contact assists a person through stressful encounters. Further support in a person's occupation in the form of job security, the practice of leadership, and relevant participation in decision making reduces the incidence of stress experienced in daily life.

A conceptual analysis comprising definitions and sample variables of the concepts which have been discussed in the second section of this chapter is presented in Appendix 3-2.

Chapter 4 describes the methodology of obtaining and analysing information for school profiles. The concepts and variables derived from the literature in this and the previous chapter on educational excellence serve as a foundation for constructing education, stress, and coping profiles.
Chapter 4  Methodology

The purposes of this chapter are to describe the methodology of this investigation into stress coping strategy usage and associated implications for schools, and to explain the reasons for this approach to research.

Overview

The approach to the study is guided by a perception of the differences between research in the sciences and educational research. Other studies into teacher stress in Great Britain, the United States, Canada, and Australia were also considered with emphases on their research methodologies.

The selection of instruments for collecting data for the study and the manner that instruments were constructed are discussed in the light of previous research. Problems that could arise in ascertaining the reliability of responses deriving from, and the validity of questions contained within, research instruments are acknowledged.

The basis for determining the number and selection of schools to be included in the sample was to ensure that the sample was representative of State high schools.

The approach

Scientific or experimental research is founded on comparisons between pretests and posttests, control groups and experimental groups and its language includes terms such as independent, dependent, antecedent, and intervening variables (Levine and Elzey, 1968; Davis, 1981).

This study cannot take the form of 'experimental' research as there are no clearly defined 'dependent' or 'independent' variables. In addition, with the exception of one minor instance referred to in the discussion of teacher interviews, variables cannot be 'manipulated' by the researcher. In essence, the study deals with a set of factors which may interact with one another and focuses on an investigation of this interaction.

Before selecting instruments for gathering data and deciding on methods of data
analysis for the current study, other research methodologies applied to investigations into teacher stress were examined with the purpose of determining an appropriate methodology for this study.

Previous research

Research into teacher stress and coping strategies has involved various methodologies and data collection instruments. Included in the many studies are those by Blase (USA - two studies - 1984 and 1986), Hosking and Reid (Australia - 1984-5), Ratsoy and Friesen (Canada - 1984-5), Schwab et al. (USA - 1986), Kottkamp and Travlos (USA - 1986), Seidman and Zager (USA - 1981-7), and Wilkinson (UK - 1988).

Blase (1984) constructed a model of coping strategies which was drawn from content-analysed data, a "grounded theory research [that] focuses on the discovery of substantive categories, hypotheses, and relationships between and among categories" (p. 176). Definitive patterns were revealed and continued cycles of analysis increased refinement. All categories were then 'fractured' and reorganised which, according to Blase, resulted in greater precision. Coping behaviours identified by university professors and doctoral students were matched with the taxonomy. Blase presented the Teacher Stress Coping Taxonomy for "testing from a variety of perspectives and through the use of different research methodologies".

Blase's 1986 study focused on the question of what teachers mean when they identify work-related factors as sources of stress. The research centered on the construction of a Teacher Stress Inventory using qualitative methods of analysis. Blase received completed questionnaires from 392 teachers who were enrolled in graduate education courses at four universities in the south-eastern and the mid-, north-, and south-western regions of the USA during 1981-3. According to Blase (1986), most previous data-collection instruments used in similar studies were prescriptive. To gain information on the sources of teacher stress and to present respondents with the opportunity of providing detailed descriptions of their perspectives of work-related stress, Blase developed a questionnaire wherein most items are open-ended. A copy of the inventory is in Appendix 4-1.

Hosking and Reid (1985) examined the available literature concerned with ways that teachers cope with stress. As consultant psychologists to the Teachers Health Centre of the Victorian Teachers' Union, Hosking and Reid related their experience to research
data and drew on material gathered during interviews with teacher welfare personnel. Organisational structures of schools and the Victorian Education Department were examined with the aim of providing a "useful starting point for those whose task it is to reduce stress in schools and Government departments" (p. 3).

In their research, Ratsoy and Friesen (1985) defined the terms 'stress', 'sources of stress', 'magnitude of stress', and 'consequences of organisational stress'. Opinions were obtained, stress frequencies and intensities were investigated, levels of stress experienced by personnel occupying various positions in the educational hierarchy were compared, and the organisational consequences of occupational stress were examined. Six members of the Edmonton Public School Local of the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Edmonton Public School District formed an advisory committee. "Considerable theorizing and research on stress was received for the study" (Ratsoy and Friesen, 1985:5). A diagnostic workshop involving a 'representative sample' of education personnel identified, ranked and discussed stress sources. This was followed by distributing questionnaires to all district personnel. The information gathered from questionnaire responses was analysed by mostly quantitative methods. All sectors of the Edmonton public school district were involved in the research. In addition to class teachers, district and school-based administrative personnel participated in providing data. The study, for which 2829 usable questionnaires were returned, was described by Ratsoy and Friesen (1985) as probably involving the greatest number of respondents in recent years. A copy of one of the questionnaires may be seen in Appendix 4.2.

Schwab, Jackson and Schuler (1986) based their research on a model drawn from existing studies of burnout and other research into organisational behaviour. The Model of Teacher Burnout was used to determine the predictors of burnout. Teachers were randomly selected and requested to complete a 16-page questionnaire. Of the 700 questionnaires distributed, a usable 48 percent were returned. The 339 elementary and secondary school teachers were members of the National Education Association of New Hampshire. Schwab et al. endeavoured to determine the organisational and personal predictors of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and low accomplishment. What Schwab et al. (1986) described as the most important organisational and personal consequences of each of the three components of burnout were also established.

Kottkamp and Travlos (1986) drew on rôle theory to define rôle conflict, rôle ambiguity, and rôle overload. Their fourth precursor of job stress, powerlessness, was
'conceptualised' by Seeman (1959). The two 'affective responses', emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction, were also examined. The research objectives were to analyse and augment conceptually-based empirical research into the stress experienced by school principals, to clarify "confusion" arising from other research into stress among school administrators, and to elucidate the quantity and intensity of stress inherent in the organisational position of school principal. Four independent teacher questionnaires were divided among teachers in 74 high schools in New Jersey of which 90 percent were completed and usable. According to Kottkamp and Travlos (1986), the first three instruments were refined by Abdel-Halim (1978) from Beehr (1976) and Rizzo et al. (1970), while powerlessness was measured by a questionnaire developed by Zeilinski and Hoy (1983). Principals completed scales measuring job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion, the two affective responses to work, and the four stressors of rôle conflict, rôle overload, rôle ambiguity, and powerlessness. The principals' questionnaire was drawn from the work of Maslach and Jackson (1978).

Seidman and Zager (1987) studied literature on the burnout syndrome to "perfect an instrument that measures accurately, ... aid[s] educators in determining the magnitude of the problem, and targets people/organisations for intervention" (p. 29). With the objective of obtaining ratings of "the relatively recent and unsubstantiated phenomenon" of teacher burnout, in 1981, Seidman and Zager administered a 65-item questionnaire to 217 elementary and secondary school teachers in southern Indiana. Subsequently, the instrument was refined and, in 1983, was administered to a further 365 public school teachers in northern Texas. Seidman and Zager drew on the Maslach Burnout Inventory, designed to measure burnout in general, and modified it to apply particularly to teachers. Copies of both the questionnaire and Maslach's Inventory are in Appendices 4-3 and 4-4.

Wilkinson (1988) analysed data from three sources. An inventory of stress causes, reactions and coping strategies provided the basis for the first stage of "progressive focussing". A second instrument, a field diary, provided data for analysis while a third source, taped interviews with a representative sample of twelve teachers, yielded further material for Wilkinson's study into stress and coping strategies. Questionnaires were also completed by sixty members of staff at the North Tyneside school, England.

Table 4.1 summarises the methodologies incorporated in the research described above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHER(S)</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blase</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosking and Reid</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Literature research and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratsoy and Friesen</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Group procedures and questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blase</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwab, Jackson and Schuler</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Document analysis and questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kottkamp and Travlos</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Document analysis and questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seidman and Zager</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Literature research and questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Data analysis, field diary, interview schedule, and questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Instruments used in previous research.

"The amount and type of instrumentation should be a function of one's conceptual focus, research questions and sampling criteria. If not, the tail is likely to be wagging the dog, and the ultimate analysis will suffer" (Miles and Huberman, 1984:43). The instruments used in this study have, therefore, been selected and designed to achieve the objectives and provide answers to the questions expressed in Chapter 1, and to test the reliability of responses.

Validity and reliability

Two aspects of validity are content validity and construct validity. Content validity, which is important for observational measures such as the social and environmental aspects of this study, is a measure of the degree to which material included in the instruments represents all possible material that could have been included (Sapsford and Evans, 1987). "Content validity is established by showing that the test items are a sample of a universe in which the investigator is interested". This infers that characteristics or conditions are operationally defined and that they are sampled systematically "within this universe to establish the test" (Cronbach and Meehl, 1973: 568). Items within the questionnaire, interview and observation schedules derive from the operational definition formulated in Chapter 2. The definition was deduced from
determined sets of premisses or 'universes' contained in other studies which have been
revealed in the literature related to the principal factors of this study.

Construct validity is a measure of the extent to which instruments encompass the
theoretical concepts and is important when making inferences about performance on the
general level from performance on the set of items included in instruments. Construct
validity embraces Campbell's (1969) distinctions of 'internal' and 'external' validity:
"Internal validity has to do with whether what is interpreted as the 'cause(s)' actually
produce the 'effects' in a given piece of research. External validity is concerned with
whether the results of this study can be generalized" (Sapsford and Evans, 1987:260). The
observation schedule has as its foundation the literature on excellence in education and
includes questions within the categories of effectiveness, flexibility, equity, efficiency,
vision, quality control and support. Other items in the questionnaire were drawn from the
principles contained in the Ratsoy and Friesen (1985) questionnaires, Maslach's Burnout
Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1978), Blase's Stress Inventory questionnaire, Seidman
and Zager's (1987) Burnout Scale, and Miles' (1987) Implementation Factors with the
remainder gleaned from personal experience. Further tests for both content and construct
validity have been applied during the research.

Confirmation of reliability can be obtained by comparing responses to items
contained within the questionnaire, observation schedule and the four interview
schedules. Similarly, responses across the various instruments can be compared for response
reliability verification. As the questionnaire and observation schedule each contain
greater than 40 items, an internal consistency coefficient greater than 0·80 for the
instruments was considered acceptable prior to field work. Taking schools individually,
analysis of responses to items within the instruments reveals a correlation of 0·94.

Instrument design

From the literature related to educational excellence, the contributing factors of
effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support, and vision appear to
be predominant. These elements assisted in determining material that should be included
in the education profile of each school. According to Nisbet and Watt (1987:84), "observing
is a task which requires a category system". Therefore, the contributing factors form the
basis for the observation schedule. The 220 items contained within the schedule are
categorised according to the appropriate factor. Copies of foundation items are in
Appendix 4-5.
In framing observation items, objectivity was considered a major concern. Continued reshaping of the instrument resulted in a reduction of the number of questions requiring subjective responses. It was pointed out by Scheffler (1973:50) that, whilst it may be argued that complete objectivity is a task impossible to achieve, "objectivity means not lack of values or interests, but rather their frank exposure and tentative espousal, and the institutionalizing of procedures for submitting value hypotheses to test by investigators with counter-interests". It is essential that the researcher makes every attempt to remain impartial when describing and interpreting what is seen to occur in schools included in the study. However, the very nature of observing and interpreting calls on some form of partiality from the observer. Nevertheless, while complete impartiality may be an almost impossible goal, while "bias in the sense of selective observation is inevitable everywhere" (Scheffler, 1973:51), the recognition of this inclination and the acknowledgement of its presence, however and whenever it occurs, is essential.

To verify the reliability of some of the data obtained during observations, questions of a similar nature are included in the other instruments. The observation schedule is augmented by a field diary in the form of a 'substantive account' in that conversations and events occurring in schools were recorded.

A questionnaire was constructed as a means of obtaining data from all teachers within each of the schools included in the study. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the sources, frequencies and intensities of stress experienced by teachers, and to obtain information on how teachers cope with stress. The word 'stress' does not appear in the questionnaire. In its stead, 'difficulty' was employed with attendant descriptions such as awkwardness, hardship, and embarrassment. The reason for the substitution lies in the possibility that, to some people, the word 'stress' may provoke an unwarranted response. If this impression is correct, answers may not accurately reflect what actually occurs in schools and thus reliability would be questionable. On the other hand, even if the notion is incorrect it is felt that validity is not affected in any way. Whilst the respondent may conclude that stress is being investigated, it is believed important that there should be some room for doubt.

In this and succeeding chapters, items included in instruments of this research are indicated in the text by changes of printing font.

The 139 questionnaire items are divided into categories of organisation, administration, academic program, students, parents, teachers, professional status, and personal factors related to teaching. The questions are categorised according to areas in
which it is perceived that problems may occur. As examples, the Organisation category includes questions on obtaining teaching materials, declining student enrolments, and class sizes while the Professional Status category contains items about job security, conditions of service, and promotion opportunities. Each category opens with the question 'Do you have difficulty with ... ?'. Following each category is a set of five questions seeking reactions to the greatest difficulty and identification of the strategies teachers use when encountering the difficulty. Nineteen strategies are presented including try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty, attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you, and talk the matter over with someone else. If none is appropriate, respondents have the opportunity to describe the strategies they use. Respondents are then requested to rate the effectiveness of their most frequently used strategy. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix 4.6.

Interviews provide a means of gaining information about aspects of the education, stress, and coping profiles which may not appear as items in the questionnaire or that may be overlooked in the observation schedule. In addition, responses to interview questions permit an assessment of the reliability of interviewees' responses to questionnaire items.

Three similar semi-structured interview schedules were developed for interviews with the principal, an assistant principal and approximately twenty percent of teachers. A fourth schedule was also constructed for use with students. Copies of the foundation items on which schedules are based may be seen in Appendices 4.7 to 4.10. Interviews enable further reliability checks to be carried out on data obtained through other instruments by comparing responses to questions of a similar nature. As an example, in the Personal category of the questionnaire, Lack of recognition from others for the work you do, is related to Are teachers complimented when they do something well which appears in both the teachers' and principal's interview schedules, while What credit is given to staff for their contributions is included in the assistant principal's interview schedule. A table illustrating the relationships between items contained in the various instruments is in Appendix 4.11. Discussions during interviews provide further insight into, and a wealth of information about, matters that staff see as problems within the school.

Trialling

Following construction of the initial instruments, the questionnaire was distributed for criticism to lecturers and students at the Centre for Education, University of Tasmania. After minor amendment, the questionnaire was trialled at a local district high school on 9th October, 1989. This exposure provided more useful criticism and, as a result, the
questionnaire was further modified. Alterations to the instrument following trialling are as follows.

• Page 1 of the questionnaire contains items relating to the respondent's length of teaching experience. There was some difficulty with this as part-time teachers were unsure as to how to equate their years of employment. Consequently, the question was divided into full-time and part-time teaching experience.

• As the questionnaire was to be administered in high schools only, references to primary school teaching were deleted.

• A question on current employment (item C) was added with a further question on the respondent's position on the career ladder and the number of years that the position has been held.

• If a teacher contracts a contagious disease such as chicken pox or measles, the time away from teaching is not deducted from the normal sick leave entitlement by head office administrative staff. As a consequence, the item Sick leave taken during the past 12 months was changed to During the past 12 months, what leave have you taken due to illness? Although this may appear trivial, it clarified the question for those involved in the research.

• An item requesting information about the respondent's teaching qualifications was added.

• The words 'of your own' were added to the item Do you have any dependent children as it could be construed that all students are dependent on their teachers.

• A box headed 'Not closely involved' was added to every stress source/frequency item in the body of the questionnaire.

The trialling procedure did not produce any other recommendations for improvement. However, further contemplation of the appropriateness of items and respondents' possible misinterpretation of phrases prompted other changes.

• The focus of the question on personal stress (item J) was shifted from a response requiring assessment of personal adjustment to one describing the stress intensity.

• The order of items in the Administration category was altered in the attempt to gain greater reliability by divaricating the respondent's thought processes. Although possibly coincidental, responses from teachers at the district high school indicated the necessity for revision.

• The item Public criticism of teachers was added to the Teachers category.

• The questionnaire was printed on A3 size paper to reduce the necessity of turning pages
and to permit the respondent, when answering the coping section for each category, to verify responses in the stress source section without having to turn back.

- In an endeavour to obtain closer representations of Howard's (1984) illustrations, phrases describing coping strategies were altered. Table 4-2 contains the original phrases accompanied by those appearing in the final instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>withdraw from the source and avoid thinking about it on all future occasions</td>
<td>steer clear of the problem at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confront the source with the purpose of eliminating the problem</td>
<td>aggressively attack the source of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare yourself by gathering information and planning ways to act</td>
<td>gather information and plan ways to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignore it if it is too troublesome</td>
<td>completely switch off and do nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliberately try not to think about it</td>
<td>try not to think about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classify it as too difficult to worry about and look for an easier problem</td>
<td>abandon it to tackle some easier problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider those who caused the difficulty as being unkind</td>
<td>attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often find that others feel the same way as yourself and that the difficulty is therefore not particularly yours</td>
<td>accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counteract the problem by thinking and acting in an alternative way</td>
<td>try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend only to favourable parts and disregard the rest</td>
<td>attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act unkindly towards others if someone is hostile to you</td>
<td>act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider that, although upsetting, the resolution of the difficulty may benefit others in the long run</td>
<td>seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliberately try to avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your unpalatable but necessary actions</td>
<td>avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk the matter over with a friend or colleague</td>
<td>talk the matter over with someone else</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Phrases describing strategies in the initial and final questionnaires.
It was thought that other strategies may be used and thus the following were added to those contained in the initial instrument:

- quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution,
- try to see the funny side of the situation,
- console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc., and
- take your frustrations out on some other person or object.

The principal's interview schedule was trialled with the principal of a non-participating school and a retired principal. The assistant principal's schedule was tested with the incumbent assistant principals of the previously-mentioned district high school. Students at the Centre for Education who had been teaching for a number of years took part in the teacher's interview trialling process. Changes to the interview schedules were of a minor nature and, in most instances, consisted merely of adding or changing a few words.

The observation schedule did not receive any preliminary trialling but was amended after visiting the first school in the sample. The item, Is the climate conducive to learning? was deleted as it appears to be value-laden and could lead to an erroneous conclusion. For example, what interpretations can be placed on the word 'conducive'? Furthermore, what is 'learning' and how can it be determined that it is taking place? Would the meaning of the word 'climate' be clear to all who receive reports? Apart from the deletion, no other changes were made.

Suggestions for improvement

Teachers reported that, after reading the considerable amount of material on pages 2 and 3, the questionnaire was easy to complete. However, it is thought that the changes listed below could improve validity and the completion of all items.

- The item Disruptive teacher transfers might convey the idea of transferring disruptive teachers and should, therefore, be styled 'Disruption caused by teacher transfers'.
- At the end of each stress source/frequency section is an indication to the respondent to proceed to the next category if answers were not higher than seldom. The instruction may be better omitted as it could encourage responses of seldom or lower and thereby produce some unreliability.
- Despite Howard's (1984) reference to aggression among the direct-action coping strategies, the phrase, aggressively attack the source of the problem, might have been misleading. A more valid response may have been obtained if the word 'aggressively' had been
omitted.

- If teachers could not identify with any of the strategy prompts in, for example, question 1-4, a dotted line is provided for describing their strategies. It is thought that the line should be omitted as it may appear to indicate the end of the section. Although there are 1841 responses indicating primary strategies, only 1665 responses were received for strategy efficacies. Some respondents overlooked both successive questions.

Recording of observation schedule responses would be simplified by separating the components of items such as 'Are students/staff/parents/community informed about school goals?', and 'Are newsletters etc. sent to parents/community?'.

Sample selection

Schools

Although the instruments designed for use in this study were originally compiled with the purpose of being applicable to any school or senior secondary college within Tasmania, it was decided to restrict the sample to state high schools for the reasons given below. In addition, a multiple-site study was thought to be more appropriate as it "can purposively sample, and thereby make claims about, a larger universe of people, settings, events, or processes than can single-site studies" (Miles and Huberman, 1984:37).

- It is considered that, of all types of schools, high schools in Tasmania are experiencing the greatest amount of change as well as the resultant pressures arising from externally set completion dates for those changes. The major changes are occurring in staffing structure, awards, curricula, and student certification.

- The age range of students in high schools is mostly confined to adolescents of 12 to 16 years.

- There are a number of factors, such as children's stages of development, differences in staff structure, and timetabling, that are extraneous to the study but could influence results. By confining the sample to only high schools, the effects of some of those factors are reduced or eliminated.

- Variables endemic to private schools, such as the differences in promotion structures and procedures, parental influences, and school governance, could also influence the results.

As indicated in Chapter 1, the Department of Education and the Arts is administered as three regions with ten high schools in the north-west, ten in the north, and fourteen in southern Tasmania. The participation of schools within each region was
considered desirable although not mandatory. A number of teachers in north-western schools intimated that most studies undertaken by either of the two tertiary education institutions, the University of Tasmania in the south and the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology in the north, have been confined to their local areas and, consequently, teachers in the north-west have been unable to participate. Although the notion is incorrect, equal representation was considered before determining that schools would be randomly selected.

It was suggested that six schools would be sufficient for obtaining adequate comparative data. However, it was considered that a sample of eight schools would provide data for generalisations of greater validity. Anticipating that approximately one-third would decline participation, principals and staff of twelve schools were invited to contribute towards the research during a week suitable to them. A copy of the introductory letter is in Appendix 1-3. One principal declined whilst two advised by telephone that they would reply when a decision had been reached. It appears that that decision has not yet been made. Ultimately, nine schools were included in the project with four located in the north-west, two in the north, and three in the south.

Teachers

The introductory letter to principals contains a request for interviews with the principal, an assistant principal, and twenty percent of the teaching staff. Negotiations with an assistant principal during the first day of the week in the school would determine those teachers who would be invited to participate.

Drawing from the school teaching timetable where teachers were identified by their initials, subjects and teaching rooms, those who had two or more non-teaching periods during a school day were listed. To avoid possible skewness of results, it was considered appropriate that a ratio similar to the school staff structure of senior staff and teachers should be applied to the interviewee list. As senior staff have less teaching periods than do teachers, it follows that a choice of interviewees could be weighted towards the former. Where the assistant principal indicated a higher ratio of senior staff, teachers were placed in their stead until an equivalence was struck. With one exception, due to a timetable change, all selected teachers were interviewed.
Students

Offers to the assistant principals of each school to supervise for absent teachers who had not set work for their classes facilitated student interviews. Approval was obtained to ask questions contained in the students interview schedule, copies of which were tendered. In all instances, offers were gladly accepted but only one assistant principal took time to read parts of the schedule. A group interview format was used for classes. Questions were also asked of students in an informal setting during recess, lunch breaks and after school while students waited for transport. Students willingly offered information and impressions of the schools they attend.

Administration of instruments

The introductory letter also included a request that time be made available during a staff meeting for teachers to answer questionnaires. To illustrate what could occur if questionnaires were not completed at staff meetings, consider the conscientious teacher who ensures that the questionnaire is completed before leaving school at the end of the day. The responses could be quite different from those given by a teacher who, after a meal, completes the questionnaire in the relaxed environment of a lounge room, television switched on, and a glass of some favourite beverage to hand. It was considered that if all teachers responded under similar circumstances, factors such as environment, attention, and time were, to a considerable extent, controlled and would therefore not need to be considered when analysing responses. In addition, by completing questionnaires at staff meetings, a high rate of return was assured.

In seven of the nine schools, questionnaires were completed during staff meetings at the end of the school day. In one instance, a meeting was arranged especially for the project. This allowed for some discussion about the research both before and after the questionnaires were completed. Where time was not allocated, the return rate was considerably lower with one school, Nairn, at the 80% level while the other, Reay, provided a 72% return. Following consideration as to whether responses were representative of all teachers appointed to the two schools, questionnaires were accepted. Comparisons between school profiles, appearing in Chapter 6, further justify their inclusion.

Despite the questionnaire's length and depth, there do not appear to be any
category responses affected by respondents' tiredness or lack of concentration. This was
 tested by 'triangulation' or cross-referencing responses obtained for the three other types of
 instruments used in the study.

Reliability was similarly ascertained by comparing responses to items appearing in
different sections of the questionnaire. Table 4-3 lists the items designed for this purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CORRELATING ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>8h. The amount of work you have to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>3h. Provision of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e.</td>
<td>8h. The amount of work you have to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>8f. Attitudes of seniors towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k.</td>
<td>6c. Your interaction with staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>8d. Parents' attitudes towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k.</td>
<td>6l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>6c. Public criticism of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>8e. Your peers' attitudes towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c.</td>
<td>7k. Support from your peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3. Cross-referenced questions.

Responses to both questions which were within one point on the five-point Likert scale were acceptable. However, if the difference was greater, other responses were compared. The questionnaire was deleted from the data bank if there were three or more inconsistencies.

Teachers were informed that individual responses would remain anonymous to all except the researcher and were requested to refrain from writing their names on questionnaires. All questionnaires were numbered when completed. Interview schedules were given a number corresponding with the appropriate questionnaire to permit post-administration cross-referencing of responses. With the exception of Portree, all interviews were completed before questionnaires were administered. At Portree, questionnaires were sorted into the order of subjects taught and interviewees were asked to
identify their questionnaire by referring to only the first page, the response to question J having been covered. When ascertaining reliability, it was found that responses matched in all cases where interview schedules and questionnaires bore the same number.

The assistant principals of all schools in the sample accepted the offer for classes to be supervised when a teacher was absent and work was not set for the students. Teaching periods in most schools are of approximately 50 minutes duration which permitted completion of all questions in the students' interview schedule. It should be emphasised that, due to the differences in students' ages, the questions were not always worded identically with those within the schedule. However, the substance of each question remained the same. On all occasions, students willingly offered information about how they saw their schools and appeared to enjoy being asked their opinions. The fact that they were not engaged in their normal school work was, no doubt, an added incentive.

To avoid interruptions, in all schools except Portree a room was made available for conducting interviews with teachers. Before an interview proceeded, the teacher was advised that all responses would remain anonymous. They were also informed that they should not feel obliged to answer any particular question if they felt so inclined. In some instances, interviewees requested that a question be deferred until later in the interview. However, none declined to answer any of the questions. Both at the beginning and conclusion of the interview, the teacher's blood pressure was taken. It is, perhaps, interesting to note that if the order of questions contained in the interview schedule was followed, blood pressure decreased by an average of 10 for both the systolic and diastolic. However, if the items focusing on the interviewee's perceived difficulties were deferred until last, the systolic increased in all instances with a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 25. This supports some of Lader's (1980) findings referred to in Chapter 3. However, in most instances the diastolic reading increased from 5 to 10 which does not align with other findings. Although unmeasured, there were also noted increases in respiration, speech rate and voice pitch.

The cooperation of all teachers interviewed is noteworthy. It appeared that, once the interview was under way, they were very willing to give of their time and to assist as much as possible by providing a great deal of information which was useful in confirming observation findings when data were analysed after the school visits.
Conclusion

Following an exploration into the methodologies of other research into stress and coping, it was determined that four different instruments would be used in this study.

To obtain a large number of responses that could be analysed quantitatively, a questionnaire was constructed. It contains a group of questions relating to the respondent's teaching experience, the subjects taught, status and position, leave taken through illness, qualifications held, dependent children, gender, age, and personal stress. The body of the questionnaire comprises items related to the eight categories of organisation, administration, academic program, students, parents, teachers, professional status, and personal relationships, all of which are consistent with the areas from which problems may arise. Each category contains items referring to stress sources and frequencies from which the respondent selects one that provides the greatest difficulty, indicates the intensity of stress emanating from that difficulty, the coping strategies employed to reduce stress intensity, the strategy most commonly used, and its efficacy. It is, of course, realised that most questions require subjective responses. However, the disadvantages concomitant with subjectivity are considered to be outweighed by the wide range of responses and the large number of respondents.

Responses from the three other types of instruments can be analysed qualitatively. Some quantitative measures may also be applied. The interview schedules contain items designed to (i) provide a means of verifying the reliability of data derived from other instruments, (ii) present an opportunity for teachers to contribute information about particular aspects of their occupation, and (iii) elicit material that may not have been previously considered. The teachers' interview schedule consists of three major sections - a school description, relationships between teachers, and coping strategies employed by the respondent.

Items in the observation schedule were drawn from factors arising from a study of the literature on educational excellence. Effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support, and vision are incorporated within an operational definition which is applied to all schools in the sample.

The diaries contain a chronological record of events, reactions, impressions, conversations, and other matters that arose while the researcher was involved in field work. They supplement the information recorded on the observation schedule and allow
for further cross-referencing with other instruments.

While the schools' education profiles are mainly drawn from observations, diary entries, and interviews with principals, assistant principals, teachers, and students, reference to questionnaire responses assists in testing the accuracy of findings.

Do the instruments measure all that could be included? Do they encompass the theoretical concepts to the stage where generalisations can be made from the particular examples provided by the schools within the sample? Answers to these questions are tendered in Chapter 5, which contains examples of the type of material that can be obtained from the research instruments, and in Chapter 6, where findings and explanations from data analyses are furnished.
Chapter 5  Midpoint high school

The purpose of this chapter is to illustrate the type of information that can be obtained through the use of the methodology described in Chapter 4. The assembled material is presented in three sections relating to sample schools' education, stress and coping profiles.

Overview

A number of characteristics common to sample schools are identified. As described in Chapters 1 and 4, the schools had similar, but not necessarily identical, timetable structures, staff/student ratios, daily routines, grade and 'home group' or pastoral care arrangements, and facilities for students and teachers. In addition, there are common threads through the schools' education, stress and coping profiles. Factors prevalent in schools' profiles were grouped and a new school, 'Midpoint High', was created to present a portrait featuring a number of commonalities among education, stress, and coping profiles. Midpoint also provides a vehicle for describing a school that is representative of high schools in Tasmania. Furthermore, the creation of Midpoint High School permits comparisons with schools in this study that rate highest or lowest in various factors of the education, stress and coping profiles. These comparisons will be presented in Chapter 6.

The Midpoint high school setting

Unlike some schools in other Australian States, Midpoint High is fortunate in possessing extensive grounds. There are football, hockey, and soccer playing fields, basketball and tennis courts, and sizeable open areas around the school buildings. In addition, there is a gymnasium that doubles as an assembly hall for formal occasions.

On first entering the school, one is confronted with pleasant surroundings. The front foyer is set out with potted ferns and honour boards portraying past head boys and girls of the Student Representative Council and State representatives in various student sports teams. A glass cabinet containing students' work in home economics and technical subjects is prominent.

With the exception of the gymnasium, most parts of the school are under the one roof. All classrooms are accessible without having to venture outside during the inclement Tasmanian winter. The school design is functional with classrooms leading off long
Corridors. Classrooms follow the traditional pattern with a blackboard at the front and display boards on other walls where students' project and art work is exhibited. Most rooms can comfortably accommodate up to about thirty six students. Recent years have seen a decline in student enrolments with most classes numbering approximately thirty in the lower grades and about twenty pupils in grades 9 and 10 classes. However, due to State government financial difficulties, the number of teachers employed was considerably reduced at the end of 1990. This will result in larger classes in the foreseeable future.

Resources provided by the local municipal council and other community organisations are regularly utilised, particularly during activities days. Occasionally, students may also attend concerts, plays, or art exhibitions. As the school is reasonably well-equipped with the gymnasium and physical education equipment, community members frequently use school resources during evenings and weekends.

The education profile

Information relating to the Midpoint High School education profile refers directly to the operational definition, provided in Chapter 2, which embraces the factors of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support, and vision. The data were obtained by an integration of responses drawn from instruments designed to construct schools' education profiles. Abbreviations appearing in the text are shown in Table 5-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaries</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire responses</td>
<td>(q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation schedules</td>
<td>(ob)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals' interviews</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principals' interviews</td>
<td>(ap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' interviews</td>
<td>(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interviews with students</td>
<td>(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-1. Abbreviations applied to data sources.

Questionnaire responses provide additional information related to material drawn from diaries, observation schedules and interviews. Data drawn from questionnaire items also
include the mean of all responses, for example \( q = 2.005 \). The number, in this case 2.005, refers to the frequency with which the difficulty occurred, that is, seldom. Frequencies were ranked as:

- 0 = not closely involved,
- 1 = never,
- 2 = seldom,
- 3 = sometimes,
- 4 = often, and
- 5 = constantly.

Although it may seem unusual to apply a number greater than zero to 'never', the reason for so doing was to recognise that the source could provide problems but, in the case of the individual respondent, the difficulty does not arise. 'Not closely involved' was apportioned zero as the source could not, under normal circumstances, provide difficulty for the respondent. As an example, the response to the item 'support from those in lower positions' would be marked 'not closely involved' by a first-year teacher.

**Effectiveness**

Involvement in staff meetings is seldom difficult for teachers \( (d, q = 2.21) \) who also work together in subject, grade, and duty teams which vary in number according to the groups' requirements \( (ap, ob) \).

School effectiveness is discussed in combined staff meetings \( (p) \), usually led by the principal or an assistant principal in the former's absence \( (ob) \). Effectiveness in achieving subject goals is mostly relegated to subject staff meetings \( (p, d) \). The problem of dubious repetition across subjects is seldom met at Midpoint High \( (q = 2.18) \). Similarly, the incidence of dubious subject repetition across years is infrequent \( (q = 2.252) \). Teachers and students experience little difficulty in getting a clear description of school goals \( (s, d, q = 2.345) \) or subject goals \( (s, q = 2.402) \). This may be due to a review of goals at the end of each term in which all teachers participate \( (p, d) \) and to the emphasis placed on achievement in the classroom \( (s, d) \). Successful individual programs are highlighted at end-of-term meetings \( (p, ob) \).

The principal and an assistant principal allocate extra duties and normally consult teachers about their allocation \( (ap, t) \).

Newsletters informing parents and the community about school matters are distributed on a regular basis \( (s, ob) \) although students do not always pass them on to their parents \( (s) \). Although some opposition or lack of support from parents has been experienced \( (q = 2.49) \) which may, perhaps, be due to a lack of their familiarity with school goals \( (q = 2.87) \).
2.364), teachers seldom meet problems with parents' attempts to exert pressure (q = 2.1).

Students are informed about school goals and rules through handbooks (s, p, ob) which teachers systematically examine with pupils during home group time (p). However, teachers intimated that, while they do not focus on the handbook in particular, home group period is sometimes used for a discussion of school rules (d, ob). Nevertheless, students appear to be aware of school rules and subject requirements (s). Their application to learning is encouraged and interruptions caused by, for example, public address system announcements during lessons, are kept to a minimum (s, ob).

Students appear to be mostly teacher-directed (d), and their attitudes to the school sometimes pose problems for teachers (t, q = 3.347). Student attendance rates are also of some concern (q = 2.756). While conduct violations are usually of a minor nature, the attitudes of some students have created complications (s, t, q = 3.347) and instances of vandalism have proved awkward (s, ob).

Students' academic achievements at Midpoint High are close to state average in basic skills achievement, problem-solving proficiency, general intellectual attainments, term tests, structured performance tests, and generalised competence (ob). Students' results in basic subjects are listed in Appendix 1.1. Teachers appear to be aware of the academic standards that students should attain (q = 2.586) but finding time to give individual assistance is difficult (q = 3.555), and there is some concern about students' academic achievements (q = 3.011). However, many students attain sound results in specific content areas (ob). Student tests are frequently administered (s) and reports on the full range of pupils' attainments are sent to parents twice a year (ob). Additional reports for grades 7 and 9 students are compiled at about the middle of the first school term (s, ob). Teachers indicated that they tend to encounter some problems with report writing (t, q = 2.763) and that pupils' performance is sometimes affected by socioeconomic disadvantage (q = 3.08).

Efficiency

Although the principal at Midpoint has not received a comprehensive formal education in allocating human, material and financial resources, experience in the position and in earlier years as a senior staff member and as an assistant principal has provided sufficient knowledge to manage a diverse range of administrative tasks (ob). The principal's position has often been equated with that of a company executive-director in handling tasks such as facilities planning, maintenance and operation; financial planning and cash flow management; personnel administration; pupil personnel services and
categorical programs management; knowledge of legal concepts, regulations, and codes of school operation; and use of analytical techniques and management (d). Through the example set by the principal, teachers are aware of their accountability to parents and the community and problems in meeting their responsibilities do not often arise (q = 2.328).

There is a considerable time pressure on all staff members (q = 3.54) and teachers often find it difficult to cope with all the work they have to do (q = 3.477). As a result, little time can be wasted due to inefficiencies (s, ob). However, some teachers hold that a closer liaison between subject departments would avoid duplication that sometimes occurs across subjects (q = 2.18, ob).

In recent years, advanced technology has received considerable attention not only in the information technology and manual arts subjects but also in other subject fields (ob). Indeed, many teachers have felt that, without the assistance of computers in recording students' results, they would not be able to cope with maintaining all records associated with criterion-based assessment (t, ob).

Teaching to ensure clarification is emphasised with a focus on students' understanding of subject matter (ob). Although teachers have expressed some perplexity with, and complexity in, the assessment procedures (ob), problems seldom occur with matching what is actually taught with the prescribed curriculum (q = 2.23).

To a limited extent, students are involved in organising activities and facilities such as class or school socials, sports teams, and other extra-curricular events (s, ob). This is achieved mainly through the student representative council which comprises delegates from most home groups in the school (s, ob). On some occasions, teachers and students combine their efforts to attain specific goals such as fund-raising for local charities (s, ob). These cooperative ventures assist in maintaining friendly relationships between teachers and students (s, q = 2.28).

From the Department's policy document, *Secondary Education: The Future*, matters referring to curriculum change have provided problems in the extra work involved (t, q = 3.208). Responses to questions about staff development usually centred on these and related issues (t, ob). However, a commonly-expressed complaint concerned the manner of delegating to teachers the responsibility of determining how change should be implemented at Midpoint High (t, d). As one senior staff member remarked, "This is what we are told we have to do, we work out how it can be done, and pity help us if we do it wrong" (t). As part of the process of "institutionalisation" (Miles, 1987: see Appendix 5-1), staff development is closely allied with school development (ob). The staff development
policy is readily accessible to all teachers (ob, d).

Matters of consequence to staff, which may affect school operations, or are of a long-term nature, are usually brought up for discussion during senior staff meetings, general staff meetings, or both (t, ob, d). Teachers seldom feel that they do not participate sufficiently in decisions affecting the school (q = 2.167). Dependent on the type of problem or the way that the organisation may be influenced, Student Representative Council members may also be involved (s, ob).

School policies are handled in a manner similar to that of decision making (ob). Most policies are formalised during senior staff meetings but teachers are able to participate. Parents are also involved on some occasions, particularly through meetings of the Parents and Friends Association (d, ob). To a limited extent, pupils take part through the Student Representative Council, particularly in aspects of student welfare (p, s).

Over time, some policy changes have occurred. For example, the appointment of head teachers has necessitated alterations to the staff structure (d). Job descriptions relevant to the positions were determined by a specially-organised group comprising the principal, an assistant principal, and elected representatives of teachers and the senior staff (d, ob). At the same time, steps were taken to delegate responsibility evenly by formalising job descriptions for all promotable positions within the school (ob). Head teachers' tasks may involve coordinating a subject department, a grade group or a school house of which there are four that are prominent at sports carnivals, or a duty team (d).

Teachers indicated that the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties is not always clear (q = 2.596). Additionally, they apparently believe that there has been a considerable loss of relativity in teachers' salaries over recent years (q = 3.782) and that their remuneration does not encourage them to take on extra responsibilities (d). However, when it is necessary for teachers to work after hours to consult with parents during parent-teacher afternoons, to attend class or school socials, or perhaps to take a group of students on intrastate or interstate school trips, they readily volunteer their services (ap, ob).

Equity

While equity receives some consideration (p, d, ob), teachers feel that more attention could be given to ensuring that all students receive equal attention (d). However, time pressures and communication deficiencies decrease the possibility of maintaining this ideal (q = 2.649, d). The wide range of students' needs and conflicting demands cause complications for most teachers (q = 2.707, ob) and this appears among the principal
pressures associated with teachers' conditions of service (d) with which many have experienced problems (q = 3.161).

Most grade 9 and 10 classes are 'streamed' in basic subjects (ob). The majority are level 2 standard with other classes for level 3 and level 1 students (s, t). While streaming is intended to provide talented and less able students with special learning situations, some teachers prefer completely homogeneous groupings and have expressed strong disapproval of streaming on the grounds that it creates class distinction (d) and that it does not improve students' attitudes towards each other (q = 3.412). Similar feelings were not articulated by students who appeared to reason that, as they can work out their own levels by matching their performance with other class members, it is more equitable to stream classes (s, d). The level system will soon be replaced by changes to the curriculum through introducing the Tasmanian Certificate of Education.

Students often take part in school assemblies by, for example, reading sports reports and presenting short plays (ap, s, d). Students consider that their Council is vested with some meaningful responsibility (s, ob). However, they had not received feedback on a few issues suggested to their representatives (s) which may have led to a degree of disillusionment on the part of students, thus bearing upon their attitudes towards school of which teachers expressed discontent (q = 3.347).

Interactions between teachers and students are normally positive both within and outside the classroom (ob, d). Those occasions when students feel that they receive negative interaction with teachers occur mostly when disciplinary action has to be taken to redress behavioural offences (s, ob). While students mostly agreed that some action should be taken when they do something wrong, there was considerable discussion on the type of action required (s, d) and the manner that it should be carried out (d).

In developing students' commitment to learning, considered by teachers as somewhat of a problem (q = 3.51), different strategies are practiced (ob). Students are publicly commended on their efforts and records of achievement have been introduced. Entries are negotiated between students and teachers and the folio is kept by the home group teacher until the pupil completes grade 10 or transfers to another school (d, ob). Records of achievement are intended to develop students' curricula vitae for presentation to future employers and to serve as mementos of students' school days at Midpoint (d).

Whilst equity is considered mostly in relation to the impartiality and integrity with which teachers attend to students, even-handedness among teachers as a group is also relevant. To this end, there appear to be some difficulties as it was indicated that,
Despite the creation of the head teacher positions, there remains a scarcity of opportunities for promotion ($q = 3.215$), the promotion system is perceived as being discriminatory ($q = 3.011$), and occasional disappointment with career advancement was expressed ($q = 2.513$, d). To an extent, the lack of opportunities for staff development appears to exacerbate the predicament ($q = 2.636$). However, such grievances do not noticeably influence staff relationships as teachers seldom experience difficulties in attitudes of peers towards them ($q = 2.019$).

**Flexibility**

Change is not normally viewed as a threat to teachers' or students' well-being. Ideas are not stifled and the introduction of innovations is usually encouraged (p), if tacitly (ob). The rewards of introducing a variation to the norm lie in the way that the success of the venture is gauged (p). Teachers seldom feel constrained when trying out new ideas ($q = 2.145$) or in expressing their opinions ($q = 2.156$). At the same time, while views may be definitive about perceived weaknesses of possible changes to the school curriculum, there is some hesitancy for teachers to discuss weaknesses in their own or a colleague's programs (ap, ob). Such restraint, however, is absent in Parents and Friends meetings where the principal's interactions with parents are quite candid (d).

Due to the changes in student certification procedures, new ways of teaching are tried (ap, ob) but the desire for explicit guidelines remains evident (d) and keeping up with new developments is of some concern ($q = 2.79$). The issue occurs mostly within subject areas as not all syllabuses for the Tasmanian Certificate of Education have been completed by the State syllabus committees (d).

A standard policy on staff development has been issued by head office (ap, ob). As distinct from staff development, teachers generally do not consider 'professional development' as directly relating to the school's daily routine but as award-bearing courses offered by the University or Institute of Technology (d). It is not normal for other teachers to be formally acquainted of an individual's participation in professional development nor do participants officially report to the staff about their studies on return to Midpoint High (ap, ob). However, teachers usually find out about another's absence when they are requested to supervise a class or a relief teacher appears in the school (d). If there was greater recognition or formalisation of teachers' participation in professional development, the school may benefit considerably through sharing knowledge.

Feedback on teachers' performance is usually haphazard as, apart from assisting
those who have had little teaching experience, the school does not now have a formal structure for teacher assessment (d, ob). However, as the school building is organised into subject areas, it is relatively easy for the teacher to be cognisant of what is happening in other classrooms (d). Due to the intimacy of classrooms, the teacher-in-charge of a subject department may assist or advise when requested or when considered necessary by either the teacher or subject coordinator (ob). The relationships between teachers within a few departments are of the degree where they freely ask for advice from their colleagues (d).

The school does not have a specifically designed unit for program development and assessment (p, ob). Likewise, diffusion of practices to other parts of the school rarely occurs on an organised basis (ob).

Quality control

Provisions exist for evaluating curricula, special programs, course materials, and the quality of activities related to the education provided by the school (ob). However, evaluation is usually carried out only when "it is thought to be necessary" (p, d). Complications emerging from the irregular assessment of programs and their associated requirements at Midpoint High are the provision of resources of sufficient quantity or quality (q = 2.835), ensuring that programs are kept up to date (q = 2.79) and adequately catering for the changing needs of students (q = 3.042).

The system of sharing data on student progress includes subject reports, student record cards, and interview files (ap, ob). In addition, the names of students who have been singled out for attention are published on the daily staff information sheet (ap). Time does not permit lengthy discussion of individual students in main staff meetings but they are sometimes mentioned during either subject or grade staff meetings (d). The difficulties encountered in report writing (q = 2.763) and in grading students (q = 2.586) may be alleviated if more attention was to be given to sharing information about students' educational progress (d).

Students are assessed on a regular basis, normally at the end of a unit of work (s, p, ob). Test design and regularity of administration are reviewed during subject staff meetings (ob). As all subject staff are involved, the expectations of those in more senior positions are not seen as excessive (q = 2.381), nor are the attitudes of seniors towards teachers considered as a source of distress (q = 2.061). All subjects are moderated by the Schools Board and Midpoint's subject representatives attend moderation meetings (d). Teachers thereby become conversant with the standardised performance-assessment practices for
gauging student performance in grades 9 and 10 (d).

For many years and despite reductions over time, class sizes have been a contentious issue (d, q = 3-105) which teachers see as a negative influence in quality control (t, d). Other aspects regarded as being of some importance with respect to quality control are the amount of work required of teachers (t, q = 3-477) and, despite the efforts of administrative staff to alleviate the condition (p, ap, ob), the amount of paperwork teachers have to do (q = 3-38).

Support

Most teachers give considerable attention to their work (s, ob) and getting a lot of work done is important to them (p, ap, t). However, an emphasis is placed not so much on the quantity of work but more on its quality (t). A shortage of time to plan and organise is one of the greatest problems at Midpoint (q = 3-54) and the sheer volume of work sometimes mitigates against production of work of the highest standard (t). Where it is seen that individual teachers or students have attained a high standard in their tasks, they are usually commended on their achievement (p, ap, t, s). However, it is believed that the form of recognition has to be appropriate to both the person concerned and the complexity of the task (s, p, t). In addition, the notion that teachers do not receive sufficient acknowledgement of their efforts (p, t) is reflected in the lack of recognition from others for the work teachers do (q = 2-751). An appendant difficulty is that of perceiving instances when work is of a high quality (p, ob, d).

A student's attainment of high personal standards is among the greatest rewards of teaching (t) and is one that may be perceived in many different ways, for example, through personal contact, meritorious academic or sporting achievement, or public performance (p, t).

Independence in learning is encouraged to a limited extent at Midpoint High (ob) and project work, especially in social science and information technology, forms part of the assessment program (t, ob). Teachers select those students who are permitted to work by themselves as previous experience has indicated that some students require closer supervision (s, t, ob).

Teachers are given significant responsibilities but they are not always delegated evenly (t, p, ap). In most instances, teacher are given the appropriate authority to execute tasks effectively (t, d). Similarly, teachers normally use their initiative and are encouraged to rely on their own judgement if a problem arises (ob).
Personal problems are discussed between teachers. Likewise, students are free to talk about their difficulties with most teachers (p, ap, t, s, ob). However, students usually approach those with whom they have the greatest rapport (s, t). The small number of students who are uncommunicative with teachers and do not feel that they 'belong' to the school are usually those who disparage other students' application, who deride the satisfaction that others gain from the school, and who are usually among the first to deface or destroy the facilities provided for or by the students (s, t, ap, ob). It is this group of miscreants that takes up a large proportion of teachers' time in providing positive reinforcement of sociable behaviour (ob). The effort involved in attempts to improve the group's attitudes towards other people and the school (ap, t) provides most of the difficulties that teachers expressed in the attitudes of students toward them (t, q = 2.391).

The principal, assistant principal, and senior staff indicated that they encouraged criticism of their ideas (p, ap, t). While all teachers indicated deference to, and appreciation of, the principal's demeanour, reservations were expressed about the openness of some members of senior staff, particularly when the senior person had held the position for a number of years (t). However, despite senior staff members' difficulties in support received from, and expectations of, those in lower positions (q: see Appendix 6-1, d1), they rarely 'talk down' to teachers (t, ob, d) nor do they criticise teachers over irregularly-occurring minor lapses (t, ob).

The courtesy of teachers towards each other is not always reflected among students (ob, d). Nevertheless, people who, by chance of racial background or some physical deformity, are different from others appear to be accepted by both teachers and students alike (ob).

Vision

The vision of Midpoint High takes the form of a 'Mission Statement' that had its origins in regional principals' meetings. As the Statement refers to the different values people hold and the assumptions underlying those values (p, ob), teachers seldom experience conflict between their values and those promoted by the school (q = 2.29). Parents and representatives of the wider community were invited to participate with teachers and students when adopting the Statement (p). Unfortunately, although there is little difficulty in communicating with parents (q = 2.111), the invitation was not accepted by all which has, perhaps abetted by of a lack of understanding (q = 2.387), resulted in
teachers' perceptions of the tendency of some parents to have negative attitudes towards the work of the school (q = 2.529). However, the broader aspects of the Statement appear to be generally accepted by parents and the community and, more especially, by the teaching staff (p, ob).

Although the Statement forms the basis of the school's philosophy, it does not necessarily fully express the vision held by the principal. There are a number of specific aspects of the principal's vision that can only be couched in general terms within the Statement (p, ob). For example, the Statement refers to the attainment of high educational standards but, although implied, it does not specifically indicate different approaches to teaching or to the management of change (p, ob). However, the principal's vision definitively refers to both change management and teaching approaches as part of the overall school development (p). This does not imply that an argument exists between the Statement and the principal's vision. The major difference between the two is that the former is in written form whereas the latter is a group of concepts and constructs by which means the principal guides the school towards those objectives considered to be of highest importance (ob). A further distinction between the two lies in the probability that the Statement could apply to any high school in the State whereas the principal's vision is idiosyncratic of, and because of its nature is applicable only to, Midpoint High (ob).

It could not be claimed that the intent of the Statement allays fear or uncertainty about the future (ob). However, this is countered by the principal's vision which is often called upon when talking over problems with teachers (p). When the principal has a vision with the central purpose of improving educational opportunities for students and which maps out a path that developments can take, teachers can be aided in finding meaning in their daily routines (p).

Time has been, and continues to be, given to discussion of the Statement during staff meetings. On the other hand, time is not necessarily devoted to an examination of the principal's vision (ob, d).

There are a few difficulties when organising the teaching timetable (ap, q = 2.595) and with attempts to obtain consistency in the demands made on teachers (q = 2.571). However, although the daily routine of the school has been standardised for administrative ease, teachers do not see the present structures and procedures as inflexible (ob).
The stress profile

Information relating to Midpoint's stress profile has been obtained by an integration of data drawn from instruments designed to construct a stress profile for each school in the study. Data sources include responses to questionnaire items, and interviews with the principal, assistant principal, and teachers. Information obtained from interview schedules has been cross-checked to verify the reliability of questionnaire responses. To avoid duplication, only questionnaire responses are reported.

In this chapter, the stress profile comprises information related to those areas in which it is considered that sources of stress emanate, namely, organisation, administration, academic program, students, parents, teachers, professional status, and personal factors directly concerned with teaching. When quantifying stress intensities, the following ratings were employed:

1 = slight annoyance, slightly annoyed, mild frustration, slight frustration, occasional frustration;

2 = resentment, some resentment, annoyance, annoyed, some annoyance, frustration, some frustration, anger, depression, regret, guilt, pressure, irritability, irritation, distress, some distress, concern, some concern, upsetting, disappointment, tiredness, fatigue, feelings of inadequacy, some anxiety, harassment, unhappiness, some futility, resignation, feeling of resignation, difficulty, sadness, feeling rushed (not rested), vulnerable, worry;

3 = considerable frustration, exhaustion, considerable anger, considerable annoyance, considerable resentment, panic, considerable stress, considerable worry, powerlessness, helplessness, alarmed, exhausted; and

4 = extreme distress, extremely annoying, extreme annoyance, great resentment, extreme frustration, extremely frustrated.

Organisation

Items included in the organisation section of the questionnaire originate from problems that could occur in the daily routine of the school. Included under this heading are shortage of time to plan and organise, the amount of paperwork you have to do, meeting deadlines, obtaining teaching materials, extra duties, undesirable physical surroundings, your involvement in staff meetings, class sizes, declining student enrolments, your teaching timetable, curriculum changes, interruptions to the teaching timetable, and conflicting demands from others. In all eight questionnaire categories, space is included for the respondent to add any difficulties not already listed. Although some of the additional organisational items are more relevant to other categories of the questionnaire, they have not been reassigned and appear as they were received from respondents. Consequently, the
meanings of some statements may be a little obscure while others clearly belong to different categories. The items added to the organisation category are:

- teaching out of my training area, trivial things e.g. end-of-day roll check, Tasmanian Certificate of Education [appearing three times], continual disturbance to extra-curricula activities, lack of opportunity for composite work, teaching too many classes, working outside school hours, lack of time for professional development, time organising other classes, class composition, restructuring, criterion-based assessment, external expectations of school, dysfunction between teaching and Education Department records and expectations, difficulties in withdrawing students, inequality of work loads, the number of different things which have to be done in a day, writing coursework, lack of clarity of direction and effective leadership, lack of time to plan new syllabuses and units, general lack of communication, & time available for staff discussion e.g. quality subject meeting time.

Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with shortage of time to plan and organise (3.502), the amount of paperwork you have to do (3.38), and class sizes (3.105). Low frequencies were accorded to declining student enrolments (1.717), your involvement in staff meetings (2.21), and undesirable physical surroundings (2.675).

The greatest organisational difficulty is shortage of time to plan and organise, selected by 34.22% of all respondents. The amount of paperwork you have to do was selected by 12.55% of teachers, and class sizes, 11.79%. A low number of responses were received for your involvement in staff meetings (0.38%), declining student enrolments (0.38%), and conflicting demands from others (3.42%).

It can be seen that, although there are some relationships between the above frequencies and items considered as the greatest difficulty, they are not synonymous. The former relate to ratings between 'not closely involved' and 'constantly' whereas the latter are derived from the question requesting the respondent to select, from all items in the category, an item perceived as the person's greatest difficulty. The differences existing between 'frequency' and 'greatest difficulty' will also be noticeable in other categories.

**Administration**

Items contained within the administration section of the questionnaire originate from problems that could occur with the way that the school organisation is managed. The items under this heading include support from those in more senior positions, support from those in lower positions, your involvement in school budgeting, introducing innovation, knowledge of procedures, participating in decisions affecting the school, opportunities for expressing opinions, expectations of those in more senior positions, expectations of those in lower positions, consistency of demands made of you, interpersonal relationships, resources for handling disciplinary problems, and learning about students from other staff. The following items were added by respondents to the administration category:
## Midpoint High School
### Consolidated Questionnaire Responses

### ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The amount of paperwork you have to do</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Meeting deadlines</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Obtaining teaching materials</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Extra duties</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Undesirable physical surroundings</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Your involvement in staff meetings</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Class sizes</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Declining student enrolments</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Your teaching timetable</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Curriculum changes</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Conflicting demands from others</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your involvement in school budgeting</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Introducing innovation</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Learning about students from other staff</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = Seen by the majority of staff as the greatest difficulty

\( \bar{z} = \text{Mean} \)
you tend not to be told everything you have to do; non-acceptance by students; lack of a teacher's conscientiousness; incompetence and lack of input and concern about what I am teaching; demands that cannot be predicted; having correspondence typed; complete lack of communication; communication breakdown from assistant principals to senior staff - inadequate briefing re discipline follow-through and student welfare; inconsistency in managing disciplinary problems [appearing twice]; the time which those in senior positions have or make available for discussion, consultation, and/or listening; & lack of adequate time.

Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with resources for handling disciplinary problems (2.592), consistency of demands made of you (2.571), and expectations of those in more senior positions (2.381). Low frequencies were accorded to your involvement in school budgeting (1.548), support from those in lower positions (1.785), and expectations of those in lower positions (1.786).

The greatest administration difficulty is consistency of demands made of you, selected by 20.51% of all respondents. Resources for handling disciplinary problems was selected by 17.09% of teachers, and introducing innovation, 13.25%. A low number of responses were received for expectations of those in lower positions (1.28%), support from those in lower positions (1.71%), and interpersonal relationships (2.14%).

Figure 5.1 illustrates the means of Midpoint High teachers' responses to items referring to stress sources and frequencies included in the questionnaire under the headings of organisation and administration.

Academic program

Items contained within the academic program category refer mostly to problems related to subject curricula and to the school's overall educational offering. Items include getting a clear description of school goals, getting a clear description of subject goals, justifying the program's relevance to students, adapting the program to suit students' needs, dubious repetition across subjects, dubious subject repetition across years, set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught, provision of resources, grading students, student report writing, responsibility to parents and the community, and meeting community expectations. Items added by respondents are:

understanding and implementing the new TCE [Tasmanian Certificate of Education]; keeping numbers viable or teaching an overload so as not to lose the subject; lack of guidelines, policy etc. at both ends of the education spectrum; completion of TTC [Tasmanian Teachers' Certificate]; introducing unproven reporting; timetabling to suit the needs of the subject; disinterest of administration staff and devaluation of subject; & the never-ending erosion of subject teaching time.
**Midpoint High School**

**Consolidated Questionnaire Responses**

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Getting a clear description of school goals</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Getting a clear description of subject goals</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Justifying the program's relevance to students</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Dubious repetition across subjects</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Dubious subject repetition across years</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Set curriculum matching curriculum which is actually taught</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provision of resources</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Grading of students</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Student report writing</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Responsibility to parents and community</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Meeting community expectations</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Meeting changing needs of students</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Consequences of student absences</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Students' attitudes towards school</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students' attitudes towards each other</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students' expectations of your teaching</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Students' commitment to learning</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Students' academic achievements</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Students' conformity to school rules</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Z** = Mean
- **O** = Seen by the majority of staff as the greatest difficulty
Higher frequencies of academic program difficulties were identified by respondents as provision of resources (2-835), student report writing (2-763), and adapting the program to suit students' needs (2-662). Difficulties considered to occur less frequently are dubious repetition across subjects (2-18), set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught (2-23), and responsibility to parents and the community (2-328).

The greatest academic program difficulty is provision of resources, selected by 20.5% of all respondents. Adapting the program to suit students' needs was chosen by 19.67% of teachers, and student report writing, 14.64%. A low number of responses were received for responsibility to parents and the community (0.42%), dubious repetition across subjects (0.84%), dubious subject repetition across years (3.35%) and set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught (3.35%).

Students

Items listed in the students category refer to problems that may arise from interactions between students and teachers. Included under this heading are finding time to give individual assistance, meeting changing needs of students, consequences of student absences, students' attitudes towards school, students' attitudes towards each other, students' expectations of your teaching, students' commitment to learning, students' academic achievements, students' conformity to school rules, the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance, and fulfilling your responsibility to students. Respondents added the following difficulties:

attending to student behaviour; smoking, drinking, drugs, 'Satanism' cult, stealing, lack of respect; students' physical violence, lack of respect for peers, peer pressure, lack of motivation, poor self-esteem; classroom behaviour discipline; & motivating students.

Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with finding time to give individual assistance (3-555), students' commitment to learning (3-51), and students' attitudes towards each other (3-412). Lower frequencies were accorded to students' expectations of your teaching (2-375), fulfilling your responsibility to students (2-72), and consequences of student absences (2-756).

The greatest difficulty with students is finding time to give individual assistance, selected by 31.98% of all respondents. Students' commitment to learning was selected by 19.43% of teachers, and students' attitudes towards school, 14.98%. A low number of responses were received for students' expectations of your teaching (0.41%), students' academic achievements (0.81%), and consequences of student absences (2.02%).

Figure 5-2 illustrates the means of Midpoint High teachers' responses to items referring to stress sources and frequencies in the academic program and students categories.
Parents

Problems that could arise from interactions between parents and schools are included in the parents category. Items under this heading include opposition or lack of support from parents, a lack of understanding between parents and staff, negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school, instances of attempts to exert parental pressure, the issue of whether parents should be involved in administration, communicating with parents, and parents' lack of familiarity with school goals. Items added by respondents are:

- inability to establish contact with some parents;
- most parents you would like to see never appear on a voluntary basis;
- apathy or apparent indifference of some parents;
- lack of support and commitment from parents;
- having parents sign and students return important forms, e.g., permission forms;
- ensuring students deliver school communications;
- parental opposition to a child's interest in this particular subject;
- parental expectations concerning imposing of behaviour standards;
- parents sometimes have unreasonable expectations of teachers and the school's influence;
- & not enough time to involve parents as often as I would like.

High frequencies of difficulties with parents were indicated by respondents as negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (2.529), opposition or lack of support from parents (2.49), and a lack of understanding between parents and staff (2.387). Difficulties of slightly lower frequency are the issue of whether parents should be involved in administration (1.727), instances of attempts to exert parental pressure (2.1), and communicating with parents (2.111).

The greatest difficulty is opposition or lack of support from parents, selected by 36.22% of all respondents. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school was chosen by 26.02% of teachers, and a lack of understanding between parents and staff, 12.25%. A lower number of responses were received for the issue of whether parents should be involved in administration (2.04%), instances of attempts to exert parental pressure (2.055%), and communicating with parents (7.14%).

Teachers

The teachers section of the questionnaire refers to difficulties that could emanate from teachers' work in the school and from interpersonal relationships among staff. Items listed in this category are lack of cooperation among staff, the staff's reluctance to being accountable, your interaction with staff, obvious instances of staff incompetence, staff
unsociability, the lack of staff conscientiousness, staff indifference to the school's espoused aims, communication deficiencies among staff, disruptive teacher transfers, other teachers relationships with students, and public criticism of teachers. The following items were added by respondents to the teachers category:

lack of appreciation to special job(s) done by staff; lack of opportunity to spend time with staff because of extra-curricular activities; sometimes a too-rigid opinion of student problems and/or capabilities; people not realising the skill required in teaching, people not acknowledging the difficulty under which teachers work, insulting office accommodation; coping with staff who are discouraged and stressed; delays in communication with central office, e.g. pay, appointments etc.; & people presenting with emotional instability/breakdowns.

Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with public criticism of teachers (3.26), communication deficiencies among staff (2.649), and obvious instances of staff incompetence (2.54). Low frequencies were accorded to staff unsociability (1.95), your interaction with staff (1.973), and the staff's reluctance to being accountable (2.08).

The greatest difficulty in this category is public criticism of teachers, selected by 45.78% of all respondents. Communication deficiencies among staff was selected by 14.22% of teachers, and obvious instances of staff incompetence, 11.11%. None of the respondents indicated staff unsociability as the greatest difficulty. A low number of responses were received for your interaction with staff (1.33%), and the lack of staff conscientiousness (2.1%).

Figure 5-3 illustrates the means of Midpoint High teachers' responses to items referring to stress sources and frequencies included in the questionnaire under the headings of parents and teachers.

Professional status

Items within the professional status category refer mostly to problems that could arise from teachers' perceptions of their position in the teaching profession. Included under this heading are lack of opportunities for staff development, loss of relativity of teachers' salaries, job insecurity, perceived injustices of the promotion system, scarcity of opportunities for promotion, disappointment with your own career advancement, ways in which staff are evaluated, the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties, your conditions of service, your participation in curriculum planning, and support from your peers. Items added by respondents are:

the government's acknowledgement of teachers' contributions; loss of motivation due to sweeping changes, less time allocated for support staff; & lack of support/interest from principal.
Midpoint High School
Consolidated Questionnaire Responses

**PARENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Opposition or lack of support from parents</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Communicating with parents</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of co-operation among staff</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your interaction with staff</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff unsociability</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The lack of staff conscientiousness</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Communication deficiencies among staff</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Disruptive teacher transfers</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other teachers' relationships with students</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Public criticism of teachers</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3. Responses to Parents and Teachers categories.
Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (3.782), scarcity of opportunities for promotion (3.215), and your conditions of service (3.161). Lower frequencies were accorded to support from your peers (1.965), your participation in curriculum planning (2.207), and job insecurity (2.273).

The greatest professional status difficulty is loss of relativity of teachers' salaries, selected by 39.5% of all respondents. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion was selected by 16.81% of teachers, and perceived injustices of the promotion system, 10.08%. A low number of responses were received for support from your peers (0%), the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties (1.26%), ways in which staff are evaluated (1.68%), and your participation in curriculum planning (1.68%).

Personal

The personal section of the questionnaire contains items relating to aspects of teaching which could be perceived as presenting personal difficulties. The items in this category are conflict between your needs and the profession, conflicts between your values and values taught, students' attitudes towards you, parents' attitudes towards you, your peers' attitudes towards you, attitudes of seniors towards you, keeping up with new developments, the amount of work you are required to do, lack of recognition from others for the work you do, constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas, and dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching. The following items were added by respondents:

- lack of time to be with my wife; lack of teaching time; stress, stress, stress; loss of motivation, fatigue, and health problems related to stress; misplacement; & not enough time to adequately plan.

Respondents indicated high frequencies of difficulties with the amount of work you are required to do (3.447), conflict between your needs and the profession (2.908), and keeping up with new developments (2.79). Low frequencies were accorded to your peers' attitudes towards you (2.019), parents' attitudes towards you (2.019), and attitudes of seniors towards you (2.061).

The greatest difficulty in the personal category is the amount of work you are required to do, selected by 37.04% of all respondents. Keeping up with new developments was selected by 16.46% of teachers, and conflict between your needs and the profession, 12.76%. None of the respondents considered attitudes of seniors towards you as the greatest difficulty, and low response numbers were received for parents' attitudes towards you (0.412%), and constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas (2.469%).

Figure 5-4 illustrates the means of Midpoint High teachers' responses to items referring to stress sources and frequencies in the professional status and personal categories.
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PROFESSIONAL STATUS

7.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Lack of opportunities for staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Disappointment with your own career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Ways in which staff are evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Your conditions of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Your participation in curriculum planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Support from your peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty with:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Conflict between your values &amp; values taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Parents' attitudes towards you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Your peers' attitudes towards you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Attitudes of seniors towards you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Lack of recognition in others for the work you do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Disatisfaction from your own standard of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = Seen by the majority of staff as the greatest difficulty
= Mean
The coping profile

Information pertaining to the coping profile of Midpoint High has been obtained by integrating data drawn from instruments designed to obtain a coping profile for each school in the study. Data sources include responses to questionnaire items and interviews with the principal, assistant principal, and teachers. To verify reliability, information obtained from interview schedules has been cross-checked with questionnaire responses. The coping profile comprises information on the strategies teachers employ to counteract difficulties listed in the questionnaire.

The format adopted in presenting responses for each category is as follows.

1. Strategies added by teachers are listed. Although many of the additional items are extensions of those contained in the questionnaire, they have not been edited and remain open to interpretation.
2. Strategies applied to items of greatest difficulty are described with percentages expressed as integers. To provide a clearer, although less detailed, illustration of strategy usage, only those employed by more than 10% of a school’s staff are listed.
3. Strategies applied to all difficulties within a category are ranked in order of usage where percentages are greater than or equal to 1. Accompanying efficacy ratings, taken to the first decimal place, are:

   1 = ineffective,
   2 = of little use,
   3 = adequate,
   4 = mostly effective, and
   5 = highly effective.

4. Within each category, the average efficacy for combined strategies is provided.
5. Strategy usages are depicted diagrammatically for each category.

Organisation

Respondents added the following strategies to the organisation category:

set aside planning time at night/weekends to seek ways to share problems and develop in staff capacity to handle the problem with support; I have no choice but to accept extra duty; organise my time according to perceived priorities; just get dragged along, often in an out of control situation; do as much as I can in the time available; work hard - figure it out - no use blaming anybody; can see no solution, so work in own time - and get very tense; moan and moan and then get down to it as best as possible; get stuck into the job; attack the problem as my mood dictates, usually slowly over time, and at night; cry a lot; I'm usually late; & tend to leave to the last minute.
The difficulty selected by the largest number of respondents in this category is shortage of time to plan and organise, for which the following strategies are employed:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (29% of all respondents),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (16%),
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (15%), and
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (13%).

To cope with difficulties arising from the amount of paperwork you have to do, respondents employ the following strategies:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (36%),
2. aggressively attack the source of the problem (16%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (15%).

The following strategies are applied to difficulties arising from class sizes:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (32%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (19%),
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (16%),
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (13%), and
5. try not to think about it (10%).

Strategies used to cope with all difficulties within the organisation category are as follows:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (28%, efficacy = 3.5);
2. talk the matter over with someone else (21%, efficacy = 3.3);
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (14%, efficacy = 3.3);
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (10%, efficacy = 3.5);
5. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (7%, efficacy = 3.3);
6. try not to think about it (5%, efficacy = 2.6);
7. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (5%, efficacy = 3.5);
8. try to see the funny side of the situation (3%, efficacy = 3.5);
9. take your frustrations out on some other person or object (2%, efficacy = 2); and
10. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (1%, efficacy = 2.3).

The average efficacy of all coping strategies exercised within the organisation category was rated by respondents as 3.302.
Administration

The following were added to the administration category by respondents:

prioritise the demands and attend to them as soon as I can - explain reasons for delay; realise that the situation is only temporary; become very frustrated and annoyed. Kids think you are at fault because you enforce the rules; & moan and then get it done or make some decision based on the above [strategies].

The strategies for coping with the difficulty selected by the largest number of respondents, consistency of demands made of you, are:

1. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (24%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (23%), and
3. talk the matter over with someone else (22%).

The strategies applied to difficulties with resources for handling disciplinary problems are:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (31%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (23%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (15%).

The strategies used to cope with difficulties encountered when introducing innovation are:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (39%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (19%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (10%).

Strategies applied to all difficulties within the administration category are as follows:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (31%, efficacy = 3-1);
2. gather information and plan ways to act (27%, efficacy = 3-4);
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (13%, efficacy = 3-2);
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (6%, efficacy = 3-1);
5. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (5%, efficacy = 3);
6. try not to think about it (3%, efficacy = 2-3);
7. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature (3%, efficacy = 2-7);
8. try to see the funny side of the situation (2%, efficacy = 3);
9. abandon it to tackle some easier problem (2%, efficacy = 2-8);
10. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others (2%, efficacy = 3-3);
11. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (2%, efficacy = 2);
12. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (1%, efficacy = 2); and
13. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you (1%, efficacy = 2-3).
COPING STRATEGY

- Aggressively attack the source of the problem.
- Steer clear of the problem at all times.
- Gather information and plan ways to act.
- Completely switch off and do nothing.
- Try not to think about it.
- Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.
- Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.
- Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.
- Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.
- Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.
- Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.
- Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.
- Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.
- Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.
- Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.
- Talk the matter over with someone else.
- Try to see the funny side of the situation.
- Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
- Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.
- Some other strategy.
Respondents rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used in the administration category as 3.071.

Figure 5-5 portrays the coping strategy usage for all difficulties listed in the questionnaire's organisation and administration categories.

Academic program

Teachers added the following items to the academic program category:

shut myself away and complete the task to the best of my ability; have left it for now and kept the class all at the same level; put off doing it till 'last moment' - report writing - grading. Get down and do it then; leave to do at the last moment; try to make more time out of school hours. Involvement in extracurricular learning so that some small group rapport can be established - e.g. sport, production, enterprise; accept the situation; muddle along; & try to do the best I can - choose or carefully the select [sic] pieces of work to mark.

The following strategies are employed to handle difficulties emanating from provision of resources:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (40%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (17%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (15%).

The strategies used to cope with difficulties related to adapting the program to suit students' needs are:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (57%), and
2. talk the matter over with someone else (20%).

The following strategies are exercised in coping with student report writing difficulties:
1. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (23%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (20%),
3. talk the matter over with someone else (17%), and
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (17%).

To cope with all difficulties within the academic program category, teachers use the following strategies:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (39%, efficacy = 3-1);
2. talk the matter over with someone else (24%, efficacy = 3-5);
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (12%, efficacy = 2-8);
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (5%, efficacy = 3-9);
5. try not to think about it (4%, efficacy = 2-4);
6. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (4%, efficacy = 3-4);
7. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (3%, efficacy = 2.7);
8. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (3%, efficacy = 3.2);
9. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you (2%, efficacy = 3); and
10. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others (1%,
efficacy = 3.333).

The average efficacy of all coping strategies used in handling difficulties arising
from the academic program was rated by respondents as 3.173.

Students

The items added by respondents to the students category of the questionnaire are:

endeavour to make time; probably a mixture of all the above [strategies] at times; try
to encourage students to make a commitment to learning; try to fit in as much
individual attention as I can without overdoing it; talk to students and try to motivate
them individually; speak to parents; try through my teaching to show education is
important and can be enjoyable; provide classroom routines that arnt [sic]
 discriminating - try to help if possible; involve parents in helping develop strategies
(variation on p [talk the matter over with someone else]); handle each situation
individually to the best of my ability; muddle along; do the best possible, try to be
fair in sharing out time; & talk with students, set an example, discussion with
students, keep trying.

The strategies used to cope with the difficulty of finding time to give individual assistance,
selected by the largest number of respondents, are:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (33%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (19%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (14%).

In handling difficulties arising from students' commitment to learning, the following are
applied:
1. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (30%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (27%),
3. gather information and plan ways to act (22%), and
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (11%).

The strategies applied to difficulties with students' attitudes towards school are:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (34%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (17%),
3. aggressively attack the source of the problem (13%),
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (11%), and
5. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (11%).

Strategies for coping with all difficulties within the students category are as follows:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (32%, efficacy = 3.2);
2. talk the matter over with someone else (22%, efficacy = 3.1);
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (11%, efficacy = 2.9);
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (10%, efficacy = 2.9);
5. aggressively attack the source of the problem (10%, efficacy = 3);
6. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (4%, efficacy = 3.3);
7. try not to think about it (2%, efficacy = 1.8);
8. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (2%, efficacy = 2.5);
9. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people (1%, efficacy = 3);
10. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature (1%, efficacy = 2.3); and
11. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others (1%,
    efficacy = 2.3).

Respondents rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used in handling difficulties within the students category as 3.009.

Figure 5.6 illustrates the coping strategy usage for all difficulties associated with the academic program and students categories of the questionnaire.

Parents

The following items were added by respondents to the parents category of the questionnaire:

leave it to the heirarchy [sic]; I think about it and do what I can but largely accept the inevitable; try to make contact with parents - publicize importance of education; try to talk it over with parents; arrange meetings with individual parents to discuss the problem; & grizzle.

The strategies used to cope with opposition or lack of support from parents, the difficulty selected by the largest number of respondents, are:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (28%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (21%),
3. try not to think about it (13%), and
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (11%).
Aggressively attack the source of the problem.
Steer clear of the problem at all times.
Gather information and plan ways to act.
Completely switch off and do nothing.
Try not to think about it.
Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.
Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.
Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.
Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.
Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.
Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.
Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.
Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.
Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.
Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.
Talk the matter over with someone else.
Try to see the funny side of the situation.
Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.
Some other strategy.
The strategies exercised for coping with difficulties arising from negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school are:

1. gather information and plan ways to act (20%),
2. try not to think about it (18%),
3. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (18%),
4. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (12%), and
5. talk the matter over with someone else (12%).

These strategies are used for handling difficulties when a lack of understanding between parents and staff arises:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (41%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (32%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (14%).

The strategies teachers employ to cope with all difficulties appearing in the parents category are as follows:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (26%, efficacy = 3.1);
2. gather information and plan ways to act (24%, efficacy = 3.3);
3. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (12%, efficacy = 2.9);
4. try not to think about it (12%, efficacy = 2.9);
5. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (12%, efficacy = 2.9);
6. aggressively attack the source of the problem (3%, efficacy = 3.3);
7. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (3%, efficacy = 2.5);
8. steer clear of the problem at all times (2%, efficacy = 2.5);
9. completely switch off and do nothing (2%, efficacy = 2.5); and
10. abandon it to tackle some easier problem (2%, efficacy = 2.3).

Respondents rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used within the parents category as 3.043.

Teachers

Respondents added to the teachers category the following strategies:

become defensive and try to explain teachers' position; value less what I do; try to get staff to pass information on more frequently; & ensure the school's parent community has better information.

The strategies for managing feelings emanating from public criticism of teachers, selected by the largest number of respondents as the greatest difficulty, are:

1. talk the matter over with someone else (22%),
2. try not to think about it (15%),
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**Figure 5.7. Primary coping strategies - Parents and Teachers categories.**

**PARENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively attack the source of the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of the problem at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and plan ways to act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely switch off and do nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to think about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk the matter over with someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to see the funny side of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively attack the source of the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of the problem at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and plan ways to act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely switch off and do nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to think about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk the matter over with someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to see the funny side of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. aggressively attack the source of the problem (12%), and
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (10%).

The strategies that respondents use when handling difficulties arising from communication difficulties among staff are:
1. talk the matter over with someone else (30%),
2. try not to think about it (17%),
3. gather information and plan ways to act (10%), and
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (10%).

The strategies employed when encountering obvious instances of staff incompetence are:
1. talk the matter over with someone else (30%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (17%),
3. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (13%), and
4. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (13%).

The strategies applied to difficulties itemised in the teachers category of the questionnaire, with the exception of staff unsociability, which was not selected by any respondent, are as follows:
1. talk the matter over with someone else (24%, efficacy = 2.9);
2. gather information and plan ways to act (13%, efficacy = 3.4);
3. try not to think about it (12%, efficacy = 2.5);
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (11%, efficacy = 3);
5. aggressively attack the source of the problem (9%, efficacy = 3.3);
6. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (8%, efficacy = 3.1);
7. completely switch off and do nothing (5%, efficacy = 3.1);
8. try to see the funny side of the situation (5%, efficacy = 3.2);
9. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (4%, efficacy = 1.9);
10. abandon it to tackle some easier problem (2%, efficacy = 2);
11. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature (1%, efficacy = 2.7);
12. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. (1%, efficacy = 3.3); and
13. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (1%, efficacy = 1.7).

Respondents rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used in the teachers category as 2.902.

Figure 5.7 illustrates the coping strategy usage for difficulties related to the parents and teachers categories of the questionnaire. In the latter category, a considerable reduction in the use of the strategy, gather information and plan ways to act, is noteworthy.
Professional status

The items added by respondents to the professional status category are:

leave to work part-time to gain work satisfaction elsewhere; nothing one can do; very difficult to do anything; work through TTF [Tasmanian Teachers' Federation] resign; act strongly in the union, profession and politically; try to find an alternative career; behave apathetically; I try to deal with this outside work; & what can I do?

The strategies respondents use when coping with the difficulty selected by the largest number of respondents, loss of relativity of teachers' salaries, are as follows:
1. try not to think about it (26%), and
2. talk the matter over with someone else (26%).

The strategies teachers favour when encountering a scarcity of opportunities for promotion are:
1. try not to think about it (33%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (13%), and
3. gather information and plan ways to act (10%).

When handling feelings deriving from perceived injustices of the promotion system, respondents use the following strategies:
1. talk the matter over with someone else (25%),
2. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (21%), and
3. try not to think about it (17%).

The strategies employed to cope with difficulties relating to professional status, with the exception of support from your peers, which was not selected by any respondent, are as follows:
1. try not to think about it (26%, efficacy = 2.4);
2. talk the matter over with someone else (26%, efficacy = 2.6);
3. gather information and plan ways to act (9%, efficacy = 2.7);
4. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (7%, efficacy = 3);
5. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (5%, efficacy = 1.9);
6. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (3%, efficacy = 2.7);
7. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (3%, efficacy = 1.7);
8. aggressively attack the source of the problem (3%, efficacy = 3);
9. completely switch off and do nothing (3%, efficacy = 2.3);
10. try to see the funny side of the situation (3%, efficacy = 3.4);
11. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. (3%, efficacy = 2);
12. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature (2%, efficacy = 2);
13. abandon it to tackle some easier problem (1%, efficacy = 2);
14. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (1%, efficacy = 4);
15. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you (1%, efficacy = 3); and
16. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others (1%, efficacy = 2).

Teachers rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used when dealing with problems related to their professional status as 149. Again, there is a considerable reduction in direct-action strategies.

Personal

Respondents added the following items to the personal category of the questionnaire:

many things are not done very well e.g. lesson preparation is often not done; try to do something about it; attack the problem (though not always aggressively); organise priorities and time management; plod along; do what I need to do; resign; I try to love the pain; organise my time carefully; force myself to take one day at a time; muddle along; & do the best possible, keep plugging away.

The strategies teachers prefer to use when coping with the difficulty selected by the largest number of respondents, the amount of work you are required to do, are:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (26%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (23%), and
3. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (12%).

The strategies teachers exercise in countering difficulties relating to keeping up with new developments are:
1. gather information and plan ways to act (44%),
2. talk the matter over with someone else (23%),
3. try not to think about it (13%), and
4. aggressively attack the source of the problem (10%).

Teachers indicated that they used the following strategies when dealing with conflict between your needs and the profession:
1. try not to think about it (27%),
2. gather information and plan ways to act (20%), and
3. talk the matter over with someone else (20%).

The strategies teachers use to cope with personal difficulties related to the teaching profession, with the exception of attitudes of seniors towards you, are as follows:
PROFESSIONAL STATUS

Aggressively attack the source of the problem.
Steer clear of the problem at all times.
Gather information and plan ways to act.
Completely switch off and do nothing.
Try not to think about it.
Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.
Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.
Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.
Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.
Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.
Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.
Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.
Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.
Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.
Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.
Talk the matter over with someone else.
Try to see the funny side of the situation.
Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.
Some other strategy.

COPING STRATEGY

PERSONAL
1. gather information and plan ways to act (25%, efficacy = 3-1);
2. talk the matter over with someone else (19%, efficacy = 2-8);
3. try not to think about it (11%, efficacy = 2-3);
4. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (10%, efficacy = 3-1);
5. aggressively attack the source of the problem (8%, efficacy = 3-5);
6. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (6%, efficacy = 2-7);
7. some other strategy not included in the questionnaire (4%, efficacy = 3-2);
8. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (3%, efficacy = 2-1);
9. completely switch off and do nothing (3%, efficacy = 2-4);
10. try to see the funny side of the situation (3%, efficacy = 3);
11. abandon it to tackle some easier problem (2%, efficacy = 3);
12. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. (2%, efficacy = 2);
13. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you (1%, efficacy = 2-5).

Teachers rated the average efficacy of all coping strategies used when dealing with personal problems related to their profession as 2.862.

Figure 5-8 illustrates the coping strategy usage for difficulties related to the professional status and personal categories of the questionnaire.

Although in all sections teachers added coping strategies, it is considered that most additions are applicable to those listed. Perhaps the most common sentiment expressed is "do the best I can", typifying most teachers' approach to their work in all schools visited. Yet even this is related to the strategy, accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution. It therefore appears that the nineteen strategies included in the coping section of the questionnaire adequately cover most possible courses of action. Nevertheless, providing the opportunity to add others strategies is justifiable when there is a possibility that the respondent could misunderstand any of those listed.

**Primary coping strategy aggregate**

To present a complete account of the frequency and efficacy ratings of strategies used by all teachers included in the sample, the responses from the eight questionnaire categories were combined. It is emphasised that the figures given below refer only to respondents' primary strategy. Most respondents (approximately 97%) provided more than one strategy. However, the penultimate item in each category required the respondent to indicate the strategy they use most.
Efficacy Ratings

Copings Strategy

Aggressively attack the source of the problem.
Steer clear of the problem at all times.
Gather information and plan ways to act.
Completely switch off and do nothing.
Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.
Try not to think about it.
Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.
Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.
Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.
Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.
Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.
Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.
Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.
Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.
Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.
Talk the matter over with someone else.
Try to see the funny side of the situation.
Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.
Some other strategy.
To obtain the efficacy, the mean rating was calculated from all responses indicating the strategy as a primary coping technique. To obtain the percentage usage, the number of respondents who selected the strategy was divided by the total of responses (1841) and multiplied by 100. As an example, the strategy, aggressively attack the source of the problem, has a mean efficacy rating of 3.31 and is used by 6.992% of the population.

Ratings of efficacy and usage of all strategies are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>% Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively attack the source of the problem</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>6.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of the problem at all times</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and plan ways to act</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>24.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely switch off and do nothing</td>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>1.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to think about it</td>
<td>2.470</td>
<td>9.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>7.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon it to tackle some easier problem</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>10.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk the matter over with someone else</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>23.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to see the funny side of the situation</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>2.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take your frustrations out on some other person or object</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other strategy not included in the questionnaire</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>3.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5-9 graphically illustrates rated efficacies and usage frequencies of coping strategies drawn from responses to all categories of the questionnaire.

Conclusion

The description of Midpoint High School contains elements common to most of the nine schools within the sample. At the same time, each school has its unique characteristics and it would be erroneous to suggest that any one school directly replicates Midpoint High. An outline of a school's education profile can be seen in Appendix 5.2. The example is similar in format to schools' second reports. Appendix 5.3, a group of tables that
very briefly summarises the data on schools' education profiles, indicates the different characteristics.

In referring to the quantitative analysis of the data obtained from questionnaire responses, it should be emphasised that, although numbers may give an impression of objectivity and precision, most items contained within the questionnaire require some form of subjective assessment on the part of the respondent. Nevertheless, it is considered that, as almost all teachers in seven of the nine schools returned usable questionnaires, Nairn and Reay being the remaining two with returns of 80% and 72% respectively, the stress and coping profiles provide a reasonably accurate representation of the feelings and opinions of teachers within those schools. Graphs depicting responses to questionnaire items specifically referring to the individual school's stress and coping profiles are contained in Appendices 6.2, and 6.6 to 6.9.

School operations differ in structure, approaches, procedures, applications, and receptiveness which may be interpreted in different ways according to the observer's outlook and biases. As an example, the observation schedule item, Is application to learning encouraged in the school?, prompts a wide range and large number of questions: What is meant by application? Does it infer the absorption of the student in the subject matter?, in the principles involved?, in the wider field of knowledge?, in its practical functions? or does it imply a rigorous lesson of the "chalk and talk" format where the focus is on attaining high marks? What is "learning"? How is and how should it be encouraged? What is its purpose for students? Is it to enlarge understanding?, to gain a pass in the subject?, to help get a job after school?, or to satisfy the demands of parents or teachers? Where this and similar items are so open to interpretation, the observer is required to establish an explication that is uniformly applied over the sample schools.

There is the necessity for a high degree of objectivity if generalisations from the particular are to be valid. However, in this study such objectivity is paralleled by a marked subjectivity as it is the variety of approaches to school operations that provide meaning to school descriptions. Attempts to clarify these issues and to indicate biases in comparing other schools' profiles with that of Midpoint High appear in the next chapter.
The purposes of this chapter are to compare school profiles and, thereby, provide answers to the following research questions:

- Do education profiles differ between schools? In what ways do they differ?
- Do stress sources, intensities, and frequencies differ between schools? In what ways do they differ?
- Do coping strategies differ between schools? In what ways do they differ?

Overview

The chapter comprises three main sections. In the first section, schools rated as having the highest and lowest level in each factor of the education profiles are compared with Midpoint High. The factors used in compiling education profiles are effectiveness, efficiency, equity, flexibility, quality control, support, and vision.

The schools' stress profiles form the second section. Stress sources, frequencies, and intensities are described and compared with Midpoint. Findings are presented according to questionnaire categories, education factors, and statistical factor analysis.

The third section, describing the ways teachers handle difficulties, is presented in a manner similar to the second section. Data from questionnaire responses, education factors, and factor analysis provide facets for examining schools' coping profiles.

School settings

To provide points of reference, school settings are briefly described in alphabetical order.

Laggan

Laggan has an historic importance in that it was the earliest shipping port in Tasmania which, because of silt deposits, can no longer be used. Most people who live in the municipality gain their livelihood as factory employees, shop keepers, and farmers, or commute to the city.

On entering Laggan school, one is greeted by a student who is timetabled to welcome visitors. Students appear to enjoy this responsibility which was initiated by the present principal. All parts of the school are under the one roof. In some parts, the building has
two-storeys. The corridors, in which there are glass display cases containing students' craftwork, are wide with high ceilings and tiled floors which tend to amplify the animated conversations of children between periods and at recess and lunch breaks.

**Mull**

Mull relies on mining for its income and most employment in the town is dependent on the viability of this major industry. The community could be described as close-knit due to its isolation from other populated areas. For a small town, it has a large number of hotels and motels to cater for a lively tourist industry. However, due to the severity of its weather, tourist travel to Mull occurs mainly during the warmer months.

Mull school has recently had extensive additions and refurbishment of existing classrooms. The Hall of Nations, which would be the envy of many schools, is a long, high-ceilinged, light and airy corridor featuring flags of many nations donated by various embassies. The children are appreciative of the efforts of others and, where it is seen that teachers have gone out of their way to help them, the children tend to respond in a more noticeable way than would students in other parts of Tasmania.

**Nairn**

Nairn is within commuting distance from the State's capital city. It is a rural area with a history of sheep farming and cattle grazing. Most families living in the town gain their income from a nearby paper mill. Unlike other schools in the study, Nairn school consists of a number of separate buildings joined by covered pathways. With the exception of the recently-built grade 7 area, the school is of the older type with external weatherboard and iron roof. The interior construction features high ceilings, solid plaster interior walls and wooden floors. The cost of heating the school during the winter months presents some problems for the Department.

**Newtyle**

Newtyle High, located in an inner suburb of the capital city, is a valuable piece of real estate which was possibly a reason prompting the financially-stricken State government to consider closing the school. The school was constructed a few years before Nairn High and is a two-storey, solid brick building. In the centre of the school is a courtyard where, within a roofed section, the students' wooden lockers are positioned. Despite the school's locality, the grounds are extensive and well maintained.

**Portree**

Portree is an outer suburb of the north's major city. As the school is surrounded by a gardening centre and farm, and is built on the crest of a hill, it has a rural atmosphere which appears to be appreciated by teachers and students. With brick and weatherboard exterior walls, the building is a single-storey construction of three long corridors lined
with students' lockers. As with most other schools in the State, Portree High's student enrolment has decreased which has resulted in a number of spare classrooms.

Raasay

Drab grey and brown cement blocks have been used in Raasay's external construction and predominate much of the interior decor. To improve and lift the heavy appearance and to display some of the work being done in classes, teachers have attached students' paintings, assignments, and printed posters to the walls.

During 1975, the first grade 7 students attended Raasay High. The founding principal undertook the task of establishing the school in what could be considered a difficult educational environment. The evidence of some of his efforts have remained with the school. For example, on their own volition some of the students go out of their way to welcome and assist visitors. Yet those same children use adjectives which would not be encountered in a literary journal. Whilst this provides embarrassment for teachers who endeavour to improve the language children use, it is remembered that these children merely converse in a way that is the norm in their own homes.

Reay

Reay High School is in a relatively prosperous city which, in previous years, was a major shipping port for the northern region. Much of the city's commerce is still conveyed through the port although this has decreased since the airport was up-graded to jet standard. The school was opened in the early 1950s and is one of long, narrow corridors, high ceilings, solid plaster walls, and many dark spaces. Being built on a hillside, it has several flights of stairs which have resulted in a few broken limbs over the past years.

Reay's playing fields have been a boon to the school, particularly in Australian Rules football in which students have excelled. Strongly encouraged by a previous principal, the teams' many championship trophies are prominently displayed alongside awards for hockey, netball, and swimming. The present principal's focus appears to be on creating a balance between sporting, academic and technological pursuits.

Rona

To enter Rona High School after visiting Raasay gives one a feeling of *déjà vu* as the schools are almost identical in plan, construction, and sombreness. During 1980, the first intake of Grade 7 pupils attended Rona school. The foundation principal, who was appointed to another school in 1988, believed that the school at Rona should have a high profile within the local community. The evidence of some of his efforts can still be seen within the school. For example, a number of coloured photographs depicting various dignitaries' visits to the school line the corridor walls between the front foyer and the main staffroom. In other corridors, similarly framed photographs of school events such as
swimming and athletic carnivals have been attached to the walls. As is the case at Raasay, the Rona community does not possess many cultural resources although Rona has seven percent less than Raasay's fifty percent of students on loan issue, that is, the books they require are bought by the State government. Unlike Raasay school whose students live locally, approximately 86 percent of Rona students live nearby with the remainder drawn from adjacent townships and farms with a small number living in the more distant and wealthier areas to the south of Rona.

Wyvis

Wyvis is similar to Laggan in that it is a fairly small rural town. The inhabitants earn their living by shop trading, dairying or mixed farming, or working in a nearby city.

The school grounds are extensive, of a rich basalt soil, with well laid-out gardens and a grove of trees lining the driveway. The corridors of a new section of the school are well lit and feature a lead-light window. There are three display cabinets in the front foyer containing students' work and mementos of the community's history. The school houses are named after ships which, in earlier years, plied Bass Strait. Framed paintings of the ships line the corridor leading to the well-equipped assembly hall and adjacent gymnasium.

The education profiles

Schools having the highest and lowest number of positive responses to the range of factors examined in the education profiles are discussed in this section. Although a school may have the lowest number of positive responses to a factor, it is not inferred that the school is severely deficient as there are many ways that the school could be serving its pupils well. In some respects, school portraits are confined to a time frame. It is known that, since the study began, there have been changes in the principalship in at least two schools which could distinctly alter a number of educational processes. Nevertheless, as the descriptions represent the school at the time of visiting them, it is believed that the findings of, and the conclusions reached in, this research project are not invalidated because of these changes.

Effectiveness

The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 (pp. 21-23) and elements listed in Appendix 5.3 indicate a number of items related to school effectiveness. The data obtained through the observation schedule and diary, supported by teachers' responses to interviews and questionnaire items, reveal that each school has two or more effectiveness elements that do not compare favourably with Midpoint. From the highest to the lowest number of
elements, the order of schools is Reay, Raasay, Newtyle, Portree, Mull, Laggan, Wyvis, Rona, and Nairn.

The following descriptions highlight those elements of effectiveness in which Reay, with the highest rating, and Nairn, with the lowest, differ from Midpoint High.

Reay school has explicit procedures for developing data-based school improvement goals. School policies are examined as a matter of routine. Reay has the largest school population of all schools in the sample and this could provide interdepartmental communication problems. However, there is little difficulty experienced with dubious repetition across subjects, with involving teachers in staff meetings, and with their participation in decisions affecting the school.

Teachers hold Reay's principal in high esteem. His democratic leadership was emphasised in interviews with teachers who expressed the opinion that he regards them as trustworthy, capable and intelligent people who, given the appropriate environment, can greatly assist the school in attaining its goals. Teachers also believe that the principal has considerable communication skills, technical knowledge, a high degree of credibility, and great patience.

While most teachers hold that students' commitment to learning could be improved, students' achievements are seen as being reasonable with a relatively high level of application to their work in the classroom. The students' academic attainments differ from State average at the fourth-year level with a higher proportion of students at level 3 and a correspondingly lower ratio of level 1 students. Results in the junior grades for literacy and numeracy tests reveal a similar high level of attainment. The number of awards presented to students for academic and sporting achievement at end-of-year functions is noticeably higher than at Midpoint.

The student drop-out rate between grades seven and ten is considerably lower at 0.8% than Midpoint and State-wide averages. Likewise, student attendance figures are the highest of all schools in the sample (97.4%).

Reay school rated lower than Midpoint in two of the elements used to assess effectiveness. Although students are informed about school goals and rules through handbooks, there is not a systematic review with students during home group periods. Nevertheless, students appeared to be fully aware of school rules, procedures, and subject requirements. In addition, the students' locus of control is external. Teachers are highly critical of student behaviour, determine the degree of student participation in many diverse fields, and student involvement in school decision making is minimal.

Nairn school rates lowest of the sample schools in those items used to assess
effectiveness. Nevertheless, Nairn High School compares favourably with Midpoint in having a lower student drop-out rate (0.9%), and an apparently higher degree of student attention to events in the classrooms.

On the other hand, there are elements in which Nairn High School does not appear to be of equal status to Midpoint. A formal mechanism for developing data-based school improvement goals was not discernible and teachers rarely discuss with students the school's goals or information contained in handbooks. Nairn has a rather unstable student enrolment. This is adversely affected by the State Government's policy on student transport. Parents pay less to send their children to city schools, even though Nairn school is by-passed.

In their final year at Nairn, students' achievements are lower than State and Midpoint's averages in basic skills achievement, problem-solving proficiency, term tests, and general intellectual attainments. On the other hand, Nairn's 14R and 14N tests results are similar to Midpoint's. The students' locus of control is mostly external.

Staff meetings are rarely held at Nairn. As a result, it was not possible to ascertain who leads discussions. Further, if a staff meeting is held, teachers reported that discussion of school effectiveness does not form part of the agenda. Most major decisions are made either by the principal alone or in conjunction with the assistant principal. According to the principal, "I know what has to be done, I don't need them to tell me".

Efficiency

Of the many elements identified in the literature on school efficiency as desirable attributes, details of which are provided on pages 38-41 and Appendix 5.3, schools in the sample rated lower than Midpoint in at least one of them. From the highest to the lowest in efficiency elements, the order of schools is Raasay, Portree, Wyvis, Rona, Mull, Newtyle, Laggan, Reay, and Nairn.

Data analysis reveals that Raasay school has the greatest number of elements that compare favourably with those of Midpoint.

Although a siren or bell is not used except in an emergency, Raasay students seem to settle into lessons well and to follow the example set by teachers in their punctuality. Ostensibly legitimate reasons were given by the few students who were out of the classroom after periods had commenced.

In addition to the many other responsibilities inherent in a principal's position, Raasay's principal has, at times, been required to assume the role of a surrogate father. Teachers reported an oft-occurring problem where a pupil's father is incapable of providing the love and attention the child sorely needs. The principal's concern is
demonstrated in many different ways, from the manner he converses with students, through providing warm clothing to those who need it, to ensuring that students receive a proper breakfast. It is known that he has often given his lunch to children whom he thought needed it more than he. On occasions during the week, the principal was seen with his arm around children as though protecting them. On each occurrence, the child had either experienced a traumatic time at home, for example, father was away and the mother's boyfriend was in for the weekend, or the child had been placed in a difficult position by other students in or outside the school. A number of teachers reported that the principal "genuinely loves kids as if they were his own".

There is an openness in relationships between teachers that pervades the school atmosphere. They do not experience difficulty with involvement in school budgeting and seldom encounter a peer's reluctance to accepting accountability to parents and the community. Difficulties emanating from accountability occur less frequently at Raasay than at Midpoint, despite the time pressures and the amount of work teachers have to do. Due to the climate within the community, making decisions about difficult problems cannot be deferred but are willingly tackled.

Teachers at Raasay regularly receive support and assistance in teaching from senior staff and from their peers. Conversations between staff members in corridors, in the classrooms, and in staffrooms confirm this.

Problems in relating the prescribed curriculum to the teaching program are of lower magnitude at Raasay than at Midpoint. Similarly, difficulties arising from curriculum changes and teachers' involvement in curriculum planning occur less frequently possibly through greater involvement of all teachers in staff meetings and to their participation in decisions affecting the school. "Innovate or perish" is a catchword in the school as many circumstances outside the normal realm of the profession require teachers to rely on their own judgement.

There is a systematic review of policies at Raasay and a timetable ensures that all policies are evaluated over a two-year period. A knowledge of procedures is an essential part of the school's program. The principal regularly and publicly ascertains the level of staff agreement with the way that the school is organised and administered.

Relationships between pupils and teachers appear to be different from those in other schools in that dialogue is on a more equal footing. Whilst it is difficult to objectively assess student/teacher interactions, pupils seem to willingly accept advice offered by a teacher who is patient with them but they are not receptive to one who tries to dominate.

There is an even delegation of responsibility and authority to Raasay's teachers.
Through the example set by the principal and assistant principal, teachers are encouraged to assist each other. In many instances, help is freely given in the duties of others despite the succinct documentation of job descriptions.

The lowest rating in the assessed elements of efficiency is attributed to Nairn. The elements in which Nairn compares favourably with Midpoint are an apparently low wastage of time, considered to emanate from teachers' application to fulfilling their responsibilities to students, and a high degree of audio-visual equipment usage which appears to be appropriate to the subject matter, to the students' attention span, and as an aid to gaining student involvement.

Elements of efficiency in which Nairn High School does not compare positively with Midpoint include a lack of student punctuality, a concentration on adherence to prescribed teaching practices, and a somewhat inflexible school administration.

Due to the paucity of formal discussion among teaching staff, group participation in regular reviews of school policies, explanation of school procedures, and examination of curriculum matters is minimal. Although teachers converse informally about policy, they indicated a powerlessness in instituting change.

Senior staff members do not appear to greatly assist teachers in their daily routines or to be involved in improving the school's educational offering. This is coupled with an irregular and uneven distribution of responsibility and authority. Moreover, there is a reluctance on the part of students to approach senior or administrative staff for assistance. A student explained, "You only see them when a teacher sends you for doing something wrong".

Equity

The data reveal that most schools give considerable attention to equity. Of the elements used to assess this factor, schools are ranked as Raasay, Newtyle, Laggan, Mull, Rona, Portree, Reay, Wyvis, and Nairn.

Raasay leads other schools in equity as it is one of the school's highest priorities. The low frequency of communication deficiencies increases the likelihood of maintaining this ideal. The school staff provides as complete a range of specialist learning situations as is possible without focusing on only a small percentage of students. Equal attention is, and is seen to be, given to all children regardless of academic ability.

The student council is vested with meaningful responsibilities and council delegates freely talk with teachers about policies that interest students. On all possible occasions, Raasay students are encouraged to participate in school or grade assemblies and other formal occasions. There is tangible reinforcement of positive interaction with all students.
that appears to be in the forefront of teachers' approach to students.

The data on equity among teachers indicate that difficulties associated with the scarcity of teachers' opportunities for promotion occur less frequently at Raasay and the perception of injustices in the promotional system is somewhat lower. Disappointment with career advancement seldom occurs and teachers encounter significantly fewer problems related to the attitudes of peers towards them.

The only element Raasay's teachers and students see as negative centre on occasions when students feel that they receive adverse interaction with staff members and with other students. Nevertheless, students admitted that misdemeanours require some form of disciplinary action. Relationships with other students, however, are sometimes very difficult. There are two sections of the Raasay community, the old and the new. Whilst both parts are in the one housing commission area, it appears that residents of the older part consider the other residents as inferior. Teachers believe that children bring the same spurious arguments into the school.

At Nairn High School, equity does not appear to be considered as highly important as it does not compare favourably with Midpoint in any elements used in assessing equity.

Teachers at Nairn appear to focus mostly on students of higher academic ability. This is exemplified by the only honour board in the school foyer listing the names of past students who have gained university degrees. Perhaps the concentration on the more able students is seen by senior staff as a means of attracting those who by-pass Nairn to attend city schools. The school organisation does not have the flexibility to allow for individual learning capacities as much as would be preferred. Most classes in the lower grades and those upper-grade classes in the basic subjects of English, maths, science, and social science are proportionally larger so that a wider range of optional subjects can be offered.

Signs of motivating students are inconsistent across the school. The school's Grade 7 area is well-provided with examples of students' work placed on notice boards both within the classroom and in the grade's assembly/activities auditorium. However, examples of older students' work are not prominently displayed. The front foyer, normally out-of-bounds to students, has a small glass cabinet containing students work, the most recent being some pottery made in 1986.

Flexibility

Raasay, again, compares favourably with Midpoint in most elements of flexibility. Nairn, however, does not compare well in many aspects. Of the assessed elements of flexibility, the schools appear in order as Raasay, Portree, Newtyle, Rona, Laggan, Mull,
Reay, Wyvis, and Nairn.

The foremost difference in flexibility between Raasay and Midpoint schools is the encouragement Raasay teachers are given to innovate. In addition, there is little hesitation on the part of Raasay teachers to discuss weaknesses in their own or a colleague's programs. Furthermore, teachers are not constrained in suggesting possible improvements to current practice. Indeed, teachers supported the assistant principal's assertion that the principal "would be upset if he thought that a teacher was reticent in offering an opinion on any matter concerning the school".

Among the greater difficulties Raasay teachers experience is parents' negative attitudes towards the work of the school. Many teachers hold that, if parents took greater interest in children's education and participated more in school affairs, students would be much better served. This belief is supported by the low frequency rating given to the issue of whether or not parents should be involved in administration. Teachers are highly committed in their accountability to students whilst not forgetting their responsibility to parents and the community.

As an outcome of procedural changes in student certification, new ways of teaching are often tried at Raasay and the desire for explicit guidelines is not as prevalent as at Midpoint. The policy outlining general school development forms the basis for formal staff discussions and a schedule for regular evaluations of various aspects of curriculum and school development is maintained.

Professional development receives strong support from Raasay teachers who willingly supervise lessons for those who are absent on such activities. Relief teachers external to the school are called upon only in an emergency as, according to the principal, "the kids do not think of them as a part of the family". Participants in professional development normally report to the staff on matters beneficial to the school in either the near or distant future.

Regular feedback on teachers' performance is a feature at Raasay as the principal and assistant principal are frequently seen in classrooms or walking the corridors. Teachers view the presence of either the principal or assistant principal as a matter of providing support rather than of surveillance. Consequently, new ways of teaching are often tried. Teachers also explained that support and assistance is freely given by other teachers if and when required.

At Nairn High School, the feedback frequency on new developments, particularly those emanating from central office, is high. Due to the small number of staff, communication with other teachers is not the problem it can be in a large school. On the other hand, emphasis is placed on the "tried and true" practices of school administration
of past years. Teachers avoid discussing weaknesses in their teaching programs and the introduction of innovation in administration or in teaching practice is not encouraged.

As Nairn has only one assistant principal and four senior staff members, the daily routines take up most of the time. Regardless of the student enrolment, there are many administrative functions assigned to the assistant principal or senior staff. In a larger school, these duties are normally shared between two or more assistant principals and a greater number of senior staff whereas, in the small school, the responsibilities fall on the shoulders of fewer individuals.

Nairn school does not possess formal school or staff development policies. Professional development activities are discouraged as a teacher's absence is seen as disrupting students' education. In the few instances where teachers undertake professional development out of school hours, the irregularity of staff meetings does not permit formal communication of their experience.

The school does not have a specific group to develop new practices or projects as, according to the principal, "With all the pork provided by the Department, we don't have enough room on our plates to add the ketchup".

Quality control

The data reveal that most schools have procedures for quality control. In order of priority given to quality control, the schools appear as Raasay, Rona, Newtyle, Mull, Reay, Portree, Wyvis, Nairn, and Laggan.

"Caring for kids" describes the distinctive vision that has been developed and instituted at Raasay High. The vision contains specific references to the quality of both teaching and learning. The principal and the assistant principal are closely involved in interpreting the results of quality control efforts.

Provisions exist for making data-based decisions related to the quality of education and to ensure that decisions are implemented. The vision also refers to the periodic evaluation of curricula, special programs, and course materials which is diligently maintained. In the light of these provisions and assisted by the low degree of subject matter duplication between departments and across years, the school curriculum appears to be more flexible at Raasay than at Midpoint.

The assertions of the principal and assistant principal that constant efforts are made to ensure that teachers' paperwork is kept to a minimum were endorsed by teachers during interviews.

A system of sharing data on student progress has been developed at Raasay. The frequently-held but short meetings after school are a valuable adjunct to the usual
methods of obtaining data on students. As a consequence, learning about students from other staff is seldom difficult. The problems that teachers in most other schools encounter in reporting student progress are alleviated at Raasay through the frequent sharing of information on student development.

A further benefit of the frequent and open meetings is that Raasay teachers appear to be highly aware of good performance-assessment practices and use this knowledge to assess students on a regular basis.

Laggan school appears to have the lowest number of quality control processes and is not considered to have any elements superior to those of Midpoint.

Whilst there may be provisions for making data-based decisions related to teaching quality, they do not appear to be used frequently. The first formal senior staff meeting for the year was held on 26th April. Only five of the seven senior staff members attended and both assistant principals were absent. As a consequence of the irregularity of these meetings, it is thought that difficulty arises in ensuring the implementation of decisions related to the quality of teaching. In addition, planning and interpreting the results of quality-control efforts appear to be hampered and rather unmethodical.

The decision as to whether curricula should be evaluated is delegated to subject department staff. Enquiries concerning curriculum evaluation at Laggan did not reveal any definitive response as most teachers appeared to be concentrating on implementing the Tasmanian Certificate of Education requirements. Similarly, a mechanism for sharing data on course materials or special programs was not evident.

The principal and assistant principals were not seen visiting classrooms or walking the corridors during teaching periods. This raises questions about many aspects of quality control at Laggan High School.

Support

Most schools in the sample appear to have two or more elements of support that could be improved. However, the amount of support among teachers and students at Raasay is considerably high when compared with other schools. The order of schools is Raasay, Mull, Portree, Wyvis, Rona, Newtyle, Reay, Laggan, and Nairn.

The following elements of Raasay High appear to be decidedly more favourable than at Midpoint.

All teachers are given significant responsibilities within and outside the normal sphere of their professional obligations and, as was expressed by the assistant principal, "If they can't carry them out, they can't be thought of as professionals". The principal added that if teachers could not be entrusted with significant responsibility, "the school
would cease to function". Consequently, teachers are urged to rely on their own judgement and to use their initiative on all possible occasions. Help is, however, freely available. If a task is not included in any of the job descriptions, there are many who are willing to assist. In all instances, they are given the authority to act as they see appropriate and in the best interests of the school.

Teachers and students at Raasay take pride in their school. The care and attention given to the environment is noticeable in the cleanliness of the school grounds, the tidiness of classrooms, and the lack of signs of vandalism. It was noted that the school buildings and its environs produced a more pleasant impression than that generally observable in the local residential area.

Teachers were seen to have a high degree of application to their work and, in particular, to the welfare of children. This impression was supported during interviews with the principal and assistant principal. The staff at Raasay frequently acknowledge the work of others within a strongly supportive environment and they appear to be constantly encouraging student participation. Teachers do not need to stand up for their students as negative attitudes are not well-tolerated within the school. In one instance where friction occurred between a teacher and student, a senior master took the child from the classroom to give both teacher and student the opportunity to "cool down". The student was interviewed to ascertain the problem but was not berated. Considerable patience was exercised in explaining the acceptable course of action students should take if they have a grievance. Where a serious offence has been committed, the teacher and student may talk over the matter with the principal in an effort to find a solution to the problem.

If students feel that a need has not been met or that they have received unfair treatment, they discuss the matter over with any teacher, including the principal. Pupils do not normally ask their parents to come to the school as many parents are insufficiently interested in the children's welfare.

Teachers indicated that they are recognised by others for the work that they do, both publicly or with a quiet word of encouragement. There is a warmth of atmosphere among teachers which is demonstrated by not only their interactions during recess and lunch breaks but also their noticeable disinclination to leave school at the end of the day. Most teachers stay for a considerably greater time than the required half hour after the last period of the day.

All members of staff indicated that they encouraged criticism of their ideas and the openness with which they received the views of others during meetings and at other times was conspicuous.
To encapsulate Raasay's supportiveness, most elements are rated higher than those at Midpoint. Raasay is lower in only one aspect - the amount of support they receive from parents. The lack of parental support appears to be the major discouragement for teachers who, despite the adversity, have maintained an exemplary educational offering.

Nairn school, rated lowest in the support factor, does not have any elements considered to be above those of Midpoint. Teachers disagree with administrative staff on allowing pupils to work independently. There are relatively low degrees of interaction between senior staff and teachers, recognition for meritorious work, teacher autonomy, and receptivity of those who differ physically or ideologically. It appears that, as a consequence, application to the school's central purpose is lower than the norm.

Vision

Of all factors examined in the education profile, vision is considered as being the most difficult to assess. In a number of schools, there appear to be two 'visions', a 'Mission Statement' and the vision held by the principal. There is a corresponding difficulty in ranking schools. In addition, the circumstances of the school were found to be a deciding factor in the acceptance of a vision by teachers, students, parents, and the community. It was, therefore, concluded that schools should be classified according to the predominance of a vision over the daily routines of the school. Thus, the order of schools appears as Newtyle, Raasay, Portree, Rona, Wyvis, Reay, Laggan, Mull, and Nairn.

A major omission is that most formalised visions do not specifically refer to the management of change. However, the necessity for change management was forcefully brought home to the principal of Newtyle whose appointment to the school at the beginning of 1989 was one of great individual challenge. Towards the end of the 1989 first school term, he faced the difficulty of the Government's edict that the school would be closed to reduce education expenditure. Meetings of teachers and parents decisively influenced the institutionalisation of the principal's vision. The necessity for the principal to possess a vision of the school's future was imperative to those who opposed school closure. According to the principal, the vision was influenced by "a whole range of people deciding on what they didn't want ... to happen in and to the school and I saw it as my task to coordinate the turbulence".

Strong support for the vision's central purpose was voiced at many meetings with parents, community representatives, and teachers. Although a formal process for the long-term management of change is yet to be instituted, short-term procedures related to the school's survival are established. The principal added, "The focus has shifted from evolvement to survival. Turmoil and uncertainty was created. Once the fog is lifted, the
overall school development plan will be in a better position to be put into place". It can be concluded that a central issue of the vision is to allay fear or uncertainty about the future of Newtyle High School.

On being asked if the school has a vision, the principal of Nairn High School replied, "What are you on about? I have a dream. I have a dream. I'll give you your b... dreams. We are here to teach kids, not to have our heads in the b... clouds". Although it appears that there may have been some animosity during the interview, this was not the case. The principal's particular sense of humour is a feature of Nairn school. He does have a vision despite protestations to the opposite. Whilst it was noticeable that his vision embraces many of the daily routines, it cannot be said to be institutionalised as there is considerable opposition from some members of staff who see the vision as "something that came from the Ark".

Teachers, parents, and community representatives have not been involved in formal discussion of the vision although there has been tacit agreement with its focus on providing a high-quality education for the children at Nairn. However, the present structures and procedures within the school are seen as being rigid as the vision neither countenances change nor variations in teaching practice. It appears that there is a marked dichotomy between the principal and his staff as to appropriate means for school development.

Summary

Although it may be argued that the above descriptions of schools' educational profiles are merely segments of a portrait that have been drawn in a short time span and that, as entities, schools are continually changing in form, structure, and style, the sketches represent schools at that period of time.

In Nairn High School as in most others, the researcher was received with considerable courtesy, teachers went out of their way to assist in gathering data by not only giving their time for interviews but also in a multitude of other directions and, despite the many pressures teachers face in normal school operations, the principal and staff of all schools kindly accepted the extra inconvenience this study must surely have provided.

Table 6.1 reviews schools' positions within the seven factors examined in constructing education profiles. It will be seen that Raasay and Nairn schools hold relatively consistent positions whereas there are considerable variations in others. A correlation exists between the schools' positions as they appear in Table 6.1 and the frequencies of stress emanating from those factors. This will be discussed in the second section of this chapter.
Table 6-1. Schools' positions: individual education factors.

Table 6-2 indicates the aggregate positions, from highest to lowest, of all schools in the sample. Schools are ranked by amalgamating all elements within the factors employed in constructing schools' education profiles; an outline of one example appears in Appendix 5-2. With the exception of Reay and Wyvis, similar positions are held when averaging the results depicted in Table 6-1.
The information on schools' educational profiles presented above positively resolves the first research question:

**Do education profiles differ between schools?**

Arising from this response is a subsidiary question:

**In what ways do education profiles differ?**

Table 6.1 indicates that schools occupy varying positions among educational factors. While two schools, Raasay and Nairn, hold relatively consistent positions, other schools do not. Reay has the greatest degree of difference in factors, leading other schools in effectiveness but occupying a low position in assessed efficiency elements.

**The stress profiles**

Stress sources, frequencies, and intensities are investigated in this section with emphasis on schools having the lowest and the highest ratings. The section has three parts. Firstly, individual schools' aggregate mean responses to questionnaire categories are presented with stress frequencies ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (constantly). Second, the items are categorised under education factors and results of a statistical factor analysis. Third, answers to research questions relating to stress profiles are provided.

**Data from questionnaire categories**

In all eight categories, respondents could add other items. The items appear unedited as they were received from respondents. Although some additional items may be more relevant to other questionnaire categories, they have not been reassigned.

**Organisation**

The order of schools from the lowest to the highest frequencies of organisational difficulties are Mull, Raasay, Wyvis, Reay, Rona, Laggan, Nairn, Portree, and Newtyle.

With the lowest frequencies, Mull respondents added two items to the questionnaire's organisation category - teaching out of my training area (maths), & trivial things e.g. end of day roll check.
Items of higher frequencies are shortage of time to plan and organise (3-4), the amount of paperwork you have to do (3-367), and curriculum changes (3). Difficulties of lower frequency are declining student enrolments (1-7), your involvement in staff meetings (2-067), and your teaching timetable (2-067).

The greater organisational difficulties were identified by Mull respondents as shortage of time to plan and organise (selected by 45% of all respondents), curriculum changes (17%), the amount of paperwork you have to do (10%), and undesirable physical surroundings (10%). Five items were not considered by any Mull teacher to be among the greater difficulties - meeting deadlines, your involvement in staff meetings, class sizes, declining student enrolments, and conflicting demands from others.

Newtyle has the highest frequency of organisational difficulties. Four items were added to this category: T.C.E. [Tasmanian Certificate of Education] - a screw up, lack of opportunity for composite group work, continual disturbance to extra-curricular activities, & teaching too many classes.

Items of higher frequencies were identified as shortage of time to plan and organise (3-636), curriculum changes (3-591), undesirable physical surroundings (3-304), and class sizes (3-304). Lower frequencies were accorded to declining student enrolments (2-087), your involvement in staff meetings (2-13), and interruptions to the teaching timetable (2-826).

Greater organisational difficulties are experienced in shortage of time to plan and organise (30% of all responses), class sizes (22%), undesirable physical surroundings (13%), and curriculum changes (13%). Items not considered among greater difficulties are obtaining teaching materials, extra duties, your involvement in staff meetings, declining student enrolments, and interruptions to the teaching timetable.

Figure 6-1 illustrates the means of responses from Mull, Midpoint and Newtyle teachers to items referring to stress sources and frequencies in the organisation category. It can be seen that Mull response means are lower than Midpoint in all items whereas Newtyle response means indicate higher frequencies in nine items, three of which are statistically significant.
1. ORGANISATION
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Shortage of time to plan and organise
The amount of paperwork you have to do
Meeting deadlines
Obtaining teaching materials
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Undesirable physical surroundings
Your involvement in staff meetings
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Your teaching timetable
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Figure 6-1. Mull, Midpoint, and Newtyle responses to Organisation items.
Administration

From the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties with administration, the schools are Wyvis, Raasay, Mull, Rona, Portree, Newtyle, Reay, Laggan, and Nairn.

During the 1990 first school term, the regional guidance officer organised a series of seminars on stress-reduction for Wyvis teachers. Although the seminars may have influenced stress frequency ratings, stress intensity appears to be less affected. Respondents did not add any items to this category of the questionnaire.

Items of higher frequencies are resources for handling disciplinary problems (2.571), consistency of demands made of you (2.321), and support from those in more senior positions (2.31). Lower frequencies were recorded for your involvement in school budgeting (1.31), expectations of those in lower positions (1.414), and support from those in lower positions (1.517). In an analysis of all schools, first-year teachers indicated a low frequency of difficulty with these three items. However, neither Wyvis nor Nairn have first-year teachers on their staff. Other differences between teachers are listed in Appendix 6.1 while teacher ratios are presented in Appendix 1.2.

Wyvis' greater administration difficulties are introducing innovation (selected by 33% of all respondents), resources for handling disciplinary problems (19%), and consistency of demands made of you (14%). Four items were not considered among the greater difficulties - support from those in lower positions, participating in decisions affecting the school, expectations of those in lower positions, and interpersonal relationships.

Nairn has the highest frequency of difficulties with administration. Respondents added two items to the administration category - lack of a teacher's conscientiousness, & non-acceptance by students.

Higher frequencies of difficulties were identified as expectations of those in more senior positions (3.524), consistency of demands made of you (3), support from those in more senior positions (2.714), and introducing innovation (2.714). Items of lower frequency are your involvement in school budgeting (1.19), expectations of those in lower positions (1.905), and support from those in lower positions (1.952).

Nairn's greater administration difficulties are support from those in more senior positions (24% of responses), introducing innovation (18%), knowledge of procedures (12%), participating in decisions affecting the school (12%), interpersonal relationships (12%), learning about students from other staff (12%), and expectations of those in more senior positions (10%). None of the other items was among the greater difficulties.

Figure 6.2 depicts the means of responses of Wyvis, Midpoint and Nairn teachers to items in the questionnaire's administration category.
2. ADMINISTRATION
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- Support from those in lower positions
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- Introducing innovation
- Knowledge of procedures
- Participating in decisions affecting the school
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- Expectations of those in more senior positions
- Expectations of those in lower positions
- Consistency of demands made of you
- Interpersonal relationships
- Resources for handling disciplinary problems
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Figure 6-2. Wyvis, Midpoint, and Nairn responses to Administration items.
Academic Program

The order of schools ranging from the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with items in the academic program section are Raasay, Wyvis, Rona, Mull, Newtyle, Laggan, Reay, Portree, and Nairn.

With the lowest frequency of difficulties, Raasay teachers did not add any items.

Respondents identified the higher frequencies of academic program difficulties as provision of resources (2.767), adapting the program to suit students' needs (2.633), grading of students (2.433), and student report writing (2.433). Difficulties occurring less frequently are set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught (1.967), dubious repetition across subjects (2), and meeting community expectations (2.067).

Greater academic program difficulties are adapting the program to suit students' needs (selected by 29% of all respondents), student report writing (21%), getting a clear description of school goals (8%), set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught (8%), and provision of resources (8%). Getting a clear description of subject goals, dubious repetition across subjects, and grading of students were not among the greater difficulties.

Nairn has highest frequency of academic program difficulties. Items were not added by respondents.

The higher frequencies of difficulties were identified as student report writing (3.048), getting a clear description of school goals (2.952), and provision of resources (2.857) while those of lower frequency are dubious repetition across subjects (2.286), dubious subject repetition across years (2.286), and getting a clear description of subject goals (2.4).

Nairn's greater academic program difficulties are justifying the program's relevance to students (26%), adapting the program to suit students' needs (21%), and student report writing (21%). Items not appearing among greater difficulties are dubious repetition across subjects, set curriculum matching the curriculum which is actually taught, and grading of students.

Figure 6.3 depicts the means of responses from Raasay, Midpoint and Nairn teachers to items included in the questionnaire's academic program category.
Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn
High Schools' Responses
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Figure 6-3. Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn responses to Academic Program items.
Students

Schools ranging from the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties with items in the students section of the questionnaire are Wyvis, Laggan, Newtyle, Mull, Portree, Nairn, Reay, Rona, and Raasay.

A Wyvis teacher added two items - lack of time to plan and write new units for TCE [Tasmanian Certificate of Education], and classroom discipline and behaviour.

The higher frequencies were identified by Wyvis teachers as finding time to give individual assistance (3.31), students' commitment to learning (3.069), and meeting changing needs of students (3). Occurring less frequently are students' expectations of your teaching (2.286), consequences of student absences (2.483), and fulfilling your responsibilities to students (2.586).

Greater difficulties with Wyvis students are finding time to give individual assistance (54%), students' commitment to learning (12%), and the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance (12%). The items, students' expectations of your teaching, students' academic achievements, and students' conformity to school rules, were not included among the greater difficulties.

Raasay respondents did not add items.

Higher frequencies of difficulties were indicated by Raasay teachers as students' attitudes towards each other (3.833), students' commitment to learning (3.8), and students' conformity to school rules (3.767). Lower frequencies were accorded to fulfilling your responsibility to students (2.667), consequences of student absences (3.033), and meeting changing needs of students (3-2).

Greater difficulties with students at Raasay are finding time to give individual assistance (30%), students' attitudes towards each other (19%), and students' attitudes towards school (15%). Three items were not included among the greater difficulties - consequences of student absences, students' expectations of your teaching, and students' academic achievements.

Figure 6-4 depicts the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint and Raasay teachers to items included in the questionnaire's students category.
4. STUDENTS
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Figure 6.4. Wyvis, Midpoint, and Raasay responses to items in the Students category.
Parents

From the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties encountered with items in the parents category, the schools are Wyvis, Mull, Newtyle, Laggan, Reay, Rona, Nairn, Raasay, and Portree.

Wyvis teachers did not add any items to this category.

The higher frequencies at Wyvis are negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (2.276), opposition or lack of support from parents (2.034), and a lack of understanding between parents and staff (1.966). Lower frequencies were accorded to the issue of whether parents should be involved in administration (1.655), instances of attempts to exert parental pressure (1.724), and communicating with parents (1.862).

Greater difficulties with parents were identified by Wyvis teachers as negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (50%), opposition or lack of support from parents (19%), and a lack of understanding between parents and staff (13%). The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration was not included among the greater difficulties.

Portree has the highest frequency of difficulties with parents. Three items were added by respondents - having parents sign and students return important forms e.g. permission forms, parental expectations concerning imposing of behaviour standards, & lack of support and commitment from parents.

Higher-frequency difficulties at Portree are opposition or lack of support from parents (2.729), negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (2.604), a lack of understanding between parents and staff (2.583), and parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (2.583). Among the lower frequency items are the issue of whether parents should be involved in administration (1.936), instances of attempts to exert parental pressure (2.255), and communicating with parents (2.271).

Greater difficulties with parents were indicated as opposition or lack of support from parents (45%), negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (15%), a lack of understanding between parents and staff (15%), and parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (15%). Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure was not considered as one of the greater difficulties.

Figure 6.5 depicts the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint and Portree teachers to items included in the parents category.
5. PARENTS
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Figure 6.5. Wyvis, Midpoint, and Portree responses to items in the Parents category.
School descriptions

Teachers

The order of schools from the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties encountered with teachers are Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Portree, Rona, Laggan, Newtyle, Nairn, and Reay.

Again, Wyvis teachers did not add any items to this section of the questionnaire.

Higher frequencies of difficulties were indicated for public criticism of teachers (2.897), obvious instances of staff incompetence (2.25), and disruptive teacher transfers (2.241). The staff's reluctance to being accountable (1.655), staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (1.828), and staff unsociability (1.862) are items of lower frequency.

Greater difficulties were indicated by Wyvis teachers as public criticism of teachers (52%), lack of cooperation among staff (13%), obvious instances of staff incompetence (9%), communication deficiencies among staff (9%), and other teachers' relationships with students (9%). Four items were not considered as greater difficulties - the staff's reluctance to being accountable, your interaction with staff, staff unsociability, and the lack of staff conscientiousness.

Reay has the highest frequency of difficulties with teachers. Two items were added by Reay teachers - media announcements, & coping with staff who are discouraged and stressed.

Higher-frequencies were received for public criticism of teachers (3.207), communication deficiencies among staff (3.138), and obvious instances of staff incompetence (2.828). The lower frequency items are your interaction with staff (2.207), staff unsociability (2.379), and the staff's reluctance to being accountable (2.414).

Rated the greater difficulties by Reay teachers in this category are public criticism of teachers (41%), communication deficiencies among staff (17%), lack of cooperation among staff (7%), obvious instances of staff incompetence (7%), staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (7%), and other teachers' relationships with students (7%). The staff's reluctance to being accountable and staff unsociability do not appear among the greater difficulties.

Figure 6-6 illustrates the means of Wyvis, Midpoint and Reay responses to items included in the teachers category.
6. TEACHERS
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Figure 6.6. Wyvis, Midpoint, and Reay responses to the Teachers category.
Professional Status

From the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties encountered with professional status, the schools rank as Mull, Raasay, Wyvis, Reay, Rona, Laggan, Nairn, Newtyle, and Portree.

Mull teachers did not add any items to this section of the questionnaire.

Higher frequencies of difficulties are loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (3.333), the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties (2.9), and scarcity of opportunities for promotion (2.6). Lower frequency items are support from your peers (1.759), your participation in curriculum planning (1.933), and disappointment with your own career advancement (2).

Mull teachers' greater difficulties in professional status are loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (40%), job insecurity (25%), lack of opportunities for staff development (10%), and your conditions of service (10%). Not considered among the greater difficulties are scarcity of opportunities for promotion, ways in which staff are evaluated, and the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties.

Portree has the highest frequencies in difficulties with professional status. One teacher added: people not realising the skill required in teaching, people not acknowledging the difficulty under which teachers work, and insulting office accommodation - take your pick!

Higher frequencies were indicated for loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (4.085), scarcity of opportunities for promotion (3.729), and perceived injustices of the promotion system (3.354). Support from your peers (2.042), job insecurity (2.396), and your participation in curriculum planning (2.438) are among the lower frequencies.

Greater difficulties in professional status at Portree are loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (38%), scarcity of opportunities for promotion (21%), and job insecurity (10%). Not included among the greater difficulties are the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties, and support from your peers.

Figure 6.7 portrays the means of responses from Mull, Midpoint, and Portree teachers to items included in the professional status category.
7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS
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Figure 6-7. Mull, Midpoint, and Portree responses to the Professional Status category.
Personal

From the least to the greatest frequencies of difficulties encountered with personal items related to the teaching profession are Raasay, Wyvis, Mull, Rona, Laggan, Portree, Reay, Newtyle, and Nairn.

Raasay teachers did not add any items to the personal category of the questionnaire.

Items having higher frequencies of difficulties are conflict between your needs and the profession (2.933), students' attitudes towards you (2.533), and dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching (2.533). Lower frequencies were accorded to your peers' attitudes towards you (1.833), parents' attitudes towards you (1.9), and constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas (1.9).

Greater difficulties at Raasay were accorded to conflict between your needs and the profession (23%), the amount of work you are required to do (23%), and dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching (23%). Four items were not considered among the greater difficulties: parents' attitudes towards you, your peers' attitudes towards you, attitudes of seniors towards you, and lack of recognition from others for the work you do.

Nairn teachers are rated as having the highest frequency of personal difficulties. They did not add any items to the personal category of the questionnaire.

Higher frequencies items are the amount of work you are required to do (3.714), keeping up with new developments (3.333), and lack of recognition from others for the work you do (3.048). Lower frequency items are parents' attitudes towards you (2.095), your peers' attitudes towards you (2.095), and attitudes of seniors towards you (2.333).

Greater difficulties at Nairn were indicated as the amount of work you are required to do (38%), lack of recognition from others for the work you do (31%), and keeping up with new developments (13%). Three items were not included among the greater difficulties: parents' attitudes towards you, your peers' attitudes towards you, and attitudes of seniors towards you.

Figure 6.8 portrays the means of responses from Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn teachers to items included in the personal category.
Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn High Schools' Responses
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Figure 6-8. Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn responses to the Personal category.
Greater difficulties

Responses to items referring to the greater difficulties in each category indicate major trends across schools that correlate with their education profiles. The following items were not included by any teacher - staff unsociability (teachers category), support from your peers (professional status), and attitudes of seniors towards you (personal). The major difficulties across schools are shown in Table 6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of paperwork that you have to do (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class sizes, Curriculum changes (12% each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing innovation (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>Provision of resources (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student report writing (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>The amount of work that you are required to do (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. Items ranked as the major difficulties across schools.

Items that individual schools rated among the greater difficulties appear in Appendix 6-2. It will be seen that differences between a school's aggregate rating and the items appearing in Table 6-3 relate to the school's education profile. By examining questionnaire items categorisation in Appendix 4-11 and comparing responses in Appendix 6-2 with those for all schools in the above table, relationships can be seen. The following examples indicate these relationships.
School descriptions

Laggan rated lowest in quality control. The school’s principal and assistant principal were not noticeably visiting classrooms or walking the corridors. This is considered to be related to a response rate of 25% for support from those in more senior positions, an item included in the quality control category in Appendix 4-11. This item does not appear in Table 6-3. Nairn teachers indicated a similar difficulty (22%) which is related to the lower degree of interaction between senior staff and teachers, reported in the education profile’s support factor (p.168).

Reay rated highest in effectiveness. Teachers indicated a considerably lower difficulty with finding time to give individual assistance (13% as compared with an all-schools average of 32%), and with a shortage of time to plan and organise (19% as compared with 34%). Both items appear in the effectiveness category in Appendix 4-11. Newtyle rated highest in vision. Newtyle teachers did not rate two vision items, consistency of demands made of you or adapting the program to suit students’ needs, among their major difficulties whereas combined schools’ responses are 21% and 20% respectively.

Synopsis of stress frequency data

Table 64 illustrates the ranking of schools according to frequency responses in each category of the questionnaire. It can be seen that Reay and Nairn schools consistently rank in the high frequencies whereas Wyvis, Raasay, and Mull are predominantly in the low frequency positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PARENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle **</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn **</td>
<td>Rassay **</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay **</td>
<td>Nairn **</td>
<td>Nairn **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree **</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree **</td>
<td>Rassay *</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay *</td>
<td>Nairn *</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay *</td>
<td>Rona **</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan **</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull **</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull **</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay *</td>
<td>Raasay **</td>
<td>Raasay **</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<01 *p<05

Table 64. Stress frequencies: questionnaire categories.
The stress frequency means for all questionnaire categories were aggregated to rank schools. Table 6.5 depicts the schools' positions from highest to lowest stress frequencies.

### AGGREGATE FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p ≤ 0.01

Table 6.5. Schools' positions: aggregate stress frequencies.

### Synopsis of stress intensity data

Responses to items requesting teachers to indicate their feelings about the greatest difficulty in each category of the questionnaire were collated to provide further data when compiling stress profiles. Table 6.6 summarises the placement of schools, calculated by obtaining the means of stress intensities for each category of the questionnaire. It can be seen that Raasay and Newtyle schools are among the higher intensities whereas Rona is predominantly in the low intensity positions.

### STRESS INTENSITIES

from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PARENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** *p ≤ 0.01 * p ≤ 0.05

Table 6.6. Stress intensities: questionnaire categories.
The stress intensity means for all questionnaire categories were aggregated to obtain school's positions. Appendix 6-3 contains graphs of all schools in the sample. Table 6-7 illustrates the schools' placement from highest to lowest stress intensities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGGREGATE INTENSITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p \leq .01

Table 6-7. Schools' positions: aggregate stress intensities.

Items categorised by education factors

Following treatment of the raw data, questionnaire categories were fragmented and items rearranged into education factors. Tables indicating the interrelationships between education profiles and questionnaire items are provided in Appendices 4-11 and 6-4. Although many of the items can be applied to other factors, the literature on educational excellence signifies them as particularly applicable to the factors under which they are placed. The items were originally drawn from the literature and were underpinned by other research into teacher stress. From this research it appears that analysis and aggregation of responses support the selection of those items.

Effectiveness

The order of schools from the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with the effectiveness items is Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Laggan, Newtyle, Rona, Reay, Nairn, and Portree. Figure 6-9 portrays the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint, and Portree.

Schools having the lowest and highest aggregate frequencies for the various factors are indicated by broad lines whilst a narrow line denotes the Midpoint High. Schools with the lowest and highest ratings for individual items are named.
EFFECTIVENESS

STRESS SOURCES
- Shortage of time to plan and organise
- Extra duties
- Undesirable physical surroundings
- Declining student enrolments
- Interventions to the teaching timetable
- Introducing innovation
- Resources for handling disciplinary problems
- Student report writing
- Finding time to give individual assistance
- Consequences of student absences
- Students' attitudes towards school
- Students' attitudes towards each other
- The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- Communication deficiencies among staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Efficiency

From the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with efficiency items, the order of schools is Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Rona, Portree, Newtyle, Nairn, Laggan, and Reay. Figure 6-10 illustrates the response means of Wyvis, Midpoint, and Reay.
EFFICIENCY

STRESS SOURCES
- Obtaining teaching materials
- Knowledge of procedures
- Expectations of those in lower positions
- Dubious repetition across subjects
- Dubious subject repetition across years
- Provision of resources
- Responsibility to parents and community
- Meeting community expectations
- Students conformity to school rules
- Obvious instances of staff incompetence
- The lack of staff conscientiousness
- Attitudes of seniors towards you

STRESS FREQUENCIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining teaching materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious repetition across subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious subject repetition across years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility to parents and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting community expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students conformity to school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of staff conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes of seniors towards you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- **p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05
- = Wyvis = Midpoint = Reay
- Range of schools' means: Lowest —— Highest

Figure 6.10. Schools' efficiency responses.

Equity

The frequencies of difficulties with equity items from the lowest to the highest appears as Mull, Wyvis, Laggan, Rona, Raasay, Newtyle, Nairn, Portree, and Reay.

Figure 6.11 depicts the means of responses from Mull, Midpoint, and Reay.
EQUITY

STRESS SOURCES
Class sizes
Justifying the program's relevance to students
Meeting changing needs of students
Students' commitment to learning
The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
Fulfilling your responsibilities to students
The staff's reluctance to being accountable
Disruptive teacher transfers
Other teachers' relationships with students
Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
Disappointment with your own career advancement
Your conditions of service

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Mull | Mull | Mull | Mull
Mull | Newtyle | Newtyle | Newtyle
Mull | Wyvis | Wyvis | Wyvis
Mull | Reay | Reay | Reay
Mull | Raasay | Raasay | Raasay
Mull | Midpoint | Midpoint | Midpoint
Mull | Rona | Rona | Rona
Mull | Portree | Portree | Portree
Mull | Newtyle | Newtyle | Newtyle

Key
* p ≤ .05
\( \square = \text{Mull} \quad \square = \text{Midpoint} \quad \square = \text{Reay} \)

Range of schools' means: Lowest ← → Highest

Figure 6-11. Schools' equity responses.

Flexibility

The order of schools from the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with the flexibility items is Raasay, Mull, Wyvis, Laggan, Rona, Portree, Newtyle, Reay, and Nairn. Figure 6-12 portrays the means of responses from Raasay, Midpoint, and Nairn teachers to flexibility items.
FLEXIBILITY

STRESS SOURCES
The amount of paperwork that you have to do
Your involvement in staff meetings
Your teaching timetable
Opportunities for expressing opinions
Expectations of those in more senior positions
Adapting the program to suit students' needs
Lack of cooperation among staff
Your interaction with staff
Ways in which staff are evaluated
Your participation in curriculum planning
Keeping up with new developments
Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key
* p ≤ .05
♀ = Raasay ♂ = Midpoint ♀ = Nairn
Range of schools' means: Lowest ←→ Highest

Figure 6.12. Schools' flexibility responses.

Quality control
From the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with quality control, the schools are Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Rona, Reay, Newtyle, Laggan, Nairn, and Portree. Figure 6.13 illustrates the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint, and Portree teachers to quality control items.
QUALITY CONTROL

STRESS SOURCES
Curriculum changes
Support from those in lower positions
Participating in decisions affecting the school
Learning about students from other staff
Getting a clear description of subject goals
Grading of students
Students' academic achievements
Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
Lack of opportunities for staff development
The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
The amount of work that you are required to do
Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key: * p ≤ .05

\[ = Wyvis \ \ \ \ \ = Midpoint \ \ \ = Portree \]

Range of schools' means: Lowest \(\rightarrow\) Highest

Figure 6.13. Schools quality control responses.

Support

The frequencies of difficulties with support items from the lowest to the highest appears as Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Rona, Laggan, Portree, Newtyle, Reay, and Nairn. Figure 6.14 depicts the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint, and Nairn teachers to support items.
SUPPORT

STRESS SOURCES

Support from those in more senior positions
Your involvement in school budgeting
Consistency of demands made of you
Students' expectations of your teaching
Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
Communicating with parents
Staff unsociability
Public criticism of teachers
Support from your peers
Conflict between your needs and the profession
Conflicts between your values & values taught
Students' attitudes towards you
Parents' attitudes towards you
Your peers' attitudes towards you
Lack of recognition from others for the work that you do

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Support from those in more senior positions
Your involvement in school budgeting
Consistency of demands made of you
Students' expectations of your teaching
Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
Communicating with parents
Staff unsociability
Public criticism of teachers
Support from your peers
Conflict between your needs and the profession
Conflicts between your values & values taught
Students' attitudes towards you
Parents' attitudes towards you
Your peers' attitudes towards you
Lack of recognition from others for the work that you do

Key

** p ≤ 0.01 * p ≤ 0.05

= Wyvis = Midpoint = Nairn

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

Figure 6-14. Schools' support responses.

Vision

The order of schools from the lowest to the highest frequencies of difficulties with vision items is Wyvis, Mull, Raasay, Reay, Rona, Newtyle, Laggan, Portree, and Nairn. Figure 6-15 portrays the means of responses from Wyvis, Midpoint, and Nairn teachers to vision items.
VISION

STRESS SOURCES

Meeting deadlines
Conflicting demands from others
Interpersonal relationships
Getting a clear description of school goals
Set curriculum matching curriculum which is actually taught
Opposition or lack of support from parents
A lack of understanding between parents and staff
Parents’ lack of familiarity with school goals
Staff indifference to the school’s espoused aims
Job insecurity
Perceived injustices of the promotion system
Scarcity of opportunities for promotion

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Figure 6-15. Schools' vision responses.

Synopsis of education factors - stress frequency data

The material presented above indicates that schools may be ranked not only by means of total stress frequency responses but also by education factors. Following categorisation of stress frequency responses into the education factors, the means of items were aggregated. The findings support the appropriateness of item categorisation by education factors even though many of the items also relate to other categories. This is exemplified by the compactness of schools’ means portrayed in Figure 6-16 as compared with factor analysis means depicted in Figure 6-17. In addition to Midpoint High, three other schools appear in Figure 6-16, namely Nairn, Raasay, and Wyvis. Nairn and Wyvis frequency responses are highest and lowest respectively. Raasay has been included as it has the highest education profile while Nairn has the lowest.
School descriptions

Nairn, Midpoint, Raasay, and Wyvis
High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

Figure 6-16. Schools' aggregate means: education factors.

Table 6-8 illustrates the ranking of schools according to frequency responses in each of the education factors. It can be seen that Nairn and Reay schools consistently rank in the high frequencies whereas Wyvis, Raasay, and Mull are, in almost all instances, in the low frequency positions.

STRESS FREQUENCIES
from highest to lowest

Table 6-8. Stress frequencies: education factors.
Synopsis of education factors - stress intensity data

Stress intensity responses were also categorised according to the factors utilised in constructing education profiles. Table 6-9 summarises the placement of schools, calculated by obtaining the stress intensity means for each question relating to greater difficulties and-classifying them under the education factors.

**STRESS INTENSITIES**
from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY</th>
<th>EQUITY</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>QUALITY CONTROL</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay**</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull*</td>
<td>Raasay *</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reasay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona*</td>
<td>Rona*</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p ≤ 01  *p ≤ 05**

Table 6-9. Stress intensities: education factors.

Questionnaire factor analysis

For the next stage of data treatment, the questionnaire was factor analysed using the Macintosh StatView 512+™ package which was employed for determining all statistical significance with the exception of the z test. The items were rearranged into categories indicated by the factor analysis, thereby offering another means for examining schools' education, stress, and coping profiles. Eight factors predominated. The classifications evinced by the factor analysis are congruity, curriculum, environment, exigency, involvement, motivation, responsibility, and time. Items included in each factor are listed in Appendix 6-5.

Synopsis of factor analysis - stress frequency data

Stress frequency responses, categorised according to the questionnaire factor analysis, are summarised in Table 6-10. The placement of schools was calculated by
obtaining the means of stress frequencies for all questions relating to the stress sources indicated by results of the factor analysis. It can be seen that, contrary to positions depicted from questionnaire categories, Reay is no longer consistently in the high frequency positions but has been replaced by Portree.

### STRESS FREQUENCIES

from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONGRUITY</th>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXIGENCE</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reay **</td>
<td>Nair **</td>
<td>Newtyle **</td>
<td>Nair **</td>
<td>Nair *</td>
<td>Portree **</td>
<td>Raasay **</td>
<td>Portree **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay **</td>
<td>Portree *</td>
<td>Portree *</td>
<td>Laggun *</td>
<td>Newtyle *</td>
<td>Nair *</td>
<td>Nair *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nair **</td>
<td>Portree *</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Raasay *</td>
<td>Reay *</td>
<td>Laggun</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Nair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle **</td>
<td>Laggun</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree *</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Raasay **</td>
<td>Raasay **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull **</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull **</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay **</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona **</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis **</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<p*.01 *<p*.05

Table 6.10. Factor analysis results of stress frequencies.

### STRESS INTENSITIES

from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONGRUITY</th>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXIGENCE</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Nair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Raasay *</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggun</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggun</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<p*.05

Table 6.11. Factor analysis results of stress intensities.
The factor analysis supports findings from investigations into schools' education profiles, presented in summary form in Figure 6-17. Schools having the highest and lowest education profiles and stress frequencies are portrayed. By referring to the schools summary charts in Appendix 6-6, it will be seen that there is a narrower range of schools' responses when categorised by education factors than when classified by factor analysis. It is considered that this confirms the verity of the former categorisation.

It can be seen from the summary data in Figure 6-17 and Table 6-11 that Raasay has the highest mean intensity yet its mean frequency is low, both being statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. Inversely, Nairn has the highest mean frequency while its mean intensity is considerably lower than Midpoint's.

**Summary Data**

- Mean frequencies
  - Nairn: 2.671**
  - Midpoint: 2.356
  - Raasay: 2.480**
  - Wyvis: 2.377**

- Mean intensities
  - Nairn: 2.080
  - Midpoint: 2.149
  - Raasay: 2.343**
  - Wyvis: 2.111

- All schools - Highest frequency: 2.671
  - Lowest frequency: 2.377
  - Highest intensity: 2.343
  - Lowest intensity: 2.025

- No. of responses - frequency: 23268
  - intensity: 1660

Figure 6-17. Factor analysis results of Nairn, Midpoint, Raasay and Wyvis schools.
A number of factors appear favourable to Raasay's educational offering.

- There is a low frequency of difficulties associated with congruity. The commonality of the school's purpose is evident.
- Compared with Midpoint, availability of time is not seen as a great difficulty when all elements of the factor are taken into account.
- The high degree of teachers' motivation is indicated by the low frequency of problems.
- There is a high degree of teacher involvement focusing on interactions between staff members and their perceived level of participation in the school's operations.
- Raasay teachers demonstrate a high level of concern about meeting responsibilities concomitant with the school's vision. The extent of concern for students' education emphasises the propitiousness of the previous four factors. The factors of congruity, time, motivation, involvement, and responsibility are statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.
- With the exception of the exigency factor, elements of which were discussed in the school's education profile, the remaining factors of environment and curriculum are below the levels of difficulty encountered at Midpoint High School.

Those who are first-year teachers at Raasay comprise 10% of the total number of respondents whereas Midpoint has only 5%. This may be thought to influence results, particularly in the involvement and congruity factors. However, any possible imbalance is redressed by a correspondingly larger percentage of Raasay teachers with 15-20 years of experience. With the additional exception of gender, Raasay's ratios are similar to Midpoint. At Raasay, 66% of respondents are male whereas Midpoint has 46%. This difference in ratio implies that greater difficulties would occur in the factors of curriculum and motivation. At Raasay, this does not appear to be the case.

Aspects that may be considered as disadvantageous to Nairn's educational offering include:

- a high frequency of difficulties in most factors, of which time, exigency, and involvement are statistically significant at $p < 0.05$,
- a level of responsibility that is only slightly above Midpoint's, and
- a high level of difficulty with curriculum, statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.

Summary

On re-examining the raw data and comparing them with education profiles, a number of patterns emerge. Tables 6.12, 6-13, and 6-14 contain lists of ten items each drawn from all questionnaire responses and ranked from the highest down. Table 6-12 lists items in which difficulties occur more frequently and those providing the greater intensity of difficulty across all schools in the sample. Differences between items of the highest frequency and intensity are noticeable.
Table 6.12. Items of higher stress frequency and intensity.

Table 6.13 lists the top ten frequencies for three schools. Raasay is rated as possessing the highest education profile, Wyvis responses indicate the lowest stress frequency, and Nairn is considered as having the lowest education profile and the highest mean stress frequency.

Table 6-13. Items of higher stress frequency for Raasay, Wyvis, and Nairn teachers.

There is an observable difference in the focus of Raasay and Nairn teachers. Raasay's responses centre on the responsibility factor whereas Nairn's are primarily concerned with time and motivation factors. Wyvis appears not to have an obvious focus.

Table 6-14 lists the top ten intensity items for Raasay, rated as having the highest...
education profile and stress intensity, Rona the lowest stress intensity, and Nairn the lowest education profile.

### Stress Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAASAY</th>
<th>RONA</th>
<th>NAIRN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism of teachers</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parent towards the work of the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td>Justifying the program's relevance to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility to parents and the community</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other</td>
<td>Support from those in senior positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of paperwork that you have to do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-14. Items of higher stress intensity for Raasay, Rona, and Nairn teachers.

With reference to stress intensity responses, the differences between Raasay and Nairn are less discernible. It appears that Raasay teachers focus on accountability to parents, students and the community while Rona and Nairn teachers seem to be more concerned with aspects not directly related to classroom teaching.

In the exposition of data drawn from the questionnaire, from classifying responses according to factors used in compiling education profiles and factor analysis, it has been demonstrated that there are departures from the pattern set by Midpoint High School. An affirmative response is, therefore, given to the research question:

**Do stress sources differ between schools?**

Arising from this response is a subsidiary and contributory question:

**In what ways do stress sources differ between schools?**

The response to this question is summarised in Tables 6-3 and 6-4 which illustrate the ways stress sources differ from one school to another.

It is considered that a clearly positive response can be given to the question:

**Do stress frequencies differ between schools?**
Tables 6.12 and 6.13 summarise the differences occurring between three schools' stress frequencies. Similarly, differences between other schools can be seen in Appendix 6.7.

A further question emanates from the response to the question as to whether or not stress frequencies differ:

**In what ways do stress frequencies between schools?**

In addition to demonstrating that frequencies differ between schools, Tables 6.12 and 6.13 indicate that frequencies relate to the emphasis a school's staff places on various aspects of the total educational offering.

It has been demonstrated that there is a definitive diversity between the frequency of stress experienced and that which teachers consider as the source of the greatest difficulty. Although distinctions between schools are not as conspicuous as those discussed in respect to stress frequencies, it is also deemed that a positive answer can be given to the research question:

**Do stress intensities differ between schools?**

As it is concluded that stress intensities differ, it follows that a subsidiary question should be examined:

**In what ways do stress intensities differ between schools?**

From Tables 6.12 and 6.14, it can be deduced that the intensity of stress teachers experience is resultant upon the combined effects of the source and the importance individuals place on overcoming the difficulty arising from that source.

Conclusions as to why stress frequencies and intensities differ between schools will be advanced in Chapter 7.

**Coping strategies**

The practices of teachers in managing perceived difficulties are discussed in this section. As in the previous section on stress, the section is presented in three parts. Firstly, individual school's responses to each of the items are presented. In all eight categories, the respondent could add other strategies. Again, the descriptions are unedited. Although most, if not all, teachers use more than one strategy to cope with a predicament, only those that teachers denoted as their primary coping strategies are reviewed. Strategy usage
means below five percent are disregarded and the coping profiles of only those schools rated the most and least successful are described. Efficacy ratings range from 1 (ineffective) to 5 (highly effective). Second, responses are categorised under education factors and results of the statistical factor analysis. Third, answers to research questions relating to coping profiles are provided.

Data from questionnaire categories

**Organisation**

From the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties within the organisation section of the questionnaire the schools are Laggan, Mull, Newtyle, Rona, Portree, Raasay, Wyvis, Reay, and Nairn.

Laggan teachers are rated as the most successful in managing organisational difficulties. Respondents did not add any other strategies. Those that teachers at Laggan frequently use to tackle problems with organisation are gather information and plan ways to act (29%), quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (21%), aggressively attack the source of the problem (14%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (14%). The other strategies indicated are try not to think about it, act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature, and talk the matter over with someone else. Teachers rated their successful strategies as aggressively attack the source of the problem (4-5), gather information and plan ways to act (4-25), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (4).

Nairn teachers rated the strategies they use as the least successful in managing organisational difficulties. Respondents did not add any strategies. Nairn teachers frequently use gather information and plan ways to act (39%), talk the matter over with someone else (22%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (17%). Other strategies used are aggressively attack the source of the problem, quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution, and try to see the funny side of the situation. Teachers rated their successful strategies as gather information and plan ways to act (3-667), aggressively attack the source of the problem (3-5), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3-333).

**Administration**

The positions of schools ranging from the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties within the administration section of the questionnaire are Raasay, Rona, Laggan, Mull, Portree, Wyvis, Reay, Newtyle, and Nairn.
Raasay respondents did not add any strategies to the administration category. Those that teachers frequently use are talk the matter over with someone else (36%), gather information and plan ways to act (32%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (14%). Other strategies include aggressively attack the source of the problem, completely switch off and do nothing, and attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty. Teachers rated their successful strategies as try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3-667), talk the matter over with someone else (3-625), and gather information and plan ways to act (3-429).

Nairn teachers rated the strategies they use as the least successful in managing administrative difficulties. Respondents did not add any items. The frequently-used strategies are talk the matter over with someone else (35%), gather information and plan ways to act (24%), try not to think about it (12%), and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (12%). Other strategies are aggressively attack the source of the problem, quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution, and try to see the funny side of the situation. Nairn teachers rated their strategies as gather information and plan ways to act (3-25), and talk the matter over with someone else (2-5).

**Academic program**

Schools ranging from the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties with the academic program are Nairn, Raasay, Rona, Laggan, Portree, Mull, Wyvis, Newtyle, and Reay.

Nairn teachers did not add any strategies. Those frequently used at Nairn are gather information and plan ways to act (41%), quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (18%), and talk the matter over with someone else (18%). Other strategies include aggressively attack the source of the problem, try not to think about it, and abandon it to tackle some easier problem. Teachers rated their more successful strategies as talk the matter over with someone else (4-333), gather information and plan ways to act (3), and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (3).

Reay teachers rated the strategies they use as the least successful in managing difficulties with their academic program. One respondent added the strategy, shut myself away and complete the task to the best of my ability. The strategies frequently applied at Reay are gather information and plan ways to act (27%), talk the matter over with someone else (23%), and try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty (14%). Other strategies used are aggressively attack the source of the problem, try to avoid becoming emotionally involved, accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people, attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you, quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution, and try to see the funny side of the situation. Reay teachers rated their strategies as gather information and plan ways to act (3-667), talk the matter over with someone else
(3-667), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (2.5).

**Students**

From the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties with students, the order of schools is Mull, Laggan, Rona, Raasay, Wyvis, Newtyle, Portree, Reay, and Nairn.

A teacher at Mull added the strategy, try through my teaching to show education is important and can be enjoyable. The strategies employed most are gather information and plan ways to act (41%), quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (19%), and talk the matter over with someone else (19%). Other strategies are aggressively attack the source of the problem, try to avoid becoming emotionally involved, and try not to think about it. Mull teachers rated their more successful strategies as quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (3.4), try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3.75), and gather information and plan ways to act (3.333).

Nairn teachers rated their approach to difficulties with students as the least successful. Respondents did not add any items. The frequently-used strategies are gather information and plan ways to act (26%), talk the matter over with someone else (21%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (16%). Other strategies used are aggressively attack the source of the problem, try not to think about it, accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people, attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you, attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you, and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution. Teachers rated their successful strategies as aggressively attack the source of the problem (3), gather information and plan ways to act (3), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3-333).

**Parents**

From the most to the least successful in handling perceived difficulties with parents, the schools appear as Portree, Mull, Raasay, Laggan, Rona, Newtyle, Wyvis, Reay, and Nairn.

Portree respondents added two items to this category of the questionnaire: leave it to the hierarchy & I think about it and do what I can but largely accept the inevitable. The strategies often used to tackle problems with parents are gather information and plan ways to act (26%), talk the matter over with someone else (26%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (14%). Other strategies are aggressively attack the source of the problem, try not to think about it, abandon it to tackle some easier problem, attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you, quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution, and try to see the funny side of the situation. Teachers rated their more successful strategies as talk the matter over with someone else (3.444), gather information and plan ways to
act (3.333), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (2.8).

Nairn teachers appear to be the least successful in managing difficulties with parents. Other items were not added. The strategies often employed are talk the matter over with someone else (40%), try not to think about it (20%), aggressively attack the source of the problem (10%), gather information and plan ways to act (10%), attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (10%), and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (10%). Other primary strategies are not used. Nairn teachers rated their strategies as quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (4), talk the matter over with someone else (2.75), and try not to think about it (2.5).

Teachers

Schools ranging from the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties with teachers are Mull, Laggan, Raasay, Portree, Rona, Wyvis, Newtyle, Nairn, and Reay.

Mull respondents did not add any strategies. Frequently used strategies are completely switch off and do nothing (16%), try not to think about it (16%), attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty (16%), and talk the matter over with someone else (16%). A wide range of other primary strategies are used at Mull: steer clear of the problem at all times; gather information and plan ways to act; abandon it to tackle some easier problem; quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution; try to see the funny side of the situation; console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.; and take your frustrations out on some other person or object. Teachers rated their successful strategies as quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (4), try to see the funny side of the situation (4), try not to think about it (3.667), and talk the matter over with someone else (3.667).

Reay appears as the least successful in managing problems with teachers. Other strategies were not added by respondents. The strategies frequently applied are try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (33%), talk the matter over with someone else (25%), and try not to think about it (13%). Others include aggressively attack the source of the problem, gather information and plan ways to act, abandon it to tackle some easier problem, seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others, and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution. The more successful strategies appear as try not to think about it (3), try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3), quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (2.5), and talk the matter over with someone else (2.5).

Professional status

The order of schools ranging from the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties with their professional status are Raasay, Portree, Rona, Wyvis,
Mull, Reay, Laggan, Nairn, and Newtyle.

Raasay teachers did not add any strategies to this category. Those frequently used are try not to think about it (36%), talk the matter over with someone else (23%), and gather information and plan ways to act (9%). Other strategies include aggressively attack the source of the problem, try to avoid becoming emotionally involved, seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others, quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution, try to see the funny side of the situation, and console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. Raasay teachers rated their more successful strategies as talk the matter over with someone else (3.6), aggressively attack the source of the problem (3.5), try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (3.5), and try not to think about it (2.5).

Newtyle teachers rated the strategies they use as the least successful in managing difficulties with professional status. Strategies were not added. Those frequently exercised at Newtyle are talk the matter over with someone else (32%), try not to think about it (26%), gather information and plan ways to act (11%), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (11%). Other strategies used are accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people, act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature, try to see the funny side of the situation, and console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. Teachers rated their strategies as talk the matter over with someone else (2.833), gather information and plan ways to act (2), and try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (2).

Personal

Schools ranging from the most to the least successful management of perceived difficulties associated with teaching are Raasay, Rona, Mull, Reay, Portree, Wyvis, Laggan, Nairn, and Newtyle.

A Raasay teacher added the item, plod along and do what I need to do. The strategies teachers frequently use are talk the matter over with someone else (27%), aggressively attack the source of the problem (14%), and try not to think about it (14%). Strategies teachers also employ are gather information and plan ways to act; completely switch off and do nothing; try to avoid becoming emotionally involved; try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty; quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution; console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.; and take your frustrations out on some other person or object. Raasay teachers rated their successful strategies as try not to think about it (3.667), quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution (3.5), and gather information and plan ways to act (3.333).

Newtyle teachers rated their approach to personal problems as the least successful. Respondents did not add any items. The frequently-used strategies are gather information and plan ways to act (40%), try not to think about it (25%), and talk the matter over with someone
information and plan ways to act (40%), try not to think about it (25%), and talk the matter over with someone else (20%). Other strategies used include try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty, try to see the funny side of the situation, and console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc. Teachers rated their strategies as gather information and plan ways to act (2.625), talk the matter over with someone else (2.5), and try not to think about it (2.2).

Synopsis of coping data

When efficacy means are combined, the adequacy of coping with all difficulties within the questionnaire and those added by respondents, it is possible to rank schools according to teachers' rated adequacy of their coping strategies. Table 6.15 lists schools from the highest to the lowest coping efficacies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PARENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤.05

Table 6.15. Coping efficacies: questionnaire categories.

Figure 6.18 portrays the usage and efficacies of coping strategies of Nairn, Midpoint, and Raasay teachers. Nairn and Raasay are included as the teachers in those schools rated strategy efficacies lowest and highest respectively. Strategies not employed by teachers at Nairn and Raasay are indicated by gaps in the connecting lines.
Figure 6.18. Coping strategy usage and efficacy ratings.

Efficacy Ratings

- Aggressively attack the source of the problem.
- Steer clear of the problem at all times.
- Gather information and plan ways to act.
- Completely switch off and do nothing.
- Try not to think about it.
- Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved.
- Abandon it to tackle some easier problem.
- Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty.
- Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people.
- Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty.
- Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you.
- Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature.
- Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others.
- Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution.
- Talk the matter over with someone else.
- Try to see the funny side of the situation.
- Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
- Take your frustrations out on some other person or object.
- Some other strategy.

Not rated by any teachers as a primary coping strategy:
Avoid sympathy or empathy with people who may be influenced by your necessary actions.

Strategy Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Usage</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively attack the source of the problem</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of the problem at all times</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and plan ways to act</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely switch off and do nothing</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to think about it</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon it to tackle some easier problem</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk the matter over with someone else</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to see the funny side of the situation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take your frustrations out on some other person or object</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other strategy</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

= Range of schools' means

= Nairn  = Midpoint  = Raasay
Education factors categorisation of strategies

Following treatment of the raw data, coping responses were applied to stress sources as categorised into factors of the education profile (Appendix 4.11). The data are presented here in summarised form. Information obtained by categorising and analysing coping strategy usages and efficacies identified a school's status in relation to other schools in the sample. In Table 6.16, the schools are listed according to teachers' ratings from the highest to the lowest coping efficacies.

Table 6.16. Coping efficacies: education factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY</th>
<th>EQUITY</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Wvvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rey</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-17. Schools' coping efficacies: factors analysis.

Factor analysis categorisation of strategies

As major changes were not noticeable in either strategy usages or efficacies, the information obtained by categorising coping strategies and efficacies according to the questionnaire factor analysis is summarised. Table 6.17 lists schools from highest to lowest in each factor according to teachers' coping efficacy ratings.

Table 6.17. Schools' coping efficacies: factors analysis.
Summary

Table 6.18 depicts the order of schools after the means of all efficacies, as they are rated by teachers, are combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGGREGATE COPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05

Table 6.18. Schools' positions: aggregate efficacies.

In the exposition of data drawn from the questionnaire, from classifying responses according to factors used in compiling education profiles and the factor analysis, it has been demonstrated that there are departures from the pattern set by Midpoint High School. An affirmative response is, therefore, given to the research question:

**Do coping strategies differ between schools?**

Arising from this response is a subsidiary and contributory question:

**In what ways do coping strategies differ between schools?**

The response to this question is summarised in Tables 6.15, 6.16 and 6.17 which illustrate the differences in coping efficacies from one school to another. Appendix 6.8 contains graphs depicting the strategy usage for each school in the sample. It can be seen from these graphs that there are considerable departures in both usage and efficacy.
Conclusion

In the opening section of this chapter, the schools' education profiles were discussed. It was demonstrated that not only do schools differ on a general plane from one to another but also that individual schools differ in particular aspects of their educational offering. A school may be outstanding in one factor while, in another, it could be considered as being below Midpoint High's standard. For example, Reay appears to be outstanding in effectiveness, parallels Midpoint in efficiency, and yet is considerably lower than Midpoint in quality control. It is clear that not one school leads others in all factors used in compiling education profiles. However, there is some consistency when all factors are taken into account.

Raasay school leads others in five of the seven factors. This may indicate bias on the part of the researcher and it is admitted that there is a positive proclivity towards the work of this school, particularly when the unfavourable environment in which the school is situated is considered. As Raasay's principal remarked, "It would be a rare bird who would apply for a transfer to Raasay but yet very few apply to leave, and then it is mostly for promotion". However, attempts have been made to reduce the possibility of bias as both positive and negative aspects have been recorded in the diary and observation schedule. These findings have been reported in this chapter.

Nairn school has been assessed lowest in five of the seven factors. It is considered that a bias against Nairn is not held but more an empathy of the difficulties Nairn teachers face in their work. It is, perhaps, important to note that the researcher did not personally know any teacher at either Nairn or Raasay before the schools were visited. Furthermore, the consideration given towards the research project and to the researcher was virtually identical in both schools.

The schools' stress profiles were discussed in the second section with findings presented according to questionnaire categories, education factors, and statistical factor analysis. It was again noticeable that one school, Wyvis, appeared to be predominantly in the lower levels of frequency while another, Nairn, has a considerably high frequency of difficulties. On the other hand, Nairn teachers reported a markedly lower stress intensity. Raasay, which is in the lower level of stress frequency, is consistently high in stress intensity. It could be considered that Nairn teachers sustain a constant 'series of pinpricks' whereas Raasay's suffer occasional 'blows of a sledge-hammer'.
The third part of this chapter also took into account questionnaire responses, education factors, and factor analysis as means for examining schools' coping profiles. Appendix 6.9 illustrates coping efficacies categorised by education factors and questionnaire factor analysis. Although there appears to be a higher correlation between stress intensity and coping efficacy, conclusions contained in Chapter 7 support the proposal that stress frequency and coping efficacy are closely interrelated. There is also a high correlation between the types of strategies employed and the level of success that teachers in different schools attached to those strategies. A summary of schools' education, stress, and coping categorised by education factors appears in Appendix 6.10.

Table 6.19 depicts the positions of schools with respect to their educational offering, stress frequency and intensity, and teachers' coping efficacy ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION PROFILE</th>
<th>STRESS FREQUENCY</th>
<th>STRESS INTENSITY</th>
<th>COPING EFFICACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.19. Schools' positions as determined by aggregate responses.

Figure 6.19, a representation of the sphere of excellence, depicts relationships between items employed in compiling education, stress and coping profiles and those resulting from the questionnaire factor analysis. Heavier lines depict axes and narrower lines, the relationships discussed in this and previous chapters.
The form of interdependence between the education, stress, and coping profiles will be examined in greater depth in the following chapter. Factors that may determine why stress frequencies, intensities, strategy usage, and efficacies differ between schools will also be discussed.
Chapter 7

Conclusions

The purposes of this chapter are twofold:

- to advance reasons for differences between sample schools' stress sources, frequencies and intensities; and coping strategy usage and efficacies, and
- to indicate why the null hypothesis, that there is not an interdependence between a school's education, stress, and coping profiles, is void. Explanations presented in this chapter portray the form of interdependence between profiles.

Overview

Schools markedly differing from Midpoint in percentages of teachers selecting the same items as sources of stress are indicated in an endeavour to explain why variations from the norm have occurred. In the examples cited, it has been found that there is a strong probability that difficulties have arisen from the lack of attainment of goals directly relating to schools' education profiles. Where a school's staff rate items significantly lower than Midpoint, it is considered that needs are being met through the cooperation of teachers, a willingness to consider the views of others, and a general awareness of not only where but also how the school's educational offering can be improved.

Differences between schools' stress frequencies appear to be related to the degree teachers perceive that they can control outcomes. The notion of increased control is enhanced by appropriate and mutually agreeable participation in decisions affecting the school. Stress frequency differences exist between teachers in various positions on the career ladder and across schools. In the latter, it is considered that the school's education factors of support and vision are major determinants of the prevalence of difficulties. There is also strong support for the proposal that stress frequency and coping efficacy are closely interrelated.

A discussion of the interdependence between stress intensity and schools' education profiles points to the likelihood that intensity decreases with the attainment of mutually accepted educational objectives.

There appears to be a relationship between the types of coping strategies teachers use, whether they be direct-action or palliative, and the assessed flexibility of the schools' education profiles. In addition, there is considerable evidence to indicate that the
type of strategy employed is dependent on the degree of individuals' perception that they
are able to alter the source of stress. It is suggested that, whatever strategies are used,
teachers' perceived adequacy of the strategy is related to the level of staff support and
cohesion, and the type of social networks existing among teachers.

Differences in stress profiles

It has been demonstrated that stress sources, frequencies, and intensities differ
between schools. How they differ has been described in Chapter 6. Arising from the
findings is a further question - why do these differences between schools occur? The
response to this question should take into account the individual school's characteristics
including its precepts, recent history, environment, ethos, management, and the
personalities of students and teachers. In addition to that of previous chapters, further
information concerning these characteristics will be presented where appropriate. In each
instance, examples will be advanced to illustrate the implications for school management.

Stress sources

Laggan has the greatest departure from Midpoint's stress sources. Among the
twenty two items in which the school differs, Laggan teachers perceived their difficulties
as greatest in communication deficiencies among staff, selected by 41% more teachers than at
Midpoint, scarcity of opportunities for promotion (+21%), students' commitment to learning (+19%), set
curriculum matching curriculum which is actually taught (+17%), students' attitudes towards school (+17%),
loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (+17%), support from those in more senior positions (+15%),
opportunities for expressing opinions (+14%), communicating with parents (+13%), learning about students
from other staff (+11%), shortage of time to plan and organise (+10%), lack of cooperation among staff
(+10%), and conflict between your needs and the profession (+10%). Difficulties that teachers rated
lower compared with other schools are public criticism of teachers, with 28% less teachers
selecting this item, finding time to give individual assistance (-19%), student report writing (-15%), the
amount of work you are required to do (-14%), introducing innovation (-13%), students' attitudes towards
each other (-13%), perceived injustices of the promotion system (-10%), and your conditions of service (-
10%). Other schools' percentages are contained in Appendix 7-1.

The most significant difference, communication deficiencies among staff, is considered to
emanate from two sources. Firstly, there is little personal contact between teachers. The
diary contains a number of entries which, although heavily marked as impressions,
appear to be supported by teachers in responses to interview and questionnaire items. In
precis form, diary entries include: not introduced to staff; atmosphere appears slightly
impersonal; few teachers (12) in main staffroom at recess; only four teachers in main staffroom at end of day - most left as soon as permitted; the staff do not appear to be unified in approach to policies; it appears that senior staff do not have a great influence in school decision making; some teachers appear to be protective of their departments; staff cooperation seems low; the assistant principal advised that four teachers had nervous breakdowns during the past two years; and teachers expressed the problem of not knowing what was going on in the school [three occasions with different teachers]. This is supported by questionnaire frequency responses above those of Midpoint including interpersonal relationships, learning about students from other staff, your interaction with staff, staff unsociability, communication deficiencies among staff, and your peers' attitudes towards you. Further supporting the assertion are responses to the interview item concerning the free discussion between teachers of problems encountered in the profession, presented here in abridged form:

only some; only on a work level; teachers are not prepared to solve problems between each other; not absolutely, tendency towards cliques; most problems to do with school; only some; teachers may approach anyone but they don't (ap); I'm not sure, I think so - you'll have to ask them (p).

The second reason for the difficulty of communication is considered to be, in part, a characteristic of the school's administration. The principal intimated that, as he holds a position paying a higher salary, it is his responsibility to make what he believes to be the important decisions. By so doing, teachers can "get on with what they do best". Consequently, there is little staff input in the school's decision-making processes.

The following questionnaire frequency responses indicate means above Midpoint's: your involvement in staff meetings, conflicting demands from others, support from those in more senior positions, your involvement in school budgeting, participating in decisions affecting the school, expectations of those in more senior positions, consistency of demands made of you, and attitudes of seniors towards you. The suggestion that Laggan's difficulty in communication is a characteristic of the school's administration is supported by responses to the interview item, are problems freely discussed between teachers and senior staff, assistant principals or principal which, again, are in precis form:

I do not feel that they can; only when it is to do with work; there seems to be a lack of caring; only some problems; emphasis is placed on teachers working out their own problems; the senior staff have 'abdicated' and are seen as no higher than teachers; & some problems are discussed with two out of the seven senior staff.

Having discussed one school with a markedly higher number of teachers who indicated similar difficulties when compared with Midpoint, an examination of another school showing a slightly lower degree response unanimity than at Laggan proves
interesting. Raasay has twelve items that diverge by 10% or more from Midpoint. Among those items, teachers at Raasay perceived their difficulties to lie in opposition or lack of support from parents, with 20% more teachers selecting this item, class sizes (+19%), dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching (+16%), public criticism of teachers (+16%), knowledge of procedures (+13%), job insecurity (+10%), and conflict between your needs and the profession (+10%). Difficulties that teachers rated lower than other schools are the amount of work you are required to do, selected by 14% fewer teachers, introducing innovation (-13%), loss of relativity of teachers’ salaries (-12%), lack of recognition from others for the work you do (-12%), and curriculum changes (-11%).

Difficulties with parents and the significantly lower level of Raasay’s difficulty with curriculum changes were cited in a previous chapter. It is suggested that the items of less difficulty compared with Midpoint High, the amount of work you are required to do, loss of relativity of teachers’ salaries, and lack of recognition from others for the work you do, are indicative of other rewards of the teaching profession that predominate at Raasay. Extrinsic rewards, such as salary and position, may attract those who are entering a profession but, once a person is in a profession, other rewards can provide greater motivation. According to Lortie (1975:21), “intrinsic rewards, and particularly those derived from effective communication with students, are the rewards which teachers value and result in the fusing of ‘product’ and ‘process’”. Effective communication with other teachers is also considered to be a primary intrinsic reward. Johnson (1986:59) noted that “... efforts to motivate veteran teachers with pay and promotions may prove to be misdirected and counterproductive”. It is not proposed that extrinsic rewards are irrelevant as they correspond with Maslow’s (1954) lower orders. However, the higher orders of esteem, autonomy and self-actualisation also need to be considered. In Raasay’s case, previously-cited evidence indicates that Maslow’s higher orders are addressed.

A number of diary entries refer to interactions among teachers and between teachers and students at Raasay. In all interviews with teachers, strongly positive responses were received for items including do pupils freely approach teachers about their personal problems; are problems freely discussed between teachers; are teachers complimented when they do something well; do senior staff encourage criticism of their ideas; can teachers give frank opinions; and are problems freely discussed between teachers and senior staff, assistant principal, or principal.

The interview responses were supported by answers to questionnaire frequency items indicating means that are, in many instances, considerably below Midpoint’s. The items include your involvement in staff meetings, support from those in more senior positions, your involvement in school budgeting, participating in decisions affecting the school, opportunities for expressing opinions, expectations
of those in more senior positions, consistency of demands made of you, lack of cooperation among staff, your interaction with staff, communication deficiencies among staff, other teachers' relationships with students, ways in which staff are evaluated, the criteria for selecting staff for extra duties, your participation in curriculum planning, your peers' attitudes towards you, attitudes of seniors towards you, and lack of recognition from others for the work you do.

To reduce the number of stress sources, the two examples, Laggan and Raasay, point to the necessity for teachers to be closely involved in planning future directions for the school, to have a high level of communication with peers and senior staff, to be aware of those aspects where improvement could take place, to be given the opportunity to freely express opinions and, of primary importance, to have the knowledge and skills to motivate students to achieve their best.

Stress frequencies

The discussion of stress frequencies in Chapter 6 centred on the emphases teachers placed on individual and aggregated items. The total number of items teachers rated above or below Midpoint has provided another avenue for classifying schools. Table 7-1 depicts the order of schools in relation to Midpoint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Above Midpoint</th>
<th>Equal to Midpoint</th>
<th>Below Midpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Numerical positions of schools' stress frequency items.

Comparisons of Tables 6-7 and 7-1 indicate that the placement of schools is identical whether calculated on the aggregate frequency means or on the total number of items to which teachers ascribed frequency levels different from Midpoint.

Although the information acquired in this study provides answers to the question of why stress frequencies differ between schools, it is considered that further investigation
into the phenomenon would be worthwhile. Nevertheless, it is postulated that the recognition and acknowledgement by administrative staff of teachers' professional difficulties have a deciding influence on the frequency of stress that teachers experience.

It has been found that other research into stress does not align with the findings of this study with respect to stress frequencies. For example, according to Hall et al. (1989:140), there is a direct correlation between aggregate stress levels and difficulties encountered with those aspects of teaching involving punishment. This is said to apply particularly to work in the classroom such as "disruption of lessons, aggressive behaviour between students, students' refusal to work as directed, and truancy". The questionnaire items considered to parallel these difficulties are interruptions to the teaching timetable, students' attitudes towards each other, students' commitment to learning, and consequences of student absences. It was suggested by Hall et al. that the greater the difficulties encountered, the greater the frequency of stress: "The list of incidents which elicit the punishing response and consequent stress reveals a striking similarity between the incidents with students and the incidents with other members of staff", the equivalents of what are considered in the instruments used in this study as consistency of demands made of you, your interaction with staff, obvious instances of staff incompetence, the lack of staff conscientiousness, and other teachers' relationships with students.

The results of this study, however, do not indicate similar reasons for stress frequency. Within Midpoint's top ten frequencies, students' commitment to learning ranks third, students' attitudes towards each other is sixth, while interruptions to the teaching timetable and consequences of student absences do not appear. In Midpoint's top ten intensity items, students' commitment to learning is in sixth place and the others are lower than tenth place. With respect to the second point made by Hall et al., the frequency of difficulties with teachers, none of the items are included in the top ten and consistency of demands made of you ranks as only ninth in intensity.

In seeking reasons for differences in stress frequencies, it has been found that the status a teacher has in the school is related to the frequency of difficulties. Due to the increased demands placed on those who hold the recently-introduced position of head teacher, it could be anticipated that stress frequency is highest with a somewhat similar ratio applying to senior masters and mistresses whose job descriptions have also undergone significant changes. This is, in fact, the case. The mean stress frequencies, intensities, and coping efficacies for positions held in schools can be seen in Table 7.2.
It is concluded that stress frequency is related to rôle ambiguity in ascertaining task requirements, rôle conflict in the attitudes towards senior staff of both those in subordinate and those in more senior positions, and rôle overload in the amount of work required of them. This finding differs from that of Kottkamp and Travlos (1984:1), who stated that "principals and other school administrators seem even more susceptible to job stress". The perception was shared by Gmelch (1977), Cooper and Crump (1978), Cedoline (1982), and Greenberg (1984). However, Ratsoy and Friesen (1985), Otto (1986), and Louden (1987) found otherwise. Ratsoy and Friesen, for example, indicated that teachers, especially of English and social science, were more highly-stressed than the Edmonton public school district average. In addition, the finding that the amount of work that has to be done directly influences stress frequency was supported by Ratsoy and Friesen (1985:177): "Throughout the study, and for all categories of personnel, the work load factor was clearly rated highest among the potential sources of stress".

It has also been found that aggregate frequencies align with the categorisation of schools according to education factors, with a high correlation between the combined frequencies and the schools' support and vision factors. This implies that the higher the level of support and the greater the acceptance of a common vision that considers the long-term future of the school, the lower are the teachers' stress frequencies. Furthermore, there is a relationship between stress frequencies and coping efficacies. This will be discussed in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Frequencies</td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>2.633</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>3,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>14,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Intensities</td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>2.055</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Efficacies</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.568</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.961</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2. Stress frequencies, intensities and coping efficacies according to status.
Conclusions

a later section of this chapter where reasons for differences in coping efficacies are considered.

Not all schools share a common vision. In addition, the principal's vision may not be sufficiently recognised and accepted by others to influence the school's future direction, interactions between student and teacher, communication with parents and the community, and aspects of the school's major purpose, the education of the child. Schools could have the type of vision which, although documented and discussed by teachers, has simply become an exercise which may have provided some reflection but has not greatly influenced the school. In most instances, the 'Mission Statement' adopted by some schools falls into this category. It is emphasised that a vision should be distinct to the school, accounting for the long-term future of the school, and not simply a 'Mission Statement' that could apply to any school. To clarify the interrelationship, Table 7.3 depicts the total stress frequencies and the frequencies for items included in the factors of support and vision.

**Stress frequencies**

from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINED</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3. Schools' combined, support, and vision stress frequencies.

The conclusion that stress frequency is particularly related to support and vision is corroborated by Dunham (1989:131), who listed teachers' essential requirements:

1. They should be able to influence the decisions which affect them at work.
2. In a healthy school they will have a sense of purpose and direction.
3. They should have a strong sense of acceptance and support from their colleagues.
4. Their work enables them to feel competent.
5. They have a rewarding awareness of their own development.
There appears to be an inverse correlation between schools' coping efficacies and stress frequencies, the noted exception being Wyvis. At the time that schools were visited, Nairn, Portree, and Reay schools, rated as having the greater frequencies, had not talked about teachers' stress in formal staff meetings. Although many teachers intimated that stress levels were high in their schools, the matter had not been addressed by the combined staff. On the other hand, teachers at Raasay, Mull, and Wyvis schools had discussed the matter during their meetings. In addition, the regional guidance officer had conducted a series of stress reduction seminars at Wyvis which may have contributed towards the school having the lowest frequency placement. However, the benefits of the seminars do not appear to have extended to stress intensities or coping efficacies. If it is accepted that there is a relationship between coping efficacy ratings and stress frequencies, it could indicate that if teachers are acquainted with the more appropriate strategies, the frequency of stress would decrease proportionately to the usage of those strategies. However, some doubt is raised on this issue. It appears that although similar strategies are used in most schools with some variations in frequency of use, depicted in Appendix 6.9, those strategies received different efficacy ratings.

Table 7.4 illustrates the inverse correlation in the order of schools according to combined frequencies and coping efficacies. Wyvis school has been excluded from the table because of the 'intervening variable' of the guidance officer's influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>COPING EFFICACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4. Schools' ratings of stress frequencies and coping efficacies.
In summary, it is concluded that there is a correlation between stress frequencies and the position occupied by the teacher in the school's promotion structure. There is also a correlation between stress frequencies and the school's quality of support on the one hand, and the teachers' and community's acceptance of a common vision on the other.

It is also proposed that, because of the inverse correlation between frequency and coping efficacy, those schools whose teachers indicated higher ratings for the strategies that they use do not experience as many difficulties with sources of stress. In addition, the number of possible stress sources is reduced. The same proposal, however, does not apply to stress intensities and coping efficacies.

Stress intensities

There is an interdependence between stress intensities and those aspects of a school's education staff members hold to be highly important and which, through circumstances that appear to be beyond the teachers' capacity at that time, may not be fulfilled or are not meeting the level teachers deem to be satisfactory. Illustrations are provided by comparing questionnaire category examples with education profiles.

Organisation

Shortage of time to plan and organise is the greatest organisational difficulty experienced by Wyvis (45%), Laggan (44%), Rona (44%), Mull (43%), Portree (31%), Newtyle (30%), and Nairn (29%) teachers. Although this is among the greater difficulties at Raasay (28%), with their emphasis on student achievement and teachers' perceived participation in the school's organisation, described in a previous chapter, class sizes rates as the greatest problem (31%). The additional problems Reay teachers appear to have with criterion-based assessment are indicated in their consideration that the amount of paperwork you have to do parallels difficulties with curriculum changes (25% each). Nairn teachers expressed a similar level of perplexity with curriculum changes (24%), with criterion-based assessment and introducing innovation.

Administration

Consistency of demands made of you provides the greatest administrative stress intensity for teachers at Rona (34%), Mull (23%), Reay (23%), and Portree (22%). As both Laggan and Nairn schools have few, if any, meetings of senior staff this may have given rise to teachers' difficulties with support from those in more senior positions (25% and 22% respectively). Newtyle teachers indicated difficulty in participating in decisions affecting the school (18%). The intensity of stress experienced is most likely to have emanated from the
Government's proposal to cut education spending by closing the school. With the student intake from a purely housing commission area, Raasay teachers experience their greatest administrative difficulty in resources for handling disciplinary problems (26%). In contrast to Raasay's maxim of "innovate or perish", Wyvis teachers indicated a great problem in introducing innovation (33%).

**Academic Program**

Adapting the program to suit students' needs was considered by Mull (31%), Raasay (29%), Laggan (27%), and Reay (27%) teachers as their greatest difficulty with the academic program. Rona indicated an equal difficulty with this and provision of resources (18%). The latter difficulty is rated by Newtyle (50%) and Portree (41%) as a difficulty which, as indicated in the observation schedule, has not been met due to funds having been directed into other programs. While all three schools operate program budgeting, albeit with some modifications, many teachers indicated during interviews that they were unable to sufficiently participate in school financial matters. Wyvis teachers find that student report writing is a great problem (23%) which possibly emanates from the problems experienced in communication between staff members. Justifying the program's relevance to students was rated by Nairn teachers as their greatest problem (24%). The difficulty is thought to arise from the administration staff's lack of appreciation of the dichotomy between introducing the new curricula required by the Schools' Board and the desire to maintain practices of past years. This is further exemplified in Nairn's responses in the questionnaire's organisation category.

**Students**

Teachers at Wyvis (54%), Mull (44%), Nairn (43%), Rona (38%), Raasay (30%), and Newtyle (24%) consider their highest stress intensity with students as finding time to give individual assistance. On the other hand, Laggan teachers indicated students' commitment to learning as their greatest problem (38%) with Portree teachers ranking students' commitment equal to students' attitudes towards the school (20%). It is considered that these difficulties arise from a paucity of monitoring teaching quality which may lead to a decrease of teachers' and students' interest in the school curriculum. Students' attitudes towards the school was viewed by Reay teachers as being the source of highest stress intensity (31%), possibly due to the low levels of teacher performance feedback and innovatory teaching methods, and to the students' external locus of control.
Parents
The comparatively fewer questions within the parents category has conceivably resulted in little difference between schools in their responses to items of highest stress intensity. Only two items, both being somewhat similar in context, appear among the greatest difficulties and received 58.7% of all responses. However, wide variations between schools in the number of responses indicate the degree of unanimity between individual school's teaching staff. Opposition or lack of support from parents is considered as the greatest difficulty by teachers at Raasay (56%), Newtyle (47%), Mull (43%), Portree (41%), and Laggan (30%). Wyvis (50%), Reay (35%), Rona (31%), and Nairn (28%) teachers viewed negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school as producing the highest stress intensity.

It is noteworthy that principals did not include either item among their greater difficulties. It appears that principals' highest stress intensity emanates from a lack of understanding between parents and staff.

Teachers
Public criticism of teachers received the highest response percentages of all items within the questionnaire. The schools rating this as the item inducing the highest stress intensity are Raasay (62%), Wyvis (52%), Portree (49%), Nairn (47%), Rona (46%), Mull (43%), Reay (41%), and Newtyle (36%). There is a notable exception in Laggan school which correlates with elements of the school's education profile. Fifty four percent of Laggan teachers indicated communication deficiencies among staff as being their greatest difficulty.

What can teachers do about their public image? It appears to be an extremely formidable problem, particularly when the 'public' appears to be unaware of the facts. For example, a December, 1986 issue of a widely-read weekly journal, The Bulletin, featuring an article that centred on the public perception of teachers, referred to a poll in which it was asked "Do teachers in your State go on strike too often?" Tasmanian responses were yes - 68%, no - 25%, don't know - 7%. Until that time, in the history of education in Tasmania there had not been one teachers' strike!

Professional status
Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries also received a high level of response from all schools: Laggan (56%), Rona (47%), Reay (46%), Newtyle (43%), Mull (38%), Nairn (38%), Portree (36%), Wyvis (30%), and Raasay (27%). In conversation, teachers intimated that, over the years, teachers' salaries had considerably decreased when
compared with other professions. The high level of response is also reflected by those in various positions of the promotion structure, the highest being assistant principals with 60%, head teachers (52%), senior masters/mistresses (48%), and teachers (47%). Interestingly, principals did not include this item among their greater difficulties, possibly because of their higher salaries when compared with others in the school. The Tasmanian Teachers' Federation has taken a conciliatory stance towards teachers claims in past years. However, it appears that stronger action is becoming necessary for the government to address the widening gap between the salaries of teachers and those of other professions. The dilemma is compounded as teachers generally consider militancy to be unprofessional.

Personal

Most teachers rated the amount of work you are required to do as being the source of highest stress intensity. The schools include Wyvis (46%), Newtyle (43%), Mull (41%), Nairn (40%), Portree (40%), Reay (36%), and Rona (33%). Raasay teachers indicated an equivalence between this difficulty and conflict between your needs and the profession (23% each). It is seen that, because of the different environment, Raasay teachers consider that personal needs have to be temporarily disregarded where more pressing problems with students are at hand. Laggan teachers rated conflict between your needs and the profession equivalent in intensity to keeping up with new developments (23% each). The characteristics of Laggan are quite different from those of Raasay in all profiles. It is suggested that the lower standing of senior staff members and an ensuing lower level of support received by teachers may be attributed to Laggan's responses.

It has been found that the status a teacher has in the school is also related to the stress intensity. The mean stress intensity for positions held in schools are: senior masters/mistresses = 2.188, teachers = 2.174, head teachers = 2.058, assistant principals = 2, and principals = 1.974. There could be a relationship between the wider range of tasks included in senior staff job descriptions which has increased the rôle complexity of senior masters and mistresses and has resulted in the highest intensity for those of senior staff status. Again, it is noticeable that principals have the lowest intensity. However, it should be taken into account that the number of responses for assistant principals (44) and for principals' (39) is relatively low.

In summary, stress intensity is related to teachers' unsatisfied needs, demands, or
desires in that the greater the deficiency, the higher is the stress intensity. It is also closely affiliated to the degree that individuals feel that they do not have control over satisfying needs, demands, and desires. The perception of powerlessness and impotence teachers experience from their inability to do something about their work loads, external criticism, and negative attitudes is signified by the stress intensity level and the higher percentages appendant to those difficulties. Although the differences in means are relatively small, the proposition is supported by the intensity experienced by those of different status in the school. Senior masters/mistresses, who are considered as the 'buffer' between the principal or assistant principal and teachers in lower positions, have the highest intensity.

It has also been evinced that, although there are similarities between stress frequency and stress intensity items, there are a number of notable exceptions. This finding is supported by Ratsoy and Friesen (1985): "The most stressful situations encountered among personnel in the district are not necessarily those encountered frequently, nor are the less stressful necessarily those occurring infrequently".

Coping strategy usage

The immediate reactions of most people would be to use water to douse a fire. However, it would be hoped that, within a short period of time, some thought would be given to the cause of the fire, whether it be electrical, chemical, or whatever. Use of the wrong extinguisher could result in death. Experience, perception, intuition, and reasoning would indicate what should be done. This is analogous with coping strategy usage. In most instances, the type of strategy a person employs to overcome an immediate difficulty is not a conscious decision. However, immediate reactions are often modified over time with cognition indicating the more appropriate strategy. This leads to the question, Why do coping strategies differ?

The findings of this study differ from other research into preferred primary coping strategies. Although there are similarities, Dunham's work (1989:123), for example, enumerated the most frequently used strategies which, because of the divergence with findings of this study, are listed in full in Table 7.5. For ease of comparison, immediately beneath Dunham's listing is Table 7-6, containing the strategies most frequently used by the participants in this study. In both tables, the strategies are in order of usage.
Conclusions

COPING STRATEGY

1. By setting aside a certain amount of time ... when I refuse to do anything connected with school.
2. Trying to come to terms with each individual situation.
3. Acceptance of the problem.
4. By talking over stressful situations with my husband/wife/family.
5. By involving myself with my family and ... friends when I am not working.
6. Trying to say 'No' to unnecessary demands.
7. By switching off.
8. Trying to bring my feelings and opinions into the open.
9. I now admit my limits more easily than when I first became a teacher.
10. By talking about it, usually with colleagues at school.

Table 7.5. Dunham's ten most-frequently used coping strategies.

(Dunham, 1989:123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gather information and plan ways to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk the matter over with someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Try not to think about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aggressively attack the source of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Try to see the funny side of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completely switch off and do nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=10. Abandon it to tackle some easier problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=10. Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6. The most-frequently used coping strategies at Midpoint High.

Information obtained from interviews reveals that approximately two-thirds of the teachers do not discuss their difficulties with family members. The reason offered by most was that, as other members of the family have their own problems, adding to them would not help. Whether or not the family is acquainted, when talking over the matter with someone else, almost all teachers do so with another teacher. This would suggest
that Dunham's fourth strategy would be placed considerably lower by teachers in this study.

It is considered that the differences that may be deduced from Tables 7-4 and 7-5 arise from the different environments. Dunham's study is based within the English education system in which there are a number of dissimilarities with the Tasmanian Department of Education and the Arts. As examples, the Tasmanian system does not have school inspectors, the grade organisation is different with Tasmanian colleges catering for grades 11 and 12, and there are differences in funding which, in England, is predominantly on a regional basis while the allocation of finances in Tasmania has a State-wide foundation. Differences in the administration of schools within this study are also considered to influence the strategies teachers use. In addition, the teacher's position on the promotion ladder is related to the types of primary strategies used. These matters will be discussed following descriptions of the strategies used for items within various questionnaire categories.

**Differences between questionnaire categories**

In the organisation, administration, academic program, students, parents, and personal questionnaire categories, the strategies teachers use most are gather information and plan ways to act, talk the matter over with someone else, and quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution. However, in the teachers and professional status categories, there is a noticeable decrease in the use of the strategy, gather information and plan ways to act. In the teachers category, there is a slight increase in a number of other strategies whereas there is a much higher use of the strategy, try not to think about it, in the professional status category.

Items within the teachers category are based on interactions between the individual and the school's teaching staff. The professional status category centres on perceptions of the individual's place within the Department while focusing on extrinsic motivational factors. The two exceptions, public criticism of teachers in the former category and 'support from your peers in the latter, were originally placed within those categories as means of ascertaining the reliability of responses.

It has been clearly demonstrated that teachers' difficulties with the structures of school and Departmental administration produce a much greater reliance on palliative strategies. Direct-action strategies are concerned with changing the source of stress thereby modifying the transaction between the individual and the environment. Where
the individual perceives that the environment is inflexible, palliative strategies, focusing on reducing feelings of powerlessness arising from stressful events, predominate.

Differences between schools

An extension of the above principle lies in the inference that there is an interrelationship between a school's educational flexibility and the degree of direct-action strategy usage. If a school is viewed as having a lower level of flexibility, a proportionally higher usage of palliative strategies would be expected than would be the case in a school with higher flexibility.

The proposal that there is an association between a school's flexibility and the type of strategies employed appears to be supported, if to a limited extent, by the information contained in Table 7-7. The table depicts, from highest to lowest, the order of schools' assessed flexibility and teachers' direct-action strategy usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION PROFILE: FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>DIRECT ACTION STRATEGY USAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Portree 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Raasay 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Laggan 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Newtyle 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Reay 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis 27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-7. Schools' assessed flexibility and teachers' strategy usage.

Differences between positions occupied

Of all strategies contained within the questionnaire and those added by respondents, two were indicated by teachers as preponderate. The strategies, gather information and plan ways to act, and talk the matter over with someone else, were rated by most as their primary strategies with 24-861% and 23-862% respectively. Table 7-8 illustrates the primary coping strategies that are used by teachers of different promotion status.
Table 7.8. Preferred primary coping strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING STRATEGY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Senior Masters/Mistresses</th>
<th>Assistant Principals</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and plan ways to act</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk the matter over with someone else</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to think about it</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively attack the source of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to see the funny side of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely switch off and do nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon it to tackle some easier problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>=11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>=11</td>
<td>=15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is a degree of commonality in strategy usage, there are significant differences in the usage of the first three of the above by those of various status. The percentages attendant to the strategies are as follows:

1. The usage of the strategy, gather information and plan ways to act, is:
   
   principals = 61.4%, assistant principals = 30%, senior masters and mistresses = 28.5%, head teachers = 25.6%, and teachers = 22.4%.

2. The strategy, talk the matter over with someone else, is used by:
   
   assistant principals = 36%, teachers = 26.4%, senior staff = 22.5%, head teachers = 16.1%, and principals = 2.3%.

3. The usage of the strategy, quietly accept the problem to facilitate its resolution, is:
   
   head teachers = 14.7%, teachers = 10.3%, senior staff = 9.4%, principals = 9.1%, and assistant principals = 4%.

There are wide variations in usage in each of the three strategies. Although the responses of principals and assistant principals are relatively small in number, it can be seen that there is a correlation between the frequency of strategy usage and the person’s status. The strategy, gather information and plan ways to act, is extensively used by principals who, once sufficient information is to hand, are in a position to act. However, as status lowers, the usage of the strategy decreases.

Information obtained from diaries and interviews indicates that assistant
principals often discuss their problems or talk matters over with the principal. It is an upward but not reciprocal flow in seeking means for handling problems. The principal is not normally in a position where advice can be sought from the assistant principal, nor, in many circumstances, would the principal look to subordinates for assistance due to the power inherent in the principal's position.

The greatest use of the third strategy, quietly accept the problem to facilitate its resolution, is by head teachers. The appointment of a teacher to the post of head teacher is made by the school's administrative and senior staff members. For an increase in salary of $2,000 a year and a reduction of two to four periods of class contact, head teachers are expected to carry out extra administrative tasks such as coordinating a subject department or a grade group. It is considered that, rather than displaying what others may perceive as a 'weakness' in ability to complete tasks, a newly-appointed head teacher could conceivably prefer to save face by simply accepting the difficulties. Assistant principals, on the other hand, have a reputation among teachers for being 'men of action' and would probably avoid using this palliative strategy. It is interesting to note that the only female assistant principal in the study used a wide variety of strategies, two only of which are direct-action.

To summarise, where it is perceived that there is a degree of powerlessness in changing a stress source, greater reliance is placed on palliative strategies in an attempt to alleviate stressful symptoms. The items in the questionnaire's teachers and professional status categories are examples where many teachers indicated that they had problems in their ability to influence the source to their satisfaction and thus alter their feelings towards the difficulties. As a consequence, palliative strategies predominate. An increase in the use of direct-action strategies is apparent where school structures are considered to be more flexible and over which some influence can be exerted by teachers. There is also a strong correlation with the usage of direct-action strategies and the within-school status of teachers. The stress frequency, intensity, and coping efficacy ratings of teachers in different positions on the career ladder may be seen in Appendix 7.2.

Coping strategy efficacies

Differences exist between schools in not only the strategies that teachers use but also in their adequacy ratings of coping strategies. Further examination reveals that, by comparing the strategies that schools' staff members use and the attendant efficacy ratings as they appear in Appendix 6-9, teachers rate the efficacy of the same strategies differently.
It was considered that one of the reasons why efficacy ratings differ between schools may be the level of support existing among teachers in the school. To test this possibility, a number of questionnaire items were combined to obtain school means. The items were selected on the basis that they apply directly to support among teachers and to the expectations of others. The items selected for the test appear in Table 7-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>Support from those in lower positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.h</td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i</td>
<td>Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c</td>
<td>Your interaction with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.k</td>
<td>Support from your peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.e</td>
<td>Your peers' attitudes towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.f</td>
<td>Attitudes of seniors towards you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-9. Questionnaire items used in assessing staff support.

Results of the test are contained in Table 7-10. There appears to be a correlation between the levels of support among teachers and the efficacy ratings of coping strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COPING EFFICACIES from highest to lowest</th>
<th>STAFF SUPPORT DIFFICULTIES from lowest to highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>3.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>3.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>3.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>3.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>3.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>2.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>2.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-10. Coping efficacies and staff support ratings.
The test was extended to ascertain the correlation between other aspects of relationships among teachers in the school, or 'staff cohesion'. The additional items, selected on the basis that they provide a representation of both the relationships between teachers and of their participation in decision-making on matters appertaining to the school, were added to those in Table 7.9. Items included in the test are listed in Table 7.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.g</td>
<td>Your involvement in staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>Support from those in lower positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c</td>
<td>Your involvement in school budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.f</td>
<td>Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.g</td>
<td>Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.h</td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i</td>
<td>Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.j</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.k</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.l</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c</td>
<td>Your interaction with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.e</td>
<td>Staff unsociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.h</td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.j</td>
<td>Your participation in curriculum planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.k</td>
<td>Support from your peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.e</td>
<td>Your peers' attitudes towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.f</td>
<td>Attitudes of seniors towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.h</td>
<td>The amount of work that you are required to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.i</td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work that you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.j</td>
<td>Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.11. Questionnaire items used to assess staff cohesion.

Results of the test are contained in Table 7.12. It will be seen that, although two positional changes have occurred, Portree with Rona and Nairn with Reay, staff cohesion and teachers' coping efficacy ratings appear to be somewhat interrelated.
Table 7.12. Relationships between coping efficacies and staff cohesion ratings.

As the support factor was examined when compiling education profiles, it was also deemed necessary to compare the findings with those of stress frequencies and coping efficacies. Table 7.13 comprises lists of schools' results in each of coping efficacies, stress frequencies related to staff cohesion and support, and education profile support findings.

Table 7.13. Coping efficacies, staff cohesion, and support ratings.

While the positions of most schools remain fairly constant, Laggan has the least stability with changes of position within a range of three steps. Nevertheless, it is
thought that there is sufficient evidence to uphold the premiss that coping efficacies, relationships among teachers, and their perceptions of participation in the school's decision-making processes are interdependent.

Social networks

Howard (1984) wrote of social networks as providing psychological stimulation and as acting as a buffer against stress. Information obtained from interviews with teachers and diary entries points to the emergence of four types of networks deriving from those described by Howard.

One of the schools in the study is in a remote area. Although access by road has considerably improved in the past two years or so, travelling time from Mull to the nearest large town or city takes two or more hours, and over four hours to the State's capital city. Harsh weather conditions during winter either increases travelling time or completely isolates the township. Teachers rarely apply for transfer to Mull. The school is staffed by two broad categories of teachers, those whose family roots are in the area and those who are transferred to Mull, a large proportion of whom are temporary teachers and constitute 37% of the staff. Consequently, there is a high degree of interaction between teachers outside the school environment. Although the network example in Figure 7.1 is intended to describe a religious sect or primitive tribe, it is probably the most appropriate description of Mull teachers' network.

It is thought that the network in which all people know each other, depicted in Figure 7.1, is a contributory factor in Mull teachers' coping efficacy ratings. Considerable support is provided through the multiplex connections of work and social interaction.
Figure 7-2, a modification of Howard's second example, depicts the relationships of teachers at Raasay. Teachers rarely apply for a transfer to Raasay, and then mostly for promotion. However, once established in the network, few teachers apply for transfers from the school, and again, it is mostly for promotion. As in the case of Mull, interactions at the work and social levels are thought to influence the efficacy ratings of teachers at Raasay.

![Figure 7-2. The Raasay teachers' network. (after Howard, 1984:76)](image)

Teachers at Laggan, Portree, Rona, and Wyvis indicated that their social network resembled Howard's second example, illustrated in Figure 7-3, in which teachers interact with two or more discrete groups of people. Some teachers at Reay described the network as applicable to them whilst others thought that their interactions were more closely represented by the 'open' network (Figure 7-4). Due to the number of teachers who described their relationships in this way, it is considered that the network is generally applicable to most teachers in country towns or suburban areas.

![Figure 7-3. A general network among teachers. (from Howard, 1984:76)](image)
Newtyle and Nairn teachers appear to have an 'open' network such as that portrayed in Figure 7.4. The open network describes individual contacts with a number of people. While there may be close interactions with the central person, those who are on the periphery do not necessarily know each other. The open network relationships were indicated during interviews with teachers and were demonstrated in the actions of teachers by leaving the school as soon as the work-day ended and, as noted in the diary, the tendency for teachers to remain in their own staffrooms during lunch. Few teachers at Nairn school live in the town. Similarly, as Newtyle school is located in an industrial-zoned inner suburb, most teachers commute from other suburbs or outlying towns.

The information received from teachers about their social networks appears to indicate that, if the connections between individuals are multiplex, the closer the network the greater is the support given to members of the network. To extend this line of reasoning, it could be considered that the type of social network is, in general, not deliberately chosen by teachers but is germane to the area in which the school is situated. Is it coincidental that those teachers within the more closed type of network rated their coping efficacies higher than teachers in the open network? The evidence provided thus far points to the likelihood that those having high degrees of social interaction that extend into the workplace consider that they can cope more effectively.

Figure 7.4. The Nairn and Newtyle teachers' network.
(from Howard, 1984:76)
Generalisations

Miles and Huberman (1984:15-16) wrote of the difficulties associated with the generalisability of qualitatively analysed data. Included is the method of sampling: "Even if a study goes beyond the classic single case to a multiple-site study, the bulk of data makes it unlikely that a sample of more than a few dozen cases can be managed. Are the cases examined ... a reasonable sample of a larger universe?" The generalisations appearing in this closing section are derived from, and are applicable to, Tasmanian government high schools. Although sampling limitations were applied, by excluding private schools and focusing on only high schools, those schools within these constraints were randomly selected. The sample is representative as 26.4% of Tasmanian high schools were included in the study. Many of the findings may be applied to a wider universe that could include any comprehensive high schools and, possibly, any educational institution.

Although referring to qualitative analysis, Miles and Huberman (1984) alluded that bias on the part of the researcher casts doubt on the generalisability of findings. The same principle holds for any research requiring some form of interpretation: "Given the fact that words are slippery, ambiguous symbols, the possibility of researcher bias looms quite large; we must be concerned with the replicability of qualitative analysis". As a large proportion of this study is based on observations, diary entries, and interview responses, there is a strong possibility of bias. However, where bias is known to have existed, it has been acknowledged. Where interpretation was seen to be involved, annotation to the incidence was heavily underscored. In addition, negative aspects of schools have been reported. Nevertheless, there could well be elements of bias unknown to the researcher, particularly in a study such as this, much of which calls for the subjective judgement of both researcher and respondent.

The conclusion that the "test items are a sample of the universe" (Cronbach and Meehl, 1973: 568), and that they represent all possible material that could have been included, has been supported by the lack of uniformity or a general trend in the few responses teachers added to the questionnaire.

The following generalisations are drawn from the data obtained from all research instruments.

1. The presence of teacher stress and an inability to cope adequately cannot be construed as indications of an individual's physical or psychological ineptitude.

In this research, it has been found that most difficulties arise from two primary
sources, those directly relating to the associations between teacher and students in the classroom, and those arising from environmental factors, most of which do not emanate from relationships between individuals. Esteve (1989) indicated several circumstances pertaining to the environment including the teacher's changing rôle, increasing rôle ambiguity, changes in societal attitudes, uncertainty about educational objectives, and deterioration of the teacher's image.

This research indicates that the difficulty with the highest frequency is loss of relativity of teachers' salaries and that the difficulty of highest intensity is public criticism of teachers. Both difficulties arise from external or environmental sources over which the teacher has little control or is unable to alter in any perceptible way.

2. Palliative strategies are used to a greater extent when the individual considers that outcomes cannot be controlled or that a change to the source of difficulty would be imperceptible.

From responses to questionnaire items involving the greatest difficulty, primary coping strategies of the direct action type are used by approximately 34% of teachers with 66% of teachers primarily applying palliative strategies. The two difficulties mentioned above serve as examples where palliative strategies have considerably greater precedence over those of the direct action type. With the difficulty, loss of relativity of teachers' salaries, direct action strategies were employed in only 14% of cases, the remaining 86% being palliative strategies. When encountering public criticism of teachers, direct action strategies are used in 25% of instances with 75% of strategy usage being palliative. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching is an example of a difficulty over which teachers possibly have some control. For this, 56% of teachers use direct action strategies while 44% have recourse to palliative strategies.

3. The positions of principal and assistant principal involve lower stress frequency and intensity than positions of subordinate status.

Due to the authority held by a principal and an assistant principal, the incumbents are able to influence decisions to a greater extent than other teachers. Consequently, direct action strategies are exercised to a significantly greater extent. This does not infer that direct action strategies reduce stress frequency or intensity as the data shows that such an
hypothesis would be incorrect. What is indicated is that the principal and assistant principal have greater control over outcomes and this is considered to support the previous generalisation. In addition, their coping efficacies are rated considerably higher than for other members of staff. However, as there is debate on the issue of the "levels" of stress in the principalship of a school compared with those in other positions and taking into consideration the low number of principals and assistant principals involved in this study, further research into this field is recommended.

4. Stress frequency is inversely related to the level of attainment of those aspects of a school's education offering considered important by the majority of teachers.

The degree of the school's effectiveness in achieving goals teachers deem to be of consequence in education is reflected in the frequency of stress experienced. From the low number of items teachers added to the questionnaire and from responses to questions asked during interviews, it is assumed that there is general agreement among teachers in the significance of the factorial elements assessed when compiling education profiles. Teachers who believe that they are achieving mutual goals indicated a low stress frequency whereas in schools where goals are not being met to the satisfaction of teachers, the frequency of stress is higher.

5. When referring to stress levels, it is necessary to distinguish between stress sources, frequencies and intensities.

Stress-sources differ between schools and are interdependent with the educational offering. Stress frequency and stress intensity are somewhat unrelated and interdependence between the two appears to be rather tenuous. Six items are rated among the top ten in both frequency and intensity difficulties, namely, loss of relativity of teachers' salaries, public criticism of teachers, shortage of time to plan and organise, finding time to give individual assistance, students' commitment to learning, and the amount of work that you are required to do. However, the four frequency items, students' attitudes towards each other, the amount of paperwork that you have to do, students' attitudes towards school, and scarcity of opportunities for promotion, do not appear in the group providing higher stress intensity. Items in the group of ten intensity items not appearing in the frequency group are opposition or lack of support from parents, provision of resources, consistency of demands made of you, and negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school.
6. Stress frequency inversely correlates with an individual's perception of the ability to control outcomes.

Increased participation in those aspects of the decision-making process that teachers see as important increases the perception of control and reduces the frequency of stress. However, there is some disagreement with Applebaum's (1981) suggestion that participation should be increased at all levels as it is considered that this would increase frustration and stress frequency. If the involvement of all teachers was required in many of the routine decisions, there would be an increase on the demands of teachers and their time which could be considered as unwarranted disturbances to their work. It is suggested that the focus should be on the control teachers have over the outcomes they see as important. Matters that could be considered are the importance and relevancy of the decision to be made, on the process of how the decision will be made, and on what bearing the resultant decision will have on teachers' tasks, perception of control, motivation, and well-being. Kyriacou (1987) also reported a correlation between a low stress 'level' or frequency and the degree to which teachers consider that they are in control of their environment.

7. There is an interrelationship between the degree of staff cohesion and supportiveness and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of their coping strategies.

It has been noted that, of the strategies used by teachers in all schools in the sample, two strategies - gather information and plan ways to act, and talk the matter over with someone else - were used most. However, there are considerable differences in the efficacy ratings attached to those strategies, the former ranging from 3.037 to 3.696, and the latter from 2.688 to 3.438. There are also differences in the means of aggregated efficacy ratings from 2.750 to 3.178. Those schools with lower staff cohesion difficulties have higher aggregated strategy efficacy means. Similarly, teachers in those schools with higher ratings in the education profile support factor rated their coping adequacy higher. King et al. (1987:111) remarked, "The community of fellow workers is most important in preventing worker anxiety".

8. The level of interest in the work of teachers and students demonstrated by the principal and assistant principal is reflected in the frequency of stress and coping efficacy.

The higher the level of interest, practically demonstrated by frequent supportive visits to classrooms and willingness to provide unobtrusive assistance, the lower the
frequency of stress and the higher the effectiveness of coping strategies.

The actions of the principal and assistant principal at Raasay in quietly assisting teachers, and the consistent help given to duty teams by the principal and assistant principals at Rona were noted. The assistant principal at Mull assumed a similar rôle and was frequently seen in corridors during teaching period changes, recess and lunch breaks. In all three schools, stress frequencies were low with high coping efficacy ratings, depicted in Table 6.19.

The generalisation supports the suggestion of King et al. (1987) that workers' morale is sustained by supervisors' regular appearances, by knowing their employees, their tasks, and by understanding the difficulties associated with their work.

9. The frequency of stress is reduced by a principal's public acknowledgement of, and action taken in addressing, the difficulties encountered by teachers.

Wyvis, Mull, and Raasay teachers rated their frequency of stress lower than did teachers in other schools. In the three schools, principals had talked with teachers, both formally and personally, about the difficulties involved in teaching. It is known that in one school, Wyvis, the principal took action in arranging group meetings with the regional guidance officer in attempts to reduce teachers' "stress levels", the results of which are significant in that teachers at Wyvis rated their stress frequency lowest in almost all factors. The principals at Mull and Raasay consistently acknowledge problems in teaching with their staff at an individual level and in staff meetings. Teachers in those schools also participate to a high degree in talking over ways of tackling problems. Responses during interviews point to teachers' beliefs that their principals are highly capable administrators and, although they relate well with teachers on both a work and social level, retain a respected position and have an "aura of success" (King et al., 1987).

10. A school climate that promotes teacher interactions on many levels reduces the difficulty of solving whole-school problems.

Raasay teachers freely interact in work-related, social, and personal matters and an example is provided by the principal's and assistant principal's relationships with other members of their staff. It has been noted that the new student certification requirements and implementation of the recommendations contained in the Department's
document *Secondary Education: The Future* have provided a marked decrease in the degree of difficulty in Raasay. Teachers in those schools in which communication difficulties occur have indicated a notably higher degree of difficulty in implementation. It is recognised that this generalisation may be debatable as the finding did not arise from the original intention of the study and is based on the researcher's impressions of staff interactions. Further research into this field could provide useful information on the effects on teachers in implementing edicts imposed from sources outside the school and its local community.

**Final statement**

Considerable change is occurring in education, not only in Tasmania but in many parts of the Western world. However, there is little indication to suggest that the needs of teachers have been considered a prime concern by those who exert pressure on schools to make those changes. While centrally defined curricula may reduce rôle ambiguity, it appears that it increases rôle conflict through the paucity of information available to schools as to how changes in, for example, student assessment, administrative structures, and school organisation, could be effected.

In recent times, teacher union activity has increased. Despite the misgivings of many that militancy is unprofessional, recourse to aggression appears to have become necessary to inform those who hold political power of teachers' plight. Such action has possibly been brought about by increasing stress intensity arising from feelings of powerlessness exceeding frustrations emanating from rôle conflict. Many teachers have spoken of the rewards of closer relationships with children through extra-curricular activities. In their efforts to be heard by parents and the wider community, 'work-to-rule' campaigns have curtailed most of these activities. The reduction of teacher numbers through redundancies and the dismissal of temporary teachers has already resulted in larger class sizes which, particularly in teaching groups where there is an element of danger such as science and metalwork classes, have added to the difficulties of those remaining in the profession.

This thesis has examined the interdependence between profiles of education, teacher stress, and coping strategies. It has been found that interdependence is of a high degree. If there is a reduction in both the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards of teaching, it is to be expected that the consequences for schools' educational offerings will be significant.
In the introduction to this thesis, the notion was expressed that schools are more than bricks and mortar; they are groups of people who combine in their efforts to communicate knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs. As each man, woman and child is an individual, so do schools have their individual characteristics and identities. The complexity of schools' individuality is apparent in findings of this research.

It is suggested that useful information could be gained from further research into two fields: firstly, the relationships that exist between teachers' interactions and the resolution of whole-school problems and, secondly, the stress frequencies and intensities of principals and assistant principals in comparison with those of subordinate status.

A school's social climate is a strong determinant of the degree of excellence attained. An excellent school sustains a climate that embodies supportive, consistent, and congenial interactions between those within its domain where all are combined in the acceptance of a vision, unique to the school, that focuses on the child's education.
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Appendices
Appendix 1
## School Certificate Results
### Pass-rate Percentages - 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th>SOCIAL SCIENCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED MATHS</th>
<th>ADVANCED SCIENCE</th>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample average</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(by courtesy of Schools Board of Tasmania)
### SCHOOL PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>LAGGAN</th>
<th>MULL</th>
<th>NAIRN</th>
<th>NEWTYLE</th>
<th>PORTREE</th>
<th>RAASEY</th>
<th>REAY</th>
<th>RONA</th>
<th>WYVIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 14 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Social Science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths/Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ed./Manual Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotable Positions Held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - less than 1 year</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10 years</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 14 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave due to Illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 day</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 days</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 days</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 days</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 days</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+ years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Personal Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - relieved</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely sad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics of respondents by schools.
22nd March, 1990

Mr. S. Argyll,
Principal,
Wyvis High School,
Wyvis,
Tasmania. 9876

Dear Mr. Argyll,

We would like to invite your school to participate in research being conducted through the Centre for Education. The study concerns the interdependence which may exist between the education offered by schools and ways which staff handle problems associated with teaching. We know that schools are always very busy but we believe that your school would be able to contribute information which would be beneficial to the study.

Approval to conduct the research project was granted by the Secretary, Department of Education and The Arts, on 20th March, 1990. Copies of the notification of approval have been sent to Regional Directors.

Three major aspects form the focus of research. Profiles will be constructed of the school's educational offering, difficulties encountered by staff members, and the ways that teachers cope with those difficulties. It is anticipated that findings from the completed research will have implications for the administration of schools throughout the State.

It is envisaged that five school days in Wyvis High School would be required to obtain the necessary data.

Information will be collected from three sources:
1. questionnaires, which would be distributed to all staff, preferably during a staff meeting so that all teachers would respond under similar conditions. Trialling has indicated that the questionnaire requires 20 - 40 minutes to complete;
2. interview schedules, for acquiring information from the principal, a vice principal and approximately 20% of staff. Interviews will take 10 -15 minutes for each staff member and will be arranged at times to suit the staff concerned; and
3. observation of school organisation which will require most of the week to complete. Further information about instruments for gathering data is available and will be forwarded to you if you so desire.

If Wyvis High participates, on completion of the case study you will receive a report detailing major findings. A further report containing findings gathered from all schools participating in the study will also be sent to you on completion of the research. It is anticipated that the final report will not identify individual schools.

We thank you for the time you have given to this matter. Within the next couple of days, I will contact you by telephone to find out if you have any questions, if you can take part and, if so, to work out suitable times.

Yours faithfully,

Ian McKay
Ph.D. Student.

Forwarded:

Dr. Bevis Yaxley
Ph.D. Supervisor.
27th March, 1990

Mr. S. Argyllle,
Principal,
Wyvis High School,
Wyvis,
Tasmania. 9876

Dear Mr. Argyllle,

In response to your request to Dr. Bevis Yaxley of this date, I enclose copies of the questionnaire and elements contained in the interview schedules for principals, vice principals, teachers and students.

I trust that you will find them helpful in deciding on your school’s participation in the study.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Ian McKay
Ph.D. Student
18th April, 1990

Mr. S. Argylle,
Principal,
Wyvis High School,
Wyvis,
Tasmania. 9876

Dear Mr. Argylle,

Thankyou for the ready acceptance of Wyvis High School to participate in research being conducted through the Centre for Education. The time you have given to considering the study is appreciated.

It is my intention that the daily routines of your school will be interrupted as little as possible and I will gladly assist the school in any way that I am able. During the first day, I hope to be able to liaise with you or a delegate in the random selection of approximately eight staff for interviews. The only other request for the direct involvement of teachers will be to provide responses to questionnaires. For the purpose of constructing profiles, it is intended that respondents will remain anonymous.

Personal assistance will not be required for observations of school operations. Nevertheless, I will be very happy to be able to converse with staff and to provide any interested person with information about the research.

I will contact you before 30th April, 1990, to confirm that the week remains suitable for your school.

I look forward to meeting with you and your staff.

Yours faithfully,

Ian McKay
Ph.D. Student.

Forwarded:

Dr. Bevis Yaxley
Ph.D. Supervisor.
Mr. S. Argylle,
Principal,
Wyvis High School,
Wyvis,
Tasmania. 9876

Dear Stewart,

Enclosed is a paper containing elements of the education profile for Wyvis High School.

It would be appreciated if you would advise me if there is disagreement with any of the material contained in the profile.

A third report containing consolidated results from questionnaire responses will be forward to Wyvis High School within the near future.

Again, I thank you for your assistance with this project.

Kind regards,

Ian McKay.
27th July, 1990

Mr. S. Argylle,
Principal,
Wyvis High School,
Wyvis,
Tasmania. 9876

Dear Stewart,

Enclosed with this letter is a further report on data obtained from the teachers' questionnaire *Coping with Difficulties*. The report provides some comparison between Wyvis High School and other schools in the sample.

The following information is presented:
1. stress sources, including those which provide the greatest difficulty for teachers at Wyvis High School and for all teachers included in the sample;
2. stress frequencies, illustrating the mean of responses from Wyvis High School staff, all staff within the sample, and the range of means of individual schools within the sample;
3. stress intensities, comparing ratings provided by Wyvis High School teachers with the consolidated mean; and
4. coping strategies, comparing strategies used by most teachers within the sample with those which were rated as most effective. These apply to the greatest difficulty and to all sources within the eight categories.

It is hoped that the report may be of interest to you and the teachers at Wyvis High School. If you would like further explanation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Again, if it meets with your approval, would you kindly pass the information on to staff. Special reports were requested by some Maths/Science teachers and Teacher/Librarians and I would also suggest that these could be forwarded to the appropriate teachers.

Since the enclosed reports were prepared, a factor analysis has been carried out and data re-categorised. If, after further research it is considered that new light is thrown on the subject, that information will be passed on to you. On completion of the study, it is envisaged that Wyvis High School will receive a final report containing a summary of findings.

It is emphasised that, unless otherwise requested, information will remain confidential.

Kind regards,

Ian McKay.
## Student Retention - Grade 10 to Grade 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade 10 enrolment 1981</th>
<th>Completed Grade 12 1983</th>
<th>Increase in ratio since 1983</th>
<th>State placing according to increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State average 2.13
Sample average 1.83
## Sample Schools' 14R & 14N Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample average</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteen-year-old students' test results for literacy (14R) and numeracy (14N).

## Community Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>QUALIFICATION/YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications are listed in terms of number of years' tertiary education or equivalent. A one-year course, for example, a diploma or trade certificate, equals 1. The statistics are compiled from the total population, including children, living in the schools' catchment areas.

## Community Annual Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>$ 10,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>$ 13,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>$ 10,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>$ 11,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>$ 11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>$ 9,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>$ 10,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>$ 10,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>$ 10,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1988 average annual income figures. The statistics are compiled from the total population, including children, living in the schools' catchment areas.

(Statistics by courtesy of Centre for Education, University of Tasmania)
Appendix 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>The state of being of extreme merit.</td>
<td>Effectiveness, equity, support, quality, efficiency, flexibility, and vision,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>The ability to produce a predetermined impressive result.</td>
<td>Strong educational leadership; match of staff with position; staff work as a team; produces support; generates quality; climate conducive to teaching and learning; high expectations of students; frequent monitoring of achievement; clear, understood, and accepted goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>All students are treated as equals and are provided with the same opportunities.</td>
<td>Recognition of individual differences; recognition of individual capabilities; motivates performance; outcomes balanced with achievement; conditions conducive to exploration, creativity, and understanding; provides necessary interaction between teacher and pupil; produces support; creates a commitment to learning; balance with other excellence factors is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>A social force that sustains, encourages, and respects the individual's integrity while maintaining a subordinate role.</td>
<td>School events mostly determined by external forces; gratifies dependency needs; provides incentives for attaining effectiveness; contributes feedback; gives credit where due; encourages affiliation; linked with school climate and thus interpersonal relationships; is externally observable when enrolments decline; must be logical, applicable and balanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control</td>
<td>The collaborative management and evaluation of school programmes.</td>
<td>Meaning of quality is diffuse and dependent upon the attitudinal aspect; quality is determined by educational aims, curriculum definition, and evaluation criteria which is ultimately decided by the school’s vision; necessity for commonality of purpose; constant monitoring of student progress and programme achievements; staff work in a group context relating personal needs and ambitions to the group; innovation should be assessed in terms of reliability, validity, generality, consistency, utility, suitability, and durability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual analysis: excellence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>The attainment of the highest quality product from the lowest capital investment.</td>
<td>Determined by financial expenditure, time on task, effort expended, and participant's ability; related to quality of teaching and learning; analysis begins at the association between student, teacher and subject; focuses effort on important goals; provides job satisfaction; associated with greater formalisation, centralisation, stratification, and lower complexity; balance with other excellence factors is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>The capacity to accurately assess the requirement for and the benefits of change, and to be adaptable to and in the change process.</td>
<td>Change should not be seen as a threat - defensiveness must be acknowledged; directly related to quality and effectiveness; all intended users should be involved in discussion and implementation; requires active formal and informal discussion groups of a size in which consensus is readily obtainable; staff development concerns changes in attitudes, behaviour, knowledge and understanding; change must be planned with a clear rationale; principal should take an active role in programme initiation, guidance and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>A mental image of a desirable future state of the school.</td>
<td>Founded on meanings of human life; possesses characteristics of practicability and communicability; should be composed, shared and owned by the community; required for successful change; encompasses change processes; discrete to the environment to which it applies; recognises external influences; increases effectiveness through inspiration; enhances flexibility by creating enthusiasm and increasing initiative; creates a sense of purpose; time is necessary for reflection; organisational structures should be seen as alterable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>An unacceptable divergence between perceived demands and an individual's coping abilities.</td>
<td>A negative response to the environment; an unpleasant emotional state; directed towards the future; emotion provoked usually exceeds the threat; produces bodily discomforts and disturbances; requires either clinical or individual control; disadvantageous to thought and action; an inverse correlation with performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>Exhaustion of physical and psychological resources.</td>
<td>A negative response to the environment; corresponds with excessive levels of stress; work is no longer possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>The mustering of resources required to handle demands.</td>
<td>A positive response to the environment; a discrete factor which does not correspond with stress; produces changes to bodily functions; correlates with performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>A determination of the amount or extent of bodily disturbances caused by exposure to stress.</td>
<td>Effects on normally voluntary controls include agitation, running, screaming, defecation; noticeable effects on involuntary systems include vertigo, horripilation, regurgitation, and palpitation; biochemical responses include raised glucose, catecholamines, fatty acids, prolactin, cholesterol and hydroxy corticosteroids; physiological responses include increased sweat gland activity and muscle blood flow, decreased salivation, skin blood flow and diastolic pressure, elevated heart rate and systolic pressure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual analysis: stress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>The technique or strategy for handling difficulties arising from an individual's interaction with the environment.</td>
<td>Differences in response are dependent on the individual's understanding of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical control</td>
<td>Stress management employing psychiatric assistance or intervention.</td>
<td>Major practices include Rational Emotive Therapy, the Talking Procedure, chemotherapy, Stress Inoculation Training, Problem-solving Therapy, Self-instruction Training, and Attribution Retraining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Emotive Therapy</td>
<td>Treatment providing individual assistance through disproving illogical convictions.</td>
<td>Assumes illogicality of thinking, an ability to identify irrational beliefs and that thinking and emotion are interrelated; overcomes negative thoughts that produce problems, e.g. demand for approval, blame-proneness, sense of helplessness, unrealistic self-expectations, procrastination, and anxious over-concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking Procedure</td>
<td>Therapy which assists individuals through a comprehensive examination of problems.</td>
<td>Assumes that close examination of problems reduces stress and that continuous contact with stress source exacerbates problems; directs attention to problems and permits objective analysis; for sustained and positive concentration, sessions should be short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemotherapy</td>
<td>The provision of physical and temporary psychological relief through drug administration.</td>
<td>Assumes regulation of physical reactions reduces effects of stress; affects a reduction in physical reactions to stress; useful in isolated encounters with stress; contraindications and tendency for habituation with some drugs; may not alter negative attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Inoculation Training</td>
<td>Prior training which enables a build-up of resistance to future stress.</td>
<td>Assumes physical and psychological inoculation are analogous and that exposure to less threatening events is beneficial; coping strategies should be flexible; training is directed towards the individual; all relevant information should be utilised;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual analysis: stress management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>Individuals are trained to independently cope with critical situations.</td>
<td>Assumes that with appropriate guidance individuals can independently solve problems; ineffective coping strategies require psychological intervention; increases probability of selecting the most appropriate strategy; some forms of treatment call on modelling procedures; generalisable with some qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instruction</td>
<td>A child-oriented training method directed towards developing thought processes.</td>
<td>Directs individuals on not what but how to think; Noninteractive: tells child how to solve problems. Interactive: progresses through modelling → instructing while child practices → child verbalises in practice without instruction → covert self-instruction. Found useful for improving reading, maths, and writing; generalisable in conjunction with cognitive and behavioural procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Therapy in which encouragement is received by taking credit for achievements.</td>
<td>Assumes that individuals can correctly discern achievements; success noticeable in cases where accumulated knowledge is not applied to new situations; task persistence is improved by changing attributional beliefs; encourages positive control and self-efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete coping</td>
<td>Strategies used by the individual alone.</td>
<td>Two basic groups - direct action and palliative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-action</td>
<td>Strategies which seek to change the source of stress.</td>
<td>Four major types: Avoidance - withdrawal from the stress Aggression - restrict, injure or destroy the source Preparation - principles similar to Stress Inoculation. Apathy - stress source is discounted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual analysis: stress management (contd.).
### Palliative strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Palliative strategies | Strategies which attempt to decrease the effects of stress without removing or altering the source. | Twelve major types:  
  - Repression - exclusion or reduction of painful thoughts.  
  - Detachment - an attempt to disregard feelings.  
  - Sublimation - energies are directed to a simpler problem.  
  - Denial - refusal to believe that the problem exists.  
  - Rationalisation - a lack of perspective in assigning the cause of a problem.  
  - Projection - the exaggerated belief that others originated an individual's feelings.  
  - Reaction formation - effective overt action which contrasts with individual's feelings.  
  - Selective perception - beneficial factors are accepted while possibly harmful elements are ignored.  
  - Identification - assuming characteristics of another individual who is the stress source.  
  - Finding meaning in adversity - ascribing broader and often exalted meanings for problem occurrence.  
  - Dehumanisation - deprivation of human qualities from those whom the individual feels required to subject to difficulty.  
  - Externalisation - the use of a second party to reduce the effects of stress through the aid of discussion. |

### Associated coping skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Associated coping skills | Skills ancillary to clinical or discrete stress management | Three major forms:  
  - Relaxation skills - based on generalisable cues; attempts to reduce anxiety over a problem or parts thereof.  
  - Social skills training - considered to reduce depression caused by a deficiency in social relationships.  
  - Assertiveness training - focuses on coping skills development. |

### Social networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>Social relationships appertinent to an individual.</td>
<td>Provide mental stimulation and a screen to reduce the effects of stress; interactions may be simple or compound, supportive, negative or neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual analysis: stress management (contd.).
Appendix 4
This questionnaire is designed to determine what is stressful for you in your work in school. On the following pages you will be asked to identify and describe several factors that are stressful for you, the approaches you use to deal with stress, and the effectiveness of such approaches. Please describe only one major stress factor on each of the following pages. (It is important that you include enough description for each of the questions asked to present a clear picture of what you mean. You will be asked to describe... work factors that are very stressful for you. Before going on, please respond to the questions below.

Present teaching level:
- elementary
- junior
- middle
- high school

Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

Male
Female

Subject/specialization
Number of years in teaching

FACTOR
1. Identify stress factor:  
Describe fully what the stress factor means to you. Give an example to illustrate what the stress factor means to you.

2. Explain why the stress factor you identified causes you stress:

APPROACHES
3. List and describe the most important typical approaches (if any) you use to deal with stress factor identified above and indicate the degree of effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEELINGS
4. Describe your typical feelings associated with the stress factor:

APPROACHES
5. List and describe the most important approaches (if any) you use to deal with your feelings identified in number 4 and indicate the degree of effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Blase stress inventory
EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STRESS

**DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE the appropriate number or fill in the blank.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which classification best describes your current assignment?</td>
<td>1. Classroom Teacher (K to 12, regular program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classroom Teacher - Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Classroom Teacher - Special assignment (resource room etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Departmental Head or Curriculum Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Specialist (Bureau team staff, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Assistant or Associate Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Other (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the total number of years you have had as an educator including this year?</td>
<td>[Number] years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many years have you been in your current assignment?</td>
<td>[Number] years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approximately how many teachers are in your school? (If not in a school, please indicate N/A)</td>
<td>[Number] teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sex:</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you teaching a split-grade class?</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I don't do any classroom teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is the grade level at which you do most of your work?</td>
<td>1. Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Grades 1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Grades 4 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Grades 7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Grades 10 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which assignment best describes your work? Choose only one.</td>
<td>1. Generalist Teacher (Several subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. English (Language Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Language other than French or English (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Fine Arts (Music, drama, art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Industrial Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Vocational Subjects (other than Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Exceptional Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Other (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is the status of your contract?</td>
<td>1. Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you hold a part time or full time appointment?</td>
<td>1. Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In general, how stressful do you find your work?</td>
<td>1. Not stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mildly stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Moderately stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Considerably stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Very stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Extremely stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. During the past two years, have you experienced stressful situations in your personal life? Rate your personal life stress using the following scale:</td>
<td>1. Not stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mildly stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Moderately stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Considerably stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Very stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Extremely stressful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_A questionnaire on stress_  
(Ratsoy and Friesen, 1985)
For each work-related situation please CIRCLE the appropriate number:

1. in Column A, to indicate **how often** the situation has occurred in your work, and
2. in Column B, to indicate **how stressful** the situation has been for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW OFTEN has this situation occurred for you?</td>
<td>HOW STRESSFUL has this situation been for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NEVER</td>
<td>1. NOT STRESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RARELY</td>
<td>2. MILDLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCCASIONALLY</td>
<td>3. MODERATELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OFTEN</td>
<td>4. CONSIDERABLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>5. VERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. VERY FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>6. EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Accommodating to curriculum changes
2. Implementing programs before training teachers
3. Changing provincial philosophy regarding program
4. Having to work with computers
5. Time spent on paper work
6. Lack of sufficient planning time during the work day
7. Lack of time during the work day to get work done
8. Lack of "breaks" (coffee, lunch, etc.)
9. Lack of support from administrators
10. Inappropriate rewards, e.g. more work for job well done
11. Meeting too many deadlines (short time spans)
12. Competitiveness because of "open boundary" policy
13. Interruptions during work
14. Lock-step pupil promotion practices
15. Job security - surplus, redundancy, transfers
16. The "label" of surplus teacher
17. Lack of direction from district about teacher evaluation procedures
18. Evaluation of your performance
19. Placement in an inappropriate assignment
20. Lack of control over job - no meaningful part in decisions that affect you
21. Lack of appreciation by others for your work
22. Lack of opportunity to interact with peers
23. Lack of communication among staff
24. Lack of opportunity for transfer
25. Limited career advancement opportunities

A questionnaire on stress
(Ratsoy and Friesen, 1985)
## Appendix 4.2

### A questionnaire on stress

*(Ratsoy and Friesen, 1985)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOW OFTEN</strong> has this situation occurred to you?</td>
<td><strong>HOW STRESSFUL</strong> has this situation been for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NEVER</td>
<td>1. NOT STRESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RARELY</td>
<td>2. MILDLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCCASIONALLY</td>
<td>3. MODERATELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OFTEN</td>
<td>4. CONSIDERABLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>5. VERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. VERY FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>6. EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26. Experiencing poor relationships with colleagues | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 27. Working with colleagues felt to be incompetent | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 28. Disagreeing with a supervisor | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 29. Lack of supervisory/consultative support services | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 30. Experiencing interpersonal conflict with a superordinate (administrator) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 31. Deterioration in working conditions | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 32. Having to deal with crises or emergencies (acts of violence, serious accidents, injuries to students etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 33. Problems related to mainstreaming of students with special needs | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 34. Inability to provide help for students who have difficulty in learning | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 35. Lack of resources for handling chronic disciplinary problems | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 36. Lack of material resources (books, supplies, equipment, etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 37. Inadequate facilities (buildings, playgrounds, workrooms etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 38. Noise level on the job | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 39. Extra assignments (coaching, band, yearbook, clubs, etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 40. Resolving time demands of job with time demands of family | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 41. Being required to make role changes (mother, nurse, referee, judge, social worker, father, policeman, etc.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 42. Serving as a role model | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 43. Unlimited expectations for your work | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 44. Implementing policies when in disagreement with them | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 45. Lack of discretionary funds to do your job | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 46. Teachers being criticized publicly | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 47. Unreasonable expectations of parents | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 48. Media treatment of the teaching profession | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 49. Problems associated with declining enrolments | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 50. Lack of support from the profession | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
THE TEACHER BURNOUT SCALE ITEMS

(The numbers preceding the following questionnaire items indicate placement when the instrument is administered.)

I. CAREER SATISFACTION

1. I look forward to teaching in the future.
5. I am glad that I selected teaching as a career.
10. Teaching is more fulfilling than I had expected.
12. If I had to do it all over again, I would not become a schoolteacher.
19. I look forward to each teaching day.

II. PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

3. I get adequate praise from my supervisors for a job well done.
8. I feel that the administrators are willing to help me with my classroom problems, should they arise.
11. I believe that my efforts in the classroom are unappreciated by the administrators.
15. My supervisors give me more criticism than praise.
18. I feel that the administrators will not help me with classroom difficulties.
20. The administration blames me for classroom problems.

III. COPING WITH JOB-RELATED STRESS

2. I feel depressed because of my teaching experiences.
4. The teaching day seems to drag on and on.
7. My physical illnesses may be related to the stress in this job.
9. I find it difficult to calm down after a day of teaching.
13. I feel that I could do a much better job of teaching if only the problems confronting me were not so great.
14. The stresses in this job are more than I can bear.

IV. ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUDENTS

6. The students act like a bunch of animals.
16. Most of my students are decent people.
17. Most students come to school ready to learn.
21. Students come to school with bad attitudes.

The teacher burnout scale
(Seidman and Zager, 1987)
The following section contains 22 statements about job related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling write "0" (zero) in both the "how often" and "how strong" columns before the statement. If you have had this feeling indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Then decide how strong the feeling is when you experience it by writing the number (from 1 to 7) that best describes how strong you feel about it.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN</th>
<th>HOW STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>0 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement: I feel depressed at work

If you never feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) on both lines. If you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1" on the line under the heading "HOW OFTEN". If your feelings of depression are fairly strong, but not as strong as you can imagine, you would write a "5" under the heading "HOW STRONG". If your feelings of depression are very mild, you would write a "1".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>0 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements:

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel used up at the end of the day.
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day.
4. I can easily understand how my subordinates feel about things.
5. I feel I treat some people as if they were impersonal objects.
6. Working with people all day is really a strain on me.
7. I deal very effectively with the problems of others.
8. I feel burned out from my work.
9. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
10. I've become more callous towards people since I took this job.
11. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
12. I feel very energetic.
13. I feel frustrated by my job.
14. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
15. I don't really care what happens to other people.
16. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
17. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere.
18. I feel exhilarated after working closely with other people.
19. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
20. I feel like I'm at the end of my tether.
21. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.
22. I feel others blame me for some of their problems.

The Maslach burnout inventory
**Observation Schedule Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do mechanisms exist for developing data-based school improvement goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there regular meetings to assess school effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is effectiveness discussed regularly in staff meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who leads the discussions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students aware of most school rules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students given material such as grade handbooks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, are these materials discussed in home groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students aware of what is expected of them in each subject?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is application to learning encouraged in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are lessons often interrupted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers work together in subject department teams?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In grade groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other teams:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What leadership style appears to dominate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have enrolments increased relative to the local population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have enrolments decreased relative to the local population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the frequency of student monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what depth are students monitored?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation schedule foundation items - effectiveness.**
**Observation Schedule**

**Efficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is much time wasted during the day due to inefficiencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff □ □ students □ □ punctual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are course sequences and educational objectives across grade levels regularly reviewed to determine compatibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are course sequences and educational objectives across grade levels regularly reviewed to monitor duplication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is teaching to ensure clarification and understanding emphasised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is appropriate use made of physical resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is audiovisual equipment fully utilised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are purposes of staff development stated and readily available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is staff development related to school development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers expected to follow prescribed pedagogy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers/pupils closely supervised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are rules and regulations strictly enforced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school administration give in to teacher pressure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are procedures regularly discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do rules and policies constantly change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there set procedures for reviewing school policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers □ □ pupils □ □ parents □ □ regularly involved in formulating/reviewing policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of budgeting exists in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there set procedures for speaking with superordinates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students regularly and freely approach senior staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are activities well-planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are rules and regulations clear and available to all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are job descriptions set out for most tasks within the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are assigned jobs explained to all who wish to know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is decision making about difficult problems mostly postponed or delayed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a time pressure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do staff freely volunteer for extra responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do most staff voluntarily work after hours when necessary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is staff meeting time formally devoted to curriculum discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do senior staff regularly assist teachers in their teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers receive teaching assistance from their peers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is attention given to advanced technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are community resources regularly utilised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is responsibility regularly and evenly delegated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers □ □ pupils □ □ involved in organising facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills for school leaders:**

To efficiently and accountably allocate human, material and financial resources in:

- a. facilities planning, maintenance, and operation
- b. financial planning and cash flow management
- c. personnel administration
- d. pupil personnel services and categorical programs administration
- e. knowledge of legal concepts, regulations, and codes for school operation
- f. use of analytical techniques and management

Observation schedule foundation items - efficiency.
### OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

**Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is equity the school's highest priority?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does equity receive any significant consideration?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do all students receive similar amounts of attention?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is attention focused on only the “top 15%”?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is teaching aimed at the “middle 65%”?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there instances of special learning situations for the gifted student</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the less able</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or those from a lower socioeconomic group?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What allowances are made for individual learning capacities?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the student council/prefect board given meaningful responsibility?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there occasions where students with special talents are able to demonstrate them to others?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What part do students play in school assemblies or other formal occasions?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there occasions when students are given to feel that they receive negative interaction with staff?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there tangible reinforcement of positive interaction with all students?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is instructional time allocated to curriculum content and to individual students that promote school goals and equity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the tangible signs of motivating students to achieve their best, to explore, &amp; to enlarge understanding?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation schedule foundation items - equity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is time set aside during staff meetings to examine new ways of doing things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do meeting groups vary in number and composition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are groups permanent for ongoing processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are groups temporary for short-term matters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are school goals clear to all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff encouraged to introduce innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are procedures uniform throughout the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do staff discuss weaknesses in their own programmes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are weaknesses of other programmes discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What validation of programme outcomes exists?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accountability a dominant theme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the daily routine take up all of the time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a policy outlining general school development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a policy on staff development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What proportion of time is given to staff input during general staff meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school have a specifically designed unit to develop new practices and projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, does the unit test new practices and projects for feasibility and efficacy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, does the unit diffuse new practices and projects to others parts of the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do staff receive feedback on new developments in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers often try out new ways of teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do staff receive feedback on performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how often is this done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are suggestions made as to how practices can be improved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff informed of other teachers' professional development activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do staff receive feedfoward on projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation schedule foundation items - flexibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the school has a common vision, are there specific references to quality of teaching and learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for making data-based decisions related to educational quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, do provisions exist for ensuring that decisions are implemented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the senior staff involved in planning and interpreting the results of quality-control efforts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has care been taken to ensure that paperwork and non-teaching activity is minimal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school possess constructive and meaningful ways of sharing data on student progress?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teacher assessments consider the monitoring of a broad range of student abilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for monitoring the quality of school improvement and staff development projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of curricula?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of course materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of special programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for monitoring teaching quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for monitoring the quality of teaching-related activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers aware of good performance-assessment practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, do they use this knowledge to assess student performance on a regular basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is anticipated change evaluated in terms of curriculum improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are questions asked about what will be removed from the curriculum if something is added?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is projected change referred to the vision in terms of altering the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has care been taken to establish clear, reasonable and well-publicised school goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has care been taken to establish subject goals that are clear, reasonable and well-publicised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has care been taken to establish clear, reasonable and well-publicised teaching goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observation Schedule: Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers given significant responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can teachers use their own initiative in most instances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to rely on their own judgement when a problem arises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers give much attention to their work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is getting a lot of work done important to staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers criticised over minor lapses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the school atmosphere impersonal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can teachers give frank opinions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are personal problems freely discussed between teacher/teacher pupil/teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior staff/teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do pupils teachers take pride in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they put a lot of effort into what they do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are individuals complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is full and appropriate credit given to teachers pupils contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers eat lunch together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do senior staff encourage criticism of their ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do pupil teachers feel free to ask for assistance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do senior staff stand up for their teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers stand up for their pupils?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are people who differ greatly accepted by others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are people talked about behind their backs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do senior staff talk down to teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers talk down to pupils?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do pupil teachers regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it difficult to get extra work done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers function fairly independently of supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are pupils encouraged to work by themselves?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do others go out of their way to help new teachers/pupils feel comfortable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are people courteous to each other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there positive reinforcement for sociable behaviour?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are bodies such as the Parents &amp; Friends well-supported with high attendance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a school council with community representatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is attention given to recommendations from parents/community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are newsletters etc. sent to parents/community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers encouraged by seniors to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers encouraged by their peers to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What organisation is in place for teachers to express their needs and wishes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What organisation is in place for pupils to express their needs and wishes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation schedule foundation items - support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the school have a vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On what does the vision focus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who introduced the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the vision distinctive to the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision contain a central purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school have a vision of teaching excellence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the daily routine embrace the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the vision discussed by staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the vision discussed by parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the community involved in the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the staff agree with the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do parents and the community agree with the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the present structures and procedures rigid?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision consider different values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision account for different assumptions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision consider different approaches to teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision contain approaches for change management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision contain procedures for change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision allay fear or uncertainty about the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is time given during staff meetings for discussion on the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the principal help staff to find meaning through the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
PLEASE CIRCLE NUMBERS WHERE APPROPRIATE

A What is the total length of your teaching experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 - 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 - 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 7 - 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 11 - 14 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 15 - 20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Over 20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B In which areas of the curriculum are you mostly employed?

1 English/Social Science
2 Maths/Science
3 Languages
4 Home Economics/Manual Arts
5 Fine Arts (Drama, Visual Arts, Music)
6 Physical Education
7 Commercial subjects
8 Library
9 Special Education
10 Other

C Are you employed as:

1 Permanent staff?
2 Temporary staff?
3 Part-time staff?

D Do you hold a promotable position?

1 Yes
2 No

If yes, what is that position?

For how many years have you held that position?

| 1 Less than one year | 1 |
| 2 1 - 3 | 2 |
| 3 4 - 6 | 3 |
| 4 7 - 10 | 4 |
| 5 11 - 14 | 5 |
| 6 15 - 20 | 6 |
| 7 Over 20 years | 7 |

E During the past 12 months, what leave have you taken due to illness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nil/Less than 1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 - 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3 - 5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 6 - 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 More than 10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F What qualification(s) do you hold (e.g. B.A., Dip.Ed., T.T.C.)?

G Do you have any dependent children of your own?

1 No
2 Yes. How many? 

H Your gender?

1 Female
2 Male

I Your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 20 - 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 31 - 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 41 - 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 51+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J During the past two years, have you experienced difficulties such as the death of a family member, marital separation, change in residence, etc?

1 Yes
2 No

If yes, were you:

| 1 Relieved? |
| 2 A little concerned? |
| 3 Somewhat upset? |
| 4 Considerably distressed? |
| 5 Extremely sad or distraught? |

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
ORGANISATION

1.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
- b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
- c. Meeting deadlines
- d. Obtaining teaching materials
- e. Extra duties
- f. Undesirable physical surroundings
- g. Your involvement in staff meetings
- h. Class sizes
- i. Declining student enrolments
- j. Your teaching timetable
- k. Curriculum changes
- l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- m. Conflicting demands from others
- n. Any other organisational difficulties (please specify):

If you circled 1 or 2 or ticked √ for all of the above, turn to page 4.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
1.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest organisational difficulty? (e.g. C)

1.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

1.4 Tick the box(es) [ ] which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.

Do you:

☐ a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
☐ b. steer clear of the problem at all times
☐ c. gather information and plan ways to act
☐ d. completely switch off and do nothing
☐ e. try not to think about it
☐ f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
☐ g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
☐ h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
☐ i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
☐ j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
☐ k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
☐ l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
☐ m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
☐ n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
☐ o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
☐ p. talk the matter over with someone else
☐ q. try to see the funny side of the situation
☐ r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
☐ s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
☐ t. None of the above. What do you do?

1.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 1.4, circle that which you use most e.g. C

1.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
### ADMINISTRATION

2.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Support from those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Your involvement in school budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Introducing innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Learning about students from other staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Any other administration difficulties (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you circled ✅ or ☑️ or ticked ✅ for all of the above, turn to page 6.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
2.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest administration difficulty? □

2.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

2.4 Tick the box(es) which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.
Do you:

- [ ] a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
- [ ] b. steer clear of the problem at all times
- [ ] c. gather information and plan ways to act
- [ ] d. completely switch off and do nothing
- [ ] e. try not to think about it
- [ ] f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
- [ ] g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
- [ ] h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
- [ ] i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
- [ ] j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
- [ ] k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
- [ ] l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
- [ ] m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
- [ ] n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
- [ ] o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
- [ ] p. talk the matter over with someone else
- [ ] q. try to see the funny side of the situation
- [ ] r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
- [ ] s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
- [ ] t. None of the above. What do you do?

2.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 2.4, circle that which you use most e.g. □

2.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM

3.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

- Getting a clear description of school goals
- Getting a clear description of subject goals
- Justifying the program's relevance to students
- Adapting the program to suit students' needs
- Dubious repetition of subjects
- Dubious subject repetition across years
- Set curriculum matching curriculum which is actually taught
- Provision of resources
- Grading of students
- Student report writing
- Responsibility to parents and the community
- Meeting community expectations
- Any other academic program problems (please specify):

If you circled ☐ or ☑ or ticked [✓] for all of the above, turn to page 8.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
3.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest program difficulty? [ ]

3.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g., slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

3.4 Tick the box(es) that describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.

Do you:

- [ ] a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
- [ ] b. steer clear of the problem at all times
- [ ] c. gather information and plan ways to act
- [ ] d. completely switch off and do nothing
- [ ] e. try not to think about it
- [ ] f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
- [ ] g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
- [ ] h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
- [ ] i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
- [ ] j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
- [ ] k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
- [ ] l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
- [ ] m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
- [ ] n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
- [ ] o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
- [ ] p. talk the matter over with someone else
- [ ] q. try to see the funny side of the situation
- [ ] r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
- [ ] s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
- [ ] t. None of the above. What do you do?

3.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 3.4, circle that which you use most e.g. [ ]

3.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
4.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Meeting changing needs of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Consequences of student absences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Students' expectations of your teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Students' academic achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Students' conformity to school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Fulfilling your responsibilities to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Any other student problems (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you circled 0 or 1 or ticked √ for all of the above, turn to page 10.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
4.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest difficulty with students?

4.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

4.4 Tick the box(es) which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.

Do you:

a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
b. steer clear of the problem at all times
c. gather information and plan ways to act
d. completely switch off and do nothing
e. try not to think about it
f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
p. talk the matter over with someone else
q. try to see the funny side of the situation
r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
t. None of the above. What do you do?

4.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 4.4, circle that which you use most e.g.

4.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
5.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Communicating with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Any other parent/teacher difficulties (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you circled 1 or 0 or ticked  V for all of the above, turn to page 12.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
5.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest difficulty with parents?

☐

5.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):


5.4 Tick the box(es) □ which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty. Do you:

□ a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
□ b. steer clear of the problem at all times
□ c. gather information and plan ways to act
□ d. completely switch off and do nothing
□ e. try not to think about it
□ f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
□ g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
□ h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
□ i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
□ j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
□ k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
□ l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
□ m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
□ n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
□ o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
□ p. talk the matter over with someone else
□ q. try to see the funny side of the situation
□ r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
□ s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
□ t. None of the above. What do you do?

5.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 5.4, circle that which you use most e.g. ☐

5.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

[Ineffective, of little use, adequate, mostly effective, highly effective]

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
### TEACHERS

**6.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of cooperation among staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your interaction with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff unsociability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The lack of staff conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Communication deficiencies among staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Disruptive teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other teachers' relationships with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Public criticism of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Any other teacher difficulties (please specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you circled 1 or 0 or ticked √ for all of the above, turn to page 14.*

---

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
6.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest difficulty with teachers? □

6.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g., slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

6.4 Tick the box(es) that which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.
Do you:

☐ a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
☐ b. steer clear of the problem at all times
☐ c. gather information and plan ways to act
☐ d. completely switch off and do nothing
☐ e. try not to think about it
☐ f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
☐ g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
☐ h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
☐ i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
☐ j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
☐ k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
☐ l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
☐ m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
☐ n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
☐ o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
☐ p. talk the matter over with someone else
☐ q. try to see the funny side of the situation
☐ r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
☐ s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
☐ t. None of the above. What do you do?

6.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 6.4, circle that which you use most e.g. ☐

6.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
## PROFESSIONAL STATUS

### 7.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Constantly</th>
<th>Not closely involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of opportunities for staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Disappointment with your own career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Ways in which staff are evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Your conditions of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Your participation in curriculum planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Support from your peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Any other status problems (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you circled Q or Q or ticked [ ] for all of the above, turn to page 16.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
7.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest status difficulty?

7.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

7.4 Tick the box(es) which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.

Do you:

- a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
- b. steer clear of the problem at all times
- c. gather information and plan ways to act
- d. completely switch off and do nothing
- e. try not to think about it
- f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
- g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
- h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
- i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
- j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
- k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
- l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
- m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
- n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
- o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
- p. talk the matter over with someone else
- q. try to see the funny side of the situation
- r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
- s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
- t. None of the above. What do you do?

7.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 7.4, circle that which you use most e.g. m

7.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is:

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
8.1 Do you experience any personal difficulty (such as awkwardness, hardship, embarrassment, distress, or strain) with:

- a. Conflict between your needs and the profession
- b. Conflicts between your values & values taught
- c. Students' attitudes towards you
- d. Parents' attitudes towards you
- e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
- f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
- g. Keeping up with new developments
- h. The amount of work you are required to do
- i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
- j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
- k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching
- l. Any other personal (occupational) problems (please specify):

If you circled 1 or 2 or ticked [✓] for all of the above, turn to page 18.

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
8.2 Which question on the previous page refers to your greatest personal difficulty? □

8.3 Briefly describe your feelings about the difficulty (e.g. slight annoyance, some resentment, considerable frustration, extreme distress):

8.4 Tick the box(es) ✓ which describe what you do when you encounter the difficulty.
Do you:

☐ a. aggressively attack the source of the problem.
☐ b. steer clear of the problem at all times
☐ c. gather information and plan ways to act
☐ d. completely switch off and do nothing
☐ e. try not to think about it
☐ f. try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
☐ g. abandon it to tackle some easier problem
☐ h. attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty
☐ i. accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people
☐ j. try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty
☐ k. attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you
☐ l. act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature
☐ m. seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others
☐ n. avoid sympathy or empathy with people influenced by your necessary actions
☐ o. quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
☐ p. talk the matter over with someone else
☐ q. try to see the funny side of the situation
☐ r. console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.
☐ s. take your frustrations out on some other person or object
☐ t. None of the above. What do you do?

8.5 If you ticked more than one strategy in 8.4, circle that which you use most e.g. (i) 

8.6 In most instances, the strategy you use to control your feelings is: 

The teacher stress coping strategies questionnaire.
9.  
a. Having given your time in answering this questionnaire, are there any particular 
details about this research that you would like to receive?

b. What information about aggregated results would you like the school to receive?

THANKYOU FOR 
ANSWERING THIS 
QUESTIONNAIRE

THE TIME YOU HAVE GIVEN TO 
THIS RESEARCH IS APpreciated.
STUDENTS' INTERVIEW ITEMS

What can you tell me about the goals of this school?
Do you know most of the school rules?
Do you receive student handbooks?
    Grade handbooks?
Are you aware of the requirements in all your subjects?
Are you encouraged to learn?
    If yes, who encourages? How?
Are lessons often interrupted?
How often do you have tests?
    In all subjects?
What do you think of this school?
Does it really matter if you are late for school?
What happens if somebody does something which is really wrong?
Do students look after school buildings?
    To classrooms?
Is everyone treated equally?
Do all students receive the same amount of attention from teachers?
Are there classes for very bright students?
Does the school student council/board have any real influence in the school?
What part do students play in assemblies?
Are there any times when you feel that teachers don't really care about you?
Do you think that teachers give a lot of attention to their work?
Do you feel that you really belong to this place?
    Is it like a second home?
Do you feel free to approach teachers about any personal problems that you may have?
Do you take pride in the school?
    Is it something really big in your life?
When you do something that is really outstanding, do you always receive some form of recognition?
    What is that recognition?
Are there times when you feel that teachers "talk down" to you?
Do students regularly volunteer to do things?
Are pupils encouraged to work by themselves?
Do people go out of their way to help new pupils feel comfortable?
Are newsletters sent out to parents?
    Do parents always get them?
What organisation is in place for students to express their needs and wishes?
Do you waste a lot of time during the day?
Are lessons often interrupted?
Do teachers keep a close watch kept on you?
Are rules and regulations strictly enforced?
Do students regularly and freely approach senior staff?
    Assistant principal(s)?
    The principal?
Are students regularly involved in organising facilities?
    What facilities?
Do any students in this class have work pinned up on boards?
    How many students?
Do any of you perform in assemblies?
    What do you do?
TEACHERS' INTERVIEW ITEMS

What, in your opinion, is the most outstanding educational feature of this school?
Do you think that this school leads all others in any specific field?
   If yes: What is that field?
Is significant responsibility and authority delegated to all teachers?
Is getting a lot of work done important to teachers?
Do teachers regularly volunteer to do things?
   What sorts of things?
Are teachers complimented when they do something well?
   By whom are they complimented?
   How is this done?
Do senior staff encourage criticism of their ideas?
Can teachers give frank opinions?
Are problems freely discussed between teachers?
Are problems freely discussed between teachers and senior staff, V.Ps. or Principal?
Do pupils freely approach teachers about their personal problems?
Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?
   What is the encouragement?
What aspect of your work causes you the most distress, awkwardness or mental strain?
What effect does this difficulty have on you?
Do you talk with any other person about this difficulty?
   At most times, with whom do you talk?
How do you handle the difficulty?
Do administration staff try to reduce the number of difficulties you face?
   How do they do this?
   Are their efforts successful in most instances?

Items contained in the teachers' interview schedule.
Assistant Principals' Interview Items

What is the most outstanding educational feature of this school?
Do you think that this school leads all others in any specific field?
   If yes: What is that field?
Do teachers work together in various teams?
   Do these teams vary in size?
   What are the various jobs done by the teams?
Is there a written policy on staff development?
Are staff encouraged to participate in professional development?
   What is the encouragement?
Are other staff informed of an individual's participation in professional development activities?
   How is this done?
On return from professional development activity, does the teacher report to all staff about the activity?
   Is the report presented during staff meetings?
Do provisions exist for monitoring the quality of staff development courses?
   What are the provisions?
Is staff development related to school development?
   How is it related?
Are staff presented with opportunities to undertake tasks according to their interests?
   How are staff allocated to extra duties?
Are staff consulted about their timetable allocation?
   When is this done?
Do provisions exist for monitoring the quality of school improvement efforts?
   What are the provisions?
Do teachers often try out new ways of teaching?
   Are teachers expected to follow set patterns of teaching practice?
Has consideration been given to reducing teachers’ paperwork?
Do staff discuss weaknesses in their own programs?
   Are weaknesses of other programs discussed?
Does the daily routine appear to take up all of your time?
Has a system been developed to share data on student progress?
   What is that system?
Are job descriptions stipulated for most tasks within the school?
   Are assigned jobs explained to all who wish to know?
Do staff freely volunteer for extra responsibilities?
Do most staff voluntarily work after hours when necessary?
Is time during staff meetings formally devoted to curriculum discussion?
Is significant responsibility and authority delegated to all teachers?
   How is it delegated?
Do teachers give much attention to their work?
Is getting a lot of work done important to staff?
Is full credit given to staff for their contributions?
Are teachers complimented when they do something well?
   How is this done?
Do you encourage staff to criticise your ideas?
Can teachers give frank opinions?
Are problems freely discussed between teachers?
Are problems freely discussed between teachers and senior staff?
What part do students play in school assemblies or similar occasions?
Is the student council/prefect board given significant responsibility?
   What responsibilities are they given?
Do pupils freely approach teachers about their personal problems?
What aspect of your work causes you the most distress, awkwardness or mental strain?
What effect does this difficulty have on you?
Do you talk with any other person about this difficulty?
   If yes: At most times, with whom?
How do you handle the difficulty?
Do you consciously try to reduce the number of difficulties which staff face?
   How do you do this?
   Are your efforts successful in most instances?

Items contained in the assistant principals' interview schedule.
**Principal's Interview Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the most outstanding educational feature of this school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that this school leads all others in any specific field?</td>
<td>If yes: What is that field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is effectiveness (i.e. achieving school goals) discussed with staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all staff involved in the discussion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is effectiveness discussed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are regular meetings held to discuss school goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a mechanism for developing data-based improvement goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the mechanism?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a regular time in staff meetings devoted to discussing new ways of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What procedure is in place for informing students of school rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a student handbook which informs students of school goals,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules, subject details etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers systematically examine these handbooks with students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff rewarded for innovation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the reward?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accountability to pupils/parents/community a matter which over-arches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other aspects of the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What feedback do staff receive on new developments in the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a staff group which develops new practices/projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the group test new practices/projects for feasibility and efficacy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the group diffuse the practices/projects to other staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school have a vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it in written form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision contain a central purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision contain approaches for change management?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision refer to the quality of teaching and learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the vision consider different values?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is projected change referred to the vision in terms of altering the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who introduced the vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the vision discussed by staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the vision discussed by parents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the community involved in the vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do parents and the community agree with the vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a regular time in staff meetings to discuss the vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there specific quality control mechanisms in the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are these mechanisms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning and interpreting the results of quality-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control efforts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of curricula? What are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the provisions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of course materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of special programs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do they entail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do provisions exist for monitoring the quality of instruction and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction-related activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is projected change evaluated in terms of curriculum improvement? How</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is this done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers/pupils/parents have input in formulating/reviewing school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What organisations are there which comprise, in part, people external</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the school (e.g. Parents and Friends)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is significant responsibility and authority delegated to all teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are they delegated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is getting a lot of work done important to teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well? What form does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it take?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you encourage criticism of your ideas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can teachers give frank opinions? When?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are problems freely discussed with teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspect of your work causes you the most distress, awkwardness or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental strain?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What effect does this difficulty have on you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you talk with any other person about this difficulty? If yes: At</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most times, with whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you handle the difficulty?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the V.Ps. and you consciously try to reduce the difficulties which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff face?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you do this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your efforts successful in most instances?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items within the principals' interview schedule.*
### EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong educational leadership</td>
<td>Are regular meetings held to discuss school effectiveness?</td>
<td>Is effectiveness discussed with staff?</td>
<td>Dubious subject repetition across years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who leads the discussions?</td>
<td>Are all staff involved in the discussion?</td>
<td>Dubious repetition across subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What leadership style appears to dominate?</td>
<td>Are staff presented with opportunities to undertake tasks according to their interests?</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, understood and accepted goals.</td>
<td>Have enrolments increased/decreased relative to the local population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are students/staff/parents/community informed about the school's goals?</td>
<td>Are regular meetings held to discuss school goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are students given materials such as grade handbooks?</td>
<td>Is there a student handbook which informs students of school goals, rules, subject details, etc?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are handbooks discussed in home groups?</td>
<td>Do teachers systematically examine these handbooks with students? When is this done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do mechanisms exist for developing data-based school improvement goals?</td>
<td>Is there a mechanism for developing data-based improvement goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are effective individual programs discussed?</td>
<td>How are staff allocated to extra duties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matching staff with position.</td>
<td>Are staff consulted about their allocation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility to parents and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents lack of familiarity with school goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting a clear description of subject goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting a clear description of school goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EFFECTIVENESS (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff work as a team.</td>
<td>Do teachers work together in teams?</td>
<td>Do teachers work together in various teams? Do these teams vary in size? What are the various jobs done by the teams?</td>
<td>Your involvement in staff meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations of students.</td>
<td>Are students aware of what is expected of them in each subject?</td>
<td>Does it matter if you are late to school or to class? Do students look after the school buildings and equipment?</td>
<td>Consequences of student absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent monitoring of achievement.</td>
<td>How often are reports on students’ achievements sent to parents? To what depth are students monitored?</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance. Students’ academic achievements. Grading of students. Meeting community expectations. Student report writing.</td>
<td>The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAMPLE VARIABLES
- Staff work as a team.
- A climate conducive to learning and teaching.
- High expectations of students.
- Frequent monitoring of achievement.

### OBSERVATION SCHEDULE
- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Students

### INTERVIEWS
- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Students

### QUESTIONNAIRE
- Your involvement in staff meetings.
- Interventions to the teaching timetable.
- Consequences of student absences.
- Finding time to give individual assistance.
- Students’ academic achievements.
- Grading of students.
- Meeting community expectations.
- Student report writing.
- The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on performance.
### EFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determined by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. financial expenditure</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Do you waste a lot of time during the day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is appropriate use made of physical resources? Is audio-visual equipment fully utilised?</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership skills - facilities planning, maintenance, and operation; - financial planning and cash flow management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What type of budgeting exists in the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. time on task</td>
<td>Is time wasted due to inefficiencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are staff and students punctual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a time pressure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. effort expended</td>
<td>Does the school administration give in to teacher pressure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. participant's ability</td>
<td>Are activities well planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership skills - personnel administration; - knowledge of legal concepts, regulations, and codes for school operation; - use of analytical techniques and management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is attention given to advanced technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to quality of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Are course sequences and instructional objectives across grade levels regularly reviewed to determine compatibility and to monitor duplication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do senior staff regularly assist teachers in their teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers receive teaching assistance from their peers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtaining teaching materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your involvement in school budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interruptions to the teaching timetable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The staff's reluctance to being accountable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes of seniors towards you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility to parents and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dubious subject repetition across years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff unsociability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE VARIABLES</td>
<td>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis begins at association between student, teacher and subject.</td>
<td>Is teaching to ensure clarification and understanding emphasised? Are purposes of staff development stated and accessible. Is staff development related to school development? Are teachers/students involved in organising facilities?</td>
<td>Is time during staff meetings formally devoted to curriculum discussion?</td>
<td>Set curriculum matching curriculum taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses effort on important goals.</td>
<td>Is decision making about difficult problems mostly postponed or delayed? Leadership skill - pupil personnel services and categorical programs administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other teachers' relationships with pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is staff meeting time formally devoted to curriculum discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are community resources regularly utilised?</td>
<td>What organisations exist which comprise, in part, people external to the school (e.g. Parents and Friends)?</td>
<td>Participating in decisions affecting the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides job satisfaction.</td>
<td>Do staff freely volunteer for extra responsibilities. Do most staff voluntarily work after hours when necessary?</td>
<td>Do staff freely volunteer for extra responsibilities. Do most staff voluntarily work after hours when necessary?</td>
<td>Your participation in curriculum planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are teachers expected to follow prescribed pedagogy? Are procedures regularly discussed?</td>
<td>Are teachers expected to follow set patterns of pedagogy?</td>
<td>Your involvement in staff meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with: a. greater formalisation</td>
<td>Are there set procedures for reviewing school policies?</td>
<td>Do teachers/pupils/parents have input in formulating/reviewing school policies?</td>
<td>The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE VARIABLES</td>
<td>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers/pupils/parents regularly involved in formulating/reviewing policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are rules and regulations clear and available to all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do rules and policies constantly change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are job descriptions set out for most tasks within the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are assigned jobs explained to all who wish to know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there set procedures for speaking with superordinates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students regularly and freely approach senior staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are rules and regulations strictly enforced? Do rules and policies constantly change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a close watch kept on pupils/teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is responsibility regularly and evenly delegated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. centralisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. stratification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. lower complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE VARIABLES</td>
<td>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of individual differences.</td>
<td>Does equity receive any significant consideration?</td>
<td>Assistant Principal Students</td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do all students receive similar amounts of attention?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicting demands from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of individual capabilities.</td>
<td>Are there instances of special learning situations for the gifted student, the less able, or those from a lower socioeconomic group?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting changing needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What allowances are made for individual learning capacities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there occasions where students with special talents are able to demonstrate them to others?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfilling your responsibilities to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is attention focused on only the &quot;top 15%&quot;?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your conditions of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is teaching aimed at the &quot;middle 65%&quot;?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your involvement in school budgeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance motivation.</td>
<td>Is the student council/prefect board given meaningful responsibility?</td>
<td>Does the student council/prefect board (or other group) have any real influence in the school?</td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of equity with achievement.</td>
<td>Is equity the school's highest priority?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions conducive to exploration, creativity, and understanding.</td>
<td>What part do students play in school assemblies or other formal occasions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of opportunities for staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between teacher and learner.</td>
<td>Is there tangible reinforcement of positive interaction with all students?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointment with your own career advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there occasions when students are given to feel that they receive negative interaction with staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your peers' attitudes towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of commitment to learning.</td>
<td>Is time allocated to an examination of curriculum content and its relationships with students in ways that promote school goals and equity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the tangible signs of motivating students to achieve their best, to explore, and to enlarge understanding?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students' expectations of your teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is everyone treated equally?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there classes for very bright students and for those who have trouble keeping up?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What part do students play in assemblies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support from your peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE VARIABLES</td>
<td>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change should not be seen as a threat - defensiveness must be acknowledged.</td>
<td>Is accountability a dominant theme?</td>
<td>Is accountability to pupils/parents/community a matter which overrides all other aspects of the school?</td>
<td>The issue of whether or not parents should be involved in administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly related to quality and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Do staff discuss weaknesses in their own programs? Are weaknesses of other programs discussed?</td>
<td>Do staff discuss weaknesses in their own programs? Are weaknesses of other programs discussed?</td>
<td>Communicating with parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All who will be affected by change should be involved in discussion and implementaction.</td>
<td>Are suggestions made as to how practices can be improved? Do teachers often try out new ways of teaching?</td>
<td>Do teachers often try out new ways of teaching?</td>
<td>Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires active formal and informal discussion groups of a size in which consensus may be readily obtainable.</td>
<td>Are school goals clear to all? Is there a policy outlining general school development? Is there a policy on staff development?</td>
<td>Are school goals clear to all? Is there a policy outlining general school development? Is there a written policy on staff development?</td>
<td>Opportunities for expressing opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is time set aside during staff meetings to examine new ways of doing things? Do staff receive feedback on projects? Do meeting groups vary in number and composition? Are groups temporary for short-term matters? Are groups permanent for on-going processes?</td>
<td>Is time during staff meetings regularly devoted to discussing new ways of doing things?</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What proportion of time is given to staff input during general staff meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your peers' attitudes towards you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justifying the program's relevance to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your interaction with staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FLEXIBILITY (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff development concerns changes in attitudes, behaviour, knowledge and understanding.</td>
<td>Do staff receive feedback on new developments within the school?</td>
<td>What feedback do staff receive on new developments within the school?</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change must be planned with a clear rationale.</td>
<td>Do staff receive feedback on performance? How often is this done?</td>
<td>Are other staff informed of an individual's participation in professional development activities? On return from an activity, does the teacher report to all staff about the activity?</td>
<td>Lack of opportunities for staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal should take an active role in program initiation, guidance, and support.</td>
<td>Are staff informed of other teachers' professional development activities?</td>
<td>Are procedures uniform throughout the school?</td>
<td>Disruptive teacher transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are procedures uniform throughout the school?</td>
<td>What validation of program outcomes exists?</td>
<td>Your participation in curriculum planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What validation of program outcomes exists?</td>
<td>Is there a staff group which develops new practices and projects, tests them for feasibility and efficacy, and diffuses them to other staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a staff group which develops new practices and projects, tests them for feasibility and efficacy, and diffuses them to other staff?</td>
<td>Does the school have a specifically designed unit to develop new practices and projects? Does the unit test new practices for feasibility and efficacy? Does the unit diffuse new practices and projects to other parts of the school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the school have a specifically designed unit to develop new practices and projects? Does the unit test new practices for feasibility and efficacy? Does the unit diffuse new practices and projects to other parts of the school?</td>
<td>Are staff encouraged to introduce innovation?</td>
<td>Introducing innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are staff encouraged to introduce innovation?</td>
<td>Are staff rewarded for innovation? What is the reward?</td>
<td>Lack of recognition for the work you do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are staff rewarded for innovation? What is the reward?</td>
<td>Does the daily routine take up all the time?</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the daily routine take up all the time?</td>
<td>Does the daily routine appear to take up all of your time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions across instruments
## QUALITY CONTROL

### SAMPLE VARIABLES
- Quality is determined by educational aims, curriculum definition, and evaluation criteria which is ultimately decided by the school's vision.

### OBSERVATION SCHEDULE
- Does the school have a common vision? Does the vision contain specific references to the quality of teaching and learning?
- Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of curricula, special programs, course materials, and the quality of education and related activities?
- Is projected change referred to the vision in terms of altering the vision?
- Has care been taken to establish school and educational goals that are clear, reasonable, and well-publicised?
- Does the school possess constructive and meaningful ways of sharing data on student progress?
- Are teachers aware of good performance-assessment practices? Do they use this knowledge to assess student performance on a regular basis?

### INTERVIEWS
- **Principal**
  - Do provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of curricula, course materials, and the quality of education and related activities? Who are involved?
  - Are there specific quality-control mechanisms in the school? What are these mechanisms?
  - Is anticipated change evaluated in terms of curriculum improvement?
  - Are questions asked about what will be removed from the curriculum if something is added?

- **Assistant Principal**
  - Has a system been developed to share data on student progress? What is that system?
  - Are provisions exist for monitoring the quality of school improvement efforts?
  - Is staff development related to school improvement? How is it related?
  - Is anticipated change evaluated in terms of curriculum improvement?
  - Are you involved in planning and interpreting the results of quality-control efforts?

### QUESTIONNAIRE
- Provision of resources.
- Keeping up with new developments.
- Knowledge of procedures.
- Student report writing.
- Expectations of those in more senior positions.
- Attitudes of seniors towards you.
- Conflicts between your values and values taught.
- Class sizes.
- Support from those in more senior positions.
- Lack of opportunities for staff development.
- Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching.
- The amount of work that you are required to do. The amount of paperwork you have to do.
- Participating in decisions affecting the school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratifies dependency needs.</td>
<td>Do senior staff stand up for their teachers?</td>
<td>Are there times when you feel that teachers talk down to you?</td>
<td>Learning about students from other staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers stand up for their pupils?</td>
<td>What organisation is in place for students to express their needs and wishes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What organisation is in place for teachers/pupils to express their needs and wishes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers function fairly independently of supervisors?</td>
<td>Is significant responsibility and authority delegated to all teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are pupils encouraged to work by themselves?</td>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td>Are pupils encouraged to work by themselves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides incentives for attaining effectiveness</td>
<td>Are teachers given significant responsibilities?</td>
<td>Is significant responsibility and authority delegated to all teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can teachers use their own initiative in most instances?</td>
<td>Are staff encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to rely on their own judgement when a problem arises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is getting a lot of work done important to staff?</td>
<td>Is getting a lot of work done important to staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do pupils and teachers volunteer to do things?</td>
<td>Do teachers regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it difficult to get extra work done?</td>
<td>Do teachers regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes feedback.</td>
<td>Can teachers give frank opinions?</td>
<td>Do students regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can teachers give frank opinions?</td>
<td>Do students regularly volunteer to do things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a school council with community representatives?</td>
<td>Do teachers give a lot of attention to their work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is attention given to recommendations from parents/community?</td>
<td>Are teachers encouraged to undertake professional development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPPORT (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE VARIABLES</th>
<th>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives credit when well done</td>
<td>Are individuals complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td>When you do something that is really outstanding, do you always receive some form of recognition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages affiliation</td>
<td>Is full credit given to staff and pupils for their contributions?</td>
<td>Is full credit given to staff for their contributions?</td>
<td>Do you feel that you really belong to this place? Do you take pride in the school? Is it something really big in your life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked with school climate and thus with personal relationships</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td>Students' conformity to school rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the school atmosphere impersonal?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers and pupils take pride in the school? Is a lot of effort put into what they do?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do others go out of their way to help new teachers or pupils feel comfortable?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are bodies such as the Parents and Friends well-supported with high attendance?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are newsletters etc. sent to parents and the community?</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers give much attention to their work.</td>
<td>Are teachers complimented when they do something well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are personal problems freely discussed between teacher/teacher, pupil/teacher, senior staff/teacher?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed with teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do teachers eat lunch together?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do senior staff encourage criticism of their ideas?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do senior staff talk down to teachers? Do teachers talk down to pupils?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are people who differ greatly accepted by others?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are people courteous to each other?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are teachers criticized over minor lapses? Do pupils and teachers feel free to ask for assistance? Are people talked about behind their backs? Is there positive reinforcement of sociable behaviour?</td>
<td>Are problems freely discussed between teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When you do something that is really outstanding, do you always receive some form of recognition?</td>
<td>Do you feel that you really belong to this place? Do you take pride in the school? Is it something really big in your life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE VARIABLES</td>
<td>OBSERVATION SCHEDULE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded on meanings of human life.</td>
<td>Does the vision consider different values?</td>
<td>Does the vision consider different values?</td>
<td>Conflicts between your values and values taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess characteristics of practicability</td>
<td>Do staff/parents/community agree with the vision?</td>
<td>Do staff/parents/community agree with the vision?</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and communicability</td>
<td>Does the vision consider different approaches to teaching?</td>
<td>Does the vision refer to the quality of teaching and learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be composed, shared and owned by</td>
<td>Who introduced the vision?</td>
<td>Who introduced the vision?</td>
<td>Curriculum changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community.</td>
<td>Was the vision discussed by staff, parents and the community?</td>
<td>Was the vision discussed by staff, parents and the community?</td>
<td>Extra duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for successful change.</td>
<td>Does the vision contain approaches for change management?</td>
<td>Does the vision contain approaches for change management?</td>
<td>Declining student enrolments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encompasses the change process.</td>
<td>Does the vision contain procedures for change?</td>
<td>Is projected change referred to the vision in terms of altering the vision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete to the environment to which it</td>
<td>Does the school have a vision? Is the vision distinctive to the school?</td>
<td>Does the school have a vision? Is it in written form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies.</td>
<td>Does the vision allay fear or uncertainty about the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognises external influences.</td>
<td>Does the principal help staff to find meaning through the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases effectiveness through</td>
<td>Are the present structures and procedures rigid?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspiration.</td>
<td>Does the vision contain a central purpose?</td>
<td>Does the vision contain a central purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances flexibility by creating</td>
<td>Does the school have a vision of teaching excellence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiasm and increasing initiative.</td>
<td>Is time regularly devoted in staff meetings to discussion of the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a sense of purpose.</td>
<td>To what extent does the daily routine embrace the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is necessary for reflection.</td>
<td>Do any students in this class have work pinned up on boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational structures should be</td>
<td>Do any of you perform in assemblies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen as alterable.</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtaining teaching materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors leading to successful institutionalisation (after Miles, 1987)

Key:
- Observed causal relationships
- Hypothesised causal relationships

School autonomy

Staff cohesiveness

Leadership

Control over resources

Control over staffing

"Vision"

Evolutionary program development

Staff willingness/initiative

External networks

"Good implementation"

Organisational change

Coping

Institutionalisation

Rewards for staff

Power sharing

Good program/fit
EFFECTIVENESS

Mechanisms exist for developing data-based school improvement goals.
School effectiveness is assessed at staff meetings.
Effective individual programmes are discussed with considerable input by staff.
Students, staff, parents and the community are informed about school goals.
Students are aware of most school rules.
Students are given material such as grade handbooks.
Most students appear to be aware of what is expected of them in each subject.
Application to learning is encouraged in the school.
Interuption to lessons is infrequent.
Teachers work together as teams in subject departments, in grade groups and in other groups.
Enrolments are affected by some students bypassing the school to attend other schools.
Students' achievements are frequently monitored and reported.

Academic achievement:
- Basic skills achievement: Average
- Problem-solving proficiency: Average
- Life role proficiency: Average
- General intellectual attainments: A lower proportion of students at the 'old L III with balance at L II.
- Achievement in specific content areas: Average
- Term and year-end test results: Average
- Awards from external sources: High
- Community involvement: Generalised competence: Average

Student attitudes:
- Self-concept: Average
- Attitudes toward school: Average
- Independence/locus of control: External - teacher directed
- Social behaviour:
  - Attendance: Lower than normal
  - Tardiness: Low
  - Cumulative dropout rate: Average
  - Code of conduct violations: Average
  - Vandalism: Appears low

EFFICIENCY

Time is not wasted during the day due to gross inefficiencies.
Staff and students are punctual.
Course sequences and educational objectives across grade levels are regularly reviewed to determine compatibility and to monitor duplication.
Teaching to ensure clarification and understanding is emphasised.
Appropriate use is made of physical resources.

Purpose of staff development are stated and readily available.
Staff development is related to school development.
Teachers are not expected to follow set pedagogy.
Teachers and students are given considerable freedom.
The school administration staff are prepared to listen to, and act on, the recommendations of teachers.
Procedures are regularly discussed.
Rules and policies are fairly stable.

There are set procedures for reviewing school policies.

Teachers, pupils, parents are regularly involved in formulating, reviewing policy.
There are no set procedures for consulting superordinates. Students and teachers regularly and freely approach senior staff.

There is a concentration on sound planning of activities.
Rules and regulations are clear and available to all.
Job descriptions are set out for most tasks within the school.
Assign jobs are explained to all who wish to know.
Decision making about difficult problems is willingly tackled.
Staff freely volunteer for extra responsibilities despite various time pressures.

Most staff voluntarily work after hours when necessary.
Time during subject staff meetings is formally devoted to curriculum discussion.
Senior staff assist teachers in their classroom teaching. Teachers also receive assistance from their peers.
Attention is given to advanced technology. The general office is well-equipped with computers and the Commerce department is a model for others.
Community resources are regularly utilised.

Teachers and students are involved in organising facilities.
FLEXIBILITY

Time during staff meetings is sometimes devoted to examining new ways of doing things. Meeting groups vary in number and composition.

Groups are permanent for ongoing processes and temporary for short-term matters.

School goals appear to be clear to all.

Staff are encouraged to introduce innovation.

Procedures are mostly uniform throughout the school.

Weaknesses of some teaching programs are discussed, usually on an informal basis.

Validation of program outcomes exist. This usually takes the form of subject and other committee meetings, and students' results

Accountability to students, parents, and the community is considered a dominant factor.

Well-documented policies exist for school development.

Considerable time is given for staff input during general staff meetings.

The daily routine does not appear to take up all the time.

The school has specifically designed units which develop new practices and projects. The units test new practices and projects for feasibility and efficacy. The units also diffuse new practices and projects to other parts of the school.

Staff receive feedback on new developments in the school.

Teachers often try out new ways of teaching.

Suggestions for improvement of practices are well-received.

Staff are informed of other teachers' professional development activities.

Staff receive feedfoward on projects.

EQUITY

Equity receives significant consideration.

All students receive similar amounts of attention. However, teaching tends to aim at the "middle 65%".

There instances of special learning situations for the gifted student, the less able and those from a lower socioeconomic group.

Allowances are made for individual learning capacities:

The prefect board and student council are given meaningful responsibility.

There are occasions when students with special talents are able to demonstrate them to others.

Students have a high profile in school assemblies & other formal occasions.

Occasions when students are given to feel that they receive negative interaction with staff occur when necessary disciplinary action is taken.

There is tangible reinforcement of positive interaction with all students.

Teaching time is allocated to curriculum content and to individual students that promote school goals and equity.

There are tangible signs of motivating students to achieve their best, to explore, and to enlarge understanding. These include classroom displays, many examples of students' art work posted in public places, and numerous photographs of past and present students and events.
QUALITY CONTROL

Provisions exist for making data-based decisions related to the quality of education and for ensuring that decisions are implemented.

The senior staff is involved in planning and interpreting the results of quality-control efforts.

Care has been taken to reduce paperwork and non-instructional activity.

The school possesses constructive and meaningful ways of sharing data on student progress.

Teacher assessments consider the monitoring of a broad range of student abilities.

Provisions exist for the periodic evaluation of curricula, course materials and special programs.

Provisions exist for monitoring the quality of teaching and related activities.

Teachers are aware of good performance-assessment practices and use this knowledge to assess student performance on a regular basis.

Anticipated change is evaluated in terms of curriculum improvement.

Projected change is referred to the vision in terms of altering the vision.

Care has been taken to establish school goals and instructional goals that are clear, reasonable, and well-publicised.

SUPPORT

Teachers are given significant responsibilities in administration. However, the Common Administrative Structure appears to have limited individual initiative. Teachers are encouraged to rely on their own judgement when a problem arises.

Teachers give close attention to their work.

Getting a lot of work done is important to staff. This applies to their lesson preparation, student assessment and the quality of students' and their own work.

Teachers are not criticised over minor lapses.

The school atmosphere is not impersonal and, on the whole, students appear quite friendly towards staff and each other.

Teachers can give frank opinions.

Personal problems are freely discussed between teacher/teacher, pupil/teacher and between principal/assistant principal/teacher.

Teachers take pride in the school and put a lot of effort into what they do.

Individual teachers and students are often publicly complimented when they do something well. Full credit is given to staff and pupils for their contributions.

Teachers frequently socialise.

Senior staff are generally receptive to the opinions of others.

Pupils and teachers feel free to ask for assistance.

Senior staff stand up for their teachers.

Teachers stand up for their pupils.

People are not talked about behind their backs.

Senior staff do not talk down to teachers; nor do teachers talk down to students.

Pupils and teachers regularly volunteer to do things.

On most occasions, it is not difficult to get extra work done.

Teachers function fairly independently of supervisors.

Pupils are sometimes encouraged to work by themselves.

Others go out of their way to help new teachers or pupils feel comfortable.

People are courteous to each other, particularly in students' relationships with adults.

There is positive reinforcement of sociable behaviour.

Bodies such as the Parents & Friends are well-supported.

Attention is given to recommendations from parents and the community.

Newsletters etc. are sent to parents and the community.

Teachers are not discouraged by others in undertaking professional development.

Organisations are in place for teachers and students to express their needs and wishes.
The school has a common vision which is distinctive to the school.
The vision contains a central purpose which is considered as the provision of the best possible education for all students.
The school has a vision of teaching excellence.
The vision is embraced by the daily routine.
The vision was and is discussed by staff.
The vision was also discussed by parents and the community.
The staff, parents, and the community appear to agree with the vision.
The vision considers different values, accounts for different assumptions, and contains approaches to change where it directly affects students.
The present structures and procedures are not rigid.
The vision appears to allay fear or uncertainty about the future.
Time is given during staff meetings for discussion of the vision. However, this is not necessarily on a regular basis.
The principal helps staff to find meaning through his own vision which is an extension of that which has been adopted by the school.
## Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Nairn</th>
<th>Newtyle</th>
<th>Portsree</th>
<th>Rassey</th>
<th>Reay</th>
<th>Rona</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement mechanisms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness assessment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program discussion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion leader</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/rules awareness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook availability</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook discussion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/subject awareness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to learning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption to lessons</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability of team sizes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership style</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment stability</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring frequency</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring depth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual attainment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific content</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured performance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term/year end test</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External awards</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalised competence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to school</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-out rate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct violations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| + = Operational               | F = Full range               | PC = Principal controlled |
| - = Irregular or non-existent | H = High                     | PS = Principal and Senior Staff |
| Key:                          | I = Internal (student)       | T = Teacher               |
| A = Average                   | Au = Authoritarian           | D = Democratic             |
| L = Low                       | V = Variable                 |

Outline of schools' effectiveness.
### Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Nairst</th>
<th>Newport</th>
<th>Rassay</th>
<th>Reay</th>
<th>Rona</th>
<th>Wvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time wasted</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher punctuality</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil punctuality</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. compatibility review</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. duplication review</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear/understood teaching</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of resources</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.V. usage</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Staff Devt.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related staff/school dev.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed pedagogy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher supervision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil supervision</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules enforcement</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. staff flexibility</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of procedures</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy inconsistency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery in place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher involvement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of budgeting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching seniors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil attitudes to heads</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities planning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules clear and available</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs explanation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postponed decision making</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time pressure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff volunteering</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-hours work</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal curr. discussion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors assisting teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers assisting teachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to technology</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of community resources</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular/even delegation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities involv. - tchrs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities involv. - pupils</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- `+` = Operational  
- `-` = Irregular or non-existent  
- `A` = Average  
- `E` = Example set by staff  
- `F` = Function  
- `H` = High  
- `L` = Low  
- `O` = Object  
- `P` = Program  
- `T` = Teacher  
- `V` = Various  

Outline of schools' efficiency.
## EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Naer</th>
<th>Newtye</th>
<th>maar</th>
<th>Ready</th>
<th>Ronai</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest priority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal attention</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on top 15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on middle 65%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist learning</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>F A</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances for capacity</td>
<td>A A L</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>L A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student responsibility</td>
<td>A A H</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent demonstration</td>
<td>H +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participation</td>
<td>H A L</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>A A A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation to equity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible motivation</td>
<td>W W W</td>
<td>W W</td>
<td>W W</td>
<td>W W W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- + = Operational
- - = Negative
- F = Full range
- H = High
- V = Variable
- A = Average
- L = Low
- W = Work displayed on boards and/or in cases

Outline of schools' equity.
### Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Nairen</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>Poortree</th>
<th>Reaasay</th>
<th>Reona</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation examination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable-sized groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going groups permanent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups temporary</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of school goals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage innovation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform procedures</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff discuss own program</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining other programs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of outcomes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability dominance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine requirements/time</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School development policy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development policy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff input in meetings</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit for new projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit tests new projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit diffuses new projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on developments</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New teaching methods</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance feedback</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback frequency</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement suggestions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on others'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of feedforward</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- + = Operational
- - = Irregular or non-existent
- A = Average
- L = Low
- H = High
- V = Variable

Outline of schools' flexibility.
### QUALITY CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Nairstye</th>
<th>Newtyle</th>
<th>Porterre</th>
<th>Ryaassay</th>
<th>Ryaay</th>
<th>Rona</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A common vision</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision refers to quality control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-based decisions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and interpreting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise paperwork</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil progress data shared</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher assessment/pupil monitoring</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor staff development and school improvement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special programs evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor teaching quality</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-related activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of good practice</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to assess students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change applicable to curriculum</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum rigidity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change referred to vision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear school goals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear subject goals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- + = Operational
- A = Average
- L = Low
- - = Irregular or non-existent
- H = High

Outline of schools' quality control.
## Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mullin</th>
<th>Naismith</th>
<th>Newstyle</th>
<th>Portree</th>
<th>Raasay</th>
<th>Rey</th>
<th>Rona</th>
<th>Wynns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher responsibility</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher initiative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on judgement</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher application</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work quantity</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal atmosphere</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion receptivity</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer interaction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/teacher interaction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/teacher interaction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for teachers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff openness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for pupils</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for teachers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from senior staff</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from teachers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-stabbing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/teacher relations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/pupil relations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil volunteering</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher volunteering</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for extra work</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher independence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil independence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception of strangers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour reinforcement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External recommendations</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors approval of PD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer approval of PD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchr needs gratification</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil needs gratification</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **A** = Average
- **H** = High
- **L** = Low
- **+** = Operational
- **-** = Irregular or non-existent

Outline of schools' support.
### Vision
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Appendix 6
In all of the following instances, where teachers rate an item either higher or lower than other teachers, the rating refers to a statistical significance at the probability of .01 or lower.

**Length of teaching experience**

A1. First-year teachers (n = 10 < .05 population) rated the following item *higher*:
1.h Class sizes (p = .0069).

The same group rated the following items *lower*:
2.a Support from those in more senior positions (p = .0044).
2.b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0053).
2.d Introducing innovation (p = .0057).
2.h Expectations of those in more senior positions (p = .0033).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0053).
6.a Lack of cooperation among staff (p = .0004).
6.b The staff's reluctance to being accountable (p = .0051).
6.c Your interaction with staff (p = .0061).
6.f The lack of staff conscientiousness (p = .0017).
6.g Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (p = .0038).
6.h Communication deficiencies among staff (p = .0035).
7.a Lack of opportunities for staff development (p = .0027).

A2. Teachers having 1 - 3 years experience (n = 16) rated the following item *lower*:
6.j Other teachers' relationships with students (p = .0035).

A3. Teachers having 4 - 6 years experience (n = 30) rated the following items *higher*:
4.a Finding time to give individual assistance (p = .0016).
6.i Disruptive teacher transfers [Disruption caused by teacher transfers] (p = .0037).

A4. Teachers having 7 - 10 years experience (n = 43) rated the following items *higher*:
5.e The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration (p = .0007).
6.d Obvious instances of staff incompetence (p = .0015).

A5. Teachers having 11 - 14 years experience (n = 32) rated the following items *higher*:
7.b Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (p = .0099).
7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0095).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0014).
7.f Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0025).

A6. Teachers of 15 - 20 years' experience (n = 44) rated the following items *higher*:
2.b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0029).
2.f Participating in decisions affecting the school (p = .0028).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0033).
2.k Interpersonal relationships (p = .0081).
3.a Getting a clear description of school goals (p = .0054).
6.g Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (p = .0034).

*Statistically significant differences.*
Appendix 6.1

7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .001).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0001).
7.f Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0025).
7.g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .0006).
7.j Your participation in curriculum planning (p = .0083).
8.i Lack of recognition from others for the work [that] you do (p = .0036).

A7. Teachers of over 20 years' experience (n = 64) rated the following items higher:
2.b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0002).
2.c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0007).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0001).

The same group rated the following items lower:
1.d Obtaining teaching materials (p = .0096).
1.h Class sizes (p = .0075).
2.a Support from those in more senior positions (p = .0002).
2.g Opportunities for expressing opinions (p = .002).
3.h Provision of resources (p = .0037).
3.i Grading of students (p = .0001).
4.a Finding time to give individual assistance (p = .0028).
4.e Students' attitudes towards each other (p = .004).
4.f Students' expectations of your teaching (p = .0028).
4.g Students' commitment to learning (p = .0075).
4.i Students' conformity to school rules (p = .0013).
5.f Communicating with parents (p = .0043).
7.a Lack of opportunities for staff development (p = .0006).
7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0041).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0045).
7.f Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0165).
8.i Lack of recognition from others for the work [that] you do (p = .0077).

Curriculum areas

B1. English/Social Science teachers (n = 66) rated the following item higher:
7.g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .0027).

B2. Maths/Science teachers (n = 72) rated the following items higher:
3.c Justifying the program's relevance to students (p = .006)
3.f Dubious subject repetition across years (p = .0001)
8.i Lack of recognition from others for the work [that] you do (p = .0027).

The same group rated the following item lower:
2.c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0042).

B3. See below

B4. Home Economics/Manual Arts teachers (n = 46) rated the following item higher:
1.h Class sizes (p = .0001).

The same group rated the following items lower:

Statistically significant differences.
3.c Justifying the program’s relevance to students (p = .0005).
3.d Adapting the program to suit students’ needs (p = .0025).
6.h Communication deficiencies among staff (p = .0076).
6.j Other teachers’ relationships with students (p = .0027).
8.a Conflict between your needs and the profession (p = .0026).
8.h The amount of work (that) you are required to do (p = .0026).

B5. Fine Arts teachers (n = 36) rated the following item lower:
3.b Getting a clear description of subject goals (p = .0072).
3.c Justifying the program’s relevance to students (p = .0022).
3.f Dubious subject repetition across years (p = .0012).
8.e Your peers’ attitudes towards you (p = .0056).
8.f Attitudes of seniors towards you (p = .0099).

B6. Physical Education teachers (n = 20) did not rate any item higher or lower.

B7. Commercial Subjects teachers (n = 14) rated the following item higher:
3.i Grading of students (p = .0098).

B3, B8, B9, & B 10. Teachers other than those mentioned above (n = 37), and excluding principals and assistant principals, rated the following items higher:
2.c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0014).
2.d Introducing innovation (p = .0016).
2.g Opportunities for expressing opinions (p = .0098).

Employment status
C2. Temporary staff, irrespective of years of experience (n = 32), rated the following item higher:
7.c Job insecurity (p = .0001).
The same group rated the following items lower:
2.c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0049).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .001).
5.e The issue of whether or not parents should be involved in administration (p = .0029).
6.c Your interaction with staff (p = .0037).
6.e Staff unsociability (p = .0017).
6.f The lack of staff conscientiousness (p = .001).
6.h Communication deficiencies among staff (p = .008).
6.j Other teachers’ relationships with students (p = .0078).
7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0073).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0099).

C3. Part-time teachers, irrespective of years of experience (n = 24), rated the following items lower:
5.c Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school (p = .0058).
5.d Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure (p = .0022).

Statistically significant differences.
Position held

D1. Teachers who hold a promotable position, including head teacher, senior master, assistant principal, principal and those who are acting in any of those capacities, irrespective of the number of years the position has been held (n = 95), rated the following items higher:

1. b The amount of paperwork (p = .0001).
1. h Class sizes (p = .003).
1. i Declining student enrolments (p = .006).
1. m Conflicting demands from others (p = .0054).
2. b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0001).
2. c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0001).
2. d Introducing innovation (p = .0033).
2. i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0001).
2. j Consistency of demands made of you (p = .0002).
5. b A lack of understanding between parents and staff (p = .006).
6. g Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (p = .0081).
6. h Communication deficiencies among staff (p = .0003).
7. g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .0034).

The same group rated the following items lower:

1. h Class sizes (p = .003).
2. e Knowledge of procedures (p = .0007).
2. g Opportunities for expressing opinions (p = .0047).
3. b Getting a clear description of subject goals (p = .0099).
3. c Justifying the program's relevance to students (p = .0009).
4. d Students' attitudes towards school (p = .0004).
4. g Students' commitment to learning (p = .0014).

D1a. Head Teachers (n = 37), all of whom have held the position for less than one year, rated the following items higher:

1. b The amount of paperwork (p = .0019).
2. b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0001).
2. i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0013).
2. m Learning about students from other staff (p = .0004).
5. b A lack of understanding between parents and staff (p = .0021).
7. a Lack of opportunities for staff development (p = .0013).

The same group rated the following items lower:

3. c Justifying the program's relevance to students (p = .0047).
8. c Students' attitudes towards you (p = .0068).

D1b. Senior Masters/Mistresses, irrespective of years of holding the position (n = 37), rated the following items higher:

2. b Support from those in lower positions (p = .002).
2. c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0001).

Statistically significant differences.
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0001).
2.j Consistency of demands made of you (p = .0002).

D1c. Assistant Principals (n = 5), acting Assistant Principals (n = 2), Principals (n = 4), and acting Principals (n = 2), irrespective of years of holding the position (total = 13 - .3 less than .05%), rated the following items higher:
2.b Support from those in lower positions (p = .0029).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .006).
6.j Other teachers' relationships with students (p = .0022).

The same group rated the following items lower:
1.d Obtaining teaching materials (p = .0033).
1.h Class sizes (p = .0011).
1.j Your teaching timetable (p = .0061).
2.g Opportunities for expressing opinions (p = .004).
4.f Students' expectations of your teaching (p = .0066).
6.d Obvious instances of staff incompetence (p = .0021).
7.c Job insecurity (p = .0079).
8.c Students' attitudes towards you (p = .0029).

**Leave taken due to illness**

E1. Teachers who had taken either less than one day's leave or had not taken any leave due to illness (n = 96), rated the following item higher:
2.c Your involvement in school budgeting (p = .0039).

The same group rated the following items lower:
1.j Your teaching timetable (p = .0022).
2.a Support from those in more senior positions (p = .0037).
2.l Resources for handling disciplinary problems (p = .0087).
8.k Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching (p = .0036).

E2. Teachers who had taken 1 - 2 day's leave (n = 80), rated the following item higher:
1.m Conflicting demands from others (p = .0023).

The same group rated the following items lower:
1.a Shortage of time to plan and organise (p = .0063).
4.k Fulfilling your responsibilities to students (p = .004).

E3. Teachers who had taken 3 - 5 day's leave (n = 56), rated the following item higher:
1.j Your teaching timetable (p = .0224).

The same group rated the following item lower:
6.e Staff unsociability (p = .0272).

E4. Teachers who had taken 6 - 10 day's leave (n = 20), rated the following item higher:

Statistically significant differences.
7.1 Your conditions of service (p = .0041).

E5. Teachers who had taken more than ten day's leave (n = 14) rated the following items lower:
1.i Declining student enrolments (p = .0012).
7.c Job insecurity (p = .0032).

Qualifications held

F1. Teachers who have qualifications equivalent to two years or less of teacher education (n = 74), rated the following items lower:
2.d Introducing innovation (p = .0018).
2.1 Resources for handling disciplinary problems (p = .0023).
3.c Justifying the program's relevance to students (p = .0014).
3.d Adapting the program to suit students' needs (p = .0014).
7.b Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (p = .0076).
7.i Your conditions of service (p = .0012).

F2. Teachers who have qualifications equivalent to three of teacher education (n = 29) did not rate any item higher or lower.

F3. Teachers who have qualifications equivalent to four years of teacher education (n = 129) rated the following items higher:
7.i Your conditions of service (p = .0001).
7.j Your participation in curriculum planning (p = .0005).
8.c Students' attitudes towards you (p = .0039).

The same group rated the following items lower:
1.i Declining student enrolments (p = .0084).
5.g Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (p = .006).

F4. Teachers who have qualifications equivalent to more than four years of teacher education (n = 32) rated the following item lower:
1.h Class sizes (p = .0031).

Dependent children

G1. Teachers who have any dependent children of their own (n = 129) rated the following items higher:
1.g Your involvement in staff meetings (p = .0025).
2.i Expectations of those in lower positions (p = .0012).
3.l Meeting community expectations (p = .0004).
6.j Other teachers' relationships with students (p = .0005).
7.b Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (p = .0001).
7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0001).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0001).
7.f Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0001).
7.g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .0038).
8.i Lack of recognition from others for the work [that] you do (p = .0044).

Statistically significant differences.
The same group rated the following item lower:

2.1 Resources for handling disciplinary problems (p = .0029).

G2. Teachers who have one or two dependent children of their own (n = 98) rated the following items higher:

3.1 Meeting community expectations (p = .0033)
5.e The issue of whether or not parents should be involved in administration (p = .0045).
6.j Other teachers' relationships with students (p = .0007).
7.b Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (p = .0009).
7.d Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0002).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0006).
7.g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .002).

G3. Teachers who have three and up to five dependent children of their own (n = 31), rated the following item higher:

3.a Getting a clear description of school goals (p = .0032).

Gender

H. Female teachers (n = 123), rated the following items higher:

2.g Opportunities for expressing opinions (p = .0037).
2.m Learning about students from other staff (p = .0014).
4.a Finding time to give individual assistance (p = .0014).
4.c Consequences of student absences (p = .0008).
4.e Students' attitudes towards each other (p = .0008).
4.f Students' expectations of your teaching (p = .0004).
4.j The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance (p = .0085).
4.k Fulfilling your responsibilities to students (p = .0057).
6.j Other teachers' relationships with students (p = .0088).
8.g Keeping up with new developments (p = .0082).

Male teachers rated the following items higher:

3.a Getting a clear description of school goals (p = .0043).
3.b Getting a clear description of subject goals (p = .0001).
7.b Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (p = .0084).
7.e Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0057).
7.f Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0022).
7.g Ways in which staff are evaluated (p = .0026).

Age

Ia. Teachers who are between 20 and 30 years of age (n = 66), rated the following items higher:

1.h Class sizes (p = .0019).
3.h Provision of resources (p = .0047).
4.h Students' academic achievements (p = .0042).
4.i Students' conformity to school rules (p = .0084).

Statistically significant differences.
8. The amount of work [that] you are required to do (p = .0051).

Ib. Teachers who are between 31 and 40 years of age (n = 91) rated the following items 
higher:
5. Communicating with parents (p = .0089).
7. Loss of relativity of teachers’ salaries (p = .0007).
7. Perceived injustices of the promotion system (p = .0029).
7. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (p = .0001).
7. Disappointment with your own career advancement (p = .0031).

The same group rated the following item lower:
8. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas (p = .0068).

Ic. Teachers who are between 41 and 50 years of age (n = 75) rated the following items 
lower:
1. Class sizes (p = .0022).
4. Students' attitudes towards school (p = .0091).
4. Students' attitudes towards each other (p = .0038).
4. Students' expectations of your teaching (p = .0078).
4. Students' conformity to school rules (p = .0026).
5. Communicating with parents (p = .0013).

Ic. Teachers who are between 41 and 50 years of age (n = 75) rated the following items 
lower:
2. Support from those in more senior positions (p = .0002).
2. Participating in decisions affecting the school (p = .0262).
3. Student report writing (p = .005).
7. Lack of opportunities for staff development (p = .0097).

Personal stress

J1. Teachers who indicated that they had experienced personal stressful situations 
during the past two years (n = 121) rated the following items higher:
1. The amount of paperwork [that] you have to do (p = .0073).
1. Undesirable physical surroundings (p = .0008).
1. Your teaching timetable (p = .0074).
4. Finding time to give individual assistance (p = .0007).
4. Students' academic achievements (p = .0073).
8. Conflict between your needs and the profession (p = .0001).

J1a. Teachers who indicated that, during the past two years, they had experienced 
personal stressful situations which either they did not rate or provided some relief (n = 
15), did not rate any item higher or lower.

J1b. Teachers who indicated that, during the past two years, they had experienced 
personal stressful situations which caused them a little concern (n = 25) rated the 
following items lower:
6. Obvious instances of staff incompetence (p = .0037).

Statistically significant differences.
6.f The lack of staff conscientiousness (p = .0012).

J1c. Teachers who indicated that, during the past two years, they had experienced personal stressful situations which somewhat upset them (n = 27) rated the following item lower:

6.b The staff’s reluctance to being accountable (p = .0028).

J1d. Teachers who indicated that, during the past two years, they had experienced personal stressful situations which considerably distressed them (n = 34) rated the following items higher:

1.f Undesirable physical surroundings (p = .0071).
8.a Conflict between your needs and the profession (p = .0047).

J1e. Teachers who indicated that, during the past two years, they had experienced personal stressful situations which left them extremely sad or distraught (n = 20) did not rate any item higher or lower.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LAGGAN</th>
<th>MULL</th>
<th>NAIRN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (44%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (43%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do (13%)</td>
<td>Curriculum changes (17%)</td>
<td>Curriculum changes (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra duties (13%)</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do (7%)</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class sizes (13%)</td>
<td>Undesirable physical surroundings (7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions (25%)</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (23%)</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions (17%)</td>
<td>Knowledge of procedures (16%)</td>
<td>Introducing innovation (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning about students from other staff (17%)</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (16%)</td>
<td>Knowledge of procedures, participating in decisions affecting the school, interpersonal relationships, &amp; expectations of those in lower positions (11% each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (27%)</td>
<td>Student report writing (24%)</td>
<td>Justifying the program’s relevance to students (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set curriculum matching curriculum actually taught (20%)</td>
<td>Provision of resources (17%)</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of resources (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student report writing (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (38%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (44%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (31%)</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (19%)</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (13%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other (11%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (30%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (43%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (20%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (24%)</td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating with parents (20%)</td>
<td>Communicating with parents (10%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (54%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (43%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff (18%)</td>
<td>Disruptive teacher transfers (24%)</td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (18%)</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff (14%)</td>
<td>The staff's reluctance to being accountable (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</td>
<td>Loss or relativity of teachers' salaries (56%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (38%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (38%)</td>
<td>Job insecurity (25%)</td>
<td>Job insecurity (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of opportunities for staff development (6%)</td>
<td>Lack of opportunities for staff development (13%)</td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (23%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (41%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (23%)</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (28%)</td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work you do (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (23%)</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (28%)</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>NEWTYLE</td>
<td>PORTREE</td>
<td>RAASAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANISATION</strong></td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (30%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (31%)</td>
<td>Class sizes (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class sizes (22%)</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do (16%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undesirable physical surroundings (13%)</td>
<td>Extra duties (14%)</td>
<td>Curriculum changes, the amount of paperwork you have to do, &amp; conflicting demands from others (10% each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum changes (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td>Participating in decisions affecting the school (18%)</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (22%)</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (18%)</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (16%)</td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions (14%)</td>
<td>Your involvement in school budgeting (14%)</td>
<td>Knowledge of procedures (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning about students from other staff (14%)</td>
<td>Introducing innovation (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>Provision of resources (50%)</td>
<td>Provision of resources (41%)</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting a clear description of subject goals (15%)</td>
<td>Student report writing (21%)</td>
<td>Student report writing (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading of students (10%)</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (10%)</td>
<td>Dubious subject repetition across years (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (24%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (20%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other (24%)</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (20%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students commitment to learning (19%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (18%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARENTS</strong></td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (47%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (41%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (11%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (17%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating with parents (11%)</td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (17%)</td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHERS</strong></td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (36%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (49%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (23%)</td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (15%)</td>
<td>Other teachers' relationships with students (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The staff's reluctance to being accountable, obvious instances of staff incompetence (9% each)</td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence (13%)</td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</strong></td>
<td>Loss or relativity of teachers' salaries (43%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (36%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system (22%)</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (20%)</td>
<td>Job insecurity (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your conditions of service (17%)</td>
<td>Job insecurity, perceived injustices of the promotion system, &amp; your conditions of service (9% each)</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (43%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (40%)</td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (17%)</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (21%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work you do (13%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards you (13%)</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>TEAY</td>
<td>RONA</td>
<td>WYVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do (25%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (44%)</td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum changes (25%)</td>
<td>Meeting deadlines (9%)</td>
<td>Class sizes (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise (19%)</td>
<td>Obtaining teaching materials (9%)</td>
<td>Extra duties (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your teaching timetable (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (23%)</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (34%)</td>
<td>Introducing Innovation (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (19%)</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (22%)</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introducing innovation (15%)</td>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions (9%)</td>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations of those in more senior positions (9%)</td>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (27%)</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (18%)</td>
<td>Student report writing (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading of students (24%)</td>
<td>Provision of resources (18%)</td>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting a clear description of school goals (17%)</td>
<td>Grading of students (18%)</td>
<td>Getting a clear description of subject goals (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school (31%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (38%)</td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance (13%)</td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other (21%)</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other (11%)</td>
<td>Students' commitment to learning (18%)</td>
<td>The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (35%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (31%)</td>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the school (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (30%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (23%)</td>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (15%)</td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (19%)</td>
<td>A lack of understanding between parents and staff (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (41%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (46%)</td>
<td>Public criticism of teachers (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff (17%)</td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence (20%)</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff, obvious instances of staff incompetence, &amp; staff indifference to the school's espoused aims (15% each)</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff (14%)</td>
<td>Obvious instances of staff incompetence, communication deficiencies among staff, &amp; other teachers' relationships with students (9% each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</td>
<td>Loss or relativity of teachers' salaries (46%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (47%)</td>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (21%)</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (26%)</td>
<td>Your conditions of service (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system (14%)</td>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system (6%)</td>
<td>Scarcity of opportunities for promotion (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your conditions of service (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (36%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (33%)</td>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work you do (14%)</td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (18%)</td>
<td>Keeping up with new developments (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (11%)</td>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work you do (18%)</td>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attitudes towards you (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAGGAN STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

MULL STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

Schools' stress intensities.
Schools' stress intensities.
PORTREE STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

RAASAY STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

Schools' stress intensities.
REAU STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

[Bar chart showing intensity levels for different categories such as Organisation, Administration, Academic Program, Students, Parents, Teachers, Professional Status, Personal, with a midpoint indicated.]

RONA STRESS INTENSITIES
by questionnaire categories

[Bar chart showing intensity levels for different categories such as Organisation, Administration, Academic Program, Students, Parents, Teachers, Professional Status, Personal, with a midpoint indicated.]

Schools' stress intensities.
WyVIS stress intensities by questionnaire categories

Schools' stress intensities.
Appendix 6-4

EFFECTIVENESS
Extra duties
Undesirable physical surroundings
Declining student enrolments
Interruptions to the teaching timetable
Expectations of those in lower positions
Resources for handling disciplinary problems
Student report writing
Finding time to give individual assistance
Consequences of student absences
Students' attitudes towards school
Students' attitudes towards each other
The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
Communication deficiencies among staff

QUALITY CONTROL
Curriculum changes
Expectations of those in more senior positions
Participating in decisions affecting the school
Learning about students from other staff
Getting a clear description of subject goals
Grading of students
Students' academic achievements
Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
Lack of opportunities for staff development
The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
The amount of work you are required to do
Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

EFFICIENCY
Shortage of time to plan and organise
Obtaining teaching materials
Knowledge of procedures
Your involvement in school budgeting
Dubious repetition across subjects
Dubious subject repetition across years
Provision of resources
Responsibility to parents and community
Meeting community expectations
Students' conformity to school rules
Obvious instances of staff incompetence
The lack of staff conscientiousness
Attitudes of seniors towards you

SUPPORT
Support from those in more senior positions
Support from those in lower positions
Consistency of demands made of you
Students' expectations of your teaching
Opposition or lack of support from parents
Negative attitudes of parents
Staff unsociability
Support from your peers
Conflict between your needs and the profession
Conflicts between your values & values taught
Students' attitudes towards you
Parents' attitudes towards you
Your peers' attitudes towards you
Lack of recognition for the work you do
Public criticism of teachers

EQUITY
Class sizes
Justifying the relevance of program to students
Meeting changing needs of students
Students' commitment to learning
The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on performance
Fulfilling your responsibilities to students
The staff's reluctance to being accountable
Disruption caused by teacher transfers
Other teachers' relationships with students
Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
Disappointment with your own career advancement
Your conditions of service

VISION
Meeting deadlines
Conflicting demands from others
Interpersonal relationships
Getting a clear description of school goals
Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
A lack of understanding between parents and staff
Communicating with parents
Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals
Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
Job insecurity
Perceived injustices of the promotion system
Scarcity of opportunities for promotion

FLEXIBILITY
The amount of paperwork you have to do
Your involvement in staff meetings
Your teaching timetable
Opportunities for expressing opinions
Introducing innovation
Adapting the program to suit students' needs
Lack of cooperation among staff
Ways in which staff are evaluated
Your interaction with staff
Your participation in curriculum planning
Keeping up with new developments
Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas

Questionnaire items by factors drawn from literature.
CONGRUITY
Interruptions to the teaching timetable
Conflicting demands from others
Lack of cooperation among staff
The staff’s reluctance to being accountable
Your interaction with staff
Obvious instances of staff incompetence
Staff unsociability
The lack of staff conscientiousness
Staff indifference to the school’s espoused aims
Communication deficiencies among staff
Other teachers’ relationships with students
Lack of recognition for the work you do

CURRICULUM
Getting a clear description of school goals
Getting a clear description of subject goals
Justifying the relevance of program to students
Adapting the program to suit students’ needs
Dubious repetition across subjects
Dubious subject repetition across years
Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
Grading of students
Student report writing
Responsibility to parents and community

TIME
Shortage of time to plan and organise
The amount of paperwork you have to do
Meeting deadlines
Extra duties
Finding time to give individual assistance
Keeping up with new developments
The amount of work you are required to do
Dissatisfaction from your standard of teaching

RESPONSIBILITY
Meeting changing needs of students
Consequences of student absences
Students’ attitudes towards school
Students’ attitudes towards each other
Students’ expectations of your teaching
Students’ commitment to learning
Students’ academic achievements
Students’ conformity to school rules
The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage
Fulfilling your responsibilities to students
Communicating with parents
Conflict between your needs and the profession
Students’ attitudes towards you

INVOLVEMENT
Support from those in more senior positions
Expectations of those in more senior positions
Attitudes of seniors towards you
Support from those in lower positions
Expectations of those in lower positions
Support from your peers
Your peers’ attitudes towards you
Interpersonal relationships
Knowledge of procedures
Participating in decisions affecting the school
Opportunities for expressing opinions
Conflicts between your values and values taught
Introducing innovation
Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
Your involvement in school budgeting
Learning about students from other staff
Resources for handling disciplinary problems
Consistency of demands made of you

MOTIVATION
Lack of opportunities for staff development
Public criticism of teachers
Loss of relativity of teachers’ salaries
Perceived injustices of the promotion system
Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
Disappointment with your own career advancement
Ways in which staff are evaluated
Your conditions of service
Your participation in curriculum planning

ENVIRONMENT
Obtaining teaching materials
Undesirable physical surroundings
Your involvement in staff meetings
Class sizes
Your teaching timetable
Curriculum changes
Provision of resources

Factor-analysed questionnaire items.
SUMMARY DATA

* p ≤ 0.05

Laggan mean frequency: 2.586
Laggan mean intensity: 2.125
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Group - Highest frequency: 2.671
- Lowest frequency: 2.377
- Highest intensity: 2.343
- Lowest intensity: 2.025

No. of responses - frequency: 23268
- intensity: 1660

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

SUMMARY DATA
*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01
Mull mean frequency: 2.403 **
Mull mean intensity: 2.130
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Nairn and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01
Nairn mean frequency: 2.671 **
Nairn mean intensity: 2.080
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.025
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Newtyke and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01
Newtyke mean frequency: 2.618
Newtyke mean intensity: 2.205
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
**Portree and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies**

**BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

**SUMMARY DATA**

* * * p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

Portree mean frequency: 2.652 **
Portree mean intensity: 2.124
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
**Raasay and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies**

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

**SUMMARY DATA**

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01

Raasay mean frequency: 2.480 **
Raasay mean intensity: 2.343 **
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

SUMMARY DATA

- Reay mean frequency: 2.640 **
- Reay mean intensity: 2.218
- Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
- Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Rona and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

SUMMARY DATA

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01

Rona mean frequency: 2.563
Rona mean intensity: 2.025 **
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint High Schools' Stress Frequencies

BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

SUMMARY DATA

** p ≤ .01

Wyvis mean frequency: 2.377 **
Wyvis mean intensity: 2.111
Midpoint mean frequency: 2.556
Midpoint mean intensity: 2.149

Schools' factorised stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS SOURCES</th>
<th>STRESS FREQUENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims</td>
<td>Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Communication deficiencies among staff</td>
<td>Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Disruptive teacher transfers</td>
<td>Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other teachers' relationships with students</td>
<td>Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, Laggan High School and all other schools in the sample consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

STRESS SOURCES

- Shortage of time to plan and organise
- The amount of paperwork you have to do
- Meeting deadlines
- Obtaining teaching materials
- Extra duties
- Undesirable physical surroundings
- Your involvement in staff meetings
- Class sizes
- Declining student enrolments
- Your teaching timetable
- Curriculum changes
- Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- Conflicting demands from others

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- Greatest difficulty - Laggan
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- Laggan
- Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest — Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

- Laggan
- Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (1a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All organisation sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting
d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school
g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key

○ = Greatest difficulty - Laggan
□ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
△ = Laggan
■ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest — Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight — Extreme

Key

I = Laggan
II = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2 j)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 28% teachers)

EFFECTIVITIES

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
**Laggan and Midpoint**

**High Schools' Responses**

### 3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

#### STRESS SOURCES

- a. Getting a clear description of school goals
- b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
- c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
- d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
- e. Dubious repetition across subjects
- f. Dubious subject repetition across years
- g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
- h. Provision of resources
- i. Grading of students
- j. Student report writing
- k. Responsibility to parents and community
- l. Meeting community expectations

#### STRESS FREQUENCIES

![Graph showing stress frequencies]

**Key**

- □ = Greatest difficulty - Laggan
- ○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- △ = Laggan
- ▽ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

#### STRESS INTENSITIES

- Slight
- Extreme

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

- Greatest difficulty (3%)
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Try not to think about it

**All program sources**

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

**Efficacies**

![Graph showing efficacies]

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- Finding time to give individual assistance
- Meeting changing needs of students
- Consequences of student absences
- Students’ attitudes towards school
- Students’ attitudes towards each other
- Students’ expectations of your teaching
- Students’ commitment to learning
- Students’ academic achievements
- Students’ conformity to school rules
- The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students’ performance
- Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
- All student sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

Efficacies

Key

* p ≤ .05

Range of schools’ means: Lowest — Highest

Schools’ stress frequencies.
**Laggan and Midpoint**

**High Schools' Responses**

### 5. PARENTS

**STRESS SOURCES**

| a. Opposition or lack of support from parents |
| b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff |
| c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school |
| d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure |
| e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration |
| f. Communicating with parents |
| g. Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals |

**STRESS FREQUENCIES**

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often

**Key**

- P ≤ 0.05
- = Greatest difficulty - Laggan
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = = Laggan
- = = Midpoint
- Range of schools' means: Lowest to Highest

**STRESS INTENSITIES**

- Slight
- Extreme

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

- Greatest difficulty (5a)
  - Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
  - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

- All parent sources
  - Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
  - Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

**EFFICACIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers **
j. Other teachers' relationships with students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers **
j. Other teachers' relationships with students

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (6k)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 14% teachers)

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Stress Intensities

Slight Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Laggan and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught
c. Students' attitudes towards you
d. Parents' attitudes towards you
e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments
h. The amount of work you are required to do
i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often

1.1a = Greatest difficulty - Laggan
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Laggan	= Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight	Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (8th)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All personal sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Efficacies

H	I
I	F
E	E

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

Mull High School
Second Reports

STRESS SOURCES

a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
c. Meeting deadlines
d. Obtaining teaching materials
e. Extra duties
f. Undesirable physical surroundings

Illustration:

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample. An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

STRESS FREQUENCIES

In this example, Mull High School and all other schools in the sample consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

Indicates the mean of all Mull High School responses.

Indicates this range of means of all schools in the sample.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

STRESS SOURCES
- a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
- b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
- c. Meeting deadlines
- d. Obtaining teaching materials
- e. Extra duties
- f. Undesirable physical surroundings
- g. Your involvement in staff meetings
- h. Class sizes
- i. Declining student enrolments
- j. Your teaching timetable
- k. Curriculum changes
- l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- m. Conflicting demands from others

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stress intensities:

- Slight
- Extreme

Key:

- * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01
- = Greatest difficulty - Mull
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Mull
- = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest Highest

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

- Greatest difficulty (1a)
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

- All organisation sources
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

Efficacies:

- Effective
- Ineffective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Stress Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support from those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your involvement in school budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Introducing innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Learning about students from other staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRESS FREQUENCIES

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often

Key

- * p ≤ 0.05
- Greatest difficulty - Mull
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Mull
- = Midpoint

Group Coping Strategies

Greatest difficulty (24)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

(Used by 28% of teachers)

Efficacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

- Getting a clear description of school goals
- Getting a clear description of subject goals
- Justifying the program's relevance to students
- Adapting the program to suit students' needs
- Dubious repetition across subjects
- Dubious subject repetition across years
- Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
- Provision of resources
- Grading of students
- Student report writing
- Responsibility to parents and community
- Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Intensities</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often |

Key:
- M = Mull
- = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ➔ Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (3h):
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources:
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

(a. Finding time to give individual assistance
b. Meeting changing needs of students
c. Consequences of student absences
d. Students' attitudes towards school
e. Students' attitudes towards each other
f. Students' expectations of your teaching
g. Students' commitment to learning
h. Students' academic achievements
i. Students' conformity to school rules
j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key
○ = Greatest difficulty - Mull
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
وسط = Mull
وسط = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ——— Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key
= Mull
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (4a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

(a) Opposition or lack of support from parents
(b) A lack of understanding between parents and staff
(c) Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
(d) Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
(e) The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
(f) Communicating with parents
(g) Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key

- = Greatest difficulty - Mull
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Mull
= Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ➔ Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight — Extreme

Key

= Mull
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5a)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else
(used by 26% teachers)

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES
a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff *
i. Disruptive teacher transfers
j. Other teachers' relationships with students *
k. Public criticism of teachers *

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key
* p ≤ .05

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Range of schools' means: Lowest — Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES
Greatest difficulty (6k)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 14% teachers)

Efficacies

Effectiveness

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
- b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
- c. Job insecurity
- d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
- e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
- f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
- g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
- h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
- i. Your conditions of service
- j. Your participation in curriculum planning
- k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

Efficacies

Key:

* $p \leq 0.05$

- $\square$ = Greatest difficulty - Mull
- $\triangle$ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- $\bigcirc$ = Mull
- $\bigtriangleup$ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest $\rightarrow$ Highest

Schools' stress frequencies.
Mull and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES
a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught
c. Students' attitudes towards you
d. Parents' attitudes towards you
e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments
h. The amount of work you are required to do
i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key
○ = Greatest difficulty - Mull
Ο = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
■ = Mull ▲ = Midpoint
Range of schools' means: Lowest ——> Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key
■ = Mull ▲ = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (8h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem
All personal sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

Nairn High School
Second Report

STRESS SOURCES

a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
c. Meeting deadlines

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.
Indicates the mean of all Nairn High School responses.
Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

In this example, Nairn High School and all other schools in the sample group consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

STRESS SOURCES

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample.
An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Nairn and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

**STRESS SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The amount of paperwork you have to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Meeting deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Obtaining teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Extra duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Undesirable physical surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Your involvement in staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Class sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Declining student enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Your teaching timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Curriculum changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Conflicting demands from others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRESS FREQUENCIES**

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often

**Key**

- *p ≤ .05*
- = Greatest difficulty - Nairn
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Nairn
- = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest — — Highest

**STRESS INTENSITIES**

- Slight
- Extreme

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

Greatest difficulty (1a)
- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All organisation sources
- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

**EFFICACIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
Nairn and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting
d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school
g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

= Greatest difficulty - Nairn
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Nairn = Midpoint

Range of schools’ means: Lowest — Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

= Nairn
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2 j)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 28% teachers)

Schools’ stress frequencies.
3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

- Getting a clear description of school goals
- Getting a clear description of subject goals
- Justifying the program’s relevance to students
- Adapting the program to suit students' needs
- Dubious repetition across subjects
- Dubious subject repetition across years
- Setting curriculum matching curriculum taught
- Provision of resources
- Grading of students
- Student report writing
- Responsibility to parents and community
- Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Intensities</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>~</th>
<th>~</th>
<th>~</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key**

- **p ≤ .01**
- **p ≤ .05**
- = Greatest difficulty - Nairn
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Nairn
- = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ~ ~ ~ ~ Highest

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (3☆)

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

- Ineffective
- E
- Effective
- H

Schools' stress frequencies.
Nairn and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Finding time to give individual assistance
b. Meeting changing needs of students
c. Consequences of student absences
d. Students' attitudes towards school
e. Students' attitudes towards each other
f. Students' expectations of your teaching
g. Students' commitment to learning
h. Students' academic achievements
i. Students' conformity to school rules
j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

** p ≤ .01  * p ≤ .05

- Greatest difficulty - Nairn
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

= Nairn  = Midpoint

Slight Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools' stress frequencies.
STRESS SOURCES

- Opposition or lack of support from parents
- A lack of understanding between parents and staff
- Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
- Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
- The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- Communicating with parents
- Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key:

- □ = Greatest difficulty - Nairn
- ○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Nairn = = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ~ Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

- Slight
- Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5a)
- Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
- Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
- Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
- Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else
  (used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Nairn and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers
j. Other teachers' relationships with students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (6k)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 14% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

= Greatest difficulty - Nairn
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
\{ = Nairn \{ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest \(\asha\) Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight \(\asha\) Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

EFFECTIVITIES

E

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Nairn and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

3. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught
c. Students’ attitudes towards you
d. Parents’ attitudes towards you
e. Your peers’ attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments
h. The amount of work you are required to do
i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

Greatest difficulty (8h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All personal sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Key:

** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>= Greatest difficulty - Nairn</th>
<th>= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Nairn</td>
<td>= Midpoint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of schools’ means: Lowest ——> Highest

Schools’ stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries **
c. Job insecurity

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample.

An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the mean of all Newtyle High School responses.

Newtyle High School staff and other schools in the sample consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Newtyle and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

**STRESS SOURCES**

- a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
- b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
- c. Meeting deadlines
- d. Obtaining teaching materials
- e. Extra duties
- f. Undesirable physical surroundings
- g. Your involvement in staff meetings
- h. Class sizes
- i. Declining student enrolments
- j. Your teaching timetable
- k. Curriculum changes
- l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- m. Conflicting demands from others

**STRESS FREQUENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key**

- * p ≤ 0.05  ** p ≤ 0.01
- ○ = Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
- □ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- □ = Newtyle  □ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

**STRESS INTENSITIES**

- Slight
- Extreme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Midpoint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

- **Greatest difficulty (la)**
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

- **All organisation sources**
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

**Efficacies**

- High
- Moderate
- Slight

Schools' stress frequencies.
Newtyle and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting
d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school
g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRESS SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

- Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- Newtyle
- Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
All administration sources

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 28% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools' stress frequencies.
Newtyle and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program’s relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students’ needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
h. Provision of resources
i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (30)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Newtyle and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

(a. Finding time to give individual assistance
b. Meeting changing needs of students
c. Consequences of student absences
d. Students' attitudes towards school
e. Students' attitudes towards each other
f. Students' expectations of your teaching

g. Students' commitment to learning
h. Students' academic achievements
i. Students' conformity to school rules
j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- Newtyle = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight - Extreme

Key

- Newtyle
- Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (a)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Efficacies

Ineffective
Effective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Newtyle and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- Opposition or lack of support from parents
- A lack of understanding between parents and staff
- Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
- Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
- The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- Communicating with parents
- Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- = Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Newtyle = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ➔ Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight ➔ Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5a)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
### 6. TEACHERS

**STRESS SOURCES**

- a. Lack of co-operation among staff
- b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
- c. Your interaction with staff
- d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
- e. Staff unsociability
- f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
- g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
- h. Communication deficiencies among staff
- i. Disruptive teacher transfers
- j. Other teachers' relationships with students
- k. Public criticism of teachers

**STRESS FREQUENCIES**

- [Graph showing stress frequencies for Newtyle and Midpoint schools]

**Key**

- \( \square \) = Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
- \( O \) = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- \( \& \) = Newtyle
- \( \& \) = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest \( \Rightarrow \) \( \Rightarrow \) Highest

**STRESS INTENSITIES**

- Slight
- Extreme

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

- **Greatest difficulty (6k)**
  - Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

- **All teacher sources**
  - Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
  - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 14% teachers)

**EFFICACIES**

- [Table showing efficacy levels for coping strategies]

Schools' stress frequencies.
7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries **
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

** p ≤.01
= Greatest difficulty - Newtyle
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Newtyle = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

I = Newtyle
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Newtye and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

3. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught
c. Students' attitudes towards you
d. Parents' attitudes towards you
e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments

h. The amount of work you are required to do

i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- Greatest difficulty - Newtye
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- Newtye
- Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

Group Coping Strategies

Greatest difficulty (8th)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All personal sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

Portree High School
Second Report

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
- b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
- c. Meeting deadlines
- d. Obtaining teaching materials
- e. Extra duties *

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.

In this example, Portree High School and all other schools in the sample group consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample.

An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower; while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Schools' stress frequencies.
**Portree and Midpoint High Schools' Responses**

1. ORGANISATION

### STRESS SOURCES

- **a.** Shortage of time to plan and organise
- **b.** The amount of paperwork you have to do
- **c.** Meeting deadlines
- **d.** Obtaining teaching materials
- **e.** Extra duties
- **f.** Undesirable physical surroundings
- **g.** Your involvement in staff meetings
- **h.** Class sizes
- **i.** Declining student enrolments
- **j.** Your teaching timetable
- **k.** Curriculum changes
- **l.** Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- **m.** Conflicting demands from others

### STRESS FREQUENCIES

- **a.** Shortage of time to plan and organise
- **b.** The amount of paperwork you have to do
- **c.** Meeting deadlines
- **d.** Obtaining teaching materials
- **e.** Extra duties
- **f.** Undesirable physical surroundings
- **g.** Your involvement in staff meetings
- **h.** Class sizes
- **i.** Declining student enrolments
- **j.** Your teaching timetable
- **k.** Curriculum changes
- **l.** Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- **m.** Conflicting demands from others

### Key

- **= Greatest difficulty - Portree**
- **= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint**
- **= Portree**
- **= Midpoint**

Range of schools' means: Lowest ———— Highest

### STRESS INTENSITIES

- **Slight**
- **Extreme**

### GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

- **Most used:** Gather information and plan ways to act
- **Most successful:** Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

### EFFICACIES

- **Most used:** Gather information and plan ways to act
- **Most successful:** Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

Schools' stress frequencies.
Portree and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting

d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school

g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support from those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your involvement in school budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Introducing innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expectations of those in more senior positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expectations of those in lower positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Learning about students from other staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

** p ≤ .01
• = Greatest difficulty - Portree
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight     | Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2j)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 25% teachers)

EFFICACIES

11 = Portree
1 = Midpoint

Schools' stress frequencies.
Portree and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Setting curriculum matching curriculum taught

**A. Provision of resources**

i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | Extreme

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Key

" p ≤ .01  " p ≤ .05

○ = Greatest difficulty - Portree
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Portree  = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest ➔ Highest

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (3h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Portree and Midpoint High Schools’ Responses

6. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- Finding time to give individual assistance
- Meeting changing needs of students
- Consequences of student absences
- Students’ attitudes towards school
- Students’ attitudes towards each other
- Students’ expectations of your teaching
- Students’ commitment to learning
- Students’ academic achievements
- Students’ conformity to school rules
- The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students’ performance
- Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key:
- = Greatest difficulty - Portree
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Portree = Midpoint

Range of schools’ means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

| Slight | Extreme |

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

- Greatest difficulty (4a)
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

- All student sources
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
    (used by 33% teachers)

EFFICACIES

| Ineffective | Effective |

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Postres and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Opposition or lack of support from parents
b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

- Opposition or lack of support from parents
- A lack of understanding between parents and staff
- Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
- Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
- The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- Communicating with parents
- Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

Key

- \( p \leq 0.01 \) * \( p \leq 0.05 \)
- \( \square \) = Greatest difficulty - Portree
- \( \bigcirc \) = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- \( \bigtriangledown \) = Portree \( \bigtriangledown \) = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest \( \bigtriangledown \) - Highest \( \bigtriangledown \)

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight \( \bigtriangledown \) Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5a)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
### Portree and Midpoint High Schools' Responses

#### 6. TEACHERS

**STRESS SOURCES**

- a. Lack of co-operation among staff
- b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
- c. Your interaction with staff
- d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
- e. Staff unsociability
- f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
- g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
- h. Communication deficiencies among staff
- i. Disruptive teacher transfers
- j. Other teachers' relationships with students
- k. Public criticism of teachers

**STRESS FREQUENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRESS INTENSITIES**

- Slight
- Extreme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Source</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP COPING STRATEGIES**

**Greatest difficulty (6k)**
- Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
- Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

**All teacher sources**
- Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
- Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 14% teachers)

**Efficacies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
Portree and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development **

b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries *

c. Job insecurity

d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system *

e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion **

f. Disappointment with your own career advancement **

g. Ways in which staff are evaluated *

h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties **

i. Your conditions of service

j. Your participation in curriculum planning

k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | | Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

EFFICACIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

** p < .01  * p < .05

= Greatest difficulty - Portree

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Portree

Range of schools' means: Lowest —— Highest

Schools' stress frequencies.
### 8. Personal

**Stress Sources**

- Conflict between your needs & the profession
- Conflict between your values & values taught
- Students' attitudes towards you
- Parents' attitudes towards you
- Your peers' attitudes towards you
- Attitudes of seniors towards you
- Keeping up with new developments
- The amount of work you are required to do
- Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
- Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
- Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

**Stress Frequencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Stress Intensities**

- Slight
- Extreme

**Group Coping Strategies**

- Greatest difficulty (Slight)
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

- All personal sources
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

### Key

- Portree
- Midpoint

**Efficacies**

- Ineffective
- Effective

---

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

In this example, Raassay High School and all other schools in the sample group consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the mean of all Raassay High School responses.

Stress Sources:

1. Finding time to give individual assistance
2. Meeting changing needs of students
3. Consequences of student absences
4. Students' attitudes towards school
5. Students' attitudes towards each other
6. Students' expectations of your teaching
7. Students' commitment to learning

Stress Frequencies:

Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample.

An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
c. Meeting deadlines
d. Obtaining teaching materials
e. Extra duties
f. Undesirable physical surroundings
g. Your involvement in staff meetings

h. Class sizes
i. Declining student enrolments
j. Your teaching timetable
k. Curriculum changes
l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
m. Conflicting demands from others

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Key

• = Greatest difficulty - Raasay
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Raasay = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

Key

= Raasay
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (1a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All organisation sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

Efficacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
Raaasay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES
a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting

STRESS FREQUENCIES

- Slight
- Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES
Greatest difficulty (2j)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 28% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES
a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
h. Provision of resources
i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES
Greatest difficulty (3h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools' stress frequencies.
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Finding time to give individual assistance
b. Meeting changing needs of students
c. Consequences of student absences
d. Students' attitudes towards school
e. Students' attitudes towards each other **
f. Students' expectations of your teaching *
g. Students' commitment to learning *
h. Students' academic achievements **
i. Students' conformity to school rules **
j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance *
k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Key
** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05
○ = Greatest difficulty - Raasay
□ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Raasay = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (4a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Opposition or lack of support from parents
b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff
c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school**
d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
f. Communicating with parents
g. Parents’ lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key

** p ≤ .01

○ = Greatest difficulty - Raasay
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Raasay = Midpoint

Range of schools’ means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight

Extremee

Key

| = Raasay
| = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (Sa)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else
(used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Higher

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES
a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness **
g. Staff indifference to the school’s espoused aims *
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers **
j. Other teachers’ relationships with students
k. Public criticism of teachers *

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key
** p ≤ .01  * p ≤ .05
○ = Greatest difficulty - Raasay
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
={ Raasay  } = Midpoint

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty ( & )
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 14% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Raasay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers’ salaries
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion **
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

** p ≤ .01  * p ≤ .05
= Greatest difficulty - Raasay
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Raasay = Midpoint

Range of schools’ means: Lowest – Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight  |  Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources.
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

Key

= Raasay
= Midpoint

EFICACIES

Ineffective  |  Effective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Itaat and Itiap: Realt School Responses

8. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
- b. Conflict between your values & values taught
- c. Students' attitudes towards you
- d. Parents' attitudes towards you
- e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
- f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
- g. Keeping up with new developments
- h. The amount of work you are required to do
- i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
- j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
- k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS INTENSITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

- Greatest difficulty (1a)
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

- All personal sources
  - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
  - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Key

- ** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05
- = Greatest difficulty - Raasay
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Raasay = Midpoint
- Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

STRESS SOURCES

- f. The lack of staff conscientiousness *
- g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims **
- h. Communication deficiencies among staff **
- i. Disruptive teacher transfers
- j. Other teachers' relationships with students
- k. Public criticism of teachers

Reay High School staff and other schools in the sample consider this difficulty to occur most frequently.

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the mean of all Reay High School responses.

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample. An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

Schools' stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
c. Meeting deadlines
d. Obtaining teaching materials
e. Extra duties
f. Undesirable physical surroundings
g. Your involvement in staff meetings
h. Class sizes
i. Declining student enrolments
j. Your teaching timetable
k. Curriculum changes
l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
m. Conflicting demands from others

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Key

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01

= Greatest difficulty - Reay

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Reay = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

Key

= Reay

= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (1a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All organisation sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

EFFECTS

Ineffective

Effective

Highly Effective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools’ Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions

c. Your involvement in school budgeting
d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school
g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRESS SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRESS INTENSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2 p)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 28% teachers)

EFFICACIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reflective</th>
<th>Eff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Setting curriculum matching curriculum taught
(h. Provision of resources)
i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Key

p ≤ .05

= Greatest difficulty - Reay

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Reay

= Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest —— Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | Extreme

Key

= Reay

= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (3h)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act

Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act

Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

Highly Effective

Effective

Ineffective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

(a. Finding time to give individual assistance
(b. Meeting changing needs of students
(c. Consequences of student absences
(d. Students' attitudes towards school
(e. Students' attitudes towards each other
(f. Students' expectations of your teaching
(g. Students' commitment to learning
(h. Students' academic achievements
(i. Students' conformity to school rules
(j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
(k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01
○ = Greatest difficulty - Reay
□ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Reay = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest —— Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | | Extreme

Key

1 = Reay
2 = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

EFFICACIES

Greatest difficulty (4a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved
All student sources

Highly effective

(used by 33% teachers)

Schools' stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- Opposition or lack of support from parents
- A lack of understanding between parents and staff
- Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
- Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
- The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- Communicating with parents
- Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- Greatest difficulty - Reay
- Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

- Slight
- Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5s)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff’s reluctance to being accountable

c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence

e. Staff unsociability

f. The lack of staff conscientiousness

g. Staff indifference to the school’s espoused aims

h. Communication deficiencies among staff

i. Disruptive teacher transfers

j. Other teachers’ relationships with students

k. Public criticism of teachers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (6k)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 14% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools’ stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development **

b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries

c. Job insecurity **

d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system

e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion

f. Disappointment with your own career advancement

g. Ways in which staff are evaluated

h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties

i. Your conditions of service

j. Your participation in curriculum planning

k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

STRESS INTENSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>**</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)

Most used: Try not to think about it

Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources

Most used: Try not to think about it

Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Key

= Greatest difficulty - Reay

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Reay

= Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest —> Highest

Schools' stress frequencies.
Reay and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught
c. Students' attitudes towards you
d. Parents' attitudes towards you
e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments
h. The amount of work you are required to do
i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

* p ≤ .05

= Greatest difficulty - Reay

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Reay = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Efficacies

Greatest difficulty (8k)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All personal sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS SOURCES</th>
<th>STRESS FREQUENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs</td>
<td>Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample. An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Dubious repetition across subjects **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Dubious subject repetition across years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provision of resources *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Grading of students</td>
<td>Other schools in the sample consider this difficulty to occur most frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona High School staff consider this difficulty to occur most frequently</td>
<td>Indicates the mean responses of all Rona High School responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

1. ORGANISATION

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
- b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
- c. Meeting deadlines
- d. Obtaining teaching materials
- e. Extra duties
- f. Undesirable physical surroundings
- g. Your involvement in staff meetings
- h. Class sizes
- i. Declining student enrolments
- j. Your teaching timetable
- k. Curriculum changes
- l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
- m. Conflicting demands from others

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Key

** p ≤ .01

= Greatest difficulty - Rona
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Rona • = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest — Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight — Extreme

Key

= Rona
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (1a)

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All organisation sources

- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

EFFICACIES

E High E

Schools' stress frequencies.
Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES
a. Support from those in more senior positions
b. Support from those in lower positions
c. Your involvement in school budgeting
d. Introducing innovation
e. Knowledge of procedures
f. Participating in decisions affecting the school
g. Opportunities for expressing opinions
h. Expectations of those in more senior positions
i. Expectations of those in lower positions
j. Consistency of demands made of you
k. Interpersonal relationships
l. Resources for handling disciplinary problems
m. Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES
Greatest difficulty (2j)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution
All administration sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 28% teachers)

Key

Key

Schools' stress frequencies.
3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES

a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects **
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
h. Provision of resources *
i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Intensities</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Key

** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05

= Greatest difficulty - Rona
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Rona = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest = Highest

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (3h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

** Schools' stress frequencies.
Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Finding time to give individual assistance*
- b. Meeting changing needs of students
- c. Consequences of student absences
- d. Students' attitudes towards school
- e. Students' attitudes towards each other
- f. Students' expectations of your teaching
- g. Students' commitment to learning
- h. Students' academic achievements
- i. Students' conformity to school rules
- j. The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on some students' performance
- k. Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

\( p \leq 0.01 \) * \( p \leq 0.05 \)

= Greatest difficulty - Rona

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Rona

= Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest \( \rightarrow \) Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight \( \rightarrow \) Extreme

Key

= Rona

= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (4a)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 33% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Highly effective

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Opposition or lack of support from parents
b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff
c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school
d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure
e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
f. Communicating with parents
g. Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (Sa)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

KEY

= Greatest difficulty - Rona
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
= Rona = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest Highest

Schools' stress frequencies.
6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence

e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers
j. Other teachers' relationships with students

6. Public criticism of teachers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

** p ≤ .01  * p ≤ .05

= Greatest difficulty - Rona

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Rona  = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest – Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight  Extreme

Key

= Rona  = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 14% teachers)

Efficacies

Egal

Schools' stress frequencies.
Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Key

- = Greatest difficulty - Rona
- = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- = Rona - Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest - Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Key

- = Rona
- = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

Slight - Extreme

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Appendix 6.7

Rona and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

2. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict between your needs &amp; the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict between your values &amp; values taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students' attitudes towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parents' attitudes towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Your peers' attitudes towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Attitudes of seniors towards you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Keeping up with new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The amount of work you are required to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- ⬤ = Greatest difficulty - Rona
- ⬤ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- ⬤ = Rona ⬤ = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest —— Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight        Extreme

Group Coping Strategies

Greatest difficulty (8k)

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All personal sources

Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

Efficacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I = Ineffective</th>
<th>E = Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' stress frequencies.
COPING WITH DIFFICULTIES

A brief presentation of consolidated results obtained from the

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Illustration:

STRESS SOURCES

a. Opposition or lack of support from parents
b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff

c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school

d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure

e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration

Indicates a statistically significant departure from the means of other schools in the sample.

An asterisk (*) represents a probability at the .05 level or lower; while two asterisks (**) represent a probability at the .01 level or lower.

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Indicates the mean responses of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the range of means of all schools in the sample.

Indicates the mean of all Wyvis High School responses.

Schools' stress frequencies.
**Wyvis and Midpoint High Schools' Responses**

1. **ORGANISATION**

   **STRESS SOURCES**
   - a. Shortage of time to plan and organise
   - b. The amount of paperwork you have to do
   - c. Meeting deadlines
   - d. Obtaining teaching materials
   - e. Extra duties
   - f. Undesirable physical surroundings
   - g. Your involvement in staff meetings
   - h. Class sizes
   - i. Declining student enrolments
   - j. Your teaching timetable *
   - k. Curriculum changes
   - l. Interruptions to the teaching timetable
   - m. Conflicting demands from others *

   **STRESS FREQUENCIES**
   - Never
   - Seldom
   - Sometimes
   - Often

   **Key**
   - * p ≤ .05
   - ◯ = Greatest difficulty - Wyvis
   - ◯ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
   - ⊗ = Wyvis ⊗ ⊗ = Midpoint
   - Range of schools' means: Lowest → → → → Highest

   **STRESS INTENSITIES**
   - Slight
   - Extreme

   **GROUP COPING STRATEGIES EFFICACIES**
   - Greatest difficulty (1a)
     - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
     - Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
   - All organisation sources
     - Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
     - Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 11% teachers)

   **Key**
   - [Scale for efficacies]

   Schools' stress frequencies.
2. ADMINISTRATION

STRESS SOURCES

- Support from those in more senior positions
- Support from those in lower positions
- Your involvement in school budgeting
- Introducing innovation
- Knowledge of procedures
- Participating in decisions affecting the school
- Opportunities for expressing opinions
- Expectations of those in more senior positions
- Expectations of those in lower positions
- Consistency of demands made of you
- Interpersonal relationships
- Resources for handling disciplinary problems
- Learning about students from other staff

STRESS FREQUENCIES

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often

Key

* \( p \leq 0.05 \)

- \( \bigcirc \) = Greatest difficulty - Wyvis
- \( \bigcirc \) = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
- \( \bigcap \) = Wyvis
- \( \bigcap \) = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest \( \rightarrow \) Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight \( \bigcap \) Extreme

Key

- \( \bigcap \) = Wyvis
- \( \bigcap \) = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (2.7)
- Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
- Most successful: Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

All administration sources
- Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
- Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act (used by 28% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

STRESS SOURCES
a. Getting a clear description of school goals
b. Getting a clear description of subject goals
c. Justifying the program's relevance to students
d. Adapting the program to suit students' needs
e. Dubious repetition across subjects
f. Dubious subject repetition across years
g. Set curriculum matching curriculum taught
h. Provision of resources
i. Grading of students
j. Student report writing
k. Responsibility to parents and community
l. Meeting community expectations

STRESS FREQUENCIES

STRESS INTENSITIES

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES
Greatest difficulty (3h)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try not to think about it

All program sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 24% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

4. STUDENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- Finding time to give individual assistance
- Meeting changing needs of students
- Consequences of student absences
- Students' attitudes towards school
- Students' attitudes towards each other
- Students' expectations of your teaching
- Students' commitment to learning
- Students' academic achievements
- Students' conformity to school rules
- The effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on students' performance
- Fulfilling your responsibilities to students

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | Extrem

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (4a)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

All student sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 33% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Effective | High

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Group
High Schools' Responses

5. PARENTS

STRESS SOURCES

- a. Opposition or lack of support from parents **
- b. A lack of understanding between parents and staff **
- c. Negative attitudes of parents towards the work of the school *
- d. Instances of attempts to exert parental pressure **
- e. The issue of whether parents should be involved in administration
- f. Communicating with parents *
- g. Parents' lack of familiarity with school goals **

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Often

Key

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

○ = Greatest difficulty - Wyvis
○ = Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
Wyvis = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight | Extreme

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (5a)
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All parent sources
Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Talk the matter over with someone else (used by 26% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

6. TEACHERS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of co-operation among staff
b. The staff's reluctance to being accountable
c. Your interaction with staff
d. Obvious instances of staff incompetence
e. Staff unsociability
f. The lack of staff conscientiousness
g. Staff indifference to the school's espoused aims
h. Communication deficiencies among staff
i. Disruptive teacher transfers
j. Other teachers' relationships with students
k. Public criticism of teachers

STRESS FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

I = Wyvis  || = Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (6k)

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem

All teacher sources

Most used: Talk the matter over with someone else
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act
(used by 14% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint
High Schools' Responses

7. PROFESSIONAL STATUS

STRESS SOURCES

a. Lack of opportunities for staff development
b. Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries *
c. Job insecurity
d. Perceived injustices of the promotion system
e. Scarcity of opportunities for promotion
f. Disappointment with your own career advancement
g. Ways in which staff are evaluated
h. The criteria for selecting staff for extra duties
i. Your conditions of service
j. Your participation in curriculum planning
k. Support from your peers *

STRESS FREQUENCIES

Never Seldom Sometimes Often

Key

* p ≤ .05

= Greatest difficulty - Wyvis

= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint

= Wyvis = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest – Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight Extreme

Key

= Wyvis

= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (7b)
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Gather information and plan ways to act

All status sources
Most used: Try not to think about it
Most successful: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved (used by 6% teachers)

Efficacies

Schools' stress frequencies.
Wyvis and Midpoint  
High Schools' Responses

3. PERSONAL

STRESS SOURCES

a. Conflict between your needs & the profession
b. Conflict between your values & values taught **
c. Students' attitudes towards you *
d. Parents' attitudes towards you
e. Your peers' attitudes towards you
f. Attitudes of seniors towards you
g. Keeping up with new developments
h. The amount of work you are required to do
i. Lack of recognition from others for the work you do
j. Constraints on your freedom to try out new ideas
k. Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching

STRESS FREQUENCIES

The amount of work you are required to do

Key

*p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

= Greatest difficulty - Wyvis
= Greatest difficulty - Midpoint
Wyvis = Midpoint

Range of schools' means: Lowest → Highest

STRESS INTENSITIES

Slight

EXTREME

Key

= Wyvis
= Midpoint

GROUP COPING STRATEGIES

Greatest difficulty (58)
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem
All personal sources
Most used: Gather information and plan ways to act
Most successful: Aggressively attack the source of the problem (used by 9% teachers)

EFFICACIES

Schools' stress frequencies.
Schools' strategy usage and efficacy.
Appendix 6.8

Strategy **d**: Completely switch off and do nothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy **e**: Try not to think about it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.388</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy **f**: Try to avoid becoming emotionally involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy **g**: Abandon it to tackle some easier problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy **h**: Attribute unkindness to those who caused the difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers indicate rated efficacies.

Schools' strategy usage and efficacy.
Strategy \(i\): Accredit the origin of your troubling thoughts to other people

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 8 \\
\hline
\text{Usage} & 2,000 & 1,000 & 1,200 & 2,000 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strategy \(j\): Try to think and act in ways which disguise the difficulty

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 10 & \text{Usage} & \text{Usage} \\
\hline
1,000 & 2,000 & 1,500 & 2,750 & 7,000 & 2,750 & 2,000 & 3,250 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strategy \(k\): Attend to only those parts which may prove favourable to you

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 8 & 10 & \text{Usage} & \text{Usage} \\
\hline
1,000 & 2,000 & 3,750 & 3,000 & 2,500 & 2,000 & 1,300 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strategy \(l\): Act in a manner which is contrary to your usual nature

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 10 & \text{Usage} & \text{Usage} \\
\hline
2,000 & 3,000 & 1,000 & 2,667 & 3,000 & 3,188 & 2,400 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strategy \(m\): Seek meaning in your misfortune so that you can better yourself or help others

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 10 & \text{Usage} & \text{Usage} \\
\hline
4,000 & 2,500 & 3,250 & 3,000 & 2,000 & 3,000 & 3,000 \\
\end{array}
\]

Strategy \(o\): Quietly accept the entire problem to facilitate its resolution

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\% & 2 & 4 & 6 & 8 & 10 & \text{Usage} & \text{Usage} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Key: Numbers indicate rated efficacies.

\(p \leq 0.05\) \(= \) \(p \leq 0.01\)

- \(\text{Laggen}\)
- \(\text{Newtyle}\)
- \(\text{Portree}\)
- \(\text{Rona}\)
- \(\text{Nairn}\)
- \(\text{Rassay}\)
- \(\text{Wyvis}\)

Schools' strategy usage and efficacy.
Strategy p: Talk the matter over with someone else

Strategy q: Try to see the funny side of the situation

Strategy r: Console yourself with indulgences such as cigarettes, drink, sex, etc.

Key

Numbers indicate rated efficacies.

** p ≤ .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Newyle</th>
<th>Reay</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Portree</th>
<th>Rona</th>
<th>Nairn</th>
<th>Raasay</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' strategy usage and efficacy.
Strategy s: Take your frustrations out on some other person or object

Strategy t: Some other strategy not in the questionnaire.

KEY
Numbers indicate rated efficacies.

- Laggan
- Newtyte
- Reay
- Mull
- Portree
- Rona
- Nairn
- Raasay
- Wyvis
Laggan and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA
Combined means - Laggan: 3.054
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Mull and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA
Combined means - Mull: 3.144
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Nairn and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

Summary data:

* p ≤ 0.05  ** p ≤ 0.01
Combined means - Nairn: 2.750
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Appendix 6.9

Newtyle and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

Mostly Effective

Adequate

Of little use

Ineffective

Group Range

Midpoint

Newtyle

CONGRUITY

TIME

ENVIRONMENT

MOTIVATION

RESPONSIBILITY

CURRICULUM

EXIGENCY

INVOlVEMENT

FACTOR

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

Mostly Effective

Adequate

Of little use

Ineffective

Effectiveness

Efficiency

Equity

Flexibility

Quality Control

Support

Vision

SUMMARY DATA

*p ≤ 0.05

Combined means - Newtyle 2.824 *

Combined means - Midpoint 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Portree and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA

*p ≤ .05
Combined means - Portree: 3.042
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Raasay and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY FACTORS FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

SUMMARY DATA

* p ≤ 0.05  ** p ≤ 0.01
Combined means - Raasay: 3.178  **
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
Reay and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies

BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS

BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE

SUMMARY DATA

*p ≤ .05
Combined means - Reay: 2.868
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
**Rona and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies**

**BY QUESTIONNAIRE FACTOR ANALYSIS**

**BY FACTORS DRAWN FROM LITERATURE**

**SUMMARY DATA**

Combined means - Rona: 3.063
Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
**Wyvis and Midpoint High Schools' Coping Efficacies**

*By Questionnaire Factor Analysis*

- Mostly Effective
- Adequate
- Of little use
- Ineffective

Factors: Congruity, Time, Environment, Motivation, Responsibility, Curriculum, Exigency, Involvement

---

*By Factors Drawn from Literature*

- Mostly Effective
- Adequate
- Of little use
- Ineffective

Factors: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Equity, Flexibility, Quality Control, Support, Vision

---

**Summary Data**

- Combined means - Wyvis: 2.933
- Combined means - Midpoint: 2.999

Schools' strategy efficacies by factors.
### Schools' positions: education factors

from highest to lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>EDUCATION PROFILE</th>
<th>STRESS FREQUENCY</th>
<th>STRESS INTENSITY</th>
<th>COPING EFFICACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Control</strong></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Reay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portree</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Raasay</td>
<td>Rona</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Wyvis</td>
<td>Laggan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools' positions in education, stress, and coping factors.
Appendix 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Laggan</th>
<th>Mull</th>
<th>Nairn</th>
<th>Newtyle</th>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Raasy</th>
<th>Reay</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>Wyvis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of time to plan and organise</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of paperwork you have to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from those in more senior positions</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing innovation</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in decisions affecting the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for expressing opinions</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of demands made of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for handling disciplinary problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about students from other staff</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a clear description of school goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying the program's relevance to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting the program to suit students' needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set teaching to match curriculum taught</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student report writing</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding time to give individual assistance</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' attitudes towards school</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' attitudes towards each other</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' expectations of your teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' commitment to learning</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition or lack of support from parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitudes of parents towards the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with parents</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cooperation among staff</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication deficiencies among staff</td>
<td>+41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism of teachers</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of relativity of teachers' salaries</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived injustices of the promotion system</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarce of opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your conditions of service</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict between your needs and the profession</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up with new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of work you are required to do</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition from others for the work you do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction from your own standard of teaching</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between Midpoint and sample schools stress sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Frequencies</td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>2.633</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>3,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>14,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Intensities</td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>2.055</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Efficacies</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.568</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant principals</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.961</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior masters/mistresses</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>