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Abstract

Contextual factors linked to behaviour problems in schools include leadership, organisational culture (within individual schools), and levels of teacher stress. Efforts to improve the school environment, reduce teacher stress, and improve student outcomes often have a singular focus on behaviour management policy. The aim of this research concerns the direction of effects from these variables, and offers an alternative perspective on the environment-behaviour equation. That is, while student misbehaviour is viewed as a ‘producer’ of teacher stress, it may also be perceived as a ‘product’. An initial qualitative investigation (Study 1) invited behaviour management staff ($N = 23$) to participate in focus groups, where three questions were posed in relation to the overall research aims. Content analysis was performed on the transcribed focus group data, and revealed that the hypothesised direction of effect between the variables of interest appeared probable. Participants for the main studies (Studies 2 and 3) were teaching staff ($N = 136$), school administrators ($N = 17$) and students referred for behavioural problems ($N = 1432$) at seven Brisbane metropolitan schools. Teachers and school administrators completed both the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Organisational Culture Inventory, while teachers also completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Student data was collated from school records, and grouped according to categories of referral frequency per student. In Study 2, high referral rates were associated with transactional leadership, and the
Oppositional aspect of Aggressive-Defensive culture. Low and medium referral rates were associated with transformational leadership and the Dependent, Approval, and Avoidant aspects of Passive-Defensive culture, and the Affiliative aspect of Constructive culture. Regression tests found further support for the proposed path model and the hypothesised direction of effects. Transactional leadership and the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types were most influential in prediction of referral rates for student misbehaviour. Unexpectedly, teacher stress was non-significant in explanation of referral rates for student misbehaviour. Study 3 examined hypothesised differences in perception between school administrators and teaching staff, according to the leadership and organisational culture dimensions. Both groups endorsed transformational leadership as the dominant style, although results differed by degree for each group. In terms of school culture, differences between groups were again evident, as teachers’ perceptions of school culture were significantly more negative compared to school administrators. Overall, qualified support was found for the hypothesised direction of effects from school environment variables on referral rates for student misbehaviour. Leadership style and school culture emerged as most important for the student outcome variable, and may be important in consideration of school-based approaches to behaviour management. Additionally, teacher stress, while related to school leadership style and organisational culture, appeared to have no effect on student referral rates.
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CHAPTER ONE

Research Aims And Overview

Three stone cutters were asked about their jobs. The first said he was paid to cut stones. The second replied that he used special techniques to shape stones in an exceptional way, and proceeded to demonstrate his skills. The third stone cutter just smiled and said: “I build cathedrals.”

1.0 The Research Problem

The program of research presented in this thesis is an investigation of contextual issues related to the number of students referred for behaviour problems in schools. It will attempt to capture some of the relational dynamics that contribute to behaviour problems in an environment where achievement often transcends humanity as a measure of individual worth. Such a position is not stated lightly. The education literature is replete with studies about instructional efficacy, curriculum design, and the rhetoric of process improvement. Yet, in almost every case, the things that make a difference happen at the level of people relating to people. Emergent themes in the education literature bear this out when they refer to management of diversity and development of the whole person.

In contrast, children with behavioural issues are not considered for their diversity: their type of ‘difference’ persists as a problem to be remedied. In response to this observation, the research reported here is an investigation of the school
variables that may be associated with the behaviour of this sub-population of students. Specifically, the combined effects of school leadership, organisational culture, and teacher stress, are examined as variables associated with the frequency of referral rates for students deemed to be ‘misbehaving’. Following from this, the principal focus of the thesis pertains to the notion of directionality. That is, while student misbehaviour is most often viewed as a ‘producer’ of teacher stress and school level problems, it may also be perceived as a ‘product’ (Hart, Wearing & Conn, 1995). The thesis therefore, offers an alternative perspective on a widely researched area of education administration, and, in particular, aims to quantify the directional effects of the variables under investigation.

In first considering the issue of leadership, it was hypothesised that a collegial and consultative style would be associated with a positive school culture and low levels of teacher stress, especially because it relates to teachers’ perceptions of a supportive and satisfying work environment (Hipp, 1996, 1997; Peters, 1997). Leadership is viewed as important because of its propensity to compound teacher stress and a negative school culture, and to indirectly influence the frequency of student referrals for behaviour problems. While no direct association between this combination of factors has been reported, existing research supports the conclusion that such a pathway may exist (Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996; Wiley, 1998). Justification for this position comes from the substantial body of research into the differential effects of leadership style on a range of school variables, including school culture, teachers’ job satisfaction, teacher stress, change adaptation, and student achievement.

Turning now to the question of organisational culture, it was hypothesised that a supportive and satisfying school culture would be an important determinant of
teachers’ self-reported levels of stress and burnout, as well as being associated with
student referral rates for misbehaviour. Justification for this position comes from
critical evaluation of the literature pertaining to organisational culture in schools
(Mills, 1991; Mok & Flynn, 1998). While many studies explore particular aspects of
school activities as they bear on teachers’ subjective experience, and on student
achievement, supportive cultures consistently emerge as critical to ameliorating the
negative influence of stress on performance and satisfaction for both groups (Adami
Lantieri, 1999; Mok & Flynn, 1998; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996). The link arises
because teachers frequently report difficulties within the interpersonal domain,
including expectations regarding their behaviour, socialisation to the school
environment, and relations with school leaders, colleagues, and students (Abel &
Sewell, 1999; Cochran-Smith & Little, 1992; Hart et al., 1995; Hipp, 1996, 1997; Koh
et al., 1995; Kowalski, 2000). Studies have identified a range of factors, such as
student behaviour, lack of recognition and support from school administrators, the
absence of collegiality, and work duties that encroach on leisure time and family.
More recently, studies confirm that students sometimes share similar perceptions of
difficult relations within their school environment (Cowen, Hightower, Pedro-Carroll,
Work, Wyman & Haffey, 1996; Leonard, Bourke & Schofield, 2000; Schmuck &
Schmuck, 1991). Given that the vast majority of teachers are genuine in their concern
for students and for effective teaching, Noguera (1995) asked what is it about the
structure and culture of schools that propagates destructive interpersonal dynamics.

Extrapolating from the above, it was also predicted that the combination of
positive leadership, supportive organisational culture, and low levels of teacher stress,
would be reflected in lower referral rates for student misbehaviour. That is, where the
leadership style at a school promotes a supportive workplace culture, teachers’ subjective levels of stress may be reduced, and consequently, so may be teachers’ negative reactivity to students’ problem behaviour (Friedman, 1991; Mills, 1991; Smith & Bourke, 1991). Following this line of reasoning, it was hypothesised that a reduction in teachers’ negative reactivity would be associated with a concomitant reduction in the referral rates for student misbehaviour. Such a position may offer an alternative perspective on entry points for management of student behaviour, compared to existing strategies that focus only on students as the primary problem.

To examine why referral rates may diverge across schools, additional analyses investigated whether the perceptions of teachers and their school administrators differed. This avenue of enquiry was pursued because, although the whole-of-school environment includes teachers, students and administrators, any assumption of shared perceptions may under-estimate the effects of school level factors, such as leadership and culture. Questions have already been posed in relation to perceived differences between rhetoric and reality in school processes (Wilkinson, 1993). Yet, little has been done to clarify any discrepancy between school leaders and teaching staff, and indeed, to test whether any discrepancy exists. The inter-relatedness of school and teacher level variables does not necessarily translate to similar perceptions between school administrators and teachers; thus, it was further hypothesised that differences in perceptions between each group may go some way to explaining variance in referral rates for student behaviour problems.

1.1 Methodology

In the first instance, behaviour management staff were approached to participate in an exploratory study. This action was taken because the nature of their
work combines proximity to student issues with operational distance from their respective schools. Focus group interviews obtained qualitative information regarding observations of possible links between leadership, organisational culture, and teacher stress, as they might bear on student behaviour issues. The resulting data were content-analysed within relevant theoretical frameworks, and emergent themes located to inform the next stages of the research program.

Following from this, teaching staff and school administrators were surveyed to capture school level differences regarding leadership, culture, and teacher stress. Quantitative measures for the study were chosen according to the clarity with which they captured the variables under investigation, their psychometric reliability, and specifically, to address measurement deficiencies in prior research. To reduce potential reporting bias, student behavioural event data were obtained directly from school records, and recorded as frequencies per student, according to gender, grade level, and event type. Discriminant function analysis was employed to identify differences between schools on the school and teacher variables, and to establish any association with referral rates for problem student behaviour.

To further explore within school factors, the perceptions of teaching staff and school administrators regarding leadership style and school culture were also investigated. While school administrators and teaching staff are co-located, they do not share the same proximal relationship to student behaviour issues by virtue of their position in school hierarchies. In addition, the roles of each group diverge in fundamental ways. Thus, it was reasonable to presuppose school administrators may hold different viewpoints about school environment factors, including leadership style and culture. It was presumed that status differences between teachers and school administrators could influence perceptions about the mechanisms of social control, as
they pertain to teaching staff, and, by implication, as they apply to students. In the context of school culture, the mechanisms of social control arise from the nuances of in-school cultural phenomena, such as norms and values, which constrain teacher behaviour. Such differences may go some way to explaining any relationship between organisation level variables and referral rates for problem behaviour in students, especially where teaching staff report lower satisfaction with leadership and school culture.

1.2 Outline Of The Thesis

The thesis begins with an overview of student behaviour issues, as reported in the literature, and particularly the education literature. This is followed by chapters concerning models of leadership, organisational culture, and stress, and includes a review of the literature as each aspect pertains to schools. For clarity, definitions of key concepts are presented in the relevant chapters. In addition, when examining models of leadership and organisational culture, schools are not treated as microcosms that exist in isolation from other workplaces; instead, they are examined using applied models from the organisational psychology literature. A summary chapter will draw together the over-arching theme of ‘environment’ within which referral rates for student behaviour problems can be examined. These chapters will form the springboard from which the program of research will unfold.

Study 1 is a qualitative investigation of the perceptions of behaviour management staff regarding school leadership, organisational culture, and teacher stress, as each relates to student behaviour issues. Study 2 is a cross-sectional survey of teachers and school administrators, which examines the association between the frequency of referrals for behavioural problems and quantitative measures of school
leadership style, organisational culture, and teachers’ subjective levels of stress. The third and final study explores differences between teachers and school administrators in relation to their perceptions of the school environment variables, leadership style and organisational culture. The thesis concludes with a summary discussion of the results, and presents conclusions about the direction of effect of school environment variables on referral rates for problem student behaviour.

1.3 Delimitations Of Scope And Key Assumptions

The central focus of this dissertation pertains to secondary students referred for intervention arising from infringements of published school behaviour policy. It does not attempt to address more serious behavioural issues associated with mental illness or disability, which are beyond the scope of this research. Nonetheless, some overlap is likely because the collection of behavioural event data necessarily includes infractions that occur in the context of such conditions. Moreover, behaviour, for the most part, is presented simply as behaviour, unless the need to specify it as misbehaviour or problem behaviour serves to clarify the attendant argument. This action is taken as a deliberate acknowledgement of children’s behaviour as the best choice s/he could make about a situation given the resources and constraints of the moment; that is, any label of misbehaviour is ascribed by external others, and generally by teachers in the school setting. Thus, the data concerning student behaviour presumes that the infraction have already been viewed as a breach of published school policy. In addition, while teachers and school administrators are key to this investigation, their contribution is limited to provision of survey information about school environment variables, while student data were secured from other sources. That is, the outcome of this research is intended to advance theory and
practice concerning management of student behaviour, and only refers to teaching staff as data sources and potential instruments of change. Except where indicated, research cited pertains to middle grade or secondary students, to maintain consistency with the population investigated for the research presented here.

1.4 Summary

In conclusion, the research presented here argues that student misbehaviour may be as much a product of influences operating within the school environment, as it is a contributor to perceptions of problem behaviour. That is, system level variables such as school leadership and school culture, combined with teachers’ experience of both, may coalesce to influence how student behaviour is perceived within school systems. In Chapter 2 the literature pertaining to student behaviour is summarised, with particular reference to how it is interpreted and understood within the education context. For the most part, misbehaviour is pathologised, almost by degree, according to how far it deviates from prescriptions for acceptable behaviour. The chapter begins with a discussion of definitions and categories of student misbehaviour, which have emerged in recent decades of significant social upheaval.
CHAPTER TWO
The Nature And Context Of Student Misbehaviour

“In low-income public high schools organized around control through silence, the student, parent, teacher, or paraprofessional who talks, tells, or wants to speak, transforms rapidly into the subversive, the troublemaker.” (Fine, 1992, p.132, cited in Anderson, 1996)

2.0 Introduction

Student behaviour is, perhaps, the most oft-cited factor contributing to classroom management problems for teachers, and is commonly acknowledged in the education literature as a factor in teacher stress and low student achievement (Epstein, 1996; Hart, Wearing & Conn, 1995; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996). Landmark studies dating back to the 1960’s identified a multiplicity of factors that contribute to student behaviour problems, although quality investigations of the students’ perspective have only emerged in the last 10-15 years. Prior to that time, behavioural issues were examined in simplistic and narrow terms associated with academic achievement, or in relation to new methods for controlling problem students (Hanna, 1988; Lantieri, 1999; Marchesi, 1998). Many studies, essentially, reflected growing anxiety about escalating school violence and perceptions of a simultaneous diminution of school authority.

Nevertheless, concerns for the welfare of children were finally and fully legitimised by recognition of entrenched social problems, and the education monolith
suddenly found itself with a limited, and increasingly inadequate, repertoire of responses. Further, because a focus on negative behaviour may be symptomatic of distal system-level difficulties in the school environment, it is important to recognise the nature of student problems. Children’s behaviour is widely acknowledged as the expression of a complex interplay of biological and environmental factors. However, unless situational factors are accounted for, there is a risk that children could be held disproportionately accountable for problems generated elsewhere in the school system. As a result, it is central to this program of research to appreciate current conceptions of student misbehaviour, and especially to consider how such an understanding has evolved. In this section, definitions of misbehaviour will be presented as a precursor to a discussion of identified historical, structural, social, and related causes of problem behaviour.

2.1 The Nature Of Student (Mis)Behaviour

Interestingly, early definitions of actual problem behaviour are scarce, and by implication, the term ‘misbehaviour’ appeared to connote any student action likely to impact the quiet orderliness of classrooms. More recently, there is a trend in Australia and the United States towards using the term ‘violence’ to include all but the most innocuous of misdeeds. For example, what was once understood as insolence or insubordination may now appear as ‘verbal abuse’. Some also include ‘trespass’ as a form of violence, presumably due to fear of what trespassers might perpetrate (McCraith, 1996; Noguera, 1995).

Prochnow (1998) identified three general types of behaviours, likely to lead to suspension in New Zealand schools. The first category, most strongly linked to student suspension, included “violent, aggressive, destructive and non-compliant
behaviour” (p.43), as well as defiance and lack of cooperation. The second category, which occurred less frequently, was inappropriate touching or other sexual behaviour. The third general category of behaviour related to smoking, or alcohol or drug use on school grounds (Prochnow, 1998). Most incidents leading to suspension often followed some history of corrective action, and eventual suspensions usually reflected duty of care issues mandated under the New Zealand Education Act (1989). Nonetheless, the three general categories appear consistent with other research, and with anecdotal reports of what constitutes ‘problem’ behaviour amongst students.

Mc Craith (1996) on the other hand, specified a definition of ‘violent’ behaviour, in an investigation of the level of violence in Australian schools. McCraith (1996) identified 19 possible forms of school violence, that were defined according to when “…any members of the school community (student, staff, parent, or visitor) is assaulted, intimidated, or abused” (p. 1). For the 33 participating government schools, students’ verbal abuse of teachers was rated as the most frequent form of ‘violence’, followed by violence perpetrated by a ‘trespasser’ (for example, students from other schools), and then by actual physical assault between students (Mc Craith, 1996). Other categories of student initiated ‘violence’ included sexual harassment of students or staff, possession of a weapon, group assaults of individual students, and student assaults of staff (Mc Craith, 1996). In terms of how the concept of violence was presented, there was an interesting equivalence between McCraith’s study and expanded definitions of ‘violence’ that reflect fear arising from the perceived threat of harm or trespass (Noguera, 1995). The trend may disclose more about the anxieties of those who perceive violent intent in every nuance of behaviour, than about the actual level of aggression intended by child or adolescent perpetrators. This does not mean
to discount the natural human response for self-regard however, or to deny the possibility of actual threat in some cases (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Selye, 1956).

While the seriousness of aggressive behaviour tends to be inversely related to the frequency of its occurrence, the potential for aggression increases for individual students as risk factors accumulate. For example, an American study by Epstein (1996) of homeless children and children living in shelters reported increased frequency of problem school behaviours such as hostility, aggression, emotional neediness, promiscuity, difficulty trusting others, school refusal, drug use, suicidal ideation and overt suicidality. Moreover, psychotic symptoms amongst homeless adolescents were found to be more prevalent than for similar groups in developing countries, and were not attributable to illness or drug use (Epstein, 1996). As a result of unpredictable and transient lifestyles, the level of disadvantage for these groups was amplified in the school setting, because their adjustment to school was further impaired by poor organisation skills and low ability to conceptualise and complete assigned tasks (Epstein, 1996). Overall, the results indicated that the level of risk is positively associated with more frequent behavioural problems, and to frank and serious psychopathology. The behavioural expression appeared to be one of degree, rather than type, for this uniquely vulnerable group.

While available sources for definitions of school misbehaviour may be meagre, there remains sufficient evidence of consensus about the types of behaviour likely to be disruptive in the school setting. From the foregoing, it seems clear that any behaviour likely to disturb the classroom may be deemed misbehaviour, from insolence and non-compliance to assault, inappropriate sexual conduct, and the behavioural effects of psychosis. In contrast, there is a substantial volume of research dedicated to understanding the causes of misbehaviour, as well as potential methods
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for control. These will be presented in the next section, along with a discussion about how current conceptions of school organisation may work in opposition to solutions.

2.2 Perceived Causes Of Student Misbehaviour And School Responses

The discussion that follows here reviews literature that describes how the causes of misbehaviour are understood, and thus how responses are subsequently formulated. Four explanations can be distinguished around broad themes of social, school environment, developmental, and school culture, all of which have been linked to problem behaviour in students. In some cases, the lens through which problem behaviour has been viewed has also informed the manner in which schools respond, as will become evident shortly.

2.2.1 Social Causes And ‘Youth Containment’

Since the social upheaval of the 1960’s, volumes of research have reported a range of environmental and dispositional factors likely to contribute to delinquency and maladjustment in children and young people. Not surprisingly then, the literature regarding student behaviour examines the same factors known to predict poorer outcomes, such as socioeconomic status, parental divorce or separation, ethnicity, early trauma, alienation, and poorly developed bonds with family, school, and community (Adami & Norton, 1996; Cowen et al., 1996; Enomoto, 1994; Jackson & Bynum, 1997; Lantieri, 1999; McCraith, 1996; Noguera, 1995). As a result, student misbehaviour is often considered an outgrowth of social and familial dysfunction, and only weakly influenced by the school setting. In addition, the capacity to respond effectively to such diverse aetiology is often beyond the scope of individual schools.
Inventive and well-intentioned solutions offer some respite, but may be poorly conceived for longer-term consequences.

For example, a worrying trend has emerged in the Australian education system, where categories of disability have expanded to capture the increasingly pathologised troubles of socially and economically marginalised youth (Prochnow, 1998; Slee & Cook, 1994). Consider the 1990’s pandemic of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and autistic spectrum disorders, for example (Slee & Cook, 1994). Where a child is officially ‘diagnosed’ as disturbed in some way, neither the school nor the parent/s need to assume blame – it is the child who is defective. Because Australian schools are facing increasing levels of violence in an environment of diminishing youth opportunity, they have embarked on wholesale pursuit of diagnoses in order to secure funding and services available under departmental integration policies. Slee and Cook (1994) euphemistically refer to this phenomenon as the ‘youth containment industry’, a new weapon in a war against the miscreant and maladjusted, with long-term deleterious effects for the child so labelled.

Superficially, the immediate intent appears to be humanitarian management of student behaviour. However, such actions also illustrate how institutional responses use whatever is at their disposal to inadvertently reinforce assumptions for achievement, self-reliance, and adaptation to the dominant system. The individual student is ultimately responsible for their success or failure, chiefly because there is no systemic or curricular sensitivity to the specific needs of at-risk children (Epstein, 1996). The school’s response presupposes the students’ deficits and difference, and works towards solutions that will align them more closely to accepted measures of human worth. The presumed universality of an achievement ideology serves to remind students of their difference and, in all likelihood, to catalyse more problem
behaviour (Epstein, 1996). As Marchesi (1998) comments, “It is easy to see how commonality can be accommodated” (p. 27), and that academic performance is an “easy way” of evaluating students.

In contrast, students with behavioural issues often exist outside such narrow definitions of human value. The result has been recognition of misbehaviour or withdrawal as expressions of psychological forces employed by students to redress poor self-image (Hanna, 1988), or to communicate dissatisfaction about restricted access to opportunities, within and beyond the limits of schools (Mc Craith, 1996). Through their behaviour, students denounce school evaluation processes as measures of their worth and capabilities, and to express their perceived incompetence in the roles of student and community member (Hanna, 1988; McCraith, 1996). The acknowledged failure of schools to prepare students for the world of work and life has led more recently to calls for broader definitions of achievement to include the ‘whole person’, a trend that has not been without its critics (Lantieri, 1999). It has also led some academics and school faculty to question how students perceive their experience of school, as will be discussed next.

2.2.2 The School Environment And Student Stress

Schools as institutions are, by necessity, environments that comprise multi-layered social microcosms, embedded within a traditional hierarchy. While children are usually deemed to be active participants in the school experience, the class environment operates in such a way that passive acceptance is the preferred modality (Hanna, 1988; Kowalski, 2000). Even so, an array of undercurrents permeates the class environment, arising from social, cultural, and class differences, within and beyond the school setting, leading to considerable stress (Hanna, 1988; Jackson &
Factors contributing to school-induced stress include over-emphasis on academic success, societal and parental pressure, and reliance on the individual student to manage increased demands. Further, research indicates that students may react to the school environment in much the same way as teachers and other school staff.

For example, Leonard, Bourke and Schofield (2000) drew parallels between schools and adult workplaces, and found a strong association between student perceptions of their environment and rates of absenteeism. The study was framed around the notion that school children undertake tasks of similar duration and intensity to working adults, and do so within a regimented routine where their achievements are constantly monitored. Results indicated that school children experience a similar stress response to adults, including the well-documented physical and psychological effects frequently associated with chronic work stress (see also Chapter 5). Implications included the need for specific skills training in stress coping for students to reduce the psychological and behavioural sequelae of stress arising from organisational factors within their schools. The main proposition though, was that students experience substantial stress from the school environment, and that the effects are sometimes lost in the maze of absentee data and disciplinary actions. In their attempts to manage the burden of regimented task demands, adaptation to social diversity, and close supervision, students may externalise their stress reactions as misbehaviour. Control of behaviour then becomes the focus of attention, at the expense of important information regarding entrenched structural and(or) social issues.

It is important to recognise too, that the stress children experience from the organisation of schools occurs in addition to chronic and/or acute stress in other areas.
of their lives. For example, circumstances including physical characteristics and health status, and stressful life events, such as parental divorce, the death of a close family member, or unemployment, to name a few, have been associated with poorer school adjustment and lower achievement (Cowen, Hightower, Pedro-Carroll, Work, Wyman & Haffey, 1996). Stress accumulates across the various layers of a child’s life, from their immediate family environment, the subculture of their classroom, and the broader milieu of school and community. For some, the myth of a carefree childhood is exactly that. Moreover, the nature of stressors in children’s lives has been shown to predict the type of problems they may display, such as acting-out behaviours, or withdrawal and anxiety problems (Cowen et al., 1996). Clearly, student stress has implications for teachers and the school community if it is associated with the very behaviours teachers report as problematic.

Elias (1989) also explored the notion of school as stress-inducing for students, and identified concerns that well-intentioned efforts in the academic preparation of adolescents may be misdirected. While many children cope, and some no doubt benefit, others become “psychological casualties” (p.393), reflected in statistics for youth suicide, substance abuse, delinquent behaviour, and school failure. According to Elias (1989), school-induced stress affects children’s self-concept and sense of efficacy, without countervailing influences to support positive coping and competent stress management. Thus, the only recourse for some students may emerge as problem behaviour, interpreted as *mis*behaviour, and is essentially an expression of their failure to effectively navigate the school system. Some may simply become overwhelmed by a system they are mandated to traverse. Coupled with stress in other areas of their lives, the needs of some students may not be well served in the school setting.
2.2.3 Developmental Issues In Student Behaviour

Previous sections have highlighted issues that may be further affected by the developmental needs of students at different ages. For example, older students who are pondering their first steps towards a vocational identity may differ markedly from younger adolescents whose self-concept is founded to a greater extent on social acceptance. Prevailing models of education neglect to consider that, for children, school is “…primarily a social experience”, in terms of relationships with both teachers and other students (Elias, 1989, p. 397; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). This notion is supported by Maehr and Anderman (1993) who found that the amount of variance in student motivation explained by school culture increased at successive grade levels. That is, student academic achievement could be partly accounted for by the degree to which individual students considered themselves accepted in the school’s social community. One explanation was the pervasive emphasis on ability goals over task goals that exacerbate negative social comparisons between high achievers and students at risk of school failure (Friedland, 1999; Maehr & Anderman, 1993). Ability goals refer to those goals where success is defined as ‘doing better than others’, compared to task goals where success was defined as effort expended in problem solving and finding solutions to novel problems. The authors proposed a shift towards task goals to support intrinsically motivated ‘learning for the sake of learning’, which could preclude the necessity for students to venture where failure is perceived as likely (Maehr & Anderman, 1993). As a result, one layer of threat to students’ self-concept could be removed to reduce the frequency of misbehaviour as de-compensated coping, and may be crucial when negative social comparisons have significant developmental consequences.
According to the authors, such a shift was viewed as especially important for at risk adolescent students at a critical period of identity and social development, and in particular, to minimise separation from ‘those who belong’ (Maehr & Anderman, 1993). Exclusion from ‘those who belong’ effectively separates those who ‘do not belong’, or those who are marginalised for whatever reason that distinguishes them from the dominant group (Elias, 1989; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). Where learning and belonging are defined in the narrow terms of the dominant ethos, those who ‘do not belong’ have limited recourse but to act out against the system that defines their difference. Given that social support is widely acknowledged as one of the most important buffers against life’s travails, the failure of some schools to more fully address the social needs of children may, therefore, work in opposition to academic objectives, and potentially, be tantamount to neglect of students’ developmental needs.

The issue is particularly salient for adolescents negotiating the developmental journey to identity and independence. As an illustration, an American study by Schmuck and Schmuck (1991) involving 212 high school students asked about the best and worst aspects of school. Students identified first and foremost, “lots of friends”, followed by “everybody knows everybody else” and “small classes with individual attention” (p. 87). Other aspects were extra-curricular activities, absence of school violence, and caring teachers. The list of ‘worst’ aspects reflected the inverse of these themes, and a lowered sense of community and belonging (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). Surprisingly, only one reference was made to curriculum matters, and it appeared on the ‘worst’ list. Thus, at least during the adolescent years, the social environment is central to students’ experience of school, as well as facilitating their adaptive development. Given that students may externalise their sense of
exclusion from ‘those who belong’, there is a need for greater consideration of the school environment as a vehicle for reducing student misbehaviour.

The above is also consistent with claims that link the school social environment to school shooting incidents in America’s recent past. Friedland (1999), for example, asserts a need for change in the culture of schools, rather than moving – predictably – towards ‘lock-down’ security measures. If students perceive their school experience as threatening, the result will be increasing numbers of young people who are ill-equipped to confront the pressures of work and living as they move into their adult years. By implication, the social environment of schools is viewed as a key pathway for reducing perceptions of threat and alienation during critical periods of student development. While shooting incidents involving American students may be extreme examples, they highlight the criticality of acknowledging the social needs of developing adolescents. Friedland (1999) argued further, that solutions outside the narrow context of academic achievement and isolated “clinical” interventions for indicated cases were essential to remediation. Recommendations included collaboration between educators, psychologists, and other school personnel, with emphases on psychosocial growth and changes in school climate. Both factors play an integral role in satisfactory developmental adaptation during the adolescent years. Nonetheless, other researchers have found that such solutions may not be easily delivered, as will become clear in the next section.

2.2.4 School Culture And Students Who Don’t ‘Fit’

The complex interplay of factors affecting students with behaviour problems does not occur against a backdrop of stable social and economic forces. To illustrate, Enomoto (1994) explored the multiple meanings of truancy according to subcultural
groups within the school system, and how organisational culture may determine the
treatment of truanting students. According to Enomoto (1994), social diversity (such
as socio-economic status and race) places increasing demands on educators to respond
to the changing demographics of student populations. Although the accommodation
of racial, ethnic and gender differences may be visible in the rhetoric of school
reform, the gap between minority students and white middle-class teachers challenges
the penetration of reform objectives. For example, students from ethnic minorities
may be socialised to respond differently in certain situations, such as not making eye
contact with people in positions of authority (Australian Aborigines). Unless
teachers have been trained to recognise and respond to the nuances of ethnic culture,
there is a risk of the behaviour being misinterpreted as overt disobedience. Not
surprisingly then, the consequence of ‘difference’ in all its variations, is associated
with reduced academic achievement and the frequency of diagnoses for learning
difficulties (Enomoto, 1994).

One of the concerns central to corrective efforts is the failure of teacher in-
service training to address issues of power, authority, and social structure, which offer
a broader framework for understanding problems such as truancy (Enomoto, 1994).
As illustrated above, these factors may influence the treatment of ‘misbehaving’
students, simply because they are embedded in the dominant culture of the school. In
addition, early research neglected to link schools to other socio-cultural institutions,
such as class and socio-economic status, which define the context of schools in the
wider community. As a result, the channels through which teacher-student conflicts
were interpreted had been limited in some cases, especially where one-way
communication was used to ‘tell’ and to ‘control’ (Enomoto, 1994; Kowalski, 2000). This issue is noteworthy when the interpretation of cultural phenomena may indirectly
affect how problem students are treated, because, by virtue of the situation, teachers are always intermediaries in the process.

Moreover, strategies to address the influence of school culture have tended to focus on students as the source of the problem, rather than viewing the issue contextually. Yet, significant between-school differences have been reported for a range of interpersonal violence indicators. In a study of 87 American schools, more between-school variance could be explained by subcultural values within individual schools, and was not necessarily associated with race or class (Felson, 1994). Paradoxically, it is contextual differences such as race and class that are typically used to describe problem students, although the ‘context’ usually only applies beyond that of the school environment. For example, children from low socioeconomic and ethnically diverse backgrounds are overwhelmingly represented in statistics for behavioural (and emotional) problems (Jackson & Bynum, 1997). In such cases, behavioural problems may simply reflect normal reactions to the acculturation process, or behaviours that are otherwise acceptable to the students’ ethnic group (Jackson & Bynum, 1997). These students’ overrepresentation in statistics for emotional and behavioural problems may in fact expose the insensitivity of the broader community context, or dominant culture (Jackson & Bynum, 1997). This is consistent with earlier research that identified alignment between students’ values and those of the dominant cultural group as a predictor of student success (Ellefson, 1993). Attempts to resolve the problem, however, were again focused on individual students.

Recent trends in the education literature refer to emerging strategies oriented towards student self-regulation and internalisation of prosocial norms and values (Cowen et al., 1996; Ellefson, 1993). For example, school-based programs often
focus on development of adaptive interpersonal skills or social problem solving, because of empirical support for the enduring positive effects of prosocial behaviour in school and across the adult years (Cowen et al., 1996). The rationale for such programs is provided by evidence linking chronically under-socialised or asocial children to later maladaptive outcomes, such as delinquency, substance abuse problems, and mental health difficulties. Such findings lend credence to the idea that teaching children positive instrumental skills may provide a foundation for adaptive development, regardless of the conditions of their existence. Further evidence for the utility of this approach is reflected in the widespread use of elements of social-problem solving to enhance other school-based training programs, such as those for drug and alcohol abuse prevention (Cowen et al., 1996). Following from this, it appears that most intervention programs are aimed at the level of individual children, albeit in a classroom setting, which would presume an immutable context for children’s behaviour. An additional assumption is, perhaps, that the school environment is somehow removed from that context, and that it is - once again - the answer to the problem, and not part of the cause.

### 2.2.5 Approaches To Management Of Student Behaviour

A considerable portion of the education literature on student behaviour is dedicated to describing approaches to discipline and other behaviour management strategies. These include school-based discipline policies, teacher in-service training, and ‘alternative education programs’ designed to assist the integration of problem students. In many papers, leadership and/or culture rate more than a passing mention as factors that help or hinder the management of student behaviour, as does the necessity of ‘protecting’ teachers and students (Enomoto, 1994; Jackson & Bynum,
1997; Marchesi, 1998; Mok & Flynn, 1998). Nonetheless, students are deemed to bring their problem behaviour to school, where it is seen as something to be fixed, controlled, or removed. Discipline and behaviour management plans persist as the strategy of choice, but continue to fall short of Ellefson’s (1993) definition of discipline as, “…the ability to identify the character of a circumstance or situation to determine one’s most constructive role in it, to carry out that role directly, to sustain it as long as necessary, and to learn from the consequences of one’s actions” (p. 236).

Ellefson’s (1993) position connotes a dynamic interaction between person and situation that leads to deep learning, change, and the getting of wisdom. Ellefson (1993) also suggests that discipline and behavioural regulation “…is taught best by people who are willing to demonstrate it in their own lives” (p. 236). However, this critical ability is somewhat remote from the weary acceptance by teachers that students have problems, and that schools are expected to have answers. Instead, schools perpetuate the typical inevitability of adults-as-expert embedded in the narrow models of behaviour management mandated by disconnected education departments (Ellefson, 1993; Kowalski, 2000). What this position reflects is, fundamentally, a dichotomy of presumed causes and controls that have persisted well beyond their historical usefulness.

According to Noguera (1995), this type of cause-control dichotomy emerges from the philosophical orientation of early institutional models and approaches to discipline. The development of the public school system during the nineteenth century was conceived along the lines of prevailing models for asylums. In terms of their architecture, organisation, and operation, human service institutions evolved to meet the custodial functions of their respective populations, be they insane, sick, or criminally inclined. Not surprisingly, their role became synonymous with
regimentation, orderliness, punctuality, discipline, and the imposition of rigidly enforced rules, all of which served to assuage prevailing anxieties about controlling those held in custody (Noguera, 1995). Although schools may have differed in their purpose, an agenda of social control dominated the development of public education systems in the industrialised world.

At the same time, well-intentioned social reformers called for the creation of pedocentric schools, which would assume pre-eminence in correcting and compensating for the perceived shortcomings of familial education (Noguera, 1995). The ‘problem’ was defined in moral terms and reflected two dominant themes, 1) a humanitarian or welfare theme that regarded poor and immigrant families as unfit to raise their children, and, 2) fear arising from the threat of crime and delinquency. Building on the asylum model for human service institutions, and borrowing from the – at the time – popular writings of Frederick Taylor, order, efficiency, and routinisation of school activities, became the standard for public schools. The evidence suggests that we have not travelled far in the journey through time.

Further, Noguera (1995) asserted that many teachers continue to embrace untested assumptions about the background of their students as being impoverished and dysfunctional. In the absence of objective data, teachers fill the knowledge void with stereotypes from the media, or from what they learn indirectly from their own lives (Noguera, 1995). They may then respond differentially to students based on these assumptions, and remain preoccupied with discovering new recipes for controlling student behaviour (Noguera, 1995; Matzin, Pick, Bell & Barrett, 2003). While teachers tacitly accept that social ills and family dysfunction exert a pervasive influence on children’s behaviour, they fall back on the forms of control ordained in their own histories of school and family. Such is the social power teachers bring to
the classroom that they, incidentally, perhaps blindly, perpetuate the historical morality of public education in the developed world (Noguera, 1995; Tauber, 1993).

In sum, the term *misbehaviour* has largely been understood in terms of *any* behaviour that disturbs the orderly routine of schools and school classrooms. Numerous social ills perpetuated in structural and historical inequality are widely acknowledged as the causes of misbehaviour, and are sometimes used to inform strategies for resolution. School responses have generally clustered around themes of humanitarian or discipline-based approaches, but according to the literature, behaviour problems persist despite intervention, and are perceived by some to be escalating, for teachers, for school administrators, and for students categorised as a ‘problem’. Student misbehaviour endures as an identified source of difficulty for teachers and school administrators, but the nature and frequency of the problem is rarely subject to rigorous investigation. Instead, it usually emerges as one of a range of named variables, and then only in categorical terms (verbal abuse, violence, et cetera). As a result, the perception of an escalation in behaviour problems has had no empirical basis, a situation that has only recently been addressed at the departmental level (in Queensland, and only in relation to suspensions and exclusions). In the next section, issues concerned with capturing student behaviour data will be discussed, with an emphasis on overcoming particular challenges.

### 2.2.6 Capturing Student Behaviour Data

Following from the above, it should be apparent that a gap exists between perceptions of increasing frequency of student misbehaviour, and what is actually measured. However, obtaining an accurate picture of student behaviour in schools is fraught with difficulty given the plethora of additional factors that may bear on the
collection of data. From the students’ perspective, there is potential for attributional biases where they perceive teachers to favour some students over others, intentionally or otherwise (Noguera, 1995). From the teachers’ perspective, deciphering whether students’ behaviour has situational or dispositional origins can influence choices about pathways for intervention and reporting (Matzin et al., 2003). The context of past interactional history, personality variables, situational factors, life circumstances, and personal resources, are salient for both teachers and students whenever an incident occurs.

How behaviour is reported and managed is guided by departmental policies that aspire to support all students through an inclusive curriculum and a supportive school environment, the philosophy of which is said to be ‘embedded within school culture’ (for example, SM-06: Management of Behaviour in a Supportive School Environment, Department of Education, 1998). The aspirational goals of such policies are captured in guidelines to achieve objectives for ‘social justice’ and principles of ‘equity’, ‘responsiveness’, and ‘authentic participation’ (pp.3-5).

Implementation aims for behaviour management policies advocate strategies where schools “…deploy human, financial and material resources to respond to the school community’s identified needs and priorities” (p. 6). Teachers and school administrators may question the obvious conflict between utopian ideals and restricted government funding for public education. Nonetheless, the guidelines recognise that “…curriculum design and delivery can exclude some groups through stereotyping, inappropriate expectations, racism and sexism, negative classroom interactions, or failure to address barriers to participation and achievement” (Department of Education, 1998, p. 4). While this acknowledges the potential for unequal treatment of students, it also perpetuates the conventional focus on curricula as the vehicle for
remediation. The SM-06 policy in particular, mandates school-based Behaviour Management Plans designed to articulate codes of behaviour and to establish procedures for documenting and managing infractions (Department of Education, 1998). As a result, all Queensland schools are required to have a published code of behaviour and behaviour management procedures. It is this framework that informs how a teacher first distinguishes whether an infraction has occurred.

In the moment of choice however, teachers are presented with the unenviable task of divining the implicit nature of a behavioural event, and responding in the manner most likely to restore order and support student learning and development. They must examine the mix of what is known about a student, and draw conclusions about what can only be inferred, for example, a student’s developmental level and individual vulnerabilities, such as family history, or limited support systems. Nonetheless, underlying the stated goals for a “…supportive school environment… characterised by non-violent, non-coercive and non-discriminatory practices” (Department of Education, 1998, p. 2; see also, Duke, 1996) lies an ambitious assumption that teachers are equally endowed with the requisite knowledge and skills to interpret the nuances of student behaviour. Children’s behaviour is not so easily decoded, however. When a teacher chooses to report an infraction, their decision may be dictated by both static and situational factors, including the teacher’s capacity to assess students in terms of adjustment or other problems, based on that teacher’s training, life experience, and the constraints of the classroom.

In addition, there are different schools of thought regarding how best to assess the adjustment of misbehaving children. The conventional approach has been to define positive adjustment by the absence of clear psychopathology, or of overt indicators for distress and maladjustment (Cowen et al., 1996; Luthar & Zigler, 1991;
Sagy & Dotan, 2001). The appraisal of adjustment problems is generally made by some exogenous other, such as a guidance officer, nurse, welfare officer, or psychologist, rather than individual teachers. Recent approaches to assessment are defined as salutogenic, in that adjustment is conceptualised according to how competent the child perceives him/herself to be, cognitively, socially, and physically (Lantieri, 1999; Sagy & Dotan, 2001). This perspective emphasises the child’s perception of their experience, as well as their use of positive coping resources in the face of stressful situations. Again though, the classroom environment limits the degree to which such appraisals can be made in the teacher’s moment of choice.

Further, research indicates that some children internalise their reactions to stressful life events, and that they may appear only superficially competent (Sagy & Dotan, 2001). The ability to distinguish which children are so affected can easily exceed the training and expertise of many teachers, especially given that internalised reactions are less likely to draw attention in the classroom. Internalised reactions may include depression, anxiety, and a range of somatic problems such as headaches and stomach aches (Hanna, 1988; Sagy & Dotan, 2001). In comparison, externalised reactions include the ‘acting out’ behaviours usually associated with maladjustment and discipline problems. Not surprisingly then, the frequency with which teachers report the stress-inducing effects of students’ misbehaviour most often arises in connection with externalising behaviours, which may or may not reflect adjustment issues (Hanna, 1988; Hart, Wearing & Conn, 1995; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996). The result is likely to be an over-reporting of externalising behaviours that conceal more widespread social maladjustment.

While the influence of teacher subjectivity cannot be entirely controlled, it is at least now possible to compare incidence rates of misbehaviour across schools. The
established codes of school conduct refer largely to the externalising behaviours most often cited as disruptive. In contrast, internalising behaviours are usually referred for therapeutic intervention from guidance officers or external mental health agencies. As a result, most records of problem behaviour report the externalising behaviours identified in the literature (McCraith, 1996; Prochnow, 1998). Thus, the frequency of misbehaviour can be captured using an event-based measure operationalised from published codes of school conduct, which also serves to reduce extraneous within-school influences. This provides an opportunity to enhance the level of objectivity in studies of student behaviour, and how it may be associated with other school based variables, such as those investigated here.

### 2.3 Summary

This chapter highlighted the pervasive nature of student behaviour problems in school settings, and the complex issues that may bear on the emergence of, and response to, such problems. Misbehaviour was identified as student actions that disrupt classroom order, including categories of aggression, non-compliance, inappropriate sexual behaviour, drug use, verbal abuse, and trespass. The origins of behavioural problems were then described, based on social, familial, structural, developmental, and school environment factors. School responses to misbehaviour were also discussed, and focused on school discipline policies and the emergent notion of ‘youth containment’. Key to the argument was the complex array of influences that give rise to behaviour problems, and the difficult task of developing effective and enduring solutions that do not have unintended consequences for the students concerned. The final section presented information on factors likely to help
or hinder the capture of student behaviour data, to answer identified problems in the empirical rigour of previous research.

In the next chapter, the issue of school leadership will be discussed. The chapter begins with a definition of leadership, and follows with a discussion of leadership models drawn principally from the organisational psychology literature. Literature regarding school leadership is then reviewed, especially as it relates to teacher and student outcomes. The chapter concludes with an overview of the methodological issues found in educational leadership literature, to inform how the present program of research can be conceptualised. To begin however, it is necessary to appreciate how the concept of leadership is defined and has evolved over time, before proceeding with a discussion of how it has been applied in previous investigations of school leadership.
CHAPTER THREE
The Nature And Models Of School Leadership

“In my current work...I have come to know many schools well: by the way children move in the hallways – silently, boys and girls in neat, separate lines, or in noisy, uneven clumps...When I get to know the principal, I realize that, essentially, the school’s characteristics are a reflection of the educational values of its leader.” (Goldman, 1998, p. 20)

3.0 Introduction

In the education literature, leadership has emerged in a number of studies as important for a range of school outcome variables. Most often it is defined in terms of influence on subordinates, especially interpersonal influence, as it pertains to relations within the school community, as well as school performance generally. Interest in school leadership escalated during a period of rapid social transformation, and led to recognition of trends in student demographics, including the effects of socio-economic status, cultural and language diversity, as well as changes to the labour market which disproportionately affect youth (D’Arcy, 1994; Griffith, 1999; Hart et al., 1995; Marchesi, 1998). Concomitant rises in teacher stress have also led to studies of leadership influence in the amelioration or aggravation of teacher distress. Outcome variables have included teacher self-efficacy (Hipp, 1996, 1997), school culture (Begley, 1994; Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996; Jason, 2000), organisational citizenship behaviour (Koh et al., 1995), and student achievement (Griffith, 1999; Todd, 1999). To provide background for this chapter, leadership will first be defined
and contextualised within theories of leadership, before proceeding with a review of literature relevant to school leadership, and to transformational leadership in particular.

3.1 **Leadership Defined**

According to Langford and Fitness (2003), there is no widely accepted definition of leadership, and most capture only some of the important features. There appears to be, however, some consensus that leadership is something a person does, rather than what a person is. Further, it is concerned with processes of influence that are not necessarily associated with the power of positional authority, or with conventional notions of management (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Parry, 2002; Riggio, 1999). The notion of leader influence is, moreover, confined to non-coercive techniques, which distinguish it stylistically from management and dictatorship (Greenberg & Baron, 2000).

In contrast, management is concerned more with the rational analytic functions of management, including such activities as planning, organising, coordinating, and controlling (House & Aditya, 1997). A leader changes the actions and attitudes of others through the exercise of influence in a process that employs compromise and social skills to accomplish organisational goals (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Smither, 1998). Leadership is not simply the use of exceptional interpersonal skills, however, as technical and conceptual skills are required as scaffolding for the exercise of influence (Muchinsky, 2000). Interpersonal skills include the capacity to persuade others and to develop productive and harmonious relationships, while technical and conceptual skills are concerned with the leader’s operational expertise and analytical and problem-solving abilities (Muchinsky, 2000). Thus, effective leadership
combines the use of influence, knowledge, and skills, to facilitate goal achievement; it is the combination of these competencies that has been observed as ‘what a leader does’ (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Muchinsky, 2000). In the next section, the most widely known parent theories of leadership are briefly reviewed, including trait, behavioural, contingency, situational, and neocharismatic theories.

3.2 Models Of Leadership

3.2.1 Trait Approaches

Even before the formal existence of social science disciplines, questions had been posed about the nature of leadership (Riggio, 1999). Universalist theories (first identified circa 1840) sought to identify the key characteristics or cluster of attributes common to effective leaders, the essence of which persisted as trait theories of leadership. The simplest of these, the ‘great man [sic] theory’ proposed, “great leaders are born, not made” and that the natural abilities of ‘born leaders’ will facilitate their progression to leadership positions (Riggio, 1999; Robbins, Millett, Cacioppe & Waters-Marsh, 2001). Psychologists later attempted to isolate specific qualities associated with leader success, including physical attributes such as height, appearance and energy levels, personality traits like extraversion and dominance, and other characteristics, such as intelligence (Riggio, 1999). However, early research findings failed to locate a single trait common to all effective leaders, and a resurgence of interest in trait theories in the mid-twentieth century, saw a shift towards more complex ‘constellations’ of leader characteristics.

Working from the premise that traits are enduring characteristics that persist across time and place, trait theorists began to explore unseen drives and motivations that could be inferred from individual patterns of behaviour (Langford & Fitness,
McClelland and Boyatzis for example, identified three categories of needs likely to drive the behaviour of individuals, and specific combinations that could predict leader effectiveness (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). These three broad categories were need for power, need for affiliation, and need for achievement. People with a high need for power enjoy influencing others, tend to be dominating, and to seek positions of power. People with a high need for affiliation derive satisfaction from cooperative and friendly relationships, and may not be comfortable with conflict or with situations that call for assertive action (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). A substantial body of research indicates that the combination of a high need for power and low need for affiliation, can successfully predict leader effectiveness (Langford & Fitness, 2003). The last category, need for achievement, is concerned with how individuals are motivated to pursue challenging goals, and to successfully complete tasks (House & Aditya, 1997; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001).

Later research identified a number of additional traits shown to contribute to prediction of leadership ability. For example, specific traits included internal locus of control, high self-monitoring, confidence, and effective stress coping (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). Nonetheless, criticism was levied against the trait approach, based on the simplicity of using only descriptors to predict leader behaviour. Not surprisingly though, the censure of Universalist theories occurred during the rise of behaviourism in psychology, and precipitated extensive research into observable leadership behaviours (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Riggio, 1999).
3.2.2 Behavioural Approaches

Behavioural theories of leadership distinguish two independent categories of behaviour associated with leader effectiveness, ‘initiating structure’ and ‘consideration’. Initiating structure includes leader activities associated with the organisation of work, such as task assignment, meeting production goals, maintaining standards, and decision-making (Riggio, 1999). Consideration, on the other hand, pertains to how a leader develops rapport with subordinates, manages conflicts, and provides support to subordinates (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Riggio, 1999). Early research found correlations between these two dimensions and important outcome variables, such as work performance and job satisfaction. For example, initiating structure was found to be positively associated with productivity, but negatively related to job satisfaction and positively to turnover. In contrast, consideration was found to have an inverse relationship to productivity, and a positive association with the remaining two outcome variables (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Riggio, 1999).

Around the same time, parallel research by the University of Michigan produced two strikingly similar dimensions of leader effectiveness, task-oriented behaviours, and relationship-oriented behaviours (Riggio, 1999). Essentially, they refer to the same characteristics of initiating structure and consideration, as described above, and both approaches can be similarly conceptualised as either ‘task-focused’ or ‘relationship-focused’ (Langford & Fitness, 2003). However, critics suggested that the two conceptual categories central to behavioural models appear to be attitudinal dimensions, rather than true behavioural styles (Robbins et al., 2001), and were criticised further for their simplicity, largely because they neglected the influence of environmental factors.
3.2.3 Contingency Approaches

Recognition of the influence of environmental factors on leader behaviour provided the springboard for contingency and situational models of leadership. Contingency theories of leadership grew out of research by Fiedler (1967, in Smither, 1998), vis-à-vis the relationship between therapists and clients. It was later used to explore the interaction between leaders and their environment, including leader-subordinate relationships (Riggio, 1999; Smither, 1998). The main contention is that leader effectiveness is contingent upon factors in the environment, and specifically focuses on the alignment between individual leadership style and its interaction with a particular situation (Riggio, 1999; Smither, 1998). Given that a leader’s style is likely to be relatively stable, either task-focused or relationship-focused, three dimensions of the ‘situation’ can be measured to establish the degree of fit it has with the leader’s style. These dimensions include, 1) leader-member relations, poor versus good, 2) task structure, structured versus unstructured, and 3) position power, strong versus weak (Riggio, 1999).

Different situations call for different leadership styles, and contingency approaches provide a vehicle for measurement and prediction of leader behaviour in specific contexts. As a result, contingency approaches acknowledge the potential to optimise group functioning by applying or developing different leader behaviours for different organisational environments (Smither, 1998). Advances in behavioural models of leadership, specifically situational leadership, explored an important additional variable, that of subordinate maturity (Smither, 1998). Subordinate maturity refers to the workers’ capacity for self-directed behaviour, and includes competence, or ‘can-do’ factors, and motivation, or ‘will-do’ factors (Robbins et al., 2001; Smither, 1998). Where subordinate maturity is low, leaders may need to
emphasise structure, and when maturity is high, they can de-emphasise structure to focus on relationship factors (Smither, 1998). The principal innovation of contingency and situational models is that they acknowledge there is no ‘one best way’ of leading, and thus improve on the simple dichotomies of behavioural approaches.

One of the key contributions from behavioural and contingency approaches was recognition of the relationship between leaders and subordinates as fundamental to leader effectiveness. Central to the argument is that leadership involves intentional influence exerted by a leader over subordinates, and that influence depends on the leader’s behaviour being acknowledged as ‘leadership’ by others. Those who consent to be led thereby cast themselves in the role of followers, and leadership is thus conceived as the process of being perceived as a leader (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996). The idea spawned a number of additional leadership theories aimed at capturing the characteristics of exceptional leaders that go beyond relatively simple behavioural adaptation.

3.2.4 Charismatic, And Transactional And Transformational Leadership

Such approaches include the Charismatic and Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership (or Neocharismatic) models that emerged as a major paradigm shift in the 1970’s (House & Aditya, 1997). These theories ask what it is about some leaders that enable them to energise and inspire subordinates, and transform them into highly effective teams (Riggio, 1999; Robbins et al., 2001). Evidence indicates that it is somehow embedded in the relationships that leaders have with subordinates, and is defined by the leader’s ability to communicate strong convictions about shared goals, convey confidence in their own abilities and those of
their followers, and to demonstrate sensitivity to both the environment and to followers (Barnett et al., 2001; Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Parry, 2002; Riggio, 1999; Robbins et al., 2001).

The notion of sensitivity to the environment reflects, at least superficially, the technical and conceptual competencies mentioned by Muchinsky (2000), as they refer to the leader’s critical ability to make realistic assessments of environmental constraints and resources. Additional research suggests that the exceptional qualities of charismatic leaders are related to highly developed social skills and the capacity of leaders to inspire and relate to subordinates at a deep emotional level. This proposition echoes the belief that the success or failure of leaders is often based on the perceptions of followers (Barnett et al., 2001; Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Riggio, 1999). Following from this, research has added subordinate characteristics to the success equation, and includes such factors as, identification with the leader, susceptibility to the emotional content of leader communication, and motivation to follow (Riggio, 1999). When the various factors are combined, charismatic leadership can be viewed as an interaction of leader characteristics, subordinate characteristics, and aspects of the situation.

Transactional versus transformational leadership extends the key tenets of both charismatic leadership and contingency theories, by distinguishing the behavioural elements of each style (Riggio, 1999; Robbins et al., 2001; Smither, 1998). The transactional style encapsulates many of the features already described, in that leader effectiveness is based on an exchange, or transaction, between leaders and subordinates (Riggio, 1999; Robbins et al., 2001). Transactional leaders are characterised as task-focused or people-focused, who influence subordinates through performance monitoring, clarifying role and task requirements, by rewarding desired
behaviours and punishing undesired behaviours (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). The *sine qua non* of transactional leadership is that, by working towards the achievement of organisational goals, the interests of subordinates will also be rewarded (Robbins et al., 2001).

In contrast, transformational leaders rely more on emotive means to influence followers, especially in times of organisational upheaval (Langford & Fitness, 2003). They model a high degree of personal integrity, provide vision and a sense of purpose; they inspire subordinates by communicating high expectations, promoting intellectual stimulation and careful problem solving, in addition to individualised consideration, and personal attention for coaching and advising (Barnett et al., 2001; Robbins et al., 2001). Many transformational leaders also exhibit charismatic qualities, and are capable of having a profound effect on subordinates by inspiring them to transcend self-interest to achieve higher order goals (Barnett et al., 2001; Robbins et al., 2001). Transformational leaders are thus oriented towards vision, empowerment, and self-actualisation, and rely more often on communicating high expectations, and inspiring a sense of purpose, than being preoccupied with the mundane.

Nonetheless, transformational leadership is not necessarily independent of the transactional style (Barnett et al., 2001; Langford & Fitness, 2003). At the core of each style are exchanges, or transactions, between leaders and subordinates, which are recognised as having far-reaching effects on group performance and morale (Andrews & Herschel, 1996). Such exchanges may range from those based on restraint and control to a form of partnership where subordinates have considerable freedom and autonomy to define and develop their work-related roles (Andrews & Herschel, 1996). The principal difference has been described as “…leaders…who do the right thing [versus] managers…who do things right” (Bennis, 1991, p. 398). That is, the
technical aspects of managerial competence may be unknowingly confused with ‘leadership’. True leadership however, includes the leader’s capacity to be a social architect, and is more evident in the transformational style (Bennis, 1991; Parry, 2002). Following from this, the vertical reach, or penetration, of leadership influence may have substantial implications for schools.

3.3  **Leadership In Schools**

This section will provide a review of literature relevant to school leadership, and to transformational leadership in particular. In recent years a trend has emerged that acknowledges the potential for transformational leadership as a vehicle for responding to change in the education setting (Barnett et al., 2001; Koh, et al., 1995; Yu, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2002). In line with this trend, the present program of research also focuses on the transactional versus transformational model of leadership. However, a number of studies allude to facets of transformational leadership without explicitly applying the model as an explanatory framework (Doyle, 2004; Silins & Mulford, 2002. Some of these will also be reviewed in the absence of further research that bears directly on the question under investigation. To begin, it is useful to consider how school leadership has been conceived in the education literature to date.

Historically, research on effective school leadership proposed that principals focus primarily on activities concerned with curriculum and instruction, rather than human relations issues, an approach that typifies the transactional style (Griffith, 1999). The depth and breadth of social change in recent decades, however, portended a shift towards balancing academic and social outcomes for students, and a concomitant need to address rising levels of work stress for teachers. In an increasingly pluralistic society, schools have been challenged to provide a panacea for
all manner of social ills affecting children. Questions have thus emerged about how leadership style interacts with the organisation of schools amidst discontinuous change in the wider community, and whether existing approaches continue to have a place.

For example, Wilkinson (1993) proposed that “…most schools are institutions designed and run for stability rather than change” (p. 339), a description usually associated with conventional styles of management (House & Aditya, 1997). Implicit in Wilkinson’s (1993) assertion is the notion that a transactional style of leadership is deeply embedded in school administrative practices, and is oriented toward narrow objectives of academic outcomes and ‘doing things right’. While many school leaders and departmental directors preach the rhetoric of equality, power-sharing, and collaborative decision-making, evidence suggests that many school leaders actually enable the perpetuation of assumptions, values, and actions that serve to reinforce the status quo (Doyle, 2004; House & Aditya, 1997; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Wilkinson, 1993).

Whether unconsciously, inadvertently, or intentionally, educational leaders may support the dominant ethos of the existing hierarchy, which is largely transactional in nature. Juxtaposed to stated goals of organisational reform (in departmental literature) are conservative elements that emerge as cultures of resistance at the individual school level. Wilkinson’s (1993) answer to the problem was change initiatives driven by ‘bottom up’ processes, and supported by ‘top down’ leadership support. Linked to such initiatives were recommendations for change in the broad spectrum of teaching staff, the need to examine change in power relationships arising from emergent styles of ‘feminine’ leadership, school readiness for change, and investigation of perceived discrepancies between rhetoric and reality.
in decision-making processes. According to Wilkinson’s (1993) suggestions, some acknowledgement needs to be made that the current model of (transactional) educational leadership is no longer suited to its purpose, a proposition consistently – albeit indirectly - supported in educational leadership research.

D’Arcy (1994), for example, described educational administration in Queensland as male-dominated, both in terms of gender representation and institutional ecology. D’Arcy (1994) further cited the perceived failure of the educational system to embrace a paradigm shift towards more feminine approaches to leadership. Such approaches are said to combine collaborative working relationships, empathic communication, and the cultivation of empowerment, which, incidentally, characterise the transformational style of leadership described earlier (Bielski, 1983; Everett, Vaughan & Aagard, 1992; Maeinza, 1986, Porat, 1985; Pounder, 1988; Riehl & Lee, 1996). Competitive and power-oriented, the existing cultural orientation [of the Queensland Department of Education] was said to isolate and alienate female educational administrators, and perpetuate masculine organisational norms. This contradicts the feminine pedagogy of empowerment, voice, and context, underpinning current models of organisational theory (D’Arcy, 1994; Riehl & Lee, 1996). In contrast, the leadership style of male educational administrators in Queensland was viewed as “…predominantly authoritarian, power-seeking and hierarchical” (D’Arcy, 1994, p. 113). Pressure to conform to an androcentric culture was based on the phenomenon of ‘homosexual reproduction’, or “…men manag[ing] to reproduce themselves in kind” (Kanter, 1977, p. 48). The trend survived in the face of evidence that superior learning environments will occur as more women achieve leadership positions in schools.
Such a position is also reflected in Wilkinson’s (1993) argument that power is likely to play a pivotal role for the devolution of control within the social milieu of schools. Or, as Power, Stoddart and Wilkinson (1989) proposed, the “…ultimate test of the appropriate use of power is whether it flows on to others” (cited in Wilkinson, 1993, p. 44) or whether it is used to sustain another’s ego. Theoretically at least, the preceding distinction is consistent with those made about the moral or altruistic use of power, versus self-aggrandising or exploitative power (House & Aditya, 1997). The contention is that educational leaders need to be able to resolve how “…power relationships… penetrate the organisation, distribution, and evaluation of knowledge through the social context, that is, how class structures impinge on organisational relationships and hierarchies of control” (Wilkinson, 1993, p. 44). While such idealistic goals may reflect the essence of the transformational style, conventional approaches to leadership continue to hold sway.

Solutions that are sufficient to counter entrenched paternalism and archaic methods of social control require a commitment to publicly scrutinise every layer of the social structures of schools (Wilkinson, 1993). To do so would fundamentally challenge the stability of the system, and given that principalship forms only one such layer, the task is indeed daunting. It calls for vision, inspired purpose, and referential influence, aspects of transformational leadership that are not always liberally to hand. So, while the role of school leadership has a critical role in the distribution of power and the exercise of control, reform may ultimately depend on the exigencies of disposition and environment. How this may unfold, in terms of outcomes for particular student populations, remains unchartered territory.

One of the difficulties relates to how language and discourse serve as powerful exclusionary devices, a paradox given what is known about the characteristics of
effective leadership. The notion emerges amidst recognition of the pervasive inability of educational leaders to incorporate heterogeneity (D’Arcy, 1994; Enomoto, 1994; Kanter, 1977; Kowalski, 2000). It is, perhaps, simply another manifestation of androcentrism, where authoritarianism and the exercise of power serve to suppress and isolate any ‘voice’ of difference, whatever the source (D’Arcy, 1994; Kanter, 1989; Riehl & Lee, 1996). This aspect is particularly noteworthy in the face of departmental policy that explicitly defines the use of language and practices as central to a ‘supportive school environment’ (Queensland Department of Education, 1998). It is also significant given that research clearly demonstrates the link between leadership style and important school outcomes.

For example, Hipp (1996, 1997) found a positive association between principal’s leadership behaviour and teachers’ sense of efficacy. Particular behaviours from school principals were found to promote general and personal teaching efficacy for 280 teachers in 10 (American) middle grade schools. Leader behaviours included, 1) s/he models behaviour, 2) believes in teacher capacity, 3) inspires group purpose, 4) promotes teacher empowerment and shared decision-making, 5) recognises teacher effort, 6) provides personal and professional support, 7) manages student behaviour, 8) promotes a sense of community, 9) fosters teamwork and collaboration, and 10) influences teachers’ work and its outcomes. When compared to characteristics of transformational leaders, Hipp’s (1996, 1997) research provides evidence of a relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and specific teacher outcomes, as well as an indirect influence on school culture. Findings revealed the critical importance of leadership style on school outcome variables in general, and teacher wellbeing in particular (Hipp, 1996, 1997; Peters, 1997).
Jantzi and Leithwood (1996) investigated how teachers develop perceptions of transformational leadership, based on the premise that leadership is ascribed to leaders by their followers (teachers). The study examined fixed characteristics of the social environment, as well as ‘alterable’ conditions in the wider school environment. In a sample of 423 teachers from 147 (primary) schools, results explained 46% of the variance in teachers’ perceptions of school leaders. The ‘alterable’ variables included in-school factors such as mission and goals, culture, structure, programs and instruction, policies, and resources. Out-of-school ‘alterable’ variables included conditions in the broader community and departments of education. When tested against specific facets of transformational leadership, the same relatively high proportion of variance again accounted for teachers’ perceptions. The authors concluded that the most powerful variable explaining teachers’ leader perceptions, were in-school conditions, that is, the school’s mission, vision, goals, culture, programs and instruction, policies and organisation, decision-making structures, and resources. Where school leaders were seen to contribute meaningfully and positively to these dimensions in ways that assisted teachers, leader behaviour was more likely to be interpreted as transformational. This result occurred irrespective of fixed factors such as age, gender, and tenure, and was summarised by the authors thus, “…it is what you do, not who you are, that matters to teachers”, (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996), a conclusion that is remarkably similar to the Langford’s and Fitness’ (2003; see also Barnett et al., 2001) definition of leadership, previously quoted (see page 39).

Elsewhere, research has examined transformational leadership as it bears on change adaptation in schools, possibly because of a need to respond to the shifting conditions facing education in the developed world. For example, in a qualitative study by Leithwood, Steinbach and Ryan (1997), facets of transformational leadership
were investigated in relation to team learning for secondary school teachers. Teachers’ team learning was represented as including team leadership, culture, team self-talk, and group vision, in the context of school leadership and out-of-school variables. Results indicated that successful teachers’ team learning was characterised by shared beliefs, support, collaboration, challenge and constructive conflict, occurring in an atmosphere of open enquiry. Interestingly, the 48 participants maintained a singular focus on internal conditions for team learning, and team outcomes, to the exclusion of principals’ leadership influence. However, most teams reported positive aspects of principal leadership, such as trust, support, flexibility, encouragement for growth, modelling of risk-taking, shared responsibility, and decision-making freedom. Other teams were less favourable in their estimations of their principals’ value. While the divergent results for leadership may, essentially, reflect a dichotomy of style, the differences were not considered in any depth, possibly as a result of methodological design problems. For example, principals attended some interviews, a situation that could clearly contaminate teacher data given power and status differences (Leithwood et al., 1997).

Not surprisingly, further links have been found between transformational leadership and other school outcome variables. For example, Koh et al. (1995) investigated the association between leadership style and organisational citizenship behaviour for teachers, and student academic achievement in 100 Singaporean secondary schools. Organisational citizenship was defined as a belief in the values and goals of the organisation, and a willingness to commit extra effort towards the organisation’s (school’s) success. Significant add-on effects were found for transformational leadership style, over transactional leadership, in the prediction of organisational citizenship behaviour. Post hoc analyses also found an indirect, but
significant and substantial, association between transformational leadership and student academic outcomes, via the aggregated teacher level variables (Koh et al., 1995). The authors offered several possible explanations for this last result, but concluded that the indirect relationship between leadership and student outcomes begs further investigation. While the link was identified, the pathway was not clear. The results have been supported elsewhere, when a similar relationship was found between transformational leadership and student outcomes, although the intervening teacher level variable was limited to ‘professional community’, a facet of organisational culture (Wiley, 1998). Again however, the narrow focus remained on student academic achievement, and neglected the social, behavioural, and other elements of students’ school life.

Griffith (1999) was more specific in addressing leadership and school configuration variables including climate, structure, and student population characteristics. Acknowledging that principals are “captives of their environment” (p. 268), the author drew parallels between social-psychological models of leadership and dependency on contextual variables. While not specifically framed within a particular model of leadership, the study examined links between school leadership and organisational characteristics during periods of internal upheaval. The ‘upheaval’ was linked to changes in principal incumbency, where some had recently changed, compared to schools where the incumbent principal remained. The argument offered was that school leadership would be more likely to change in an environment of diverse demographic indicators, and where students and parents perceived the schools as insensitive bureaucracies, or were uncertain of the school environment. Drawing from large samples of students, parents, and staff populations in 122 elementary schools, results indicated that schools where principals had changed could be
classified according to student demographics, such as race, economic disadvantage, percentage of new students (turnover), and school size (student population density). Potentially at least, the results may reflect the difficulty some principals experience in navigating challenging school environments with entrenched social problems and structural inequalities. Interestingly though, these issues are likely to be implicated in the student behaviour variable investigated in the present study. Whether or not there is any direct effect from student characteristics – or vice versa – remains open to speculation.

Griffith (1999) also included a criterion-referenced test to compare student achievement, which disclosed lower mean scores for those schools where the principalship had been unstable. This last result was also reflected in parent perceptions where some participant schools were viewed as less ordered, less disciplined, and less empowering. In contrast, those schools rated as ‘effective’ by parents were characterised as having high internal control with an emphasis on the end product, which parallels the character of transactional leadership. What this reflects, perhaps, is tension between conventional models of school organisation that focus on student achievement, versus the needs of certain student sub-populations. Such tensions may operate as potent environmental forces, possibly at the expense of school leaders (or students?). In this study at least, the picture typifies the ‘chicken-and-egg’ argument. Questions remain about what came first, unstable leadership or unstable school environment and/or demographic factors, and how these forces affected students who face challenges elsewhere in their lives.

In other studies, the notion of transformational leadership was specifically investigated in connection with adaptation to social pluralism in the wider society. Some studies identified a certain aspect of social pluralism, while others focused on
what principals already do to promote adaptation, knowingly or otherwise (for example, Begley, 1994; Jason, 2000; Jung & Avolio, 1999). Most, incidentally, reflect features of the transformational leadership style, either directly or implicitly.

For example, Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) described literature on the role of school administrators that emphasised the concept of ‘instructional leadership’. Instructional leadership was defined as, “…the strengthening of teacher skills, the systematising of the curriculum, the improvement of organisational structures, and the involvement of parents and other citizens in a school-community partnership” (Ubben & Hughes, 1992, p. 38, in Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). The authors linked specific roles and behaviours expected of ‘instructional leaders’ that necessitate strong interpersonal skills sufficient for building relationships with teachers, community, and superiors/colleagues.

Begley (1994) reported similar findings in a tri-nation study (including Australia) that profiled key dimensions of successful school principals, to be used as a benchmark for principals’ self-development. Among the (Western) Australian dimensions of successful principals’ practice, were social influence domains, some of which clearly reflected transformational leadership. For example, “vision”, “change agent”, “staff developer”, “expectation holder”, and “community facilitator” (Begley, 1994, p. 332). Both papers hinted at the interpersonal milieu in which ‘instructional leadership’ occurred, yet both offered only fleeting references to transformational leadership. In each case however, social influence processes were integral to achieving satisfaction and a sense of community, outcomes commonly associated with transformational leadership. This arises because transformational leadership is based on social processes, including participation, individual consideration, and genuine consultation, to influence the work of subordinates. Again though, social influence
was limited to teaching staff or student academic outcomes, rather than acknowledged ‘problem areas’ such as student misbehaviour. For Begley (1994) the positive effects of leadership style were specific aspirational goals, while Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) indicated that results may be linked to cultural expectations commonly found in Israel’s education system. Each study mirrors the narrow focus of earlier research, with one-dimensional academic outcomes as the primary objective for students. Nonetheless, Rosenblatt and Somech’s (1998) study includes some interesting points of departure with regard to other student outcomes.

For example, social influence processes, including a range of formal and informal social interactions, were cited as central to the success of the 94 Israeli elementary principals who participated, and emerged as one of the most frequently observed behaviours (Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). Interestingly, social influence skills are not generally included as a formal indicator of principals’ success in Israel, but are specifically absent as either a formal or informal indicator in Western schools. This may, perhaps, reflect the highly centralised structure of the Israeli education system, which allows Israeli principals to expend less time on basic management functions, and more on social behaviours compared to Western schools. It may also reflect differences in how social processes are understood and valued as the mechanism for exercising leader influence in each country. As a result, Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) reported personal handling of student behaviour as the second most frequent activity for Israeli principals, compared to those in 152 ‘successful’ American schools where it was the thirteenth most frequent activity (Mangieri & Arnn, 1985, in Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). Some of the effective principal behaviours described in the study are consistent with elements of transformational leadership. Principals displayed social influence behaviours similar to aspects of
transformational leadership, such as individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation. However, only passing mention was made of transformational leadership as a potential framework for understanding the social success of Israeli principals, an omission that reveals the authors’ possible unfamiliarity with the concept.

Other studies have highlighted an emerging trend towards investigations of alignment between transformational leadership and desired outcomes, specifically in relation to how schools adapt to facets of social pluralism. For example, in a theoretical essay, Jason (2000) explored how transformational leadership could be used to capitalise on diversity, through explicitly working to inform school actions via the merging of different perspectives. This was predicated on what Jason (2000) referred to as the ‘moral and growth dimensions of transformational leadership’ which were reinforced through “…the value placed by members of the organisation on eliciting, respecting, and considering diverse points of view...in an environment receptive to change, individuals are encouraged to present their positions” (p. 2). The contention was that transformational leadership may promote cultures conducive to meeting the challenge of diversity, and will become increasingly important to meet reform agendas, restructuring efforts, and social justice initiatives. Essentially, while the structure and function of schools have previously served to inhibit learning opportunities for students from minority groups, school leadership was considered a potential entry point for change.

Jason (2000) further discussed conceptions of transformational leadership as fundamental to activities that critique, educate, and transform school communities. Central to such activities was the principals’ role of relationship building, serving as a role model, sharing decision processes, and supporting meaningful interaction between groups to avoid clique formation (Jason, 2000; see also Kowalski, 2000).
Such action provides a platform for community members to evaluate and test their beliefs (critique), to learn about equity based on access, participation, and life chance (educate), and to change both structures and programs according to need (transform). Jason (2000) acknowledged that the task for principals is daunting, and described it as “…moral leadership of the highest order since it is directed at helping students achieve their potential” (p. 10). The conclusion was that failure to appreciate diversity, and the values, norms, beliefs, and experiences from which perceptions are formed, will lead inexorably to a clash between educators and those they educate. If student misbehaviour is framed as one form of diversity, there is considerable potential to catalyse outcomes to answer a recognised area of difficulty for teachers. Such a position is not intended to diminish the significance of student misbehaviour, however, but to frame it differently so that negative reactivity is reduced. That is, when school leaders legitimise all forms of diversity in their actions and attitudes, they unify and enrich the experience of students and school faculty, an outcome that is eminently compatible with transformational leadership. For Kowalski (2000), this will occur largely through the communication of school leaders, because communication and culture cannot exist in isolation from each other. It is, therefore, school administrators whose actions and words will shape the evolution of inclusive school cultures (Kowalski, 2000).

Turning now to a specific aspect of diversity, Jung and Avolio (1999) looked at leadership style and cultural orientation in an experimental study of 347 students. Leadership style was manipulated for a brainstorming task to discover the influence of transformational versus transactional leadership style on collectivist and individualist cultural orientations. Findings revealed higher performance for the collectivist culture group in the transformational leadership condition, compared to all other task and
leadership conditions. On measures of quality and practicality, better ideas were generated in the transformational leadership group condition, compared to transactional. Overall, results indicated that the same leadership style may be perceived quite differently depending on one’s cultural orientation, and may differ in terms of motivation and performance for individuals from different cultural groups. In particular, students from collectivist cultures were more likely to achieve task goals if supported to work together, and transformational leadership generated better task outcomes, especially where quality outcomes were at stake (Jung & Avolio, 1999). Given that race and ethnicity are frequent correlates of student misbehaviour, there is some indication that leadership style can indirectly, and positively, influence outcomes for minority groups.

Further, Todd (1999) considered how transformational leadership could inform teaching strategies to promote information technology skills in students. In a theoretical essay, Todd (1999) argued that improved learning outcomes will demand expertise and leadership for transforming classroom practices through teacher empowerment, and that transformational leadership of schools will be needed to support transformational learning at the classroom level. Todd (1999) asserted that participative processes will be required for principals to communicate vision, to identify “what ought to be”, to emphasise collaborative decision-making, and to acknowledge the many kinds of leadership in the school. It was further argued that ongoing renewal could only be achieved through evaluation of practices and policies that hinder progress towards developing the student’s “wholeness” and “power to discover” (p. 7). Such a position connotes an ideology of inclusion and support, in contrast to existing practices which focus on the containment of problem students and(or) problem behaviour.
While the exigencies of advancing technology were argued as central to the need for change, the proposed solution is essentially similar to that argued elsewhere. That is, there is recognition that current approaches to leadership and learning do not work well in the new millennium. Students need a vehicle to learn critical literacy skills to connect with and interact with information, to enhance their lifelong capacity to make decisions, take action, construct meaningful answers, find solutions, and reflect on outcomes. New ways of thinking will be required to negotiate the vast amount of information now available. The question remains about whether old pedagogies will have a place in a high-tech landscape, or whether they will further entrench existing inequalities for those least equipped to navigate the terrain (Todd, 1999).

In sum, the language of transformational leadership is replete with such terms as vision, inspiration, commitment, purpose, learning, and growth, all of which have the potential to lose meaning and wither as idealistic platitudes (Duignan, 1997). In every case, authors offer an argument for its potential to facilitate change, to resolve the intractable, to nurture the different, and to find meaning in a vacuum (Duignan, 1997; Jason, 2000; Peters, 1997; Todd, 1999). Indeed, the rhetoric is as strong as the possibilities proclaimed. Nonetheless, studies of transformational leadership in schools are few, especially in direct relation to student outcomes, or outcomes associated with diversity and disadvantage that often underpin behavioural problems. Instead, distal links are frequently alluded to, usually in reference to academic outcomes, and given the potential impact on students, such references call for clarification and focus.
3.4 Limitations Of The Educational Leadership Literature

A key criticism of literature on education leadership generally, is the continued focus on leader-subordinate relations, to the exclusion of other important leader functions (House & Aditya, 1997). The assumption of leader-subordinate relations as central to leader effectiveness is predicated on knowledge of how ‘good relations’ are characterised. To date, this is an unknown, and is subject to myriad other influences (House & Aditya, 1997). Further, in the context of schools, any separation of leader-subordinate relations from other organisation functions could be harmful. For example, school leaders need to demonstrate some technical competence in the discharge of their role. The key difference is that the transactional style may not be as useful where change and improvement are driving school agendas. In addition, the pathways most often cited are leader-to-teacher, or leader-to-school environment, and tends to neglect the largest group within the school community - students. Nevertheless, there is consensus that the transformational style of leadership is viewed as a possible avenue of redress for long-standing ills within schools, and is an approach likely to facilitate change and improvement for the future. The most significant contribution offered by transformational leadership is that it provides a theoretical basis for appreciating school leadership style, one that recognises the multi-faceted nature of this important role.

Unfortunately, some of the available research suffers from a lack of empirical rigour, making it difficult to draw firm conclusions about the positions put forward. For example, some researchers approach their task using description and metaphor, such as case study essays and theoretical papers, rather than empirical research design. Second, a related issue concerns measurement of leadership style, where the problems appear to be twofold. First, the literature is replete with qualitative
investigations and, second, the survey instruments used were of dubious psychometrics. While neither qualitative or survey studies are inherently wrong or unsuitable, it is how each is employed that affects the conclusions that may be drawn. For example, qualitative studies are inclined to report participant statements directly, from which broad themes are generated. Few authors consider using established methods of analysis for qualitative data, or give any consideration to issues of sampling or method bias. In addition, most survey measures are, essentially, structured interview schedules, as none appeared to have been subjected to appropriate survey construction methods. As a result, they add little rigour to the qualitative approaches described above. Combined with the narrow focus of the school variables examined, it is difficult to derive a sense of how leadership may affect vulnerable students, either directly or indirectly.

3.5 Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the historical context of leadership theory, leading to a discussion of the neocharismatic model pertinent to the present studies. A review of the educational leadership literature followed, with a specific emphasis on research that has investigated transactional versus transformational leadership in schools. In particular, transformational leadership has a demonstrated association with positive school outcomes, sometimes beyond the usually narrow focus on curriculum and instruction. Because such studies are few in number, other literature was also reviewed which alluded to facets of both leadership styles as they relate to school outcome variables. In reference to student outcomes, however, research investigations tend to perpetuate the focus on academic achievement,
possibly at the expense of other important foci such as student behaviour. This issue is central to the present argument, because of the frequency with which student misbehaviour is cited as a problem both for teachers, in terms of their job satisfaction, and for students, because of their development and life prospects. The chapter concluded with a discussion of methodological problems evident in the educational leadership research, as well as the neglected focus on student level variables, as mentioned above.

The next section offers a discussion of how culture may also influence the school experience of teachers and students. While culture has a demonstrated association with leadership, culture is the lens through which most will view their experience on a day-to-day basis. The chapter begins by defining organisational culture from the literature, and discusses the confluence of terminology that has emerged in recent decades. A number of widely accepted definitions will be offered, including a discussion of the nature of culture and its origins. A dichotomous model is then presented to articulate the current position regarding models of organisational culture. Following this, a review of literature concerning organisational culture in schools is offered, including examples of how it has been related to school outcomes, and, where available, to student outcomes in particular.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Nature And Models Of Organisational Culture

You think because you understand one you must understand two, because one and one makes two. But you must also understand and. (ancient Sufi wisdom)

We know...why Baptists are Baptists; why Mormons are Mormons; why thieves are thieves; why Republicans are Republicans...we know that it is a matter of association and sympathy, not reasoning or examination....

(‘On the Damned Human Race’, Mark Twain, 1923)

4.0 Introduction

Studies that examine the relationship between leadership style and culture in schools arrive at recommendations, somewhat predictably, that point to the utility of the transformational style in promoting positive school culture (Duke, 1996). Indeed, for many recent studies in the education literature, the two constructs are discussed in tandem, a reflection of their inter-connectedness. Leaders of ‘good’ schools know the deeper meaning of things before they attempt change, they are able to uncover and articulate core values, and fashion positive cultures from the way they work with the various layers of school life (Doyle, 2004; Peterson & Deal, 1998). In this section, culture is discussed separately from leadership, in order to describe the fundamental nature and power of culture as it is experienced. The nebulous character of culture is also highlighted, as a pervasive force that drives the subjective experience of one’s environment. This last proposition will become central to the current research aims, because of its potential to over-ride pressure for change, its relationship to teachers’
job satisfaction, and on the treatment of vulnerable students. To begin however, culture must first be defined.

4.1 Organisational Culture Defined

Although definitions of organisational culture vary, most have at their core the notion of shared meanings and patterns of beliefs and expectations. For example, organisational culture has been defined as comprising the amorphous “…shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms that knit an organisation together” (Department of Education, 1990, p. 37). Ouchi (1981) included the tangible and intangible aspects of culture, by defining culture as the sets of material symbols, along with the ceremonies and myths that communicate underlying values and beliefs to employees. Further, Uttal (1983) described culture as the shared values and beliefs that interact with organisational systems and structures to produce behavioural norms; in short, what is important, how things work, and the ‘way we do things around here’. Schein (1986) on the other hand, is acknowledged as capturing the dynamism of culture in his definition; “…[it] is the pattern of basic assumptions that the group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration” (p.30).

At the organisational level, culture represents a powerful force for determining the attitudinal and behavioural boundaries for employees, as well as the boundaries between one organisation and another (Robbins, Millett, Cacioppe, & Waters-Marsh, 2001). It implicitly communicates appropriate models for what may be said and done, so that acceptable behaviour is encouraged and transgressions reproached. Culture also serves as a meaning-making and control mechanism for employees, a lens
through which the nuances of behaviour are interpreted and moulded towards accepted norms (Robbins et al., 2001). It conveys a sense of identity and commitment to something beyond mere self-interest (Jordan & Jackson, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). Potentially, such a force can substitute formal socialisation pathways for employees, while maintaining the stability of social systems within an organisation.

How this occurs is understood to emerge from the interaction between individuals and the organisation to which they belong (De Witte & van Muijen, 1999). According to De Witte and van Muijen (1999), learning mechanisms are set up during an organisation’s early establishment. For example, the organisation’s founders are constrained to find solutions to problems, and develop methods and systems around which to frame efficient daily functioning in order to succeed (De Witte & van Muijen, 1999). Decisions are informed by the founders’ philosophy, and influence is brought to bear on who is recruited to the organisation, and then how the organisation evolves over time (Peterson & Deal, 1998; Robbins et al., 2001). This is consistent with Schein’s (1986) assertion that culture emerges from learning to cope with the problems of “external adaptation and internal integration” (p. 30). Clearly then, the dynamic and intangible nature of culture can be difficult to characterise, not the least because it is most often experienced as subjective.

To describe characteristics of organisational culture, Wilson (2000) adopted the position that most models may be more parsimoniously viewed as either functionalist or symbolic. From the functionalist perspective, culture is considered distinct from the less tangible properties of organisations, and embraces such things as structure and technology (Wilson, 2000). Consistent with this notion are the ‘artefacts’ and ‘material symbols’ of culture which divide the visible from the invisible, and includes observable behaviours, language, clothing, buildings,

In contrast, the symbolic perspective views culture as a metaphor that illuminates and informs without averring either cause or effect (Wilson, 2000). It is concerned with the shared meanings and images of organisational life in the narrative form (Wood et al., 1998). Such meanings emerge from the invisible aspects of organisations as values, beliefs and social rules, and serve to guide the socialisation of organisation members (Schein, 1985, 1992; Wood et al., 1998). Individuals then test the validity of their actions and attitudinal heuristics during the process of adaptation (De Witte & van Muijen, 1999). A deeper layer of culture may also be discovered in the form of assumptions that sustain organisational values, and operate as a potent influence over what is accorded validity in the organisational context (Schein, 1992; Wood et al., 1998). It follows that the subjective nature of culture-as-metaphor gives rise to the possibility for consensus or disparity between the individual meanings ascribed to organisational phenomena (Wilson, 2000). Moreover, culture-as-metaphor may remain vulnerable to de-construction and re-construction during an organisation’s life cycle, and in the relational dynamics of organisation members (Wilson, 2000).

What emerges from the foregoing is a dichotomy between the seen and unseen manifestations of organisational culture. That is, the ‘functional’ and visible manifestations of culture are reflected separately in the ‘symbolic’ but invisible meanings attributed to them (Wilson, 2000). While culture from the functionalist perspective may thus be deemed an independent variable and open to manipulation, the symbolic aspects of culture may be viewed as dependent and less amenable to direct observation (Wilson, 2000). Black et al. (1992) attempted to draw together the
convergent themes of culture, and capture its layered structure in an ‘iceberg’ model, illustrated overleaf in Figure 4.1.
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*Figure 4.1  The iceberg model of culture (Black et al., 1992).*

While the model presented above is useful from a descriptive standpoint (and culture *is* most often descriptive), it adds little to an understanding of how cultures develop. Most writers agree that the common thread is found in the systematic socialisation of organisation members as described earlier (De Witte & van Muijen, 1999; Pascale, 1985; Schein, 1985, 1992; van Muijen et al., 1999). Culture is experienced as a Foucauldian ‘regime of truth’ that directs organisation members about what can be said and what should be left unsaid, about what can be done and not done, and provides the interpretive frameworks for distinguishing truth from error in the organisational setting (Peterson & Deal, 1998; Schemp, Sparkes & Templin,
Therefore, culture is the channel through which organisation members ascribe meaning to their experiences (Hoy, 1990).

In some circumstances, leaders may also work consciously to alter the course of cultural evolution, and thus influence the content and process of individual adaptation (Peterson & Deal, 1998). As a result – and consistent with Wilson’s (2000) and Schein’s (1986) approaches - adaptation may be seen to occur at the functional or observable level, and is followed by integration at the internal ‘symbolic’ level. The accepted dimensions along which adaptation takes place, and how the various elements combine to produce identifiable differences between cultures, will be the focus of the next section.

4.2 Models Of Organisational Culture

In this section, organisational culture is discussed with reference to particular characteristics, and how these reflect differing values and assumptions. Differences are described in terms of how they underpin predictable organisational foci, and thus socialise organisation members towards particular objectives and a “distinctive identity” (Hoy, 1990, p. 156). Cultural ‘types’ are also discussed, to provide an illustration of the strength and direction of variations between cultures. Although Schein (1988) maintains that “…we have not studied nearly enough organi[s]ations to argue that cultures fall into types” (p. 30), the concept may offer some insight into how aspects of culture combine to produce identifiable cultural patterns and unique organisational characters.

To illustrate, while there is general consensus about definitions of culture, closer examination indicates that systems of ‘shared meaning’ can differ markedly on a number of dimensions. O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell (1991) for example, posit
that the values and beliefs implicit in organisational culture can be appraised according to seven characteristics to capture key differences between organisations. The characteristics include; 1) innovation and risk taking, 2) attention to detail, 3) outcome orientation, process versus outcome, 4) aggressiveness, including competitiveness, 5) people orientation, 6) team orientation, and, 7) stability versus growth (O’Reilly et al., 1991). Each characteristic exists on a continuum from low to high, and in aggregate, gives a composite portrait of an organisation’s culture, or cultural ‘type’.

For example, if an organisation is high on innovation and risk taking, attention to detail, outcomes and aggressiveness, but low on people orientation, team orientation and stability, the culture is more likely to reflect a high risk, market driven enterprise aimed at achieving a competitive edge (Robbins et al., 2001). The types of organisations to which the culture is suited would be clearly circumscribed. When the reverse pattern is apparent, that is, the organisation is high on people orientation, team orientation and stability, but low on the four remaining characteristics, a different picture, or cultural type, emerges. This second example of culture is more likely to be observed in the human services or education field. Thus, it is not enough to simply describe an organisation’s culture; the dimensions along which it can be distinguished from others must be appreciated to more fully characterise a particular situation.

A somewhat similar approach was developed by Quinn (1988), and, while it has the appearance of a typology, it is most often presented as a circumplex of related components. In Quinn’s (1988) approach, culture is explicitly modelled around two dimensions with contrasting poles, based on competing organisational values (Quinn, 1988; van Muijen, 1998). The first dimension captures the internal versus external focus of the organisation, that is, whether its attention is directed internally to people
and processes, or to the external environment (van Muijen, 1998). The second dimension is concerned with the continuum between flexibility and control regarding organisational processes. In combination, four cultural orientations are produced; 1) the human relations or support culture, 2) the innovation or open systems culture, 3) the internal process or rules culture, and, 4) the goal orientation culture (Quinn, 1988; van Muijen, 1998). Consistent with the approach offered by O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell (1991), Quinn’s (1988) four cultural orientations are largely descriptive and generate images of the ‘usual suspects’ to which each cultural style will most likely apply.

Following from Quinn’s values-based cultural types, an additional aspect of culture is concerned with the degree of influence an organisation’s core values and beliefs may have on employee behaviour. Wiener (1988) described strong cultures, where an organisation’s “…core values are intensely held and widely shared” (p. 536), compared to weak cultures characterised by fragmentation, low commitment, and high turnover. Strong cultures are reflected in consensus amongst employees about what the organisation represents and how it operates, and is reinforced by an internal climate of high behavioural control (Robbins et al., 2001). In practice however, higher levels of behavioural consistency can prove to be a double-edged sword.

For example, unanimity of purpose can serve to enhance productivity, but has the potential to become dysfunctional where pressure for change is evident. That is, while it may be appropriate in a stable environment, it has the potential to act as a barrier to change when change is needed. When an organisation’s continued success depends on responsiveness to unpredictable environmental forces, an entrenched culture based on behavioural consistency may become anomalous and frankly
obstructive (Robbins et al., 2001). The issue becomes more salient for successful organisational reform, particularly when reform initiatives depend heavily on the transformation of culture (Cranston, 1993). It appears then, that the ‘type’ and ‘strength’ of an organisation’s culture may be a critical factor in the change equation, and especially where stability and behavioural consistency have been enduring core values. What this means in the context of school settings has been investigated in relation to a number of academic and school staff issues, and will be reviewed in the next section.

4.3 Organisational Culture In Schools

Much of the current research on school culture presents implications only as they pertain to positive versus negative effects on student academic and teacher outcomes. Other research focuses on cultural issues as a barrier to school outcomes and change initiatives in particular. In addition, ‘school culture’ is often explored as a whole of school variable that includes students, rather than simply a workplace level variable that, potentially, has implications for teacher and student outcomes at the sub-group level. Conversely, student culture is sometimes examined as a discrete phenomenon, indicating that some researchers view student culture as insulated from system level influences and amenable in isolation to “constructive modification” (Cowen et al., 1996, p. 149). Thus, the extant literature on school culture is typified by an absence of consensus regarding meanings and methods, an issue that will be revisited in later sections. For the moment, it will be sufficient to become acquainted with the research relevant to culture as it has been investigated in schools.

As a case in point, Mitchell and Willower (1992) contended that traditional notions of organisational culture may not generalise to the school setting, because
they are based on corporate applications (see also Hoy, 1990). The explanation offered for this position is that adult faculty and students, or large portions of each group, can be viewed as opposing subcultures rather than elements of a single school system (Mitchell & Willower, 1992). While the necessity of unifying each element was argued as crucial to school improvement, the divergent nature of each group was deemed to characterise separate cultures. The idea that contrariety between the two groups might reflect the nature of a school-wide culture based on opposition was not considered. Instead, Mitchell and Willower (1992) described the culture of a ‘good school’ based entirely on observational data where a high proportion of ‘doctor’s children’ agreed with teaching staff about academic issues. By implication, a ‘bad school’ compared poorly because of perceived deficits on the dimensions measured: perhaps the students’ opinions did not align as easily with teachers’ perceptions in ‘bad schools’. However, a restricted sample precludes any firm conclusions, and narrow interpretations influence how far the results can be generalised. Enomoto (1994) offered a similar perspective by presenting culture as a school-wide phenomenon linked to subcultural groups and individual perceptions. Similar to Mitchell and Willower (1992), the notion of culture was posited as diverging between adult faculty and students, rather than considering the presence of subcultures as symptomatic of a school-wide culture of disunity. If, as Weiner (1988) asserts, weak cultures are characterised as fragmented and indifferent, the presence of disunity in Enomoto’s (1994) study may have actually signalled the nature of culture at the whole-of-school level. While institutional realities appeared unified at the organisational level, inconsistencies were evident at the subcultural and individual levels. The multiplicity of ‘cultures’ differed from existing notions of subculture based on race and ethnicity, however, and were attributed instead to
individual level interpretations of the schools’ cultures. No consideration was given to the possible failure of the schools to adapt to specific sub-populations, which may have been the authentic source of cultural disunity.

Moreover, the idea of school culture was, according to Enomoto (1994), functionally orientated, and organised around structures, systems and behavioural norms. This is an important distinction, given that the author highlighted symbolic meanings and interpretations as being pivotal to the identification and treatment of ‘truants’. Substantial discrepancies were noted in teachers’ treatment of students, due in large part to individual interpretations regarding which students were ‘in need’ and which could be reported as truant to “…remove the student from class for troubling behaviour” (Enomoto, 1994, p. 193). Conspicuous departures from policy mandates and behavioural norms suggest that unity was indeed a misnomer, and according to definitions of culture, indicate fragmentation and lack of consensus along key dimensions. It implies further, that teachers may experience conflict between individually held beliefs and their interpretation of cultural norms, which in turn, translates to differential treatment of truanting students. Evidently, at least some beliefs were not ‘widely shared’ and ‘intensely held’ at the individual level, and that some layers of the school culture were fractured from the whole (Enomoto, 1994; Wiener, 1988).

While socialisation is the vehicle by which individual teachers adapt to the internal workings, or culture, of schools, a study by Schemp, Sparkes and Templin (1993) indicated that beginning teachers work consciously to negotiate a ‘fit’ as members of the school community. Even though most cultural norms are not formalised or openly articulated, the codes of school culture can be apparent in the recruitment and selection processes for new staff. Schemp et al.’s (1993) findings
indicated that beginning teachers were aware of the cultural codes and made deliberate attempts to meet expectations for behaviour, appearance, and attitude, in order to secure employment. It was also noted that these ‘codes’ had less to do with educating students, and more to do with looking ‘like a professional’. In addition, the post-induction period brought with it the realisation that a beginning teacher’s status was measured more by their ability to control students, and by activities not formally required or associated with classroom instruction, such as curriculum committees. From the outset, new recruits must navigate the complex landscape of organisational culture to find their place in the school community, and to demonstrate their capacity to meet the key criterion of student control in the classroom.

The dominant strategy employed by beginning teachers was to simply remain silent and to withhold opinions from colleagues and superiors, lest they jeopardise their chances for survival and success (Schemp et al., 1993). An unstable economic climate and the power of school administrators were cited as compelling forces for such strategies. This occurred because school administrators held the decision authority that would ensure continued employment in an insecure job market, and to speed progression to permanent or otherwise preferred teaching positions. Typically, there are only brief periods of grace to ask critical questions and express uncertainty or frustration (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992). Over time, cultural pressure to be seen to be professional operate to preclude open expression and further questioning (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992). As a result, the choice to quietly comply ensures initiates a place within the existing school community (Schemp et al., 1993). It seems, however, that the seeds of discontent are nevertheless sown during the initiation period, and any expectations about what the job can, or will, offer, are quickly dispelled.
Other research also suggests that many teachers struggle to endure the cultures of their schools over the longer term, and the erosion of their professional status in the community only serves to amplify frustration. Sweeney (1993) acknowledged that teachers’ needs for esteem are rising, possibly as a backlash to negative media coverage and parental concerns regarding the perceived failure of education. Teachers’ needs were defined in terms of “…the gap between what teachers want and are getting from their jobs” (Sweeney, 1993, p. 95), and most needs related to aspects of school leadership and culture. For example, the need for improved organisational relationships highlighted a lack of trust between principals and teachers, as well as expectations about participation in the decision-making process. Environmental factors were also cited, including decision implementation, workload, parent support, student work ethic, and respect from students and the public generally. Of interest to the present study were significantly different results according to student ability levels.

Teachers of low-ability students expressed higher needs in all areas, which may reflect a greater need for supportive work environments than for teachers of average or high ability students. This result is important given the established relationship between behaviour problems and student ability and achievement (Adami & Norton, 1996; Cowen et al., 1996; Jackson & Bynum, 1997; Lantieri, 1999; McCraith, 1996; Noguera, 1995). The author argued for “…a full scale campaign” (p. 98) to create school cultures marked by respect and support, which energise and promote job satisfaction for teaching staff (Sweeney, 1993). The aspirational flavour of this statement hints at the power of culture to affect the experience of school communities, and consequently, school outcomes. Not all teachers and students are created equal though, and individual differences may be discounted in one-size-fits-all
solutions that erode the effectiveness of teachers, even though they are central to change efforts. Not surprisingly then, the literature on cultural change in schools is often less than encouraging, as will become evident.

4.3.1 Cultural Change In Schools

According to Meier (1992), teachers are crucial to reform agendas that aim to counter nostalgia about what schools “used to be like”, and to re-shape the institutions within which teaching takes place. However, teachers are often constrained by role demands and old habits that make them unknowing confederates to a system-wide inertia. Teachers learn to be teachers principally from their childhood experience of being taught, and this may not be fertile ground from which to grow better teachers and teaching institutions (Meier, 1992). In line with this, Meier (1992) argued that if schools do what they have always done, they will get what they have always gotten - a reproduction of twentieth century schools with all their acknowledged failings. Given concerns about a backlash from parents worried about the failure of education, “old habits” and childhood experiences may not be useful guideposts (Sweeney, 1993). In essence, schools may have some way to travel before they can respond effectively to cultural change efforts. Yet, the way in which schools respond to cultural change occurs largely at the level of individual teachers.

Hamilton and Richardson (1995) examined the relationship between school culture and staff development outcomes in two schools, in response to the failure of such development programs to effect meaningful cultural change. The authors maintained that much of the literature on staff development reflects a strong focus on methods of teaching and classroom management, without consideration of the context in which these activities occur. ‘Development programs’ take the form of traditional
models of learning transfer, “…wherein ‘experts’ inform teachers about methods mandated for classroom implementation” (p. 381). Still, existing behavioural norms for individual autonomy meant that staff were at liberty to implement or ignore any new classroom strategies. The cultural norm of individualism in teaching actually worked against collegiality to prevent both the exploration of teachers’ beliefs, and open discussion of teaching practices. Findings revealed that the interaction of school culture and expectations for participation in staff development strongly affected progress toward program goals (Hamilton & Richardson, 1995). It was concluded that allowances needed to be made for teachers’ beliefs and concerns within the context of organisational culture, in order to optimise school improvement processes.

The above compares to findings by Welch (1989), who had previously argued that implementation difficulties in change strategies were due to factors such as norms, beliefs, and attitudes, that arise within the firmly entrenched traditions of school culture. Welch (1989) maintained that the likelihood of shifting attitudes and increasing behaviour change is to some degree dependent upon the beliefs and feelings of individual teachers operating within target schools. While research has been conducted regarding teacher receptivity to change (Waugh & Punch, 1987, cited in Welch, 1989), any evaluation of the relationship to student development was not pursued. Not surprisingly, teachers assessed the advantages and disadvantages (of collaborative consultation) primarily in terms of how it would affect them personally (Welch, 1989). By implication, student outcomes were a secondary consideration where cultural change initiatives were proposed, regardless of declarations to the contrary. Clearly, such inconsistencies will be pivotal to the success of change efforts where objectives pertain to student growth and achievement.
The National Schools Network (NSN) expressly supports cultural change initiatives, especially where they promote exploration of methods to improve student learning outcomes (Australian Centre for Equity Through Education, 1997). An explicit aim of the NSN is development of collaborative professional organisational cultures, which acknowledge the primacy of culture to educational reform (White & Harradine, 1997). In 1997, White and Harradine reported that cultural change is equally as important as changing organisational structures, so that collaborative learning communities can evolve to support both teachers and students. White and Harradine (1997) cited further a 1994 study that found structural and cultural change within schools was positively associated with student achievement (Lee & Smith, 1994, cited in White & Harradine, 1997; see also, Bourke & Smith, 1995). Thus, some evidence exists for the pervasive influence of positive culture in achieving stated goals.

Not surprisingly though, some researchers argue whether truly collaborative working relationships and cultures can ever be achieved amongst school staff (Nevin, Thousand & Villa, 1993). Indeed, the idea of mutuality and egalitarianism stands in contrast to the hierarchical structures on which most schools are founded. Of interest to the present study is the tendency for researchers to examine culture in connection with change initiatives largely focused on improving academic outcomes for students, or job satisfaction for teachers. As this section has indicated, most studies included student behaviour only in terms of whether it was considered a problem for teachers, or was the subject of new classroom methods. Several studies pointed to teachers’ needs for support and to be esteemed as professionals, with some evidence of ambivalence towards departmental or school level responses. Yet, there are examples where supportive school cultures, based on trust and collaboration, have emerged
from the morass of traditionalism to embrace heterogeneous student populations. The
evidence continues to accumulate amidst a backdrop of research on the success of
cultural change initiatives. Following from this, the next section will focus directly on
literature relating school culture to specific student outcomes.

4.4 Implications For Students

From the preceding section, it should be evident that cultural change is
considered key to reforms for the organisation of work in the education system, and
this applies equally to the Australian context (Australian Centre for Equity Through
Education, 1997; Department of Education, 1990). In this section, the relationship
between school culture and student outcomes will be reviewed in an attempt to
capture some evidence of culture’s influence on students. Although much of the
literature concentrates on academic achievement, some studies highlight elements of
the school environment that link to the interpersonal substrates of organisational
culture, and consequently, to how students experience the culture of their schools.
That is, those components of culture that are experienced as ‘support’ and ‘social
cohesion’, are frequently cited as central to positive outcomes. It is in the context of
support and cohesiveness that links to organisational culture are most clearly
articulated, and especially as an expression of students’ subjective experience. The
evidence therefore indicates that culture offers some protective benefit for students
and teachers with regard to problem behaviour.

For example, Mok and Flynn (1998) examined the effects of Catholic school
culture on the academic achievement of 4,949 Year 12 students from 44 Catholic
schools in New South Wales. Student achievement was significantly different
between schools, and was explained by a number of antecedent variables, including
school socioeconomic status, coeducational status, school size, student gender, and student background factors such as parent’s education level. Further variance was accounted for by student motivation, expectations, and students’ religious attitudes, although the contribution from each was small. Of particular note was the additional 20% of variance in student achievement accounted for by quality of school life, which was measured as a single higher order factor consisting of seven culture subscales. Of the seven subscales, students’ sense of achievement and relationship with teachers contributed most to explanation, over satisfaction with school, alienation from school, relevance of school, sense of identity, and self-esteem and status. An additional and independent contribution was made from a favourable educational culture, accounting for six% of school-level variance and four% of student-level variance. Overall, the composite of all school culture and background variables explained 57% of school-level, and 29% of student-level variance (Mok & Flynn, 1998). Further, when school-level sources of variance were controlled, school culture had as strong an influence on achievement as parents’ education level. Students who reported more favourable school cultures and positive home background experience, scored significantly better than their peers in terms of academic achievement.

In contrast, Gaziel (1997) cited investigations of the relationship between school culture and Israeli secondary school effectiveness, where culture was measured as academic emphasis, continuous school improvement, orderliness, teamwork, student participation, and adaptation. Participating schools were classified as effective or average, and as religious or state, by independent assessors, and also rated according to matriculation results. In effective schools, academic emphasis was found to explain the greatest amount of variance in outcomes for minority students,
represented by Asians, blacks, and disadvantaged students. Contrary to expectations, student participation contributed nothing to explanation, possibly because the student samples were uniformly ‘disadvantaged’ compared to mixed background samples in other studies. Conversely, those schools classified as ‘average’ valued orderliness and teamwork followed by academic achievement, and highlighted the primacy of norms for orderliness at schools servicing disadvantaged students. Effective schools apparently manage to achieve orderliness in the usual course of their activities, and without displacing the primary goal of academic achievement. The author conceded that the difference in values between effective and average schools reflects teachers’ beliefs that it is impossible to improve the achievement of disadvantaged students until an orderly environment is established. Thus, when orderliness becomes the most important school norm, it is likely to be associated with lower scholastic achievement. (Gaziel, 1997).

Other research demonstrates that school cultures can respond well to the needs of ‘disadvantaged’ students. For example, Zollers, Ramanathan and Yu (1999) investigated specific educational practices that promote successful inclusion programs for students with complex and/or severe cognitive and/or physical disabilities. The student sample was part of a ‘mainstreamed’ group, but was also part of an ethnically and economically diverse school population where Anglo-Americans were a minority, and ‘disabled’ students comprised more than one-fifth of the overall population. For this school at least, consideration of diversity was an imperative. Findings revealed that most of the school’s success in managing all manner of diversity, and disability in particular, was embedded in the school’s inclusive culture. They cited such salutary features of the school’s culture as, inclusive and values-driven leadership, shared language and values, participative decision-making across all layers of the school
community, behavioural modelling, community spirit, and a broad vision for a school community that extends membership to all. Essentially, while determining to locate the ‘magic’ ingredient that differentiated the successful ‘inclusive’ school, the authors concluded that the school’s culture was the key ingredient. Students were not viewed as “…intruders needing to be integrated” (Zollers et al., 2000, p. 172); they already belonged. Inclusion was not merely a model or a product of school culture, it was a way of thinking.

In another study, Heck and Marcoulides (1996) set out to test the culture-outcome relationship in a sample of 140 secondary students from 26 Singaporean schools, where outcomes were measured as academic achievement compared to national norms. Strong associations were found for positive social relations and teacher attitudes generally. The authors interpreted this to indicate that the attitudes that teachers hold about students may ultimately determine the students’ classroom experience. Further, the more flexible schools were in terms of structure and control, combined with greater teacher decision power, the more likely it was that teachers and students would evaluate school climate and leadership as positive. In contrast, school leadership exerted only a weak, and non-significant, relationship to school outcomes, but was argued as possibly having an indirect effect via organisational climate and teacher attitudes. Essentially, school culture was found to have the greatest influence on outcomes, although the role of school leaders could not be fully excluded. While the Heck and Marcoulides (1996) study resembles the present research in terms of the school factors investigated, the outcome variable in the present study – student misbehaviour – remains unexplored.

Nonetheless, such findings support the theoretical positions of other authors who argue for examination of the relationship between school culture and the
experience of students. For example, Wren (1999) framed the notion of culture as an almost imperceptible but powerful “hidden curriculum”, and asserted that educators overlook school culture as a matter of course. On the one hand, students may be successfully socialised towards positive goals, such as vocational readiness and involvement in community activities. On the other, discipline problems may arise for those who have difficulty complying with, and internalising, school rules and routines (Wren, 1999). According to Wren (1999), the symbolic aspects of the hidden curriculum need to be scrutinised to determine whether culture hinders or helps educational goals.

In line with this, it is not surprising that the symbolic architecture of schools is most often targeted in student misdeeds, taking the form of uniform breaches, graffiti, vandalism, and ‘re-birthing’ of school mottoes to mock the values embedded therein. In an investigation of the symbols and iconography of educational values in Queensland schools, Synott and Symes (1995) refer to uniforms as the student manifestation of the school’s official identity. In addition, school mottoes echoed those found elsewhere, celebrating such virtues as “…achievement, hard work, patriotism, godliness and honour…[and] Victorian notions of self-regulation and the work ethic, self-help philosophy and the ennobling effects of industry” (Synott & Symes, 1995, p. 143). Symbols such as these were argued to reflect the puritanical and evangelical roots of public education, and the underlying value that children need to be the objects of moral engineering and civilisation. For disenfranchised students grappling daily with the effects of disadvantage, the high moral ground is indeed another Everest.

Even so, recognition of student behaviour as a ‘problem to be fixed’ remains evident in approaches to cultural reform. Johnson and Pajares (1996) for example,
described the outcomes of a change initiative designed to introduce shared decision making (SDM) as a school improvement process. In a longitudinal study tracing the implementation of SDM in a large American public high school, the first critical ‘victory’ was achieved in relation to student attendance. Central to the initiative was implementation of a new attendance policy that rewarded good student attendance and introduced consequences for excessive truanting. Success was therefore defined by the introduction of a new mechanism for control of student non-compliance, presumably because it would resolve a persistent problem. However, only two layers of the school organisation were involved, the principal and the teachers; students, who would be the recipients of the new procedure were considered central to the ‘problem’ rather than being viewed as a stakeholder group. This perception had as much to do with the dated theoretical thrust of the research, as it had to do with teachers’ limited knowledge of organisational culture and approaches to change management. Thus, even during a well-intentioned effort at cultural change, the school had inadvertently perpetuated norms for control and coercion. In fairness though, the outcomes for teaching staff may reduce the predictable resistance to future school improvement initiatives and, potentially, promote cooptation of their support for deeper cultural transformation. In the section that follows, the limitations of literature pertaining to school culture will be considered.

4.5 Limitations Of The School Culture Literature

The principal difficulty encountered in the research on school culture, pertains to measurement of cultural phenomena. The nature of culture is such that one must uncover the subjective experience and attempt to do so without risk to empirical rigour. In practical terms, this is not always done well by education researchers, many
of whom have relied heavily on qualitative methods that have not been subjected to 
precise analysis. In contrast, other researchers have employed quantitative measures 
of unproven reliability, or proxy measures not directly related to organisational 
culture (Lancaster, 1991; Sweeney, 1993). While not discounting the value of 
ethnographic approaches, Hoy (1990) recommended that researchers develop methods 
for more accurately mapping school culture, and consider the whole school in their 
investigations of cultural phenomena, especially as they relate to the school’s social 
archnitecture. In addition, some authors assert that the use of aggregated school data 
eliminates within-school variation, or that analysis at the student level ignores 
between-school differences (Mok & Ling, 1993). Thus, the issue of measurement is 
not simply one of reliability, but also one of validity in terms of how well the within-
and between-school variance can be captured.

Paradoxically, the only consistent theme to emerge is the absence of 
consistency and empirical rigour in measurement of school culture (Hoy, 1990). 
Some researchers use qualitative methods alone and without guiding theory, while 
others use quantitative measures designed for disparate purposes. According to Hoy 
(1990) and Mawhinney (1999), the tension between the two approaches is not in itself 
a problem. Indeed, it signals healthy competition that should be encouraged to 
 augment broader conceptions of school culture. Underpinning the tension however, 
lies a more insidious problem – the failure to recognise that existing approaches may 
serve to reinforce the insularity of a system that is essentially anachronistic. This 
highlights a need to at least consider new formulations and means of measurement. In 
the case of the present research, school culture will be conceptualised using models 
and measures from the discipline of organisational psychology.
While some researchers have criticised the use of corporate measures as inappropriate for the school context, others argue for the opposite position with regard to both culture and school leadership (Hoy, 1990; Leithwood, Leonard & Sharratt, 1998). For example, Kowalski (2000) reasoned that cultural reform agendas at the forefront of recent school improvement efforts are predicated on flawed assumptions. To answer the problem, greater theoretical and empirical rigour is called for in studies of educational phenomena, and investigators have begun to seek explanations outside the narrow frames of educational research. Schools are complex social systems, and the manipulation of a single factor – culture – discounts the multifaceted and interdependent character of the system. It is essential therefore that school culture be measured with greater care than has been the practice so far, and especially to capture the dynamic layers of the system’s complexity. Systems models of organisations acknowledge differential effects for both the combined and independent influences of a system’s elements, which further supports the necessity to measure cultural type and its component parts.

4.6 Summary

This chapter has presented definitions and models of organisational culture that attempt to characterise the subjective nature of the cultural experience. What should be clear is that culture is most often understood as a powerful unseen influence on the behaviour and cognition of organisation members, and may have links to distal outcome variables. In the school setting, culture has been associated with a range of important school outcome variables, such as teacher wellbeing, teacher job satisfaction, and student academic achievement. Importantly, some studies have highlighted the unexplored potential for culture to bring about change to enduring
systemic problems. However, references to effects on student misbehaviour are sparse, and are either mentioned in passing, or linked to teacher level factors. In addition, much of the research suffers from measurement problems and a concomitant lack of empirical rigour. As a result, some authors have argued that further investigations of school culture are needed, with an emphasis on remedies for measurement issues. As mentioned in the section above, this last issue will be addressed in the current research.

In the next chapter, teacher stress is examined, as it is frequently measured as an outcome variable for both school leadership and culture, and is considered here as a potential intervening variable for student behaviour problems. The chapter begins by defining stress generally, and work stress in particular, followed by a review of the literature regarding teacher stress, especially where it has been related to student outcomes. The chapter concludes with an overview of the limitations regarding the literature on teacher stress, leading in to an outline of the current program of research.
CHAPTER FIVE
The Nature And Models Of Work Stress

“Within the teacher’s emotional life are the forces that most powerfully affect
the entire teaching process. The human, emotional qualities of the teacher are
the very heart of teaching….the humanity of the teacher is the vital ingredient
if children are to learn.” (Greenberg, 1969, p.20)

5.0 Introduction

Work related stress has become increasingly recognised as a diagnosable
psychological ‘injury’, or disorder, a phenomenon reflected in workers’ compensation
claim statistics (Stebbins, 2003). Indeed, the Australian scenario mirrors recent
international trends among industrialised countries, in that documented cases have
been increasing more than any other type of work-related injury (Kendall, Murphy,

Early models for understanding stress were framed around the medical model
of individual vulnerability, leading to labelling of workers as blameworthy victims
who were somehow disconnected from the work setting (Stebbins, 2003). In contrast,
sociological models focused on environmental factors as the precipitants of work
stress, and neglected the interaction with individual risk factors. More recently,
integrated approaches consider how environmental factors combine with individual
diatheses to produce the subjective experience of work stress (Stebbins, 2003). To
understand the nature and implications of work stress, this chapter will define stress
and review models of stress, followed by a discussion of how the school environment and student behaviour problems have been consistently associated with teachers’ self-reported experience of stress. The broad theoretical divisions of the stress literature, mentioned above, are captured in four approaches discussed by O’Driscoll and Brough (2003), and will be explicated further in the ensuing section.

5.1 Stress Defined

Essentially, early definitions of individual level stress had a singular focus on either the response or the stimulus (response-based and stimulus-based approaches), while comparatively recent interactional and transactional models more explicitly address the influence of environmental factors (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). In terms of historical context, however, Hans Selye is generally acknowledged as the first person to identify the pattern of physiological and psychological sequelae of stress (Riggio, 1999; Smither, 1998). Selye proposed a response-based model where the physical and psychological expressions of stress emerge as an adaptation to demands made upon the organism; he referred to this phenomenon as general adaptation syndrome (Selye, 1956, in O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Riggio, 1999).

Physical responses could include increases in heart rate, blood pressure, and respiration, and lead to conditions such as hypertension, heart disease and gastrointestinal disorders, or psychological manifestations such as headaches, sleep disturbances, and anxiety (Smither, 1998). The substance of Selye’s model remains evident in present-day definitions, which characterise stress as a “complex pattern of emotional states, physiological reactions, and related thoughts in response to external demands” (Greenberg & Baron, 2000, p. 226). In time, the nature of the external
demands, or stimuli, that precipitate a stress reaction came to be viewed as equally salient.

Stimulus-based models of stress reflect their origins in physics and engineering, where the notion of load tolerance is described as the point at which stressors may exceed the system’s ability to cope (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Leonard, Bourke & Schofield, 2000; O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). That is, the accumulation of stressors results in strain that leads to deviations from a normal state, or homeostasis. In the context of work it may first appear as physical and psychological symptoms of stress, followed by noticeable decrements in work performance (Greenberg & Baron, 2000). Underpinning this approach is the notion that the system, or individual, is continually exposed to potential stressors, and that one’s tolerance or coping resources are finite. Once the threshold of tolerance is reached, some level of distortion or disturbance occurs, resulting in observable strain (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). Given that stress reactions cannot occur in the absence of external demands on coping resources, interactional models emerged to explain the relationship between stimulus and response.

The interactionist perspective is based on the person-environment fit approach to human behaviour, which accounts for both the conditions in the environment and characteristics of the individual who must cope with those demands (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Smither, 1998). Historically, the notion of person-environment fit captured a broad range of individual level factors, including disposition and ability, which influence how well a person will be able to meet the demands of a given situation (Leonard et al., 2000; Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Robbins et al., 2001). A plethora of research confirms that the alignment between people and jobs is critical to job satisfaction and reduced turnover. Later trends in research and practice have
expanded this notion to include alignment on organisation level factors, such as culture and values (Bochner, 2003; Smither, 1998). While research has consistently demonstrated that stress can result from a disparity between individual abilities and job demands (Smither, 1998), people also have the capacity to think about and act on their environment. That is, there is an interaction between environment and person, which recognises people’s choice to be instrumental in protection of their personal wellbeing.

Following from this, current models of work stress combine individual and environment level factors in a dynamic framework that includes the person’s ability to appraise the situation as within or beyond their coping resources (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Riggio, 1999). According to this perspective, or transactional model of stress, the subjective experience of work stress arises from a perception that a particular environmental event is a threat or challenge (Lazarus, 1991, in Riggio, 1999). The initial, or primary appraisal, is concerned with how the person evaluates the implications of a stressor, followed by secondary appraisal where an assessment is made about available coping resources. For example, while a situation is perceived to be stressful by one person, another individual may interpret it as entirely harmless. It is the mediating aspect of cognitive appraisal that determines whether the outcome will produce the subjective experience of stress for a particular individual (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Riggio, 1999). Thus, no single element is deemed liable in isolation; it is the interplay between environmental stimuli, cognitive appraisal of events, and individual resources, that combine to produce a stress-inducing transaction. When the transaction leads an individual to perceive the situation as beyond his or her coping resources, the overall process is understood as stress. The physical, psychological, and behavioural sequelae however, are
differentiated from the stress process, as strain reactions (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). It is the strain reaction aspect of stress to which the next section will be dedicated.

5.2 Strain Reactions And Stress Coping

As mentioned above, stress affects the individual on a number of levels. These include physical manifestations such as increased heart rate and blood pressure (especially diastolic blood pressure), changes in hormone secretions, as well as increased respiration and blood cholesterol (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Riggio, 1999). Long-term effects have been linked to a range of serious illnesses, for example, heart disease, colitis, respiratory illnesses, and migraine headaches (Riggio, 1999). The effects may be compounded by the frequency with which the affected individual succumbs to common ailments, such as colds and ‘flu, and concomitant increases in recovery time (Riggio, 1999). In psychological terms, strain reactions can emerge as anxiety, depression, and chronic fatigue (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003; Riggio, 1999). Prolonged exposure to stress may also lead to a chronic affective response to extreme demands from the work environment, and has been identified as a specific syndrome referred to as ‘burnout’ (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Maslach & Jackson, 1986; O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). Burnout typically presents as emotional exhaustion, detachment from co-workers, negative self-evaluations, and lowered self-esteem, as well as reduced perceptions of personal accomplishment (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

Not surprisingly then, there are a number of behavioural indicators which reflect the subjective components of strain reactions. These may include withdrawal behaviours, such as reduced social contact and support seeking, and behaviours that
are more directly related to organisational outcomes, such as absenteeism and turnover (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). Numerous studies have also linked health related behaviours to defensive, or avoidant, stress coping, citing increases in smoking, alcohol, and drug use, as well as disturbances in eating and sleeping patterns which may occur as either an increase or decrease for different individuals. Clearly, the picture is complex and the consequences both substantial and costly for the affected person and their employing organisation. To appreciate how the elements of stress and strain reactions can be combined conceptually as an overall process, O’Driscoll and Brough (2003) offer the following model that summarises the various components of stress discussed above.

Figure 5.1 Variables in the stress-coping process (O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003).

In summary, the experience of stress has several components that begin when an individual discerns an environmental stimulus, appraises whether the stressor can be managed within available coping resources, and then responds accordingly.
When the stressor is beyond an individual’s coping resources, or follows a chronic course that depletes coping resources, the consequences can range from increased susceptibility to common illnesses, to burnout, or significant physical and psychological illnesses. In the next section, the nature of stress for teachers will be considered, and will include a review of literature that examines how teacher stress has been understood and how schools have responded. Where possible, links to student behaviour will be identified. While student behaviour is most often identified as a source of stress, the literature also points – at least implicitly – to potential flow-on effects from teacher-to-student. To begin, the nature of teacher stress is discussed as it arises in the context of classrooms.

5.3 Teachers And Work Stress

Although schools tend to be viewed as microcosms that exist within, but operate separately from, their local communities, they are essentially workplaces for people who choose the profession of teaching. Yet, the experience of stress for teachers is qualitatively different from the work stress experienced by many others in the work context. Van Der Linde (2000) describes teaching as characterised by great responsibility, with no freedom to leave the classroom for more than a few moments, and pressure to control one’s emotions. In the school setting, this gives rise to what has been described elsewhere as ‘communities of coping’, where there is little respite from the relentless demand for emotional labour (Korczynski, 2003). Given what is known about the physiological effects of stress, situations such as this may have serious health consequences for the teachers concerned.

The body’s stress reaction is designed to prepare the organism to flee or fight when confronted with a threat to wellbeing. For teachers however, situational
constraints impinge heavily on their capacity to manage stress, regardless of its intensity (Dorman, 2003; Van Der Linde, 2000). In the context of teaching, the body readies itself physiologically for a response that is psychologically unacceptable, and the stress reaction is thus blocked. The full transaction remains suspended. Over the longer term, inhibition of the normal stress response leads to, sometimes serious, health consequences (Fisher, 1988; Van Der Linde, 2000). For this occupational group, the sources of stress are manifold and intensify the conflict between preservation of wellbeing and continuing to function in the face of such influences. It is the substance and character of these influences that will be highlighted in this section.

Like their workforce colleagues, teachers are subject to the interaction of organisational and individual level factors typically associated with work and work stress. The outcomes for teachers are more pronounced in light of the well-documented isolation they experience in the normal course of their work (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992). Isolation produces a double-bind for teachers, in that it allows for privacy, but can also lead to loneliness, and while it permits autonomy, it can amplify one’s sense of separation (Dorman, 2003; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992).

Grady (1993) explored the types of mental images teachers have of Australian schools, and how their experience may be revealed in part through metaphors. The contention was that such images guide the thinking and behaviour of teaching staff, and contain the subjective knowledge of their work environment (Grady, 1993). These images hint at the conceptual frameworks employed by some teachers to enable their continued survival in workplaces they describe, metaphorically, as “prisons” (Grady, 1993, p. 24) and “little House[s] of Horrors” (p.26), reflecting the levels of stress and tenuous coping some teachers experience in their work. If this is the
perception from an adult’s perspective, what residual effects might there be for other layers of the school system?

Further, McCormick and Solman (1992) examined the nature of occupational stress for teachers, with an emphasis on blame as the behavioural externalisation of low job satisfaction amongst teaching professionals. No implications were reported for the student populations of participating schools, but instead, the study identified the New South Wales Department of Education as the object of blame (albeit during a time of profound structural change within the department). Analysis revealed four factors likely to engender teacher stress: 1) supervision, particularly general satisfaction with the interpersonal elements of supervision, and low satisfaction with recognition, 2) extrinsic factors such as low salary levels and poor working conditions, which were not compensated for by job security, 3) school culture, especially where teachers did not have a strong sense of ‘fit’ with the school environment, and 4) low satisfaction with advancement opportunities. Of interest to the present study, was an association found between negative stress and schools as a work environment. The human relations element of supervision along with school culture, were suggested as logical target areas for improvement to reduce teacher stress. Essentially, supportive social systems were viewed as the primary pathway for countering negative environmental forces.

The results discussed above are also consistent with findings by Boyle, Borg, Falzon and Baglioni (1995) in an investigation of teacher stress, where causal modelling techniques were used to look at the strength and direction of specific relationships. Based on a sample of 710 primary teachers, exploratory factor analysis produced a five-factor model of teacher stress, accounting for 65 % of variance. Dimensions of stress were workload, student misbehaviour, professional recognition
needs, time/resource difficulties, and poor colleague relations. To further explore the relationships found, the authors modelled links between the exogenous (student misbehaviour, time/resource difficulties, workload, and professional recognition) and endogenous (poor colleague relations and stress) variables. Student misbehaviour and workload emerged as the strongest predictors of stress, and were entirely consistent with studies reported elsewhere. However, results for time/resource difficulties and professional recognition needs contradicted the findings of other researchers. Poor relations with colleagues failed to emerge as a direct predictor of stress in its own right, in contrast to results generally reported by other researchers. Regardless of the apparent contradiction in some of these results, the study still offers support for the notion of multiple sources of teacher stress, in line with similar research.

The above findings are consistent with earlier research by Friedman (1991) that examined personal and organisational factors associated with high and low teacher burnout, with a particular emphasis on environmental variables. Superficially, some aspects of the predominant organisational structures implied a satisfying work environment in participating schools. In contrast, the reality for teaching staff was a perception of distance between themselves and school administrators. This had the effect of confining teaching staff to well-defined roles, norms, and procedures, and a limited psychological sense of community. Findings revealed four major school variables in high burnout schools, including, 1) the pressure of measurable goal-achievement behaviours imposed by school management, 2) distrust of teachers’ professionalism, 3) a school culture which was perceived as circumscribed, and 4) an unpleasant physical environment (Friedman, 1991).

For teachers in high burnout schools, the effects on professional functioning included a decline in teaching performance, emotional and physical exhaustion, low
commitment to teaching goals, absenteeism, and early retirement. Of interest to the present study, Friedman (1991) also discussed the influence of teacher burnout on students, citing exaggerated behavioural rigidity and inflexibility towards students, reduced expectations for student effort, and low frustration tolerance within the classroom. In essence, Friedman (1991) described the psychological and behavioural manifestations of work stress, or strain reactions, and implicitly identified the direction of effect as teacher-to-student.

In line with the above, a study by Punch and Tuetteman (1996) investigated the relationship between support found in the work environment and amelioration of teacher stress in Western Australian secondary schools. The authors hypothesised that, while certain stressors may heighten levels of teacher distress, the effects may be offset somewhat by supportive relationships in the work environment, and by teachers being acknowledged for the work they do. The four stressors identified in the study were, 1) inadequate access to facilities, 2) intrusion of school related work into recreational time, 3) student misbehaviour (reported by 24 % of males, and 29 % of female teachers), and 4) excessive societal expectations. Potential avenues for remedy were cited as, 1) support received from colleagues, including principals, and 2) praise and recognition. For both males and females collegial support emerged as the strongest countervailing influence for the amelioration of distress, and the most significant resource for coping with student behaviour problems. In contrast to Friedman’s (1991) study however, student misbehaviour was deemed a contributing factor in teachers’ stress, rather than a potential consequence, a position broadly maintained by other authors.

While the issues appear to be largely constant across schools generally, perceptions may differ by degree on other dimensions. To illustrate, Abel and Sewell
(1999) investigated differences in the sources of stress between rural and urban schools. Ninety-eight secondary school teachers in two states of America completed the *Sources of Stress Questionnaire*, which specifically measures sources of school-based stress, and the *Maslach Burnout Inventory* to assess levels of stress and burnout. Significantly greater stress was found for urban versus rural schools from, 1) poor working conditions, including inadequate resources, 2) lack of recognition and advancement prospects, and 3) poor staff relations, including an unfriendly atmosphere, and lack of support from both colleagues and school administrators. For both urban and rural schools, student misbehaviour and time pressures were the leading sources of stress, with no significant differences between groups.

According to the authors, the higher levels of stress arising from poor working conditions and staff relations for urban schools could be explained by overcrowded classrooms, sparsely distributed education funds, larger school systems and therefore diminished opportunities to develop networks of collegial support (Abel & Sewell, 1999). Overall, different relationships were found between the sources of stress and dimensions of burnout; for example, student misbehaviour and poor working conditions predicted burnout in urban schools compared to time pressures and poor working conditions for rural schools. The findings are highly consistent with other studies of teacher stress (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Friedman, 1991; McCormick & Solman, 1992; Smith & Bourke, 1991; Van Der Linde, 2000), but point to a need to differentiate remediation strategies according to the primary sources of stress in different schools.

The results discussed above bear out an earlier Australian study by Smith and Bourke (1991), which mapped aspects of the work environment and teachers’ work stress. Six Hunter region (New South Wales) schools, and 204 teachers, participated
in an investigation of stress arising from the demands of teaching, levels of work satisfaction, and background conditions in the teaching environment. Of interest to the present study was a moderate relationship ($r = -0.48$) found between school background factors and teachers’ feelings towards students. A similar result was reported for teacher workload, where higher workload was purported to increase stress and reduce satisfying relationships with students. Both issues have relevance to the question under investigation here.

Consistent with previous research were results found for work stress from time pressure, and lack of rewards and recognition, compared to only “a little or some” stress attributed to conflict arising from staff tensions and interactions with students. In terms of work satisfaction, a positive association was found for relationships with principals and senior staff, followed by relationships with students, while workload and work conditions achieved the lowest mean satisfaction rating overall (Smith & Bourke, 1991). Although the positive result for relationships with students may appear surprising, it is often a source of contradiction given that students can be either a source of stress or intrinsic reward for teachers. Both the positive and stress-inducing aspects were, in fact, supported in additional findings for an inverse association between stress and satisfaction with students in the same study. Further, a range of background variables were associated with conflict-based stress, such as conflict with peers, and role conflict linked to the school where one teaches, length of tenure, nature of classes taught, administrative workload, and lack of teaching resources. Each was also found to be important additional determinants of teachers’ student-related stress.

When describing one of the hallmarks of organisational failure, the authors declared, “…if the beast copes with the load there is a tendency to increase its
burden” (Smith & Bourke, 1991, p. 15). This is essentially a criticism of how schools may fail teachers who are experiencing significant stress, especially given the consistency of results found for workload, time pressure, negative interactions with colleagues and students, inadequate teaching resources, and poor working conditions. Not surprisingly then, the authors maintain that the context of teaching should be an area for continued investigation. From the results presented above, the picture is one of a complex network of interlocking factors coalescing to produce the individual experience of work stress. The sources of teacher stress may be multidimensional, but the conclusions arrived at by individual researchers reveal considerable similarity in identification of contributing factors (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Admiraal, Korthagen & Wubbels, 2000; Dorman, 2003; Friedman, 1991; Leithwood, Menzies, Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996). The notion of multi-dimensionality becomes more pertinent still in the context of changes to the composition of student populations. That is, changes in recent decades that reflect broader trends in the community, have placed additional demands on teachers’ coping resources. As indicated earlier, increasing numbers of students are being labelled and marginalised in ever-expanding categories of disability (Prochnow, 1998; Slee & Cook, 1994). In America, this is possibly reflected in the growing numbers of children needing special education, the rate of which exceeds the population growth rate for school age children generally (Miller, Brownell & Smith, 1999).

The intent behind the labelling of children may be to secure needed services, but the trade-off is greater pressure on teachers to meet the increasingly diverse needs of altered student populations in their classrooms. In an investigation of attrition rates amongst special needs teachers, Miller et al. (1999) attempted to locate potential pathways to reverse the erosion of teacher numbers. Once again however, the
proposed explanations simply mirror those in related research. Environmental factors, such as school climate, absence of collegial support, poor relations with school administrators, dissatisfaction with professional growth opportunities, and perceived stress, all contributed to intentions to leave or transfer. The issues that exerted the greatest influence on teachers’ perceptions of high stress were consistent with those identified elsewhere, even when additional objective stressors particular to the student population, were added to the equation.

The most striking theme amongst these studies is the consistency with which environment level factors emerge as stress-inducing. Added to this are concerns arising from the perceived failure of education, and the concomitant need for teachers to feel valued for the work that they do (Friedman 1991; Mannion, 1994; Sweeney, 1993). As described earlier (in Chapter 4), perceptions of a failing education system have been the subject of negative media coverage in Australia, followed by a predictable backlash from parents (Sweeney, 1993). As a result, teachers may well feel themselves trapped in the ‘prisons’ that Grady (1993) speaks of when appraisal of their work and workplaces is overwhelmingly pessimistic. Nonetheless, a paradox is revealed. Given that most teachers are inspired to pursue teaching careers for rewards inherent in the job (Quinn, Lyons & Sumsion, 2003), it is external factors that most often lead to burnout. Yet, any assumption that teachers are able to engage the right coping responses in the right amount, are deeply flawed. That is, teachers vary as much as others in terms of their dispositional and situational coping resources – the context of the problem, though, remains constant.

To illustrate the preceding proposition, Czubaj (1996) cited several studies that explored how the effectiveness of one’s stress coping may be related to motivational differences in the face of objective stressors. Some of the variables identified as
intrinsic motivators were internal locus of control, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, psychological attachment to the teaching profession, and failure tolerance. Each factor is related to the notion of secondary appraisal described previously as part of the stress-coping process (see Figure 5.1, O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). Higher scores on measures of these constructs were associated with lower perceived stress and fewer strain reactions. In contrast, people who were higher on external locus of control and lower on the remaining dimensions were more likely to experience stress or burnout when external stressors accumulated. The results highlight the idea of stress as a transaction between person and environment, and points to a need for robust supportive cultures to counterbalance individual variation in stress coping.

Following from the motivation theme, Mills (1991) believed that aspects of the ‘higher self’ could be taught as a means of inoculating teachers against negative environmental influences over which they had limited control. Training in the ‘higher self’ involved coaching teachers to function from an internal orientation where they learned to offer non-contingent regard and genuine care. It was argued that this would reduce their reactivity to, and judgement of, student behaviour, and assist students to develop metacognitive awareness, learned vicariously from teachers’ who present as models of enthusiastic and unconditional wellbeing and self-assurance. One of the claims made by Mills (1991) was that teachers who were unable to harness their ‘higher self’ were more likely to become ‘burned out’ and apply external pressures to catalyse motivation in their students, against what is now the prevailing wisdom. However, when teachers were trained to operate from their ‘higher self’, outcomes for students were quite remarkable. Longitudinal results indicated reductions in the rate of teenage pregnancies, referrals for discipline and delinquent
behaviour, and in the number of students deemed to be failing. As well, family level outcomes demonstrated improved relationships, more parental involvement in school, and reduced incidence of child abuse. Is it really as simple though, as providing teachers with tools to empower themselves in an otherwise unforgiving environment? Evidence suggests the picture may become more complex as additional demands are placed on teachers’ emotional labour.

To illustrate, Davis and Wilson (2000) examined the results of efforts to empower teachers to reduce stress and improve job satisfaction and motivation. The authors explored links between principals’ empowering behaviour and teachers’ perceptions of their personal power, defined as when individuals, “…believe they can adequately cope with events, situations, and/or people they confront” (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 473, cited in Davis & Wilson, 2000). Personal power emerges from the choices one makes as well as from events in the environment, and has a demonstrated positive association with job satisfaction and an inverse relationship to job stress. Davis and Wilson (2000) conceptualised personal power as part of intrinsic motivation, and included cognitive and behavioural aspects such as competence, meaningfulness, impact, and choice. Competence was defined as a belief in one’s capacity for performance, meaningfulness as the value one places on task goals according to personal ideals, impact as the degree to which one perceives their behaviour is producing intended effects, and choice as the intentional selection of actions to produce desired outcomes.

In a sample of 660 elementary teachers, findings revealed that the more principals participated in empowering behaviour, the more teachers were encouraged to make effective choices in fulfilment of job tasks (which was equivalent to ‘impact’, as described above, Davis & Wilson, 2000). While no direct relationship was found
between principals’ empowering behaviours and stress or job satisfaction, a moderately strong positive association was found between both variables and improvements in teachers’ sense of personal power. Short and Johnson (1994) found similarly, that the type of power base a principal operates from can have consequences for teachers. For example, legitimate power was found to be a significant predictor of status, self-efficacy, and teacher impact, while referent power was positively related to decision making. Thus, a work environment that supports teachers to exercise choice and decision control over their work may have both direct and indirect links to principals’ behaviour, and thus influence the level of stress experienced by teachers.

In contrast, some well-intentioned change initiatives have the potential to produce negative outcomes for teachers, regardless of good intentions championed at the departmental level. During the period when major structural change in education was beginning to accelerate, Bourke and Smith (1994) investigated teachers’ levels of workload, stress and satisfaction. In a comparison between two New South Wales samples, surveyed at the beginning (1989) and later (1992) in the change process, the authors concluded that there was a substantial increase in work stressors across all domains. For example, increases in workload were attributed to decentralisation of school management that called for greater participation from teachers in policy development and school organisation. Other factors were significant too, such as ‘mainstreaming’ of special needs students, higher retention rates to Year 12, centralisation of curriculum, and curriculum changes requiring development of new lesson plans, all of which placed substantially increased demands on teaching staff. Not surprisingly then, the levels of stress reported were consistently higher for the second time period, with minimal variability on all stress scales.
However, for the four areas of stress examined - that is, interpersonal and role conflict, interactions with students, time pressure, and rewards and recognition – only time pressure and rewards and recognitions had altered at the second time period (Bourke & Smith, 1994). In contrast, changes in the mean level of stress associated with student interactions was negligible between times one and two. This last finding was consistent with the level of satisfaction reported for relationships with students, which persisted at similar levels across time. Bourke and Smith (1994) concluded that there had been a sustained increase in teachers’ workload and the associated stress that continued to have an effect. Of interest to the present study is the clear combination of factors in teacher stress, which point to a sustained contribution from environmental factors, such as workload, time pressure, and rewards, versus student issues which did not alter across time.

Clearly, the acknowledged sources of teacher stress are manifold and apparently enduring. There also appears to be general agreement in the literature that negative stressors are a combination of workload, student misbehaviour, poor relations with colleagues, lack of recognition, few advancement opportunities, time pressure, and inadequate resources. Protective factors were found to have two aspects; 1) individual level, including differences in locus of control, self-efficacy, and stress-tolerance, for example, or 2) school level, including good working relations with senior staff, relations with students, appropriate workload, and satisfactory working conditions. In line with the present research aims, there is also some indication that teacher stress may affect students, even though it is most often viewed as an intractable difficulty for most teachers.

Because disruptive student behaviour has been widely acknowledged as a factor contributing to teacher stress, Hart, Wearing and Conn (1995) explored the
potential for reducing teacher stress through improvements in school discipline policy. Longitudinal research evaluated the impact of the *Whole School Approach to Discipline and Student Welfare* program, implemented in Victorian schools between 1989 and 1991. While the results demonstrated an overall reduction in teacher stress, some important additional findings were reported. For example, although teachers’ subjective levels of stress had decreased, it did not co-occur with reduced levels of student misbehaviour. Interestingly, little relationship was found between discipline policy and perceptions of student behaviour problems. Suspension rates however, were found to be unrelated to student misbehaviour, but could be predicted on the basis of school discipline policy and teacher self-esteem. The authors suggested that efforts to reduce teacher stress by reducing student misbehaviour could be misguided. Instead, the authors asserted that it would be more appropriate to intervene with both the teacher and student aspects of stress coping and misbehaviour, by directing attention to developing supportive organisational environments. The findings are, therefore, essentially consistent with other investigations of teacher stress and burnout (Evers, Brouwers & Tomic, 2002; Leithwood et al., 1996; Maehr, 1995; McCormick & Solman, 1992; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996).

A key issue in the extant literature, however, pertains to measurement of teacher stress. In the studies reviewed above, it is evident that teacher stress has been investigated in a number of ways. For example, some authors utilise purpose-designed measures to examine the sources and nature of teacher stressors (e.g., Admiraal, Korthagen & Wubbels, 2000; Boyle et al., 1995; McCormick & Shi, 1999; van Dick & Wagner, 2001), while others use instruments designed to tap specific components of stress, including psychological distress, behavioural disengagement, strain reactions, and health consequences (e.g., Griffith, Steptoe & Cropley, 1999;...
Pithers & Soden, 1998; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996). Still others discuss stress and burnout, using the two constructs interchangeably (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Dorman, 2003; Evers, Brouwers & Tomic, 2002; Fisher, 1988; Friedman, 1991; Labone, 2002). Although the preceding authors do not indicate why, this approach may be intended to reflect the continuum of stress highlighted in theoretical formulations of the stress construct. In the studies just mentioned, investigators also differentiated the sources of stress from its effects, that is, the psychological and affective sequelae, possibly in an effort to be comprehensive. In contrast, other authors specify their singular focus on stress, but actually describe burnout (Czubaj, 1996; Van der Linde, 2000). Consequently, there is some conceptual and methodological disparity in studies of teacher stress and burnout. Whichever approach is taken, however, recent evidence indicates that high levels of stress – measured as burnout – are experienced by teachers within six months of starting work, and is maintained at 12 months and beyond (Goddard, 2004, 2005 in press). This is consistent with a number of investigations of teacher stress, where burnout has been used as the marker of elevated and unremitting stress in this population (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Evers, Brouwers & Tomic, 2002; Fisher, 1988; Friedman, 1991), and as result, will also be the approach used for the present program of research.

5.4 Summary

This chapter opened with definitions and current conceptions of stress and strain in the workplace, followed by a review of the literature on teacher stress. Both the positive and negative effects of within-school variables were discussed, in order to highlight factors which contribute to, or ameliorate, teachers’ experience of stress and
burnout in the workplace. Extrinsic job factors, and aspects of leadership and the work environment, including student behaviour, are the most frequently identified problem areas, yet research findings were sometimes equivocal. Entry points for a remediation were consistent in their focus on environmental factors, while student misbehaviour was viewed as a separate issue requiring separate interventions. In contrast, collegial support, recognition, and quality interaction with colleagues and school principals, emerged as the most important pathways for a resolution of teacher stress. Of particular interest is the absence of direct effects reported for students, except for academic achievement. The student experience is far more than academics though, and as Czubaj (1996) maintains, the teacher’s experience may become integrated within students’ schemata. If the teacher’s experience of the teaching world is negative, then elements of that experience may coalesce within students. In the next section, themes from the preceding chapters are drawn together, leading in to a series of hypotheses to be examined in the chapters that follow.

5.5 The Current Program of Research

5.5.1 Aims And Overview Of The Research Program

Based on the foregoing, there is evidence to support relationships between student misbehaviour and school leadership style, culture, and teacher stress. Specifically, it is proposed that the combined influence of leadership, culture, and teacher stress, may be important determinants regarding how student behaviour is perceived and acted upon. The main proposition is that each school and teacher level factor has been demonstrated to exert a unique influence on important school outcomes, yet each factor has also been related to the others in prior research. Additionally, the influence of each factor on student outcomes is usually examined in
isolation, or within a limited combination of factors, but has not been linked to student behaviour. Nevertheless, Hart et al., (1995) asserted that some student misbehaviour could actually be the outgrowth of school and(or) teacher level problems, and not simply another cause. Therefore, the aim of the present program of research is to investigate whether the combined influence of leadership style, school culture, and teacher stress, are related to student referral rates for misbehaviour.

5.5.2 Summary Of Literature Regarding Leadership, Culture, Teacher Stress, And Student Behaviour

Underlying most research findings was the common thread of difficult interpersonal relations and failure to accommodate diversity, compounded by systems and processes that are increasingly irrelevant (D’Arcy, 1994; Kowalski, 2000; Riehl & Lee, 1996). At the student level, this may be experienced as unrealistic expectations for achievement (Epstein, 1996; Marchesi, 1998) in a regimented and unforgiving school environment (Leonard et al., 2000). Typically, the institutional response has been to escalate efforts for shaping students to fit the dominant system, using whatever legitimised means are available (Marchesi, 1998; Slee & Cook, 1996). This has sometimes taken the form of one-size-fits-all social skills programs, which perpetuate core beliefs about students being incompetent and dysfunctional (Cowen et al., 1996; Noguera, 1995). In contrast, discipline policies have been implemented on faulty assumptions that students are equally skilled at reasoning about, and self-regulating within, culturally-bound prescriptions for behaviour (Hart et al., 1995). Evidence has mounted against such interventions, and point towards a need for greater balance between academic and social curricula (Friedland, 1999). Indeed, there is limited evidence to suggest that discipline policies and other strategies assist
misbehaving students to “…learn from the consequences” (Ellefson, 1995, p. 236) in the constructive manner imagined. Instead, other factors may play an important role in catalysing desired student outcomes.

In terms of school leadership style, the processes of leader influence are fundamental to the question under investigation. That is, leadership, as distinguished from management, is viewed as the effective deployment of social and technical skills to achieve organisational (school) goals (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Muchinsky, 2000). Of central importance is the interaction between leaders and followers, and specifically, the transformative influence of effective leaders. Transformational leadership has recently emerged as a useful vehicle for navigating change in the educational setting (Barnett et al., 2001; Koh et al., 1995). Positive associations have been found for a range of school level factors, including teachers’ self-efficacy (Hipp, 1996, 1997), organisational citizenship (Koh et al., 1995), a range of student outcomes (Wiley, 1998), school culture (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996), adaptiveness to change (Leithwood et al., 1997), and – notably – social diversity among students (Griffith, 1999; Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). In each case, positive outcomes were associated with critical social influence processes exercised by school leaders.

Culture has also been cited as a significant factor in school outcomes. Most authors understand culture through its symbolism in observable artefacts, including language, buildings, and policies, and by its function, whereby members are socialised to school norms and values to become organisation members (Schein, 1985; Wilson, 2000). Culture is thus the lens through which organisation members view the work environment, and come to know the systems of shared meaning (Hoy, 1990; Peterson & Deal, 1998). Where members fail to negotiate a fit with the environment, the culture for some may become weak, fragmented, or(and) harmful, producing lasting
gaps between what teachers want and get from their jobs (Enomoto, 1994; Mitchell & Willower, 1992, Sweeney, 1993). Evidence indicates too, that the process of cultural socialisation in schools is most often oriented to the needs of teachers, rather than students (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Schemp et al., 1993). Yet, culture has been cited as important for positive teacher and student outcomes, especially where the interpersonal substrates of culture are characterised by inclusivity, participation, and values-driven leadership (Mok & Flynn, 1998; Punch & Tuettman, 1996; Zollers et al., 1999). Thus, cultures that propagate core values of stability, compliance, and behavioural consistency, may operate as a barrier to change when change is needed.

In line with the argument above, environmental factors are also known to be crucial to amelioration or exacerbation of work stress, as a product of the interaction between person and environment (Bochner, 2003; Leonard et al., 2000; O’Driscoll & Brough, 2003). The person-environment interaction is amplified for teachers because of high expectations for self-control in a work context characterised by isolation and (often) limited support (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Van Der Linde, 2000). Stress from supervision issues, poor working conditions, school culture, and low advancement opportunities (McCormick & Solman, 1992), performance pressures (Friedman, 1991), intrusion of work into family life (Punch & Tuettman, 1996), and student behaviour, poor relations with colleagues, and lack of recognition (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Smith & Bourke, 1994), are frequently reported as enduring and intransigent factors in teachers self-reported stress. Further, student misbehaviour is commonly reported as a factor in teacher stress, but for the most part, the evidence is subjective and anecdotal. The issue is important, however, given the failure of studies to locate a direct empirical link between student misbehaviour and the variables under investigation here (Bourke & Smith, 1994; Hart et al., 1995).
Given the above, the present study aims to clarify reported links between school environment variables, and whether these variables are related to objective data concerning student misbehaviour. To that end, school leadership will be examined as transactional versus transformational, school culture as constructive versus negative, and teacher stress according to the affective and psychological sequelae of chronic stress. Student behaviour data will be represented by evidence collected under mandated school discipline policies. In this manner, greater rigour is brought to an area of research frequently criticised for subjectivity and poor research design. To answer the question under investigation, therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

5.6 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1, as presented diagrammatically in Figure 5.2 overleaf, proposes that the combination of transformational leadership, constructive organisational culture, and lower levels of teacher stress, will be associated with lower referral rates for student misbehaviour. In addition, the proposed associations are expected to be found for the overall model, and, where possible, between individual pathways as indicated below:

5.6.1 Leadership

Hypothesis 1(a), that leadership style will be associated with referral rates for student misbehaviour, and specifically:

Hypothesis 1(b), that transformational leadership will be related to lower rates of referral for student misbehaviour.

Hypothesis 1(c), that transactional leadership will be associated with
higher referral rates for student misbehaviour.

*Hypothesis 1(d)*, that transformational leadership will be positively associated with constructive organisational culture and negatively related to defensive organisational culture.

*Hypothesis 1(e)*, that transformational leadership will be associated with lower levels of teachers’ stress.

5.6.2 Organisational Culture

*Hypothesis 2(a)*, that constructive organisational culture will be associated with lower rates of referral for student misbehaviour.

*Hypothesis 2(b)*, that passive-defensive and aggressive-defensive cultures will be associated with higher rates of referral for student misbehaviour.

5.6.3 Teacher Stress

*Hypothesis 3(a)*, that constructive organisational culture will be associated with lower levels of teacher stress.

*Hypothesis 3(b)*, that passive-defensive and aggressive-defensive cultures will be associated with higher levels of teacher stress.

*Hypothesis 3(c)*, that higher levels of teacher stress will be positively associated with referral rates for student misbehaviour.
Figure 5.2  Model of hypothesised relationships among school level variables, including school leadership, organisational culture, teacher stress levels, and the proposed direction of effects to be tested.
CHAPTER SIX
Methodology

6.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the methodological issues pertinent to each aspect of the research program. To appreciate the structure of the overall project, the principles and paradigmatic assumptions used to inform the design will be discussed first in the ensuing section. Next, issues concerning access to Queensland schools will be explained, including appropriate management of ethical concerns. The specific methods for data collection and analytic techniques are also described, along with discussions of the suitability of each to answer the question under investigation. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the overall design, as a precursor to the presentation of Study 1, a qualitative investigation of the research problem.

6.1 Paradigmatic Foundations Of The Research Design

The aim of the present research is to investigate the organisation level factors that may be associated with the frequency with which secondary school students are referred for behavioural interventions. Organisation level variables include school leadership style, school culture, and teacher stress, while referral rates for misbehaviour are examined as the dependent variable. A mixed methods design is employed, comprising an initial qualitative exploration of the research problem, followed by a quantitative test of the proposed model. A third study is developed from the first two, and designed to investigate perceptual differences between school administrators and teaching staff, to surface potential explanations of the pathways
involved. To begin, the utility of qualitative and quantitative methods for the overall
design will be explicated.

Qualitative approaches to research inquiry in educational settings have been
widely used for several decades, and more recently, have evolved considerably with
regard to method and rigour. Qualitative research has in common with its
quantitative counterpart the objects of exploration, description, and(or) explanation,
although the two differ considerably in philosophy and methodology (Atkinson,
Coffey & Delamont, 2003; Babbie, 2001). Nonetheless, both have strengths and
limitations, the core of which reflects a long-standing tension between positivistic and
constructivist paradigms (Kidd, 2002). Each paradigm differs in terms of ontology, or
how it understands the nature of reality, and in terms of epistemology, or the
relationship between the inquirer and the phenomenon of interest. At the core of
tension between the two paradigms lies the problem of causation, and how it is
inferred and tested from representative data (Atkinson et al., 2003; Cook & Campbell,
1979).

Positivists subscribe to the ontological tenet that there is a reality external to
the inquirer that can be objectively quantified and measured. Inferences can then be
drawn about cause and effect relationships to generate universal principles about the
classical of certain phenomena (Byrne, 2002). Epistemologically, positivists strive
for objectivity, aiming for ‘gold standard’ experimental methodologies for the purpose
of explanation and prediction (Gorard, 2003). Essentially, positivism deals with
facts, and the representations of facts, in numeric terms. In contrast, constructivists
hold that each person’s reality is formed as he or she interprets the world through
subjective filters, including values and beliefs, and is therefore ontologically relativist
(Kidd, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 2000). In this case, the epistemology, or process of
constructivist inquiry, involves an interaction between the meaning systems of the researcher and research informants, to arrive at a deeper understanding of the phenomena of interest (Atkinson et al., 2003; Kidd, 2002). Clearly, the position adopted by individual researchers will inform the design and methods used for data collection and analysis. For most, the practical distinction between the two approaches is understood in terms of quantitative versus qualitative analytic methods.

Quantitative methods are based explicitly on principles of positivism, which hold that the objects of scientific inquiry can be measured and used to describe events, independent of the context and nature of the measurement process (Byrne, 2002). The over-arching goal is to enhance the validity and generalisability of research results by increasing objectivity through the collection and treatment of numeric data. The presumption is that research subjects can be objectified and quantified in the service of positivistic research goals, and that social values and meaning serve only to cloud the resulting picture (Atkinson et al., 2003). From brute facts, causation is inferred from effects, because, in the positivist tradition, effects always follow cause (Byrne, 2000). Some disciplines, including psychology, have become so enamoured of numbers as a means of representing reality, that they may accept quantitative ‘evidence’ uncritically, and sometimes with dire consequences (Gorard, 2003). It is this dehumanising aspect of quantitative methods that constructivist researchers find difficult to admit. In practice though, many researchers design quasi-experimental methodologies that are less than purely positivistic (Cook & Campbell, 1979).

In contrast, qualitative methods draw from the constructivist tradition, and allow for the ‘voices’ of participants to be captured, usually in narrative form, and includes those who may have been otherwise marginalised (Atkinson et al., 2003; Scott, 2002). Atkinson et al. (2003), for example, discussed the idea of ‘perspective’
as being “perfectly unremarkable” (p. 75) in sociological frameworks of institutions and people. The shared experience of people in institutional settings, dealing with similar situations and problems, leads to shared ways of thinking about, and acting upon, those conditions. Qualitative research is, therefore, typically conducted in field settings, and the material for study is generated from individuals and groups using a variety of methods such as interviews and observation (Kidd, 2002; Murray, 1998). As an approach to scientific inquiry, qualitative methods are firmly established in fields such as education, nursing, social work, and medicine, and have appeared increasingly in mainstream psychology journals over the last decade (Kidd, 2002).

However, concerns about lack of generalisability, bias and validity, and paradigmatic differences, have continued to nourish a long-standing debate about the acceptability of qualitative research generally, and its methods in particular (Burt & Oaksford, 1999; Kidd, 2002). In real terms, however, most qualitative researchers are simply more constructivist than positivistic in their orientation, without necessarily being at the extreme end of either approach.

Further, in recent decades the use of numeric data to represent qualitative evidence has emerged as an accepted middle ground (Gorard, 2003). In either case, there are implications for the methods employed in the service of research inquiry, and a combination of approaches is often considered most useful in supporting the breadth, depth, and rigour, required of research investigations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Gorard, 2003; Liebscher, 1998; Scott, 2002). The danger lies in accepting one paradigm over another, or asserting the transcendence of one method to the exclusion of others. According to Scott (2002) both methods co-exist in practice, and the trend in the social sciences generally is to incorporate “…meaning as well as measurement” (p. 924). As a result, the research presented here employs a mixed methods approach,
with due regard for the strengths and limitations of both forms of inquiry. In this manner, the investigation progresses from the inductive position of hypothesis generation, to a second stage of model testing and inference using the deductive approach of quantitative methods (Babbie, 2001; Burt & Oaksford, 1999).

In the next section, issues concerning sampling, recruitment of participant schools, and data collection are discussed, following a brief introduction to the structure of public education in Queensland, Australia.

6.2 Access To Schools

To provide a context for the current program of research, this section begins with a description of the education system in Queensland, Australia, and an overview of Education Queensland’s (EQ) approach to behaviour management in particular. Consideration of ethical management issues will also be discussed, as it affects the data collection process for each phase of the study. Following this, an overview of the research design will be presented, providing a foundation for Study 1, an exploratory investigation of the research problem.

6.2.1 The Structure Of The Education System In Queensland

In Queensland, Australia, public education is administered by the state government’s Department of Education and the Arts. Two Deputy Directors General, one each for education and the arts, answer to the incumbent Minister of State Parliament through the Director General, who receives policy and performance information through four Assistant Directors General. Education Queensland is itself served by an additional four Assistant Directors General, each of whom is responsible for a specific education portfolio, including, 1) School Administration, 2) School
Performance, 3) Curriculum, and, 4) Learning. The Executive Directorate (Schools) makes up the final section of EQ’s central office, and is the directorate to which school principals are accountable. The department’s services are then delivered to communities through 33 district offices based on geographic boundaries, and comprise 20 to 40 school sites per district (Education Queensland, 2004a).

At the time of writing, EQ has been working through a 10-year strategic plan for reform and equity, with a long-term focus on competitive access to the ‘knowledge economy’ for all students (Department of Education, 1999a). In line with this ideal, an EQ discussion paper, ‘The Next Decade, a Discussion About the Future of Queensland State Schools’ (Education Queensland, 1999b), identified four pillars on which schools should base their approach to schooling, 1) learning to be, 2) learning to do, 3) learning to live together, and, 4) learning to know. Embedded in EQ’s policy towards students, including those considered at-risk, are the learning goals stated above. Of interest to the present research is EQ’s published position regarding behaviour management in Queensland schools, which asserts that student behaviour will be “managed supportively” and that schools are “expected to develop a range of strategies to assist students to meet behavioural expectations” (Department of Education, 2004a).

To supplement school-based efforts, EQ has produced a number of policy documents to guide development of local behaviour management strategies. While principals were still endowed with the authority to suspend or exclude students, or to cancel the enrolment of those over the age of 15, EQ policies mandate how school-based behaviour management strategies should be established. Such policies (for example, see SM-06, Management of Behaviour in a Supportive School Environment, previously cited) are explicitly calculated to inform “consultation with the school
community”, and to assist the development of specific school-level procedures for promulgation within those communities (Department of Education, 2004a). The policy defines a ‘supportive school environment’ as one that is geared toward inclusive approaches in the areas of curriculum, interpersonal relationships, and school organisation (Department of Education, 1998). It also makes specific reference to equity and diversity issues, identifies those student sub-populations most likely to be disenfranchised, and acknowledges the multiple sources of ‘difference’ among such groups. The dimensions of school performance known to reduce poorer outcomes for ‘at-risk’ students are also listed, based on research regarding school effectiveness. The objective put forward is optimisation of educational opportunities and outcomes “for all” through quality educational practices.

In line with this aim, and the focus of this research, one of the strategies deployed by EQ to respond to behaviour management issues was implementation of district level behaviour assessment and/or management teams, sometimes referred to by the acronym, ‘BAT teams’. Behaviour management teams serve both secondary and primary schools in their respective districts, and while they are functionally located within education districts, as a general rule, they are operationally located within schools. It was to these teams that the initial approach was made for interview data, prior to proceeding with data collection for later phases of the research which involved school staff and student records. However, before the behaviour management teams could be located, selection of participating schools had to be finalised in order to identify the district teams responsible for behaviour management.
6.2.2 Selection Of Participant Schools

After obtaining ethical clearance from both Education Queensland and the sponsoring institution, Griffith University, the data collection phase of the research could proceed. Selection of participant schools was based on Education Queensland’s socioeconomic indicator scores. The indicators are derived from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSED; ABS, 1996), and are used by EQ to rank schools in order of comparative disadvantage. Each school’s score is an average of IRSED values by census collection district, and weighted by student enrolments in each catchment area. The decision to consider school participation according to IRSED rank was taken to ensure socioeconomic status could be examined for confounding effects. For both Studies 2 and 3, schools are listed in Tables 8.1 and 8.2 (Chapter 8) according to IRSED rank, where low ranks (and thus list position) indicate greater socio-economic disadvantage. However, because IRSED scores provide a means by which participant schools could be identified with minimal calculation \(^1\), actual scores cannot be reported here for reasons of confidentiality. Nonetheless, sufficient distance between the upper and lower bounds of IRSED scores for selected schools was allowed to investigate the influence of socioeconomic status, and participating schools fall within the ‘middle-low’, ‘middle-high’ or ‘higher’ IRSED categories, according to Education Queensland’s definition for each band of scores (Department of Education, 2004b). \(^2\)

Following the above, 10 metropolitan schools in the Brisbane (Queensland) region were initially contacted by letters addressed to each principal. An overview of the project was included with an invitation to participate (see Appendix A). Follow

---

\(^1\) Reverse calculation of total students per school from percentages reported in Study 2, and compared to EQ’s IRSED list, produces the identifying score.

\(^2\) Note that low IRSED schools were also approached to participate, and stated their willingness to do so; however, difficult conditions within those schools eventually proved insurmountable for the respective principals.
up telephone calls resulted in tentative agreement to participate from seven schools. Of the remaining three schools, one school cited a full moratorium on all research participation, and two others were unable to proceed due to feasibility problems (see Footnote 2 previous page). Each principal identified their parameters for participation, especially in regard to timing and process. All contact with schools was noted on hand-written records for the duration of the data collection period, to assist continuing negotiations and to ensure momentum was maintained with each school (recommended by Kidd, 2002, as crucial to a thorough qualitative process). From the 10 schools originally identified, the selection process resulted in participation of seven schools, and two behaviour management teams, the composition of which will be described in later chapters.

6.2.3 Ethical Issues Concerning Management Of Data Collection

One of the challenges faced during the school recruitment phase involved concerns about confidentiality with regard to student behaviour data. While most participating schools were responsive to assurances regarding appropriate ethical management, one school in particular would not be assuaged. All appropriate steps were taken with regard to ethical standards for informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and data storage (see Appendix B), although one Principal remained unconvinced.

The stated grounds for the person’s concern was that particular students or teachers could be identified if their class position was reflected anywhere in the analyses. As a result, the sampling method for Studies 2 and 3 incorporated only collection of cross-sectional data for teaching staff, school principals, and deputy
principals. Student data were recorded to reflect the frequency of referrals according to individual students (unidentified), students’ year level, and behavioural event type (enabling disaggregation for future analysis), although no student data were collected for one of the seven schools because of the concerns mentioned above. Thus, there were implications for how the data could be treated in Studies 2 and 3, as only aggregated cross-sectional data could be used for analysis. In the event, statistical analyses were not compromised, as alternative analytic options could be appropriately applied, as will become evident later.

In the next section, the methodological and analytic approaches to Study 1 will be described before proceeding with a discussion of the same for Studies 2 and 3. In line with the practice of field research generally, a qualitative investigation was employed for Study 1, and was conducted in the natural setting of schools where behaviour management teams were co-located.

6.3 Study 1- Methodology And Analytic Technique

According to qualitative research approaches, members of school-based behaviour management team are sufficiently representative as a sample for Study 1, because their role locates them within the target population (Murray, 1998). Possibly because they have already invested their career interests in school-based interventions with problem children, their participation was readily co-opted for the initial phase of the research. In contrast to concerns about data collection described above, all available behaviour management staff were eager to assist with any research that they considered might alleviate a pervasive and intractable problem in public education. Thus, informed consent was obtained to audio-tape focus group interviews, the
content of which would form the basis of qualitative analyses relative to the question under investigation.

As indicated, a qualitative approach was selected for the initial phase to assess the potential for later testing of the research question and proposed model using quantitative means. That is, qualitative inputs were used as a means of ‘discovery’ that could both inform and confirm the next stages of investigation, and for the present research, enabled a degree of triangulation in the methods of data collection (Babbie, 2001; Eubanks & Abbott, 2003; Liebscher, 1998; Murray, 1998). To enhance rigour and reliability, the author adopted the role of ‘participant-observer’ during this phase, providing only guidance during the course of discussion, rather than contributing directly to the interactions of each group (Babbie, 2001; Murray, 1998). According to Murray (1998), such a position allows the researcher to understand the functioning of people and places from the perspective of those that inhabit the situation, while participating as a ‘temporary’ group member. In this case, the structure of discussion was framed around three questions developed to reflect aspects of the research problem, and were presented to participants in focus group interviews.

Focus groups are a form of semi-structured interviews, or in-depth discussion, which allows for guided dialogue regarding particular topics, and are an effective vehicle for capturing real-life data in a social setting (Babbie, 2001; Murray, 1998). The objective is to simulate the discussion format found most often in the natural environment, in order to improve the validity of both the interview process and the quality of data generated. Focus groups are an accepted vehicle for qualitative data collection, having found convergence with quantitative methods in earlier tests of the focus group technique (Reynolds & Johnson, 1978). As a qualitative method, it has evolved over 60 years in usability testing and market research, to emerge in the
1980’s as a viable method in the social sciences, and in education and health care in particular (Eubanks & Abbott, 2003). While participants are not always fully representative of the target audience, the effectiveness of the method is enhanced by combining focus group findings with quantitative methods, as occurs in the present program of research (Murray, 1998; Tipping, 1998). An additional rationale for using focus groups as the method of choice was the ease with which the audio-taped material could be transcribed and thereby rendered amenable to content analysis. This was an important consideration given that one goal of the research was to investigate whether the domains of interest could be subjected to content analysis using theoretical models described in the organisational psychology literature.

Content analysis enables classification of verbal, textual, and other communications according to specified conceptual frameworks, based on explicit coding rules (Babbie, 2001; Smith, 1995; Stemler, 2001). Prior to analysis, each communication element is deemed a unit of observation, and subjected to systematic coding into specified content categories, which can then be replicated to assess reliability. Such a process allows conclusions to be drawn about the results of coded material, which can be corroborated using other methods of data collection (Stemler, 2001). Content analysis also provides the researcher some degree of control over the depth and specificity of coded material.

For example, coding of the visible or manifest content, according to a predetermined scale enhances specificity, and thus reliability. In contrast, coding of the less visible, or latent content, offers the potential for a deeper understanding of communication elements. As a result, coding of latent content may enhance validity in terms of meaning, but sometimes at the expense of specificity. According to Babbie (2001), a combination of methods answers the dilemma, because each unit of
communication is coded with regard to both manifest and latent content. Achieving a useful balance relies on a mix of the theoretical and empirical: that is, content analysis demands careful attention to how code categories are first conceptualised and then operationalised. This approach also solves potential problems that can arise with simplistic approaches to coding, such as word-frequency counts, which may be influenced by stylistic differences when meaning and context are not considered (Stemler, 2001).

For Study 1, numerical representation of the coded observations was desirable, so that the material could be coded according to a defined format, and then assessed for reliability. For this to occur, data processing operations needed to specify the manifest content and simultaneously capture the latent content. As stated above, an implicit goal of the research was to improve upon the theoretical and measurement foundations of earlier related research. Thus, an a priori approach (compared to ‘emergent’) was adopted for the categorisation process (Stemler, 2001).

First, content themes were consolidated into a checklist using established theoretical models to derive mutually exclusive code categories. Each theme was based on pre-determined theoretical models of leadership, culture, and stress, and enabled specification of the content themes, followed by the operationalisation of pertinent attributes (Babbie, 2001; Smith, 1995). This action produced the referent, or manifest, code categories, which were then divided according to negative versus positive valence to capture the latent content. The outcome was an immediate doubling in the number of coding categories, in that every referent category could now be coded according to positive or negative valence. One additional category was added per content theme, that being an “OTHER” category, to account for those units of observation where valence was indeterminate.
Next, the observation units were defined syntactically, by numbering speech segments that could be independently understood as meaningful propositions, whether or not they appeared as complete or part-sentences of transcribed text (Stemler, 2001). According to Weber (1990), the most important consideration in determining the units of observation is consistency, which in turn affects the stability of results produced by individual coders, otherwise known as reliability. To pre-empt such problems, a well-developed set of recording instructions is critical, including definitions of categories and coding rules, to form the basis of training for those who actually undertake the coding (Stemler, 2001; Weber, 1990). In this case, a ‘Focus Group Interviews - Coding Manual’ was developed, which incorporated all of the recommended elements, including examples and a standardised record form that could be copied and re-used as required (see Appendix C for a copy of the actual manual). As a result, all of the qualitative data generated from the focus group interviews were transcribed, coded, and assessed for inter-rater reliability, thereby addressing possible problems with methodological rigour. Further detail regarding the method and results of Study 1 will be discussed in Chapter 7, following the next section, which presents the methodologies and analytic techniques for Studies 2 and 3. Note that the methodologies and analytic techniques for both studies are presented together, primarily because data for each were generated concurrently.

6.4 Studies 2 and 3- Methodology And Analytic Techniques

As indicated previously, the overall design of the research program involved a mixed methods approach, the first phase of which was a qualitative exploration of the research problem. The second and third stages, discussed next, involved a quantitative approach based on cross-sectional questionnaire data, collected from a
A purposive sample of teaching staff and school administrators at each school. The foundation of cross-sectional studies is numerical representation of observations, or data, collected from the sample population at one time. Previously known as correlational studies, the collection of cross-sectional data enables the researcher to identify relationships among variables, using statistical analysis. However, the approach is not without its critics (Babbie, 2001).

Care has been recommended in respect of the inferences drawn from such research, because some authors assert that cross-sectional studies offer little more than explanation and description (Babbie, 2001; Cook & Campbell, 1979). Nonetheless, cross-sectional designs are useful where the research question is exploratory, as is the case in the current situation, and where the question calls for measurement of the “world as it is” (Byrne, 2002, p. 14). It is the presence and strength of association between the specified variables that is of interest in the present program of research, especially given that the proposed relationships have not been examined elsewhere. At this juncture, quantitative methods also serve to strengthen objectivity and rigour, by permitting statistical examination of the data to inform meaningful conclusions.

Most importantly, the inclusion of quantitative methods is designed to answer widespread criticism regarding the standards and relevance of research in educational settings (Gorard, 2003). This is consistent with observations elsewhere at a time when evidence-based practice is being touted as the new standard in most areas of the social and behavioural sciences. Further, the issue of quality is evident in educational research generally, not just in relation to pedagogy, and supports a call for improved standards both in Australia and internationally (Gorard, 2003). Thus, the design and analytic choices presented here largely reflect considerations of rigour and quality.
To address the aims of Study 2, data collection consisted of surveys administered concurrently to teachers, deputies, and principals at each school, to investigate an hypothesised relationship between school level factors and the rate at which students are referred for behaviour problems. The survey batteries produced interval level data measuring the domains of interest, which could then be examined for any association with the student behaviour data. In addition, certain sections of the data generated would later form the basis of Study 3, which was designed to examine differences in perception between teaching staff and school administrators.

In contrast, the process for collation of student data involved substantial coding of historical records held at each school under published discipline policies. Following the process explicated earlier for Study 1, breaches of school discipline policy were coded according to 12 “behavioural event” categories. A second coding manual was then developed to inform the training and coding work of research assistants (Babbie, 2001; Stemler, 2001; Weber, 1990). Following from this, the author and assistants recorded every occurrence of each behavioural event type over a specified time period, based on individual student records, including the students’ year level, and school. Because of confidentiality concerns discussed previously (see Section 6.2.3 above), student data were aggregated for analysis and categorised according to low, medium and high rates of referral. That is, the data were grouped to reflect only the total number of students referred for behaviour management as a proportion of the school population, rather than total frequencies of behavioural events (even though both elements were coded).

The main hypothesis test, which considers whether there is an association between leadership style, school culture, teacher stress, and the rate of referrals for

---

3 For details of how the referral categories were derived, see Chapter 9.
student misbehaviour, was examined via Discriminant Analysis in SPSS Version 11. Discriminant analysis is a parametric technique used to determine which weightings of quantitative variables will discriminate between groups of cases (Cramer, 2003; Field, 2002). Essentially, the weightings of variables form a new composite variable, or discriminant function, based on a linear combination of the weightings and scores for each variable (Cramer, 2003). Membership of certain groups is predicted from a combination of independent variables, which are weighted to maximise the between-group variance, and each case then classified accordingly (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). One of the strengths of the analysis is that it allows for direct, or simultaneous, entry of predictors, and generates discriminant functions that are orthogonal, or unrelated, to each other (Cramer, 2003).

This was an important consideration given that the relative theoretical importance of each variable could not be determined in advance, but would be inferred from the resulting output to establish the pattern of relationships. That is, the collective effect and predictive utility of independent measures were of most value to the research objectives. In relation to the question under investigation, referral rate categories were used as the grouping factor in order to distinguish which school level issues were associated with group membership, and therefore referral rates, based on the variables of interest. When the grouping factor is the dependent variable, Discriminant Analysis is the appropriate analytic technique (Field, 2002; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Additional analyses, using regression and analysis of variance techniques, allowed further examination of the statistical relationships, thereby informing conclusions about the direction of effects. These will be discussed in detail later in Chapter 8.
For Study 3, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to assess differences between staff groups within the participant schools, based on the dependent measures (Field, 2002; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). That is, MANOVA enabled examination of between-group differences for the school leadership and culture variables, where one group consisted of teachers, and the other was formed from principals and deputy principals (referred to collectively as school administrators). The utility of MANOVA as an analytic technique is that it simultaneously detects group differences on several dependent measures, without losing information about the relationships amongst them (Field, 2002). Mathematically, it is the equivalent of Discriminant Analysis, discussed above. However, in the case of MANOVA, the weighted linear composite is formed from the dependent variables, and it is the significance of the effect from the linear composite, and the contribution of each dependent measure, that is of interest. That is, results reflect the combined influence from the dependent variables, weighted so that they maximally separate groups, and can be examined for correlations between individual variables and the linear composite. This compares to univariate ANOVA techniques that consider group differences on a single dependent measure; in cases where several ANOVA analyses are conducted in lieu of one MANOVA, the result tends to model less meaningful relationships among variables (Field, 2002; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In this case, the aim of the analysis was to explore group level differences, so that conclusions could be drawn about perceptions of school leadership and culture, based on each person’s location in the respective staff groups. Given that the group factor was the independent variable for this analysis, MANOVA was the analytic tool of choice (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).
6.5 Summary

In conclusion, this section has presented the paradigmatic foundations, methodologies, and analytic techniques relevant to each phase of the research program. A discussion of the nature and benefits of both qualitative and quantitative approaches was offered, followed by attention to how these informed the research design for each phase of the project. Thus a mixed methods approach was described, with the express aim of hypothesis generation and theory testing in relation to the research aims. Wherever required, the discussion addressed methodological and ethical issues relevant to each stage, to ensure a secure foundation for the project generally. Detailed explanations of the recruitment phase were also provided, as well as an overview of the analytic techniques employed for each study. As indicated previously, further detail regarding the method and results of each study appear in later chapters, where specific research questions are addressed. In the meantime, the following Figure 6.1 diagrammatically represents the overall design of the research program, prior to presentation of Study 1.
Study 1 – Qualitative
Exploration of research aims using focus group methodology with behaviour management staff.
Content analysis of focus group data.
Derivation and clarification of hypotheses.

Study 2 – Quantitative
Selection of measures based on Study 1 results and pre-determined theoretical frameworks.
Measurement of school leadership style, school culture, and teacher stress, using survey methodology. Record frequency of student misbehaviour from school records.
Statistical tests of hypotheses, including test of model invariance.

Study 3 – Quantitative
Comparison of group differences amongst teaching staff and principals/deputy principals, with regard to school leadership style and culture.

Conclusions
Based on all phases of the project.

Figure 6.1 Diagrammatic overview of the program of research.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Study 1

The Relationship Between Student Referrals For Behavioural Problems And Organisational Culture, School Leadership, And Teacher Stress, As Observed By Behaviour Management Staff.

7.0 Introduction

Study 1 presents an initial exploration of whether school level factors may affect student misbehaviour. In particular, it is proposed that the direction of effects from school level variables is the converse of that usually cited in the literature. That is, school level factors, consisting of leadership, school culture, and teacher stress, were explored as leader-to-students, culture-to-students, and teacher stress-to-students. This approach contrasts with the direction of effects generally reported in the literature, where student behaviour is identified in categorical terms as a cause of school level issues, rather than as an outcome. The principal aim was to assess, firstly, whether such a proposition was valid, and second, whether it was amenable to quantitative investigation, based on any associations uncovered.

First, information regarding participants is presented including an overview of the recruitment process specific to this study. Next, further detail is provided with regard to the procedure for preparation and conduct of focus group interviews. The tabulated results of coded focus group data are then offered, followed by a discussion of the most salient findings. The section concludes with a summary and brief
discussion of how the results of Study 1 compare to prior research, and especially, how the results relate to the question of directionality, in terms of the results for students.

Method

7.1 Participants

Because behaviour management staff work closely with those students considered most ‘at-risk’ of school failure, qualitative accounts of their observations were initially sought with respect to each focal area of investigation, that is, leadership, school culture, and teacher stress. As described in Chapter 6, behaviour management teams are functionally associated with school districts, and in operational terms, are located within schools. While they are not generally involved in classroom activities, they are close enough to observe the day-to-day workings of schools, but do so from a more distant perspective than staff working within the confines of each school system. As a result, the domains of leadership, culture, and teacher stress, as they may be implicated in student misbehaviour, were explored via focus group interviews to elicit observations from this highly specialised group. To achieve this, focus group interviews were conducted with behaviour management staff recruited from teams affiliated with two metropolitan districts of Education Queensland, where each was linked to schools already recruited to participate in Study 2.

Focus Groups 1 to 3 were conducted within one metropolitan district, and Focus Group 4 in an adjacent district to achieve adequate participant numbers. In the first instance, only one team leader was approached to recruit participants for the interviews. From a pool of 20 persons, three focus group interviews resulted with attendances of six, three and four persons respectively, for a total of 13 persons
overall. Given the limitations of such a small participant pool, a second team leader from an adjacent district was approached. A fourth focus group resulted, and consisted of 10 persons, from a possible 18. Participation rates for the interview process thus equated to 48% of the available pool (total \( N = 23 \)). Table 7.1 below summarises participant demographic details according to the composition of each focus group.

Table 7.1

*Summary Of Participant Demographic Data For Study 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43,47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39-50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47-52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42-46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30-52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* (n.s.) = age not stated.

7.2 *Materials And Procedure*

To ensure procedural consistency, three questions were formulated for the focus group interviews, and were specifically aligned to the domains under investigation. That is, questions were posed about school leadership organisational culture, and teacher stress, and, in particular, how each aspect has been observed by participants in relation to management of students with behaviour problems. To ensure participants had a comparable understanding of culture, a definition of
organisational culture was included in the interview prologue, which is included in Table 7.2 below, along with the focus group interview questions.

**Table 7.2**

**Focus Group Prologue And Questions**

| OPENING STATEMENT: | When thinking about the questions for this interview, the idea of culture will be defined as “the shared values and beliefs that interact with your school’s organisational structures and control systems to produce behavioural norms”. Based on this definition, what is your response to the following question/s? |
|                  | 1. In your opinion, what is the relationship between culture in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems? |
|                  | 2. In your opinion, what is the relationship between the level of teacher stress in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems? |
|                  | 3. In your opinion, what is the relationship between the style of leadership in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems? |

Each of the four focus group interviews was conducted at different school locations to maximise participant convenience and, therefore, availability, and were conducted between March and October, 2000. Prior to commencement of each interview, participants were apprised of the nature of the project, and asked to read and sign the research consent form (see Appendix B). Although the consent form specified possible use of audio-recording equipment, permission to record was also checked verbally with all participants.

Once consent was obtained, the focus group interview proceeded according to the format presented in Table 7.2 above. The questions were posed in turn, and linked
explicitly to the issue of student misbehaviour in order to frame participants’ thinking about salient aspects of school culture, leadership, and teacher stress, which were the principal focus of interview questions. Integrity of participant responses was secured by limiting additional input from the author to clarification, or when required, to re-direct participants to the question under discussion. The audio-taped focus group interviews were later transcribed to type-written format, copies of which are included in Appendix D. Following this, examination of the transcribed focus group data were performed using applied content analysis, which has been argued as an appropriate method for the study of discourse and conversation, as described in Chapter 6 (Babbie, 2001; Green & Gilhooly, 1997; Smith, 1995).

Drawing from theoretical models of leadership, culture, and stress, a procedures manual was developed for Study 1 to guide the coding process for the categories of interest. Selection of code categories was based on themes in the organisational psychology literature, in terms of how well each theme represented the accepted position in the relevant fields. For example, while the literature regarding stress continues to evolve, there is considerable evidence to support an acknowledged dichotomy between the cognitive and behavioural components of stress (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Holahan, Moos & Schaefer, 1996; Moos, 1995). The teacher stress categories were therefore coded to reflect this position.

Similarly, leadership was dichotomised in terms of task-based versus relationship-oriented approaches (Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001). This decision was taken for three reasons. Firstly, while the educational literature discloses a trend towards the transactional versus transformational model of leadership, the principal difference between each style remains broadly consistent with the focus on task versus relationship. Second, it was unreasonable to expect that
participants would be familiar with a particular model of leadership, given that it was outside their area of expertise. Third, the attitudes and behaviour associated with leadership style were of most interest at this stage of the research, rather than an identified model. To proceed otherwise could artificially constrain the participants’ contributions. As a result, each category of leadership and teacher stress was operationalised according to the dichotomies offered in the literature, and defined according to frequently used descriptors from the literature (Holahan, Moos & Schaefer, 1996; Langford & Fitness, 2003; Robbins et al., 2001).

The picture was less clear for organisational culture, however. For example, culture may be understood quite differently by participants, depending on perspective. Because most teachers have only a lay understanding of the construct, they may report their observations from the school, classroom, or student vantage point. Thus, a definition of culture was offered at the beginning of focus group interviews, as mentioned earlier, and a specific model selected for coding. O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell’s (1991) model was chosen as reasonably representing the components of culture contained in competing models, and because it offered the broadest range of cultural characteristics compared to other taxonomies. O’Reilly et al.’s. model contains seven culture components, including, 1) innovation and risk taking, 2) attention to detail, 3) outcome orientation, process versus outcome, 4) aggressiveness, including competitiveness, 5) people orientation, 6) team orientation, and, 7) stability versus growth. For a more detailed description, however, the reader is directed to Chapter 4 and Appendix C.

From the above, seven referent codes for the culture category, and two each for the stress and leadership categories were identified, to extract the manifest content from each transcribed focus group interview. In addition, an ‘OTHER’ sub-category
was included for each component to account for those units of analysis found to be indeterminate in either manifest or latent content. Each of the categories was divided further to include negative versus positive valence, thereby allowing access to the latent content, or the deeper meaning of interview data. Positive valence was defined in terms of “positive perceptual information”, where a unit of analysis was likely to reflect a positive effect on the school or school community. The opposite was true for negative valence. Examples of each code were included to indicate how manifest content could be determined, and to assist trained coders to distinguish between positive and negative valence. An example of how each code was operationalised to capture both the manifest and latent content is presented in Table 7.3 below (see also Appendix C).

Table 7.3

Excerpt From Focus Group Coding Manual, With Examples Of Negatively And Positively Valenced Statements – see Appendix C For The Complete Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER STRESS – BEHAVIOURAL DOMAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural:</strong> descriptions of actions or statements that reflect the behavioural sequelae of stressful situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong> “Some teachers will make light of what the kids do – you know, they don’t act as if the kid’s attacking them personally by being naughty.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> “I was talking to a teacher the other day who reckons stress leave is for wussies – but this guy drinks like a fish and smokes a pack a day – sure, he’s not stressed!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each transcript was then partitioned into speech segments, and numbered to signify complete propositions, based on a whole or partial speech segment. To
illustrate, the extract below is an actual example of a proposition within a speech segment, which was later coded as “People Orientation - negative”.

\[18\] The other issue I would see in terms of cultures are teachers concerned about behaviour with compliancy [sic] rather than recognition of individuals. \[19\]

(Focus Group participant – Focus Group 4)

In the above example, the speech segment has been partitioned as the eighteenth unit of analysis in a series from Focus Group 4’s response to the question regarding culture. The manifest content has been identified as the cultural aspect of ‘people orientation’, which the coder has viewed as negatively valenced because the meaning of the segment suggested a focus on behavioural compliance. In the context of the transcribed interview, compliant behaviour was deemed a manifestation of a cultural norm for behavioural regimentation, and viewed as negative or maladaptive because it reflects a failure to encourage tolerance for individual uniqueness. A complete copy of the coding manual appears as Appendix C, including a full description of each code and the coding report form.

Coding of transcribed interviews was completed by two honours year psychology students trained to undertake the task, both of whom were majoring in organisational psychology. The decision to employ advanced organisational psychology students was taken to ensure familiarity with the content themes, and to facilitate their training as coders. All interview transcripts were coded twice, once by each coder. Frequency data were thus obtained for all categories and sub-categories, and could be examined to identify any patterns in participant responses to the focus group questions. An additional benefit of the process was that inter-rater reliabilities could be computed, to check the consistency between coders for each focus group and category.
7.3 Results

7.3.1 Inter-Rater Reliabilities For Focus Group Data

To assess the level of agreement between coded focus group data, inter-rater reliabilities were computed using Spearman’s rho correlations. Table 7.4 presents the correlation coefficients by category and focus group, indicating high correspondence between coders on 11 of the 12 data sets. Some variation in results for Focus Group 2 was expected, as participants experienced difficulty maintaining their attention on the questions during the interview, and frequently departed from the topic under discussion. As a result, the information obtained did not match well to the available code categories.

Table 7.4

Inter-Rater Reliabilities For Coded Focus Group Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Focus Group 1</th>
<th>Focus Group 2</th>
<th>Focus Group 3</th>
<th>Focus Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>.11n.s.</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Stress</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01.
Table 7.5 (overleaf) presents the coding frequencies by category and sub-category, where occurrences have been aggregated from all focus group data for individual coders. The two most frequently endorsed sub-categories are highlighted, and the highest for each is also italicised. In each case, results are listed per coder, and then averaged. Note again, that Appendix C contains a full description of each code category, and that focus group interview questions were posed in general terms as related to “management of students with behaviour problems” (see also Table 7.2, page 133).
Table 7.5

Aggregated Frequencies of Focus Group Ratings - Per Category and Sub-Category – According to Observational and Experiential Perspectives of Behaviour Management Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>Innovation and risk-taking – positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation and risk-taking – negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention to detail – positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention to detail – negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes orientation – positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes orientation – negative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People orientation – positive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People orientation – negative</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team orientation/collaboration – positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team orientation/collaboration – negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressiveness – positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressiveness – negative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability – negative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture other (neutral)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Focus on task – positive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Focus on task – negative</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on relationships – positive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on relationships – negative</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership other (neutral)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Stress</td>
<td>Behavioural – positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioural – negative</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological – positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological – negative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher stress other (neutral)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most noteworthy amongst these results is the frequency with which the negatively valenced sub-categories were endorsed by participants, compared to positive aspects in each category. The evidence suggests that inclusion of latent content, as valence for each category, surfaced important information regarding the variables of interest in relation to management of student misbehaviour. With regard to the school culture category, the sub-category of ‘People orientation – negative’ demonstrated the clearest result with an average frequency of 78.5 compared to the next most frequently coded sub-category, ‘Outcomes orientation – negative’, which was averaged at a frequency of 27. By way of contrast, following close behind was ‘People orientation – positive’, which achieved an average of 23, and ‘Aggressiveness – negative’, at 18.

A similar pattern was evident in results for the remaining two categories. For example, ‘Focus on task – negative’ occurred most frequently for leadership, averaging 50.5, while ‘Focus on relationships – negative’ was the next nearest at a mean frequency of 42.5. ‘Focus on relationships – positive’ followed at 33.5, again indicating a negative skew to observations regarding leadership in the context of this study. Likewise, the results for teacher stress were overwhelmingly negative for both the behavioural ($M = 53$) and cognitive ($M = 45.5$) manifestations of stress. Following from this, further examination of the qualitative results is warranted, and will be discussed next. For consistency, the two highest categories will again be discussed in each case.

7.3.2. Qualitative Results

The present study sought to ascertain whether behaviour management staff had observed any effects for leadership, school culture, and teacher stress, in relation to
the management of students with behaviour problems. Results indicated clear
differentiation between sub-categories within the areas of interest, according to the
observations reported during focus group interviews. Essentially, theory-driven
content analysis revealed overwhelmingly negative perceptions about school
leadership, culture, and teacher stress, in relation to students with behaviour problems.
Tentative support for the research aims is thus contained in the qualitative data, and
will be discussed next.

For the domain of culture, the most frequently mentioned category was
‘People orientation – negative’ \((M = 78.5)\). This code was defined as, “the degree to
which the decisions of school administrators take account of the effects for teaching
staff” (see Appendix C, Focus Group Interviews - Coding Manual). In the context of
Study 1, findings indicated that participants believed that the real outcomes for
teachers and students were not often considered by school administrators in the course
of school governance. In addition, this was seen as having consequences for how
teachers manage both their work and students with behaviour problems, possibly
because school administrators failed to consider the implications of decisions beyond
the immediate situation.

Rather, expectations for compliance and conformity were embedded in
participants’ observations regarding the effect of culture on teachers and students. At
the heart of many comments was a perception of double standards, in that schools
appear to promote a culture of fairness and inclusion, but the reality was perceived as
quite different. When students failed to conform they were subject to selective
ostracism, and eventual exclusion, regardless of the values and goals promulgated. In
addition, it appeared that teachers experienced their principal’s people-orientation as
inducing a sense of powerlessness and a devaluation of their worth. In some cases,
their feelings may have been displaced as a consequence. While they may not have engaged in overt inappropriate or improper conduct, as indicated in the examples that follow, more subtle effects may have emerged such as a muted form of exclusion or a failure to confront gaps between policy and process. Illustrative examples of how behaviour management staff expressed their observations in relation to this category were:

There’s also a difference between what they espouse is their values and beliefs and the way members of the school often exhibit it.  
(Focus Group 1)

There’s that fear of non-acceptance – there’s no hostility towards them [students], but they’re not accepted into the group. I think that’s one of the common factors of why the children I work with misbehave.  
(Focus Group 1)

...you don’t fit this school so you might as well move on to the next one.  
(Focus Group 2)

I think a lot of them [teachers] actually act out and choose anger to mask it off their feelings.  
(Focus Group 3)

The culture of most say “fair go” to the kids, but there’s a culture of one that is very, very destructive.  
(Focus Group 4)

The second most frequently endorsed facet of school culture (M = 27) was ‘Outcomes orientation – negative’, defined as, “the degree to which school management focused on results rather than on techniques and processes used to achieve outcomes”. Such a result indicated that some schools maintained an ‘ends’ focus to achieving outcomes, compared to a ‘means’ focus, potentially at the expense of quality school practices. While the result was not entirely surprising given the pressures schools face, endorsement for the positively valenced counterpart of this code (‘Outcomes orientation – positive’) was negligible. The evidence suggested that schools tended to focus on achieving desired outcomes, according to culturally bound
expectations within the school, and may have failed to notice or examine procedural
problems and (or) undesirable consequences. The common thread between
observations was that more attention is paid to procedural compliance than to
development of the child, in direct contradiction of stated goals. For example:

And I find that’s the most common difference between what’s espoused and what actually takes place.

(Focus Group 1)

So, I just feel like I’m skirting ‘round the edges. Sitting in a spot that the school can then say, “Well, we’ve gone from the Guidance Officer and we have involved the behaviour management person”…tick off a box.

(Focus Group 2)

I think that when they come here the amount of time that is taken [with behaviour management staff] whereas before it’s come in, read this, sign on the dotted line and off you go.

(Focus Group 3)

In terms of how school leadership was viewed, results revealed a strong focus
on task issues, over relationships, with ‘Focus on task – negative’ achieving the
highest mean frequency of endorsement ($M = 50.5$). The task category for leadership
was defined as, “statements concerning the behaviour of school administrators as it
pertained to task issues, such as outcomes, rules orientation, efficiency, structure,
directives”. According to participants, school leadership was viewed as being largely
grounded toward regulation and governance, and targeted to managerial expectations for
outcomes, efficiency, and procedural compliance. This compares to conceptions of
leadership that comprise a strong relationship dimension, directed toward learning and
growth in followers (as described in Chapter 3). Examples of speech segments coded
as ‘Focus on task – negative’ follow.
But it’s a way of being accountable and showing that they are following the things and this is what the kid did.  

(Focus Group 2)

…but none of us were ever consulted or asked about that. We were told what was going to be the new focus and the new agenda. Now that’s financially driven – yep – it’s a politically driven thing.  

(Focus Group 2)

I’m…and the people there got to be Principals or Deputies were those people who had that strong value style, but mostly it amounts to who could knock others into shape.  

(Focus Group 4)

Not surprisingly, ‘Focus on relationships – negative’ was the next most frequently endorsed category in the leadership domain ($M = 42.5$). This category was defined as, “statements concerning the behaviour of school administrators as it pertains to relationship issues, such as, process orientation, respect, trust, interdependence, and a supportive approach to staff”. Observations by behaviour management staff indicated perceptions of distance between teachers and school administrators based on expectations that teaching staff will manage with limited support. In addition, an element of blame emerged, in that coping difficulties were often attributed as personal failures on the part of the teacher involved. Results also indicated a degree of cynicism regarding the collaborative efforts of some school leaders (see last excerpt below), and a frank belief in the futility of such approaches.

There’s a greater expectation I suppose that there’s a closed door policy (unclear)...saying, “Well, that’s your problem, not mine, I’ve got enough on my plate”.

(Focus Group 1)

...if the deputies don’t have the skills, the time, they can go to that teacher and say, you sent me that kid yesterday for whatever, that really isn’t my problem, that’s your teaching strategies.  

(Focus Group 2)
I see it in schools – the collaborative process – but then, you know, like the pseudo-collaborative discussion and meeting, and in the end the staff are disempowered anyway, because they know after the staff meeting...they all know the boss will make the decision anyway.

(Focus Group 4)

In relation to teacher stress, both negatively valenced codes again emerged strongly, with little between them and a similar distance between both codes and their positive counterparts. ‘Behavioural – negative’ (M = 53) was coded according to, “descriptions of actions or statements that reflect the behavioural effects of stressful situations’. Similarly, the ‘Psychological – negative’ (M = 45.5) category was coded as, “statements that indicate feelings or beliefs that may be the psychological sequelae of stressful work”. The behavioural implications of teacher stress were most often observed as reactivity or hostility, and linked to poor student management.

Participants also acknowledged the chronicity of stress for teachers based on isolation and limited support, and consequently located the problem at the system level. That is, teachers were viewed as being victims of the problem, rather than perpetrators.

Some examples of the behavioural effects of teacher stress follow below:

And they’re unable to implement any type of management plan with consistency, because their stress levels get in the way.

(Focus Group 1)

Oh, they’re more likely to revert to reactive strategies – they don’t think things through, they avoid, and they confront in an angry way.

(Focus Group 1)

They are really alone, really isolated and then more likely to get stuck into the kids because they are at the end of their tether.

(Focus Group 4)
In terms of the psychological elements of teachers’ stress, a similar theme emerged. Participants identified issues concerning teachers’ ability to think clearly about situations, and acknowledged the possibility of significant psychological and social distress. This is consistent with the behavioural effects highlighted above, in that the markers of distress were embedded in teacher behaviour. Examples of how psychological stress was observed follow below:

Their reasoning ability goes. (Focus Group 1)

I heard somebody say recently that they thought that teachers were en masse chronically depressed. I wouldn’t quite go that far, but it certainly opened my eyes and I thought, there is at least an element of truth in that. (Focus Group 2)

... it’s a pretty hard situation if you’re feeling that alienated, and you are – what other occupation do you walk in a room and shut a door and you’re alone with 30 other people? (Focus Group 4)

One of the difficulties in interpretation of the above is that causal relationships cannot be directly determined. For example, while many teachers cited student behaviour as causal in their strain reactions, it may simply reflect an accumulation number of stressors, or that student behaviour is temporally linked to awareness of stress. Essentially, it suggests a potential association between teacher stress and student behaviour, rather than offering direct evidence of causation.
7.4 Discussion

7.4.1 Efficacy Of Content Analysis For Models Of Culture, Leadership And Stress

As indicated earlier, a secondary aim of each study reported here is to address criticisms of the education literature regarding lack of empirical rigour in the design of research. Deficiencies have been identified on a number of levels, including absence of theoretical frameworks to inform research investigations, lack of valid and reliable measures used in analyses and poor application of research methodologies generally. Thus, an important goal of the present study is to improve methodological rigour at each stage of the research. As a first step, the qualitative phase of the study involved content analysis of focus group interviews within pre-determined theoretical frameworks, which was then subjected to reliability analysis.

A high level of concordance was found between coders for each of the categories analysed, including two perfect positive correlations, eight correlations ranging from .89 to .99, one of .60, and one non-significant correlation (refer Table 7.4). Interestingly, reliability coefficients for Focus Group 2 are uniformly lower than for the remaining three groups, with one correlation non-significant at .11. This result probably reflects how participants in Focus Group 2 drifted from the topic, rather than any issue with the content analysis per se. Clear agreement between the coders may have been compromised due to expectations that the interview data should fit the categories provided. When participants strayed from the topic, the resulting data may have been difficult to interpret within the narrow range of code categories provided. Consequently, the results for Focus Group 2 were, in fact, likely to suffer more coding problems than for other focus groups.
In relation to Focus Groups 1, 3 and 4, however, the neutral “OTHER” categories were seldom endorsed by coders, suggesting little difficulty in distinguishing the appropriate code for each speech segment. Results for the four focus groups are also remarkably similar, in that negatively valenced sub-categories emerged in a consistent manner, and as an over-arching theme within the categories analysed.

7.4.2 Summary Of Results

The aim of the present study was to explore whether school level factors affect student behaviour, and in particular, whether the direction of any effects could be tentatively viewed as leader-to-students, culture-to-students, and teacher stress-to-students. Based on the observations of behaviour management staff, this aim was clearly supported, in that behaviour management staff reported a consistently negative picture of the school environment in terms of the effects of leadership, culture, and teacher stress, in relation to management of students with behaviour problems.

In terms of school culture, findings reveal inconsistencies between espoused educational values for inclusion, justice, and support, because teachers are perceived as struggling to contain their distress, while students confront possible psychological and/or physical exclusion. As a result, teachers were observed as ‘doing things right’, sometimes in a perfunctory manner to meet expectations for accountability, and that this was viewed as working against desired outcomes. What this represents is a culture of (mostly) passive compliance and acceptance amongst teachers, which is experienced as unambiguously negative, task oriented, and insensitive to the needs of staff and students. Moreover, the most frequently endorsed categories were those suggesting that the school leadership was deemed responsible, at least in part. The
observations reported are consistent with descriptions of weak and fragmented cultures, as defined earlier (see Chapter 4), where the needs of individuals are subjugated to hierarchical structures and systems of control, sometimes at great personal cost (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Enomoto, 1994; Heck & Marcoulides, 1996; Mitchell & Willower, 1992; Schemp et al., 1993). While the examples cited highlight the frustration felt by teachers, it was also evident in participants’ responses that students were affected as a consequence, in that accountability was viewed as more important than meaningful intervention.

In terms of school leadership, results were again unequivocal. Participants indicated that both task-focused and relationship-focused leadership were experienced as negative, and that attempts at collaboration and consultation are often viewed with scepticism. In addition, school administrators were perceived as the source of expectations for compliance and efficiency, at the expense of positive workplace relations and collegial support. There was, however, some recognition that principals are also captives of the school environment, especially in relation to accountability and workload. In combination, the above reflects a task-focused leadership style, where outcomes are the most salient factor in leader-subordinate relations. This result is also consistent with the literature regarding leadership in schools, which is most often reported as task driven and transactional in nature (D’Arcy, 1994; Griffith, 1999; House & Aditya, 1997; Riehl & Lee, 1996). How participants related leadership to student behaviour appeared to occur largely through the effect on teachers, in that teachers’ actions towards students are usually constrained by policy mandates and work pressures.

This issue emerged more clearly in relation to the teacher stress question, where themes of negative reactivity, isolation, poor problem-solving and low mood
were identified, in a context of limited choice. Taken together, the picture is one of high stress and few options. In any conception of workplace stress, such findings are linked to poorer outcomes generally (Langford & Fitness, 2003; McCormick, 1997; Van Der Linde, 2000). As for leadership, above, the association with management of student behaviour was largely implicit in descriptions of teacher stress. Nonetheless, participants viewed both issues as interrelated and cited instances where teachers’ stress was clearly directed towards students (their opinion).

To sum up, content analysis of the qualitative data has produced results consistent with the extant literature. In addition, analysis of the data within theoretically based frameworks served to clarify and confirm the accepted position with regard to school leadership, culture and teacher stress. An overwhelmingly negative picture emerged, evincing a difficult, compliance based and outcome driven organisational culture, coupled with leadership practices that devalue and disempower staff, and the harmful effects of intractable stress. Most importantly, management of student misbehaviour was consistently viewed as being associated with negative school level factors, in contrast to the commonly presented direction of association presented in the education literature. While some rigour has been added to the analytic process, the issue nonetheless begs further inquiry. That is, while general support is found with respect to findings reported elsewhere, no clear claims can yet be made regarding the direction of association between variables. It is to this issue that the next two studies will be addressed.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Study 2

Organisational Culture, School Leadership And Teacher Stress,
And Their Relationships To Referral Rates For Student Misbehaviour

8.0 Introduction

This chapter reports quantitative measurement of organisational culture, school leadership and teacher stress in six metropolitan schools, and how the combined influence of these variables may be associated with referral rates for student misbehaviour. The main hypothesis (see Section 5.6) proposed that transformational leadership, constructive organisational culture, and low teacher stress, would be associated with lower referral rates for student misbehaviour. Further, because leadership, school culture and teacher stress have a demonstrated influence on a range of school outcome variables, the individual pathways were also examined, as they relate to student referral rates. In line with this, the following hypotheses were tested.

First, that leadership style would be associated with referral rates for student misbehaviour ($H_{1a}$), and in particular, transformational leadership would be associated with lower student referral rates ($H_{1b}$) compared to transactional leadership, which would be associated with higher rates ($H_{1c}$). Based on previous research, it was further hypothesised that transformational leadership would also be associated with constructive organisational culture ($H_{1d}$) and inversely related to teacher stress ($H_{1e}$). An association was further hypothesised to occur between constructive organisational culture and both lower student referral rates ($H_{2a}$) and low
teacher stress ($H_{3a}$). In contrast, positive associations were expected between passive-defensive or aggressive-defensive culture types and high student referral rates ($H_{2b}$), as well as between either or both culture types and higher levels of teacher stress ($H_{3b}$). A positive association was additionally expected between teacher stress and higher student referral rates ($H_{3c}$).

Individual teachers and school administrators were assessed using validated measures of each variable, and data were also collected regarding student behaviour in the respective schools. Because data collection for Studies 2 and 3 occurred concurrently, the next sections discuss the method and procedure for both, although the sample sizes used for analyses and discussion differs in each case, as will be noted.

Method

8.1 Participants (Studies 2 and 3)

Participants for Studies 2 and 3 were formed from a stratified sample of teaching staff ($N=136$), school administrators ($N=17$), and students referred for behavioural problems ($N=1432$), at seven metropolitan schools in Brisbane, Queensland. As described in Chapter 7, permission to collect student data in School 4 was withdrawn during the data collection period, and resulted in a reduced sample for Study 2. Thus, sample sizes differed for each study, with Study 2 comprising 121 teaching staff and 16 school administrators (Study 2 total $N=137$), compared to Study 3, where sample size was improved with the addition of 15 teachers and one school administrator (Study 3 total $N=153$).
Data collection methods were negotiated separately with individual schools, resulting in some variation in collection methods and response rates. For example, of the seven participating schools, two supported group administration of the survey battery during staff meetings, while the remaining schools directed staff to complete the surveys if and when convenient. As a result, response rates across schools were quite disparate. Demographic data relevant to teachers and school administrators for individual schools is summarised in Table 8.1, and includes details for both Studies 2 and 3.

Table 8.1

*Summary Of Demographic Data For Teachers And School Administrators For Studies 2 And 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators – Male</th>
<th>Teaching Staff – Male</th>
<th>Administrators – Female</th>
<th>Teaching Staff – Female</th>
<th>Age Range (grouped)</th>
<th>Total N achieved</th>
<th>Total N possible</th>
<th>Response Rate (M=36.25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4\a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40-65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20-65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \a School 4 recanted permission to collate student data, and was removed from Study 2 analyses due to the absence of dependent measures.
In terms of age ranges for the combined groups, most class teachers, or 41.8%, were aged 40-49 years, or 50-59 years (29.1%), compared to school administrators who were generally older with 43.8% aged 50-59 and 37.5% aged 40-49. The vast majority, or 87.4%, of teaching staff were Australian, as were all school administrators. The remaining 15.0% of teachers comprised 8.0% from the United Kingdom, 2.0% from Asian countries, and 5.0% from unspecified ‘other’ origins.

The education level of class teachers was primarily a bachelor’s degree (58.6%), with an additional 6.0% holding a teaching diploma. Almost 13.0% had completed Masters level teaching qualifications, and one person had completed a doctorate. In comparison, many school administrators (37.5%) had completed a bachelor’s degree, and another 43.8% had undertaken some graduate level training. Only 6.0% of school administrators indicated they had completed a Masters degree. Length of service ranged from one to 33 years for class teachers ($M = 15.49, SD = 8.65$) compared to 10 to 39 years for school administrators ($M = 24.83, SD = 8.56$). The inclusion of additional participant data from School 4 for Study 3 did not substantially alter the overall profile for each group according to age, ethnicity, education level, or length of service, and, as a result, will not be further described here.

Student data ($N = 1432$) for Study 2 were collated from school records of behavioural events, and again source documentation varied across schools. For example, some schools recorded behavioural incidents on a computer data-base, while others maintained hand-written records in student files. All data were transcribed to a behaviour event record form, and coded according to student and event type. For the purpose of the present study, student names were not recorded and were identified on the record form only by an assigned number. See Table 8.4 for a representative description of two event types, and Appendix E for the complete data record form and
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coding manual, a detailed description of which follows shortly in Sections 8.2.4 and 8.3. Table 8.2 summarises the number, gender, and age ranges of all students for whom were collated. Note that the use of aggregate data for analyses also served to redress concerns about statistical power, given the variable response rates of teaching staff and school administrators (Kelley & Maxwell, 2003; Maxwell, 2004).

Table 8.2

Summary Of Demographic Data For Students Referred For Behavioural Events Per School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Student Pool&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>% of Total&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>M = 918</td>
<td>M = 33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. <sup>a</sup>b Total of student pools and percentages of total pool for each school have been removed to prevent identification of schools from enrolment numbers and IRSED scores (see Procedure section in this chapter).
<sup>c</sup> Permission to collate student data for this school was recanted after staff data had been obtained; staff data were included for analysis in Study 3.

8.2 Materials

8.2.1 Organisational Culture Inventory (OCI)

Workplace culture was examined using the Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1986), an instrument that has been used in diverse organisational settings, including heavy manufacturing, government and educational institutions, as
well as non-government organisations. A specific benefit of the instrument is that it enables quantitative assessment of organisational culture phenomena, and has been validated in numerous studies since its original design (Human Synergistics, 1997). In addition, the authors’ definition of culture is consistent with that used in the present program of research, in that it acknowledges the range of cultural elements which, in combination, produce an overall cultural type.

The inventory has 108 items, 96 of which form 12 scales of 8 items each. The additional 12-item scale measures an individual’s feelings about their employing organisation and was not included in the present study. Using a five point Likert scale, where ‘1’ represents “not at all” and ‘5’ represents “to a very great extent”, respondents indicate the level to which they agree that the behaviours described in each item ‘help’ organisation members “fit in” and “meet expectations” in their school. The resulting data are computer scored and converted to percentiles. Percentile ranks are determined by comparison to normative data for occupational and industry groups, and then transferred to a circumplex graph that provides visual representation of the organisation’s aggregated data (Human Synergistics, 1997, 1998). Raw score data may also be used in statistical analysis. In the present study, both approaches were adopted. Scale scores from raw data were achieved by summing responses to the appropriate items, and dividing by eight to achieve an average rating for each scale. Thus, from a minimum achievable score of eight to a maximum of 64, a mean rating between 0 and 5 was derived for each scale. Responses by members of the same organisation can be averaged to produce an aggregate score or composite cultural profile of the organisation, in addition to scale scores, which was done for Studies 2 and 3 (Cooke & Szumal, 1993).
The 12 scales measured by the OCI are, 1) Achievement, 2) Self-Actualising, 3) Humanistic-Encouraging, 4) Affiliative, 5) Approval, 6) Conventional, 7) Dependence, 8) Avoidance, 9) Oppositional, 10) Power, 11) Competitive, and 12) Perfectionistic. Composites of the 12 scales produce three culture patterns. The first is Constructive culture (Achievement, Self-Actualising, Humanistic-Encouraging, and Affiliative) which reflects a ‘healthy balance’ of people and task related concerns, and where the attainment of goals is achieved through the development of people. Second is the Passive-Defensive style (Approval, Conventional, Dependent, and Avoidance), which is characterised by a focus on people who subordinate their needs to the organisation, thereby creating stress for themselves and, further, allow the organisation to stagnate. Third is the Aggressive-Defensive style (Oppositional, Power, Competitive, and Perfectionistic) where task goals are emphasised over people and where individual needs are pursued at the expense of others. Not surprisingly, the Aggressive-Defensive style also tends to produce conflict rather than collaboration. Alpha coefficients for the 12 scales are cited as ranging from .67 to .92 (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988), and test-retest reliability is supported by longitudinal data (Cooke & Szumal, 1993).

8.2.2 Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey (MBI)

Teacher stress was measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educators Survey (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1986). The MBI is an appropriate measurement tool because of its development for the human services and, particularly, education personnel experiencing chronic stress. In addition, the authors cite a number of organisational variables that have been found to contribute to teacher burnout, some of which also fall under the rubric of workplace culture (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). The original MBI sub-scales explore three facets of chronic stress leading to burnout,
1) Emotional Exhaustion, 2) Depersonalisation, and 3) Personal Accomplishment. Scale cutoffs allow assessment of burnout according to three levels, low, average, and high.

Respondents are presented with 22 statements and asked to rate how frequently they experience certain feelings about their work. Items are rated on a seven point Likert scale from ‘0’ (“never”) to ‘6’ (“every day”), and a scoring key is provided for summation of sub-scale items. Scores for the Emotional Exhaustion sub-scale may range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 54, while minimum and maximum scores range from 0 to 30 for the Depersonalisation sub-scale, and 0 to 48 for the Personal Accomplishment sub-scale. Specific scale cutoffs are provided for the MBI Educators Survey, which further supports its utility for the present research. The authors cite means and standard deviations for different occupational groups, and reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) for the sub-scales ranging from .71 to .90. Test-retest scale reliabilities for two samples (two to four weeks), range from .60 to .82 ($p < .001$).

Scores for Personal Accomplishment were excluded from analyses for two reasons. First, the behavioural and psychological experience of stress was pertinent to the present research, given that each element represents an acknowledged dichotomy in the stress literature. In addition, recent challenges to the factor structure of the MBI suggest that the Personal Accomplishment subscale performs poorly as a measure of stress (Kalliath, O’Driscoll, Gillespie & Bluedorn, 2000). In contrast, the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales have proven robust to tests of the MBI’s factor structure.
Note that the MBI was excluded from the battery for the school administrators group, as it was not relevant to the question under investigation: this group was included for analysis only in respect of leadership and school culture.

8.2.3 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – 5x (MLQ)

Differences in leadership style were measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995). The MLQ has a research history dating back two decades, and has further evolved since 1991 in response to criticisms regarding discriminant validity. The 1995 version of the instrument (MLQ-5x) includes 45 items and can be used to derive scale scores for transformational and transactional leadership factors. The transformational leadership scale is derived from five sub-scales, 1) Idealised Influence (attributed), 2) Idealised Influence (behaviour), 3) Inspirational Motivation, 4) Intellectual Stimulation, and 5) Individual Consideration. The transactional leadership scale is obtained from a further four sub-scales; 1) Contingent Reward, 2) Management-by-Exception (active), 3) Management-by-Exception (passive), and 4) Laissez-Faire leadership. Another nine items make up three additional outcomes scales which measure Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction; these were excluded from analyses as they were not pertinent to the present study.

The 45 items present a series of descriptive statements rated by respondents on a five point Likert scale, with ‘0’ representing “not at all” and ‘4’ representing “frequently, if not always”. Scoring is achieved by summing sub-scale items and dividing the number of items that comprise each scale according to a scoring key. For all of the leadership sub-scales, raw scores may range from a minimum 0 to a maximum 16, until averaged when scores may range from 0 to 4. Normative tables in
the form of percentiles for ‘individual based on others’ ratings’, are included with the MLQ 5x manual (Bass & Avolio, 1995). This version pertains to the ‘rater form’ and may be used by subordinates or same-level (as leader-supervisor) colleagues. An alternate form of the instrument (leader form) enables measurement of leader behaviour on the same dimensions, as it is perceived by leader-supervisors themselves. Because both ‘leaders’ and ‘subordinates’ were the subject of the present investigation, both forms were used to measure leadership style for school administrators (leader form) and teaching staff (rater form). Scale reliabilities range from .76 to .90, and have been supported by additional research on confirmatory factor analysis of the MLQ 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Since the release of the 1995 version, the MLQ has found further support in the literature and currently is one of the most frequently used measures of transformational leadership (den Hartog, van Muijen, Koopman, 1997; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). Appendix F includes the survey battery as it was presented to participant groups.

8.2.4 Student Behaviour Data

Data concerning referrals for behaviour management, truancy, suspension, and exclusion were obtained directly from school records, as described earlier (see Section 8.1, page 154). To facilitate analysis, a coding manual was developed from a sample of school behaviour plans, in line with Education Queensland’s Policy SM-06, Management of Behaviour in a Supportive School Environment. As described previously, each school plan must comply with the department’s policy, the information is required to be “…published and available to all members of the school community” (Education Queensland, 1998, p. 6).
To enable direct comparison across schools, the frequency of behavioural events was established as a percentage of each school population. However, such a result has the potential to identify participating schools with only minimal calculation, and so referral rates are reported here according to high, medium, and low frequency categories. Natural cut points for the referral categories were observed, and were well defined by a distance of five % or more between clusters of schools. Schools were listed in order of low (School 1) to high (School 7) IRSED scores (see Section 6.2.2 for a definition of IRSED) and crosstabulated against the high, medium, and low referral rate categories. Again, for reasons of confidentiality, the actual upper and lower bounds of each category are contained within the percentages stated below. The resulting categories for each school are presented below in Table 8.3. Actual frequencies per event type and school can be found in Appendix G.

Table 8.3

Categories Of Behavioural Events Frequencies Per School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Low (20-29%)</th>
<th>Medium (30-39%)</th>
<th>High (&gt;40%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* School 4 recanted permission to collate student data, and was removed from Study 2 analyses due to the absence of dependent measures.

For example, in Table 8.3, the highest IRSED rank amongst the schools co-occurred with a high rate (> 40 %) of referrals for student misbehaviour, as a proportion of the student population compared to other schools in the sample.
8.3 Procedure

Survey data collection was conducted between July, 2000, and July, 2001, with student behaviour data collected for four schools during the last weeks of school in Term 4, 2000, and during May to July, 2001, for another two schools. Although participation was voluntary, two schools agreed to allow survey completion at staff meetings while the remaining schools supported survey completion during their staff’s non-contact time. Where survey completion was undertaken during staff meetings, school staff were guided through the process of reading and signing the consent form prior to completing the questionnaires (see Appendix B for a consent form example). For those schools relying on dissemination of survey batteries through internal mail systems, additional instructions were provided to ensure, 1) participants read and signed the research consent form, 2) completed all sections of the questionnaire battery, and 3) returned their completed surveys in the addressed envelope provided. In all cases, respondents were advised to retain the participant information sheet (see Appendix B) to ensure that their interests as participants were protected. The resulting raw data were then 1) entered into an SPSS Version 11 data file for analysis, and 2) returned to the OCI copyright owner, Human Synergistics, for derivation of the circumplex models (see results section). The data set forwarded to Human Synergistics excluded all information from which individuals or schools could be identified.

Participating schools were again contacted after return of the questionnaire batteries to arrange suitable times for collation of student behaviour data. Given that the latter phase of data collection did not impinge on staff contact time, student behaviour data for the year was collated during December, 2000, for schools surveyed
in that year. For two of the remaining three schools, student behaviour data were collated to the date of data collection in May and July of 2001, and multiplied to provide a conservative pro-rated estimate of behavioural events for the year (six and four months respectively). This applied to those schools where survey completion was conducted early in 2001. One of these last three, (identified here as School 4) recanted permission to collate student data. As a result, only the staff data could be included for the final stage of the research, and is included for Study 3 only.

To ensure consistency in the data collection process, 12 “behavioural event” types were operationalised for data coding purposes, and separate categories were included for suspensions, exclusions, and ‘other’ behavioural events not defined. For each student referred for a behavioural event, the corresponding code box on the record form was checked; gender and grade level were also recorded. Each student referred for a behavioural event was identified only by a number on the record form. Names were not required for the present study, and exclusion of this information was also a condition of access to student records. Table 8.4 provides an example of behavioural event codes, while Appendix E presents the full coding manual for student behaviour data, and includes a copy of the data record form.

**Table 8.4**

*Excerpt From Behavioural Event Coding Manual, Indicating Event Type And Description For Coding Purposes See Appendix E For The Complete Manual*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAPON</th>
<th>Weapon found on person; including knives, guns, and sling-shots. <strong>Note:</strong> If used to occasion actual injury, record as ‘Assault – Major’; if used to threaten injury, record as ‘Assault – Minor’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BULLYING</td>
<td>Harassment, threats and intimidating behaviour arising from differences pertaining to age, size, weight, appearance, gender, race, culture, religion, and socio-economic status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each event was recorded as a frequency per student, and totals for each school were tallied, for event type and student. While comprehensive data were obtained for all behavioural events, only the number of students referred, as a proportion of the total pool, was retained for analysis. As indicated earlier, crosstabulation was performed on the behaviour event data, and revealed clear groupings that could be coded as low, medium, and high referral rates categories for analysis (see Table 8.3). This allowed comparability across schools using the frequency categories, and resolved problems caused by the disparities in student numbers and response rates between schools, as described elsewhere (Kelley & Maxwell, 2003).

8.4 Results

8.4.1 Overview of Analyses

As discussed in Chapter 7, discriminant function analysis was selected as the most appropriate analysis to test the proposed model for Study 2 (see Figure 5.2). The decision was taken for three reasons, all of which pertain to data collection. Firstly, as a condition of access to schools, student and teacher level data could only be examined at the school or group level, rather than the class level. This effectively removed the potential for multi-level modelling as an option for analysis. In addition, to account for differences in school size, it was necessary to reduce the student data to referral rate categories, which further limited available options. Third, low response rates in some schools gave rise to a possible problem with statistical power due to the unequal sizes of participant groups; this was resolved through conversion of the student data to a three-level categorical variable to improve the cases-to-variables ratio (Kelley & Maxwell, 2003; Maxwell, 2004). The combined effect of each issue
above was that only the *presence* of a relationship between most variables could be assessed, rather than the *direction* of those relationships. Nonetheless, the individual pathways between the variables of interest were still amenable to assessment via a mix of linear and logistic regression analyses, which enabled testing of the proposed path model. Prior to analysis however, descriptive statistics were obtained, and a number of diagnostic data screening processes undertaken.

### 8.4.2 Descriptive Statistics

For leadership, results revealed that the transformational style was endorsed most often by both teachers and school administrators compared to the transactional style. Results according to cultural type reflect a perception that most schools enjoy a moderately Constructive culture, with results for individual scales ranging from 26.08 \((SD = 5.25)\) for Self-Actualising, to 32.25 \((SD = 5.15)\) for Affiliative. In addition, average raw scores for the Constructive cluster and its composite scales were substantially higher than those for the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive clusters. Noteworthy exceptions were Conventional and Dependent from the Passive-Defensive cluster and Perfectionistic from the Aggressive-Defensive cluster. In combination, the results signal an overall perception of a Constructive culture in participant schools, with some deleterious undercurrents operating within most.

Stress was measured for class teachers only, in line with the pathways proposed in Figure 5.2. That is, teacher stress was suggested as an intervening variable between leadership style, organisational culture, and referral rates for student misbehaviour. Results for stress indicate that teachers’ average levels of Emotional Exhaustion were moderate when compared to the author’s occupational norms, and Depersonalisation levels were low (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Table 8.5 lists the
means and standard deviations for the transactional and transformational leadership scales derived from the MLQ, and the average scale scores for all organisational culture and teacher stress variables.

**Table 8.5**

*Means And Standard Deviations For Study 2 Variables*

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture - Constructive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualising</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive-Defensive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive-Defensive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership (range = 0 to 4)</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress</strong></td>
<td>120*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reduced N reflects absence of school administrators for this measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>14.</th>
<th>15.</th>
<th>16.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Transformational L’ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Achievement</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  Self-Actualising</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  Affiliative</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Approval</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Conventional</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.50**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  Dependent</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Avoidance</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>-0.54**</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Oppositional</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Competitive</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Perfectionistic</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Depersonalisation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; alpha coefficients included (in parentheses) in the diagonal.
Intercorrelations between measures are presented in Table 8.6, above, where a number of significant correlations were found for each of the variables under investigation. These results also confirm the utility of proceeding with the proposed analyses, as significant associations were found between a number of the measured variables.

Figures 8.1 through 8.6 present the OCI circumplexes for each school. Percentile ranks were computed according to normative data for occupational and industry groups, and used to model new data against known results for that industry. Note that circumplex ‘extensions’ are defined as any result exceeding the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile ($P_{50}$) dividing line. For ease of interpretation, the $P_{50}$ line is highlighted in bold on each circumplex.

School 1, a medium referral category school, achieved results that cluster around the $P_{50}$ and appeared somewhat balanced across each of the three cultural styles (see Figure 8.1). However, some deleterious undercurrents were evident, given that both the Passive-Defensive and the Aggressive-Defensive scale clusters disclosed extensions on the Conventional and Avoidant scales for the former, and on the Oppositional and Power scales for the latter. In contrast, the Dependent scale of the Passive-Defensive cluster was comparatively low. Overall, the pattern of results suggested tension between the positive and negative elements of organisational culture.

School 2, again a medium referral category school, achieved a mixed array of extensions across all three of the cultural styles (see Figure 8.2). Most noteworthy were observations that occurred for the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture clusters. The specific combination of scale extensions reflected a culture characterised by approval-seeking, conventionality, avoidance, power and
perfectionism, and – paradoxically – balanced by positive results for the Achievement and Humanistic-Encouraging scales from the Constructive cluster. Given the polarities inherent in the mix of results, it appeared likely that staff may experience significant conflict arising from tension between expectations for performance and consideration of students’ social and developmental needs.

In contrast to the above, School 3, which was another medium referral category school, emerged as quite distinct. Low scores were evident on the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive scales, compared to substantial extensions on all scales of the Constructive cluster (see Figure 8.3). Most notable was the strong result for Humanistic-Encouraging, and reflected a probable commitment to student outcomes despite the influence of socio-demographic factors. Similarly, School 5, a low referral category school, achieved pronounced extensions on the Constructive cluster, particularly for the Achievement and Humanistic-Encouraging scales, coupled with moderate extensions for Affiliative and Self-Actualising (see Figure 8.5). Moderate extensions were also evident for the Perfectionistic and Power scales of the Aggressive-Defensive cluster and the Conventional scale of the Passive-Defensive group. Thus, while overtly Constructive in cultural style, School 5 also presented with some less productive elements from other cultural elements.

Low results overall for the Constructive cultural type distinguished School 6 from others in the sample (see Figure 8.6). For this low referral category school, moderate extensions were evident on three of the Passive-Defensive scales, including Approval, Conventional and Avoidance, with only minimal elevation for the Dependent scale. The Power scale was also moderately elevated for School 6, compared to slight extensions for the remaining three scales of the Aggressive-Defensive cluster. In contrast, only minimal extensions were observed for two of the
four Constructive scales, Affiliative and Achievement. The pattern of results suggested greater emphasis on stability and safety, possibly at the expense of social outcomes. This compares to other schools where a concern for social needs co-occurs with less altruistic elements of the culture.

For School 7, the only school in the high referral category, the Constructive cluster emerged surprisingly as most prominent, with moderate extensions observed for the Humanistic-Encouraging, Achievement and Self-Actualising scales (see Figure 8.6). Consistent with results found for other schools, the Perfectionistic and Power scales of the Aggressive-Defensive style were extended beyond $P_{50}$, as well as the Avoidance scale from the Passive-Defensive cluster. School 7 followed the general trend of results achieved for others in the sample, where circumplex extensions revealed a pattern of Passive-Defensive and(or) Aggressive-Defensive styles, with an overlay of Constructive purpose.

Overall, Power and Perfectionism appeared most frequently as the negative elements of school culture, and Humanistic-Encouraging and Achievement as the most frequently endorsed positive elements. The picture is one of tension between performance and advocacy where organisational outcomes are encouraged, sometimes at the expense of human needs. This is illustrated further in the circumplex graphs that follow next.
**Figure 8.1** Circumplex for School 1 with extensions on the Aggressive-Defensive and Passive-Defensive Culture scale clusters.
School 2

Figure 8.2 Circumplex for School 2 with extensions on all culture scales.
Figure 8.3 Circumplex for School 3 with extensions on the Constructive culture scale cluster.
School 5

Figure 8.4 Circumplex for School 5 with pronounced extensions on the Constructive culture scales, and substantial extensions on the Aggressive-Defensive scale clusters.
School 6

Figure 8.5  Circumplex for School 6 with pronounced extensions on the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture scale clusters.
Figure 8.6 Circumplex for School 7 with extensions predominantly on the Constructive and Aggressive-Defensive culture scale clusters.
8.4.3 Main Tests Of Hypotheses

The aim of Study 2 was to investigate the relationships between school leadership style, organisational culture, teacher stress, and the rate at which students are referred for behavioural issues. Based on previous research, it was expected that associations would be found between leadership style and student referral rates, organisational culture and referral rates, and between teachers’ levels of stress and referral rates. This is based on the premise that student behaviour has been implicated in each domain of interest, and that each independent factor has been related to the others in prior research. Consequently, the effect of these variables on student referral rates was subjected to analysis to determine whether such relationships could be found, and to test whether the combination of variables was associated with the rate at which students are referred for problem behaviour.

Missing Values Analysis indicated that missing data did not exceed 5% for any variable. Where missing data were noted, it appeared to be randomly dispersed in the set of predictor variables, and was thus replaced by the series means for each scale (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). As the grouping variable was assigned per school from the student behaviour data, no missing data occurred. Evaluation of assumptions indicated univariate outliers on seven predictors, which were successfully resolved by square root transformation of each variable. As a result, the analyses reported here include transformed data where appropriate. After removal of one outlying case, checks of multivariate normality revealed that assumptions of linearity, normality, homogeneity of variance, and multicollinearity were met in all cases, with no inter-correlations between predictors approaching .9 (see also Table 8.6). Thus, 136 cases were retained for analysis, and comprised 120 teaching staff and 16 school administrators.
A series of *t*-tests were also performed to ascertain the characteristics and differences relevant to participating schools, and the administrators and teaching staff attached to each. In terms of demographics, no significant differences between schools were found for ethnicity, length of tenure, age, and gender. Education level was significant for the leadership variables only (*p* < .05). In addition, referral rates for student misbehaviour were significantly different between schools (*p* < .001).

Not unexpectedly, differences were found between schools for most variables, including transformational leadership (*p* < .001) and transactional leadership (*p* < .01), one Constructive culture subscale, Humanistic-Encouraging (*p* < .001), three Passive-Defensive subscales, including, Avoidance (*p* < .05), Approval (*p* < .05), Conventional (*p* < .01), and all subscales of the Aggressive-Defensive culture, including, Competitive, (*p* < .05), Power (*p* < .01), Oppositional (*p* < .05), and Perfectionistic (*p* < .01). For teacher stress, differences between schools were significant for Emotional Exhaustion alone (*p* < .001).

A direct discriminant function analysis was performed to test for the combined effects of the independent variables, using the two leadership variables, 12 culture variables and two stress variables, as predictors of membership in the three dependent groups. The leadership predictors were transactional and transformational; the organisational culture predictors were Achievement, Self-Actualising, Humanistic-Encouraging, Affiliation, Approval, Conventional, Dependent, Avoidant, Oppositional, Power, Competitive, and Perfectionistic; the teacher stress predictors were Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation. The grouping variable, student referrals for behavioural events, were low (20% to 29%), medium (30 to 39%), and high (40% or greater).
Two discriminant functions were calculated with a combined $\chi^2 (32) = 66.05$, $p<.001$. After removal of the first function, the association between groups and predictors was non significant, with $\chi^2 (15) = 16.94$, ns. Variance accounted for by the first function however, was 77.2% with a medium effect size ($\eta^2 = .36$). As shown in Figure 8.8, the first discriminant function maximally separated the high student referral group with a centroid of $-1.090$, from the low and medium referral groups with centroids of .817 and .292 respectively.

![Figure 8.8 Plots of three centroids on two discriminant functions from two leadership, 12 organisational culture, and two teacher stress variables.](image)

Of the 16 variables originally entered for analysis, seven were identified as significant in the first function, $p<.001$. Inspection of the loading matrix of correlations between predictors and discriminant functions indicated that the best method of distinguishing between high student referral rates, and the low or medium
referral groups (first function) were transactional and transformational leadership style, and the Oppositional and Approval aspects of organisational culture (see Table 8.7). Combined, the discriminating function reflects an approval-seeking, but potentially antagonistic organisational orientation, with tension between positive and negative aspects of leadership and school culture. However, while weak loadings for most variables (including Dependent, Avoidance, and Affiliative) are interpretable for this sample (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), leadership emerged as the single most important factor in prediction of student referral rates.

Table 8.7

Structure Matrix Of Canonical Correlation Coefficients Between Discriminating Variables And Discriminant Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.506*</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.257*</td>
<td>-.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>-.226*</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.479*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.457*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.453*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.407*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.350*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualising</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.073*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.061*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Largest absolute correlation between each variables and any discriminant function.
Results indicated that the first function, which comprised both leadership styles and the Oppositional, Approval, Dependent, Avoidance, and Affiliative facets of organisational culture, correctly classified 61.7% of the originally grouped cases. Classification rates for the student variable were 35.7% for the low referral group, 80.4% for the medium referral group, and 52.8% for the high referral group. The overall classification rate was somewhat low, however, given the high proportion of variance accounted for overall (77.2%). In addition, the classification rate for the low referral group is considerably less than those for the medium and high referral groups.

For the leadership predictors, the high student referral group was more likely to co-occur with transactional leadership styles than for the medium referral group or the low referral group. The opposite was true for the high referral group and transformational leadership, compared to the medium group or the low referral group. For the organisational culture variables, the Oppositional facet had the strongest association with high referral rates, compared to the medium and low referral groups, although a similar but weaker association was evident for the Avoidance culture scale. The three additional culture variables were inversely related to high student referral rates. That is, these variables were more likely to be associated with medium and low referral groups. Other predictors did not contribute further to group discrimination.

Table 8.8 presents the means and standard deviations for each discriminating variable according to the student referral category.
Table 8.8
Measures And Standard Deviations For Variables In The Discriminating Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Medium M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>High M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While discriminant function analysis allowed investigation of the association between student referral rates and the school environment level variables, it could not fully specify the direction of relationships beyond predictions of group membership. As mentioned previously, strict limits had been imposed on collection of student data and investigation of direct links between individual teachers and student outcomes was expressly disallowed. While the absence of this information did not preclude testing of the hypotheses, it limited the extent to which the relationships between variables could be fully examined. Thus, to further evaluate the proposed path model (refer Figure 5.2), a series of standard, hierarchical and logistic regression analyses were also conducted. Evaluation of individual pathways between all combinations of leadership, organisational culture, teacher stress, and student referral rates, were assessed and combined with results from discriminant analysis for interpretation. Therefore, the analyses that follow are a test of the proposed path model presented in Figure 5.2.
8.4.4 Test Of Path Model

Prior to analyses, a second order exploratory factor analysis was performed on the 12 organisational culture scales. This decision was taken to enable testing of the path model, where a single dependent factor was required for regression analyses. As a result, each of the three culture types could be used in assessment of the proposed path model in three regression equations. Factorability of the correlation matrix was confirmed by a significant result for Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, and a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of .85. A principal axis factoring method was used with varimax rotation, and accounted for the greatest amount of variance (77.67%) compared to oblique rotation (Field, 2002). As can be seen in Figure 8.9, the scree test revealed three clear factors with eigenvalues greater than one, suggesting a three factor solution. Factor loadings and communalities are presented in Table 8.9.

![Scree Plot](image)

*Figure 8.9* Scree plot for the second order Factor Analysis of organisational culture scales.
Table 8.9  
**Second Order Factor Analysis Of Organisational Culture Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCI Scale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructive (alpha = .88)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td></td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualising</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td></td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive-Defensive (alpha = .89)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td></td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive-Defensive (alpha = .91)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.510</td>
<td></td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, all scales loaded on the expected cultural style, with the exception of the Perfectionistic scale from the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, which cross-loaded on the Passive-Defensive cluster. The anomalous outcome for the Perfectionistic scale is not unexpected, however, due to sample variation. Further analysis indicated acceptable scale reliabilities, which are also included in Table 8.9 above. For the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, the reliability coefficient is actually improved with the inclusion of the Perfectionistic scale; with this item removed, the alpha coefficient was .83. Because each scale demonstrates sound reliability, regardless of the cross-loading on one scale, the culture clusters were used in regression analyses according to the original composition of four scales each.
To assess the proposed path model, evaluation of the relationship between leadership and organisational culture was conducted first via hierarchical multiple regression (HMR). Order of entry followed the theoretical position that transformational leadership has a significant additive effect over transactional leadership, and that leadership is related to organisational culture. Because differences in leadership style are theoretically linked to organisational culture types, leadership was examined separately for each of the cultural clusters of the OCI.

Consistent with this position, transactional leadership did not account for significant variance in Constructive school culture, $R^2 = .006, F (1,134) = .764, ns.$ At Step 2, when transformational leadership was added to the equation, there was an increase in variance explained, $R^2 = .205, F (2,133) = 17.170, p<.001,$ and indicated a substantial improvement in prediction over transactional leadership alone, $F_{change} (2,133) = 33.391, p<.001.$ Table 8.10 presents the beta weights for Constructive culture regressed on to each leadership style, and revealed a positive relationship between Constructive culture and transformational leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>4.622</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>9.445</td>
<td>4.252</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>13.478</td>
<td>2.332</td>
<td>*** .458</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{change} = .200$

A similar pattern emerged for the Passive-Defensive cultural style (see Table 8.11). At Step 1, with transactional leadership in the equation, $R^2 = .025, F (1,134) =$
3.430, ns. At Step 2, when transformational leadership was added, there was an increase in variance explained for Passive-Defensive culture, $R^2 = .239$, $F (2,133) = 20.860$, $p<.001$, which indicated a significant improvement in prediction over transactional leadership alone, $F_{\text{change}} (2,133) = 37.360$, $p<.001$. As shown in Table 8.11, results disclosed a negative relationship between transformational leadership and Passive-Defensive culture, in line with theoretically based expectations.

Table 8.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>9.085</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>3.089</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-14.954</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td><strong>-.474</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.468</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2_{\text{change}} = .214$  

*** $p<.001$

In contrast, both leadership styles predicted the Aggressive-Defensive cultural style (see Table 8.12). At Step 1, with transactional leadership in the equation, $R^2 = .052$, $F (1,134) = 7.337$, $p<.01$. At Step 2, after adding transformational leadership, there was an increase in variance explained for Aggressive-Defensive culture, $R^2 = .248$, $F (2,133) = 21.909$, $p<.001$, which indicated a significant improvement in prediction from transformational over transactional leadership alone $F_{\text{change}} (2,133) = 34.638$, $p<.001$. In line with theoretically based expectations, transformational leadership was negatively associated with Aggressive-Defensive culture, compared to transactional leadership which was positively associated. In contrast to results for the Constructive and Passive-Defensive cultural styles, the inclusion of transformational
leadership at Step 2 significantly reduced the unique influence of transactional leadership on Aggressive-Defensive culture ($\beta = .128, \text{ns}$)

### Table 8.12

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Of Aggressive-Defensive Culture On Leadership Style*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>12.234</td>
<td>4.517</td>
<td><strong>.228</strong></td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>6.876</td>
<td>4.139</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-13.365</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>***-.454</td>
<td>-.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2_{\text{change}} = .196$

** $p<.001$; *** $p<.001$

A direct pathway was also found for leadership and teachers stress, where Emotional Exhaustion was predicted by both transactional and transformational leadership styles (Tables 8.13 and 8.14 overleaf). In contrast, Depersonalisation was associated only with transactional leadership. Tables 8.13 and 8.14 present the regression coefficients for both measured aspects of teacher stress. At Step 1, with transactional leadership in the equation $R^2 = .070, F (1,118) = 8.934, p<.01$. At Step 2, after adding transformational leadership, there was an increase in variance explained for Emotional Exhaustion, $R^2 = .223, F (2,117) = 16.828, p<.001$, and indicated a significant improvement in prediction of Emotional Exhaustion from transformational over transactional leadership alone $F_{\text{change}} (2,117) = 23.052, p<.001$. As expected, Emotional Exhaustion was positively associated with transactional leadership and negatively associated with transformational leadership.
Table 8.13

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Of Emotional Exhaustion On Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>8.222</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td><strong>.265</strong></td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>5.712</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>*.184</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-6.827</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>***-.399</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{change} = .153$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

At Step 1, for Depersonalisation, transactional leadership did not account for significant variance $R^2 = .008$, $F(1,118) = 1.004$, ns. At Step 2, after adding transformational leadership, there was an increase in variance explained, $R^2 = .143$, $F(2,117) = 9.742$, $p<.001$, and indicated a significant improvement in prediction of Emotional Exhaustion by transformational leadership over transactional leadership alone $F_{change}(2,117) = 18.333$, $p<.001$. Thus, contrary to expectations, transactional leadership was not associated with Depersonalisation. In contrast, results found a significant negative relationship between transformational leadership and Depersonalisation that were consistent with expectations.

Table 8.14

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Of Depersonalisation On Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.722</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>***-.374</td>
<td>-.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{change} = .134$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001
The pathway between organisational culture and teacher stress was also examined using standard multiple regressions (SMR). For prediction of Emotional Exhaustion, significant relationships were found for all cultural styles, including Constructive, with $R^2 = .038 \ F(1,118) = 4.671, p<.05$, Passive-Defensive, with $R^2 = .122 \ F(1,118) = 16.369, p<.001$, and Aggressive-Defensive, with $R^2 = .137 \ F(1,118) = 8.688, p<.001$. Similar results were evident for Depersonalisation, where all cultural types again achieved significant results, including Constructive, where $R^2 = .113, F(1,118) = 15.090, p<.001$, Passive-Defensive, with $R^2 = .062 \ F(1,118) = 7.767, p<.01$, and Aggressive-Defensive, where $R^2 = .101, F(1,118) = 13.280, p<.001$. Standardised and unstandardised beta weights for each stress variable according to culture type are presented in Table 8.15 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>***-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>***.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>***.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>***-.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>***.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>***.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p<.001$

Because the referral rates variable was a three-level categorical factor, a series of multinomial logistic regressions (MLR) were performed to establish the direction of associations between referral rates and the individual pathways for leadership,
culture, and teacher stress. As an initial step, the combined model was again assessed with all predictors in the equation. The resulting output confirmed findings for discriminant analysis, in that both leadership styles and the Passive-Defensive culture cluster were the strongest predictors of student referral rates. However, because the level of threat from multicollinearity increases with the number of variables in the equation, three separate MLRs were performed with each set of predictor variables regressed on to student referral rates (leadership, culture, teacher stress).

First, the pathway between leadership style and student referral rates was assessed, with transactional and transformational leadership as the independent variables, and student referral rates as the dependent factor. With high student referral rates as the reference category, the full model was significantly better than an intercept-only model, $\chi^2(4) = 15.378, p<.01$, with variance estimated at 12.2% from the Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$. Leadership reliably distinguished between all referral rate categories for student misbehaviour, and accurately classified 52.9% of cases.

Next, the pathway between organisational culture and student referral rates was assessed, with Constructive, Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types as the independent variables and student referral rates again as the dependent factor. A test of the full model with high student referral rates as the reference category was better than an intercept-only model, $\chi^2(6) = 12.133, p<.06$, but only approached statistical significance. In this instance, the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types reliably distinguished medium and high referral rates. Variance accounted for was low at 9.7%, as indicated by the Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$, although 55.1% of cases were correctly classified.

Lastly, the pathway between teacher stress and student referral rates was assessed, with Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation as the independent
variables and student referral rates as the dependent factor. With high student referral rates as the reference category, a test of the full model against an intercept-only model was non-significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 1.654, ns$. Results for teacher stress did not distinguish between referral rate categories and are therefore consistent with those reported earlier for discriminant function analysis.

Results of likelihood ratio tests for the individual variables revealed that transactional leadership accounted for significant variance in classification according to all three referral rate categories. Two of the three culture types, Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive, accounted for significant variance in two of the dependent categories, that is, medium and high student referral rates. On this occasion, the Aggressive-Defensive culture cluster emerged more clearly in regression compared to discriminant function analysis, and probably reflects the effects from the Oppositional scale. Participants who endorsed their schools’ culture as Aggressive-Defensive, were more likely to be located in schools with medium and high rates of student referrals. Similarly, weak loadings found earlier in discriminant function analysis for scales of the Passive-Defensive cluster, were supported in MLR for classification medium and high student referral rates. Participants who endorsed their schools’ culture as Passive-Defensive, were also more likely to be found in schools with medium and high rates of student referrals. Most importantly, however, the results for teacher stress were again non-significant as independent predictors of student referral rates. Table 8.16 presents the likelihood ratio tests for individual variables in relation to high student referral rates as the reference category.
Table 8.16

**Likelihood Ratio Tests On Individual Variables Of Multinomial Logistic Regression Models Relating High Student Referral Rates To Leadership, Culture, And Teacher Stress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership MLR Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td><strong>10.387</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>2.397</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture MLR Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Culture</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive Culture</td>
<td>*7.777</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive Culture</td>
<td><strong>9.944</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Stress MLR Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$

Table 8.17 presents the parameter estimates for the likelihood of low and medium referral rates for student misbehaviour occurring compared to the reference category of high referral rates. In logistic regression, the parameters are interpreted using odds ratios ($\exp^\beta$), which describe the probability of a categorical outcome from a predictor variable, relative to the odds of the outcome at a comparison level (the ‘reference category’). Ratios between 0 and 1 indicate a decreased likelihood, and odds ratios above 1.0 indicate an increased likelihood. Results indicate that the odds of transactional leadership occurring for low and medium referral rates were significantly less likely compared to high student referral rates. Further, the odds of medium and high referral rates occurring were more likely for Passive-Defensive culture, compared to Aggressive-Defensive culture which was also significant in prediction. No other variables contributed to prediction of student referral rates. The combined results of both sets of analyses follow later in Figure 8.10.
Table 8.17

Parameter Estimates For Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting High Student Referral Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low Referral Rates$^a$</th>
<th>Medium Referral Rates$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wald $\chi^2$</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR Analysis 1 - Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td><strong>7.067</strong></td>
<td>-2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR Analysis 2 - Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR Analysis 3 – Teacher Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ The reference category for student referral rates is high.

** $p<.01$
The results for teacher stress, however, were counter-intuitive. The teacher stress variables were clearly predicted by leadership and culture, but were consistently non-significant in both discriminant function analysis and logistic regression tests of student referral rates. Consequently, two additional HMRs were performed to assess the likelihood of a mediated relationship between the leadership, culture, and stress variables. Order of entry followed Baron and Kenny’s (1986) recommendations, as significant associations between each pair of variables had already been established in prior analyses (leadership to culture; leadership to teacher stress; culture to teacher stress), and no threat was evident from multicollinearity (refer Table 8.6). Results indicated that Constructive culture mediated the relationship between leadership and Depersonalisation, although no evidence was found that culture mediated leadership and Emotional Exhaustion. These results are presented next in Tables 8.18 and 8.19, followed by the path model which now includes path specifications (Figure 8.10).

### Table 8.18

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Test Of Mediation With Leadership As IVs, Culture As Mediator Variable, And Emotional Exhaustion As DV*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>*.179</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-4.688</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>**.274</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$
Table 8.19

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Test Of Mediation With Leadership As IVs, Culture As Mediator Variable, And Depersonalisation As DV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>***-.294</td>
<td>-.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>* .293</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>**-.232</td>
<td>-.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Defensive</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Defensive</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² change = .071

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Figure 8.10 Specified model of relationships among school level variables, including school leadership, organisational culture, teacher stress levels, and the direction of effects found.
8.5 Discussion

8.5.1 Overview of Hypotheses

The aim of Study 2 was to examine the combined effect of variables that have a demonstrated association with student behaviour problems in schools. In terms of school leadership style, it was hypothesised that associations would be found between leadership and organisational culture, between leadership and teachers’ stress, and between leadership and referral rates for student misbehaviour. It was further hypothesised that links would be found between organisational culture and levels of teachers’ stress, between culture and student referral rates for misbehaviour, and between teachers’ stress and referral rates. The overall objective, however, was to assess whether the combination of these variables could predict the frequency of referral rates in participating schools, and to examine the direction of potential pathways among the relationships found (see also, Section 5.6, Hypotheses).

Results of analyses indicate that the aims of the study were largely supported, in that the overall classification model was significant in discriminating between student referral rate categories, and further supported in regression tests of the path model. Nonetheless, a number of unexpected results were also noted, and will be addressed along with the discussion of results that follows.

8.5.2 Discussion of Results

Hypothesis 1(a) proposed an association between leadership style and referral rates for student misbehaviour. In particular, lower referral rates were expected to be associated with transformational leadership (Hypothesis 1b), compared
to higher referral rates and transactional leadership (Hypothesis 1c). Results of discriminant function analysis indicate that these hypotheses were largely supported.

A high rate of referrals (>40%) of students reported as a proportion of the total population) for student misbehaviour co-occurred with transactional leadership, compared to low (20-29%) and medium (30-39%) referral rates in those schools where a transformational leadership style was endorsed. That is, participants who perceived their principal’s leadership style as transactional were also likely to be located in a school where reports for student misbehaviour were more frequent. In contrast, low and medium referral rates co-occurred with transformational leadership, providing support for Hypothesis 1(b). Participating staff who viewed their principal as transformational were more likely to be located in a school where referrals for student misbehaviour were less frequent. However, because only one participating school achieved the distinction of being in the high referral rates category, results indicate that most staff at this particular school (School 7) viewed their principal as transactional rather than transformational. While this outcome provides provisional support for Hypothesis 1(c), School 7 may differ from other schools in important ways that are not captured here. For example, individual or contextual factors operating within the school may have been attributed to the principalship.

Viewed in isolation, the outcome for School 7 suggests a transactional focus on monitoring and punishment of behaviours that deviate from desired standards. It implies that the principal’s transactional focus on technical aspects of school performance may occur at the expense of compassion and accommodation of individual differences, and is consistent with reports by behaviour management staff cited in Study 1 (D’Arcy, 1994; Riehl & Lee, 1996). In the educational setting, the transactional style may amplify the negative effects of social diversity through
pressure to comply with standards for achievement and regulated behaviour. However, previous evidence suggests that some students’ capacity to conform may be fundamentally compromised because of the known sequelae of cultural and language barriers, socioeconomic status, the effects of early trauma, and family dysfunction (Adami & Norton, 1996; Doyle, 2004; Jason, 2000; Noguera, 1995; Silins & Mulford, 2002). Those affected may be constrained in their ability to negotiate the impositions of a system that is perceived as inflexible and unresponsive. The behavioural consequences may then surface as negative reactivity towards systemic controls that fail to accommodate individual needs. Nonetheless, the emergence of an association between transactional leadership and high student referral rates offers some support for the direction of effect proposed in Hypothesis 1, and Hypothesis 1(c) in particular.

Results of discriminant function analysis were further supported in logistic regression, where significant associations were found between student referral rates and both leadership styles in the overall model (see Figure 8.10). However, individual parameter estimates (see Table 8.16) indicate that transactional leadership was the most influential variable in discriminating between referral rate categories. Inspection of the unstandardised beta weights reveal that low and medium referral rates are inversely associated with transactional leadership, thereby supporting results found for discriminant function analysis. In contrast, transformational leadership did not contribute to prediction in regression analyses, and may reflect the comparatively weak loading for this variable in the discriminating function (see structure matrix for discriminant function analysis in Table 8.7). Consequently, the direction of effect can be inferred from results of both analyses, although some questions remain regarding the results for transformational leadership.
It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that some support is found for a position that has only been alluded to obliquely in the literature, that is, leadership style may also operate as an indirect influence on student behaviour (Griffith, 1999; Koh et al., 1995; Wiley, 1998). This notion is supported by the limited amount of variance accounted for in relation to student referral rates, which suggests that leadership is only part of the equation. Moreover, how leadership exerts an influence remains unclear, but may be due to the effects of leadership style on school culture and the job satisfaction of individual teachers (Begley, 1994; Hipp, 1996, 1997; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Peters, 1997; Punch & Tuutteman, 1996). According to theories of leadership and culture, if a principal models tolerance for diversity, in all its forms, his or her behaviour is likely to be reflected in cultural norms regarding the humanitarian goals of school performance (Heck & Marcoulides, 1996; Jason, 2000; Zollers et al., 1999). Compare the above to a principal who is largely concerned with stability, achievement, and the ‘hidden curriculum’ of conformity (Schemp et al., 1993; Synott & Symes, 1995; Wren, 1999). In the first scenario, human synergies are enabled; in the latter they may be disabled. That is, beneficial outcomes are likely to follow from greater tolerance of social pluralism in student populations where the leader’s orientation promotes positive achievement motivation in both teachers and students (Begley, 1994; Jung & Avolio, 1999; Parry, 2002).

While previous research has highlighted such a possibility, assessment of the pathways between leadership and student referral rates in the present research were clearer for transactional leadership compared to transformational. One explanation may be that the transactional style is more likely to precipitate defensive behaviour in subordinates, with a concomitant focus on task issues over social needs. This may offer further explanation for the leadership findings in discriminant function.
analysis, where both leadership styles were important in prediction of student referral rates, compared to findings for transactional leadership in regression analyses. That is, transformational leadership may be most important in relation to teacher level outcomes, while transactional leadership may be most important at the student level. Thus, while results support a relationship between leadership and student referral rates, the pathways remain somewhat unclear.

Although the weight of evidence suggests that transformational leadership may be a potentially positive influence generally, school culture is often the conduit through which leadership values are revealed (Enomoto, 1994; Hamilton & Richardson, 1995; Mok & Flynn, 1998). To assess this proposition, Hypothesis 1(d) proposed that transformational leadership would be associated with Constructive organisational culture, and negatively related to Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive cultures. When the individual pathways between leadership and organisational culture were examined via regression, findings explicitly supported the predicted relationships. Results for Constructive culture were significant and positive, in line with findings reported elsewhere (Hipp, 1996, 1997; Mok & Flynn, 1998; Peters, 1997; Punch & Tuetteeman, 1996). In contrast, results were significant and negative for both Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive cultures. Such a result is not unexpected given the conceptual similarities between aspects of transformational leadership and some of the scales that form the composite of Constructive culture measured by the OCI. For example, OCI scales, such as ‘Self-Actualising’ and ‘Humanistic-Encouraging’ reflect at least some of the qualities of transformational leadership, including inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.
Nonetheless, the clear results found in regression analyses differ noticeably when compared to results for discriminant function analysis, in terms of the pathways from school leadership to organisational culture. The single weak loading for the Affiliative scale of Constructive culture, in discriminant analysis, may reflect the importance of teacher support from the apex of school hierarchies. Potentially, this may also indicate limited expectations that higher order development needs, such as self-actualisation, can be met for either students or teaching staff (Mills, 1991). Teachers, for example, may not associate the workplace setting with attainment of higher order needs, especially when tension exists from opposing cultural elements in the workplace, as highlighted in the circumplex graphs (see Section 8.4.2).

Conversely, while a positive relationship was found for transformational leadership and Constructive culture (H1d), the influence from both variables may interact in some way in terms of effects for teachers and possibly students (H1b). Results of mediation offer some support for this proposition (see Tables 8.15 and 8.16). When the relationships between leadership and teacher stress were examined with organisational culture as a mediating variable, the relationship between leadership and teacher stress was non-significant for the Depersonalisation scale of the MBI. No mediation effect was found for the Emotional Exhaustion scale however. While this provides some evidence, albeit limited, that culture may be important in terms of teacher stress (H1e, H3a), which may then influence student referral rates (H3c), leadership is still the single most important influence on school culture and teacher stress.

With regard to the predicted associations between leadership and the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture clusters, findings were again in line with expectations, thereby offering additional support for Hypothesis 1(d). That is,
significant negative associations were found between transformational leadership and both the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive cultural styles. For the Passive-Defensive cluster, transformational leadership contributed uniquely to prediction in regression analyses, suggesting that transformational leadership substantially reduces levels of defensive passivity in the domains measured. The same was true for the Aggressive-Defensive cultural cluster, where an inverse relationship was found for transformational leadership, and a positive association for transactional leadership. These results are consistent with a plethora of related research, where transformational leadership – either explicitly labelled as such, or not – has been associated with a number of positive culture and(or) school community outcomes (Begley, 1994; Heck & Marcoulides, 1996; Hipp, 1996, 1997; Jason, 2000; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996; Zollers et al., 1999).

Further support is implicit in the beta weights for each direct pathway. Higher weights occurred for the Aggressive-Defensive cluster compared to the Passive-Defensive cluster, across both leadership styles, and accounted for greater variance as expected. This suggests that the strength of the inverse association between transformational leadership and culture may increase as the school culture becomes increasingly hostile.

In terms of Hypothesis 1(e), a negative association was predicted between transformational leadership and teacher stress. In line with previous research, a direct and significant positive association was found for transactional leadership and Emotional Exhaustion. Findings are consistent with previous research which reports that teachers may feel burdened by performance expectations and increasing workload pressure, while subject to poor working conditions, amidst limited support from colleagues and supervisors (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Friedman, 1991; Van Der Linde,
No relationship was found between Depersonalisation and transactional leadership, however, and may imply that the amount of teachers’ emotional labour is reduced when the basis of the exchange, or transaction, relates explicitly to the technical aspects of teaching. That is, while teachers suffer significant work-related stress, they may attempt to maintain the interpersonal functions associated with their work role, thus accounting for low scores for Depersonalisation. This finding was also borne out in mediation analyses, where Depersonalisation was singularly related to Constructive culture.

In contrast, direct and strong negative relationships were found between transformational leadership and both the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation aspects of teacher stress, as predicted. Findings indicate that when principals’ leadership style is transformational, teacher stress is substantially reduced. These results are consistent with theoretical models of leadership, and transformational leadership especially. Given that the transformational style is characterised by the leaders’ capacity to inspire and relate to subordinates at a deep emotional level, it is not surprising that teachers will feel supported, even in the context of difficult and demanding work roles (Barnett et al., 2001; Langford & Fitness, 2003). Thus, the results are also consistent with a sizeable body of evidence attesting to the ameliorating effects of supportive school leadership, and transformational leadership in particular (Begley, 1994; Bourke & Smith, 1994; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Punch & Tuetteman, 1996).

Interestingly though, teacher stress was not associated with student referral rates, as proposed in Hypothesis 3(c). In the overall discriminant function model, teacher stress did not contribute to discrimination, and was confirmed as non-significant in regression tests. While transformational leadership was clearly and
negatively associated with teacher stress (H1e), the influence of transformational leadership on referral rates via the intervening teacher stress variable, could not be ascertained. However, the single finding for Depersonalisation in mediation analyses may actually explain the consistent non-significant findings for teacher stress in relation to student referral rates (refer Table 8.19). That is, while teachers may be suffering substantial stress, they may actively work to reduce the flow on effects to students. The negative association between Depersonalisation and Constructive culture in mediation suggests that teachers may seek support within the school community before they allow stress to affect their relations with students. However, further assessment of this pathway would require measurement of the relationships on a teacher-to-class basis, which is beyond the allowed scope and permissions of the present study (see Section 10.1, Limitations).

Overall, the broader pattern of associations for both transactional and transformational leadership reflects links to school outcome variables reported in the literature. For example, transformational leadership has been associated with student academic achievement (Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995; Mok & Flynn, 1998), positive leader evaluations from teaching staff (Hipp, 1996, 1997; Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996), student demographic variables (Griffith, 1999), attributes of successful school principals (Begley, 1994; Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998), and motivation and performance (Jung & Avolio, 1999). In each of these studies, positive student and teacher level outcomes were found for transformational leadership. The direction of effect found here indirectly supports such findings, even though the criterion variable differed. However, significant findings for both leadership styles in discriminant function analysis, compared to the singular finding for transactional leadership in regression tests, suggest that further research may be warranted.
Nevertheless, the present findings for leadership are thematically consistent with the extant literature. That is, the pattern of associations between variables offers support for the argument that leadership style may be associated with important individual level outcomes, potentially including student behaviour. Combined with results reported elsewhere, these results signal the need to manage both the social and academic dimensions of school life and that transformational leadership may be a useful vehicle to achieve this aim. Such a shift is congruent with assertions made by authors such as Elias (1989), Friedland (1999), and Schmuck and Schmuck (1991), who acknowledge the legitimacy of children’s social world as central to their experience of school. Core characteristics of the transformational style, as described previously, may operate at the social and interpersonal levels, offering individualised concern and personal attention that reduces perceptions of threat and promotes self-efficacy for those at risk of school failure (Barnett, et al., 2001; Friedland, 1999). While broadly aligned with previous research outcomes, the results found here suggest that the transactional leadership style is most influential in relation to student outcomes. However, transformational leadership may exert an indirect influence (Hart et al., 1995; Hipp, 1996, 1997), and the influence of intervening variables cannot be excluded, as will become evident next.

To assess the relationship between organisational culture and student behaviour, Hypothesis 2(a) proposed that Constructive organisational culture would be associated with lower rates of referral for misbehaviour. As indicated previously, the results of discriminant function analysis revealed only a weak association for the Affiliative aspect of Constructive culture. This result is somewhat surprising given the overt focus on (educational) achievement, a measured aspect of Constructive culture in the present study. In addition, the results of logistic regression failed to
locate any significant relationship between the Constructive culture type and student referral rates. Consequently, only limited support can be asserted with regard to Hypothesis 2(a), and only in relation to the Affiliative aspect of Constructive culture. This result contrasts with earlier research that has identified the importance of the social environment for students (Maehr & Andreman, 1993; Mok & Flynn, 1998; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). From the students’ perspective at least, social gains rate more highly as a ‘best aspect’ of the high school experience, compared to academic achievement (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). Given that approaches to student management are mandated in policy and delivered in prescriptive fashion by adults-as-experts, the social elements of school life are often regimented along with academic objectives (Noguera, 1995; Kowalski, 2000). Ellefson’s (1993) contention that deep learning is best taught by those willing to “…demonstrate it in their own lives” (p. 236) suggests that recognition of the whole person, including the social and developmental needs of adolescents, is an important component of academic achievement (Ellefson, 1993; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991). By implication, teachers and school administrators become the models from whom students learn about effective learning and community participation. If the Affiliative aspect of Constructive culture catalyses such an outcome for some students, then this result may not be as surprising as first indicated. Consequently, the issue may not be as simple as whether or not Hypothesis 2(a) is supported per se, but rather, which aspect(s) of Constructive culture are important in supporting school objectives.

Hypothesis 2(b) proposed that defensive organisational culture(s) would be associated with higher rates of referral for student misbehaviour. As expected, and in line with the hypothesised outcome, the Oppositional facet of the Aggressive-Defensive cluster was associated with high referral rates in discriminant function
analysis. This compares to weak loadings for the Approval, Dependent, and Avoidance facets of the Passive-Defensive cultural cluster, which were, paradoxically, associated with low and medium referral rates, in contrast to the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 2(b). However, results of logistic regression unequivocally support a relationship between student referral rates and the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types. Interestingly, odds ratios indicate that Passive-Defensive culture was more likely to predict student referral rates compared to Aggressive-Defensive culture. Essentially, the result for Passive-Defensive culture may signify a level of systemic inertia that operates to support passivity and dependence amongst school staff in order to meet performance goals.

Teaching staff are subject to cultural norms that decree control of student behaviour as a marker of professional success (Schemp et al., 1993), coupled with mandated accountability requirements and substantial role demands. They may feel compelled to maintain the appearance of ‘getting it right’ in a highly regulated environment that hinders collaborative decision-making and interdependence. As a result, they may focus on the accountabilities of student management at the expense of meaningful interventions, a situation that has also been observed by behaviour management staff (see Study 1, Results).

This may or may not reflect a phenomenon specific to the participant group, or education staff generally, given the associations found for Passive-Defensive culture in discriminant function analysis. Findings for the Approval, Dependent, and Avoidance elements of the Passive-Defensive cultural cluster are in accord with those reported by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992) and Schemp et al. (1993). Both studies found that expressions of uncertainty or frustration by teaching staff are tolerated briefly and usually only for early career teachers. Most teachers will choose to adopt
quiet compliance (Schemp et al., 1993) or say nothing that would risk career advancement or job security (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992). As a result, many teachers may tolerate student misbehaviour, or adhere rigidly to policy mandates, rather than draw attention to what could be interpreted by others as poor performance. Such a choice may be adaptive in the short term, but is both passive and defensive, and does little to redress the underlying problem. Superficially at least, students may benefit from greater tolerance for their misdemeanours, but the broader issues affecting students, teachers, and schools, will continue to remain fundamentally unchanged. As such, the results for the Passive-Defensive cluster may actually point to cultural elements that are instrumental in maintaining outmoded educational systems (Meier, 1992).

In contrast, the results for the Aggressive-Defensive cultural cluster were more clearly consistent with those expected for Hypothesis 2(b). Differential results for the Oppositional aspect of culture in discriminant function analysis may imply a more actively aggressive environment that translates to higher student referral rates. Inspection of the means for the Aggressive-Defensive cluster (Table 8.5) hints at substantial effects for some schools arising from the Power ($M = 19.88, SD = 6.43$) and Perfectionistic ($M = 24.09, SD = 6.20$) elements of the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, which are also clearly evident in the circumplex graphs shown in Figures 8.1 to 8.6. However, only the Oppositional facet was significant in discriminant function analysis ($M = 17.05, SD = 4.22$). This result may point to higher levels of internal tension for those schools where the organisational culture is viewed as an impediment to effective teaching. Staff may perceive greater conflict between the demands of teaching work and the systems and processes established to achieve school objectives. Consequently, the findings of this study may highlight the obstructive character of
existing organisational systems, as suggested previously by White and Harradine (1997) and Nevin et al. (1993). If collaborative working relationships are central to improving student (and teacher) outcomes, then the current organisational architecture may be fundamentally flawed (Noguera, 1995). Again though, this result needs to be viewed in context, because of the sampling limitations identified earlier.

Hypotheses (3a) and (3b) proposed an association between levels of teacher stress and school culture, and predicted an inverse relationship between Constructive culture and levels of teacher stress in the first instance, and a positive relationship between Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive cultures and levels of teacher stress in the second. Examination of the pathways in regression analyses revealed substantially clearer results than those suggested in the combined model assessed by discriminant analysis. Organisational culture was strongly related to both measured aspects of teacher stress (see Table 8.15). For example, the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture clusters were significantly and positively associated with Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation, while Constructive culture was negatively associated to both stress variables. As a result, clear support was found for both Hypotheses 3(a) and 3(b).

The present findings for teacher stress are, therefore, highly consistent with those reported in prior research. For example, organisational culture has been implicated in teachers’ perceived isolation (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992), their sense of ‘fit’ with the school environment (McCormick & Solman, 1992), interpersonal relations with school administrators and teaching colleagues (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Friedman, 1991; McCormick & Solman, 1992), perceived support (Punch & Tuetteeman, 1996), their sense of empowerment (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Short & Johnson, 1994), and a range of related factors associated with identified aspects of
organisational culture. Nonetheless, the relationships found for teacher stress in earlier HMR and SMR regression analyses did not translate to a direct effect for student referral rates in either discriminant function or logistic regression analyses.

Evidently, teachers suffer from a negative school environment, but may differentiate system level influences as the source of their distress from student level issues (H3_c). Interestingly, this apparent contradiction is borne out in McCormick and Solman’s (1992) findings, where teachers identified the object of blame as the New South Wales Department of Education. McCormick and Solman’s (1992) study was, however, conducted during a time of significant change, which may have influenced results. Similarly, Leithwood et al. (1996) contended that the teachers’ perceptions may vary according to what they choose to ‘notice’ in the environment, and whether their evaluations of environmental information are negative or positive. This suggests an individual level phenomenon which may or may not be related to school level factors. Conversely, teacher stress may mediate between school culture and student referral rates, a scenario that remains unconfirmed due to the limits of student level data (described earlier). Thus, the findings of this study may signify broader dissatisfaction with educational hierarchies that are apparently not related to student level issues, but may reflect negative attributions by individual teachers arising from role demands and school environment factors.

8.6 Summary of Study 2 Results

In summary, moderate support was found for the overall research aims regarding a relationship between school environment variables and referral rates for student misbehaviour. Findings were also broadly consistent with those reported in prior research. School leadership, both transactional and transformational, emerged as
the most important variables across each measured domain and for student referral rates in particular. Findings for organisational culture revealed that the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types were the most important variables associated with high student referral rates. Affiliation, as a marker of perceived support, may be the most influential aspect of Constructive school culture on student referral rates, although results were substantially weaker for this factor.

In terms of teacher stress, results were unsubstantiated, in that no association was found for student referral rates in either discriminant function analysis or regression tests. In contrast, both the leadership and culture type variables were influential for both teachers and students. Except for one non-significant result for Depersonalisation and transactional leadership, findings for both leadership styles and all culture types in relation to teacher stress were significant, substantial, and in the expected direction. In addition, while school culture has a sizeable influence on teacher stress, mediation analyses indicate that leadership is the single most influential factor in relation to teacher level issues. In combination, the results offer qualified support for the proposed model, although some variables appear more influential than others (leadership and organisational culture), and others require more detailed evaluation (leadership and teacher stress in relation to student referral rates).

However, greater measurement rigour has improved the certainty with which conclusions may be drawn about most variables, and therefore builds on the findings of other investigators.

In essence, results suggest that both school leadership and organisational culture are significant influences on outcomes for teachers and students, both directly and indirectly, and that leadership is the single most important influence overall. While leadership and culture emerged as the most important variables for teacher
stress, the relationship to student referral rates was not substantiated. These results have important implications in terms of how student misbehaviour is perceived and managed, and in terms of the relationships between leadership, culture and teacher stress.
CHAPTER NINE

Study 3

Perceptual Differences Between School Administrators And Teaching Staff
Regarding Workplace Culture And School Leadership.

9.0 Introduction

Based on the results found for Study 2, this study investigated differences between teaching staff and school administrators regarding each group’s perceptions of school leadership style and organisational culture. The two previous studies examined organisation and individual level factors related to student referral rates for behavioural issues. Organisational factors were leadership style and school culture, while the individual factor was teachers’ perceived level of stress. Substantial variance was accounted for in the overall model and the unique variance accounted for by individual pathways was also significant in most cases. In terms of teacher stress, results were less than clear and questions remained about any association to student referral rates given the frequency with which it is reported in related research. No association between teacher stress and student referral rates was found in either discriminant function or logistic regression analyses. In contrast, Study 2 results for teacher stress indicated strong associations with leadership and culture, and that the influence of leadership on teacher stress was mediated by school culture. The evidence thus suggested that leadership and culture may be differentially influential for teachers, and may or may not translate to effects for students. To further examine
this issue, it was proposed that school leaders and teaching staff may differ in their perceptions of school phenomena, and offer a possible explanation for the unexpected findings for teacher stress found in Study 2. As a result, the present study explored potential differences in perceptions of leadership and culture between school administrators and teaching staff.

The decision to pursue this investigation was taken for two reasons, the first being the unexpected results for teachers stress as an intervening variable in Study 2, and second, because prior research supports the notion that differences between the two groups are likely. For example, some authors assert that transformational leadership does not always translate to trust among teaching colleagues or in schools, regardless of beliefs about the principalship (Mannion, 1998; Davis & Wilson, 2000). Such findings are contrary to leadership theory, and may reflect an aspect of leader-subordinate relations that is affected by factors external to the relationship. For example, both groups may differ in their perceptions of entrenched cultural problems, depending on individual experience. As a result, any benefits from transformational leadership may not be viewed as sufficient to counter enduring systemic problems. Davis and Wilson (2000) found further that leadership behaviour may not have a direct bearing on teachers’ stress or job satisfaction, although it may improve their sense of personal power. In addition, Leithwood et al. (1996) suggest that teachers’ experience may be a product of factors they choose to attend to in the school environment, which may or may not be affected by leadership. These findings point to teacher level factors that are not directly evident, but may contribute further to explanation of Study 2 results.

The possibility of influential teacher level factors is not surprising, however, given that school administrators and teaching staff do not share the same proximity to
students and educational issues. By virtue of their positions in school hierarchies, school administrators’ and teachers’ perceptions of the school environment are likely to differ along important dimensions. In line with this argument, and because prior research has already found disparate effects for teachers and school administrators on related variables, the present study expects that differences will also be found here.

The objective of Study 3, therefore, is to examine the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4(a) proposes that differences will be found between school administrators and teaching staff regarding their perception of school leadership style, and,

Hypothesis 4(b) proposes, similarly, that differences will be found between school administrators and teaching staff on their perceptions of school culture.

Method

9.1 Participants

School administrators, consisting of principals and deputies (N = 17) were recruited along with class teachers (N = 136) as part of the data collection process for Study 2. These participant data have been fully described elsewhere, in Chapter 8 (Table 8.1). In addition, due to considerable disparity in the response rates per school, aggregated data were used for both school administrators and teaching staff for this study. Note, however, that data for School 4 was included on this occasion. As a result, the sample size was larger for this study (N = 153), and while some minor change in the demographic profile was expected, the differences were not significant when assessed.
9.2 Materials

Because Study 3 examines leader perceptions of school culture as well as self-rated leadership style, the OCI and MLQ, described previously in Chapter 9, were used to maintain comparability between studies. Each instrument allows for a direct comparison of results between groups of teaching staff and school administrators on the dimensions of interest. Differences on the OCI can be determined by simply separating data sets for each group during analyses. The MLQ, on the other hand, provides both a rater (subordinate/colleague) and a ratee (leader) format for the instrument, which provides for self-other ratings on the same measure, for the same dimensions. For a complete description of the relevant instruments, the reader is again directed to the Materials section for the preceding study (refer to Section 8.2).

9.3 Procedure

The reader is directed to the description of Study 2’s procedure for a complete report of the data collection process (refer to Section 8.3).

9.4 Results

9.4.1 Overview of Analyses

As discussed previously (see Chapter 6), the analysis of choice for Study 3 was MANOVA, because the aim of the analysis was to examine group differences based on the contribution of a number of dependent measures. For this study, participants were divided into two groups, and cases were re-coded as a two-level ‘Status’ variable to reflect the categories of class teacher and school administrator. Status therefore became the independent variable, or grouping factor, for analysis in
each case. The dependent measures were transactional and transformational leadership style in the first instance, and the 12 organisational culture scales in the second.

9.4.2 Circumplex Graphs For School Culture

As indicated in Section 9.1 above, the inclusion of School 4 resulted in the addition of 15 teachers and (one) school administrator. Figure 9.1 presents the circumplex of the culture scales for this school for descriptive purposes only. Note again, that ‘extensions’ are defined as any result that exceeds the $P_{50}$ dividing line, and is highlighted in bold on the circumplex graph. Percentile ranks reflect normative data computed according to occupational and industry groups, enabling comparisons to be made at the individual and organisation level. The circumplex of results for School 4 indicated a predominantly Constructive style, with substantial extensions for the Achievement and Humanistic-Encouraging subscales. However, minor extensions above $P_{50}$ were also noted for Perfectionistic and Power in the Aggressive-Defensive cluster. It is likely that School 4 staff are committed to social outcomes, but are also aware of less constructive undercurrents operating within the school.
Figure 9.1 Circumplex for School 4 with extensions predominantly on the Constructive culture scale cluster.
Figures 9.2 and 9.3 present the OCI circumplexes of composite data for all school administrators and for class teachers respectively. What is immediately apparent in Figure 9.2 is the extreme extension on the Humanistic-Encouraging scale, followed closely by a prominent extension for Achievement. The remaining scales of the Constructive culture were also extended well beyond $P_{50}$, and contrast with scales from the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive cultural clusters. This outcome indicates that school administrators perceived their school’s culture as being supportive and positive on all elements of a Constructive organisational culture.

The pattern of results for teaching staff, however, differed substantially. Results for most of the 12 culture scales clustered around $P_{50}$. Initial inspection suggests a balanced result for each of the three cultural types, with emphasis on the Humanistic-Encouraging and Achievement elements of the Constructive cluster. However, some tension between the positive and negative aspects of organisational culture was evident in teachers’ perceptions. The Passive-Defensive cultural style also achieved moderate extensions on Conventional and Avoidance scales, and the same was noted for the Power and Perfectionistic scales of the Aggressive-Defensive cluster. Not surprisingly, the pattern of results is similar to those reported for individual schools in Study 2 (see Table 8.5), except that it differed substantially from the results of school administrators when the data are disaggregated.
School Administrators

Figure 9.2 Circumplex for school administrators with substantial extensions on the Constructive culture scale cluster.
Figure 9.3 Circumplex for class teachers with minor extensions on all culture scale clusters.
9.4.3 Main Hypothesis Tests

The aim of Study 3 was to explore perceptual differences among teaching staff and school administrators, regarding school leadership style and organisational culture. Most previous research has tended to investigate each of these groups separately, thus disregarding potentially important within-school differences that may occur between each group. In addition, while the circumplex graphs in Figures 9.2 and 9.3 may appear self-evident, potential differences on the leadership measure are not captured by the OCI measure. Consequently, this section reports the results of two MANOVAs that examined differences between school administrators and teachers on each of the variables of interest. First however, diagnostic screening of the data set was again performed, given the inclusion of more cases for this study.

Missing data appeared to be randomly dispersed in the set of dependent factors, and was thus replaced by series means for each scale (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Evaluation of assumptions revealed univariate outliers on seven of the 14 predictors, only one of which differed from the original data set in Study 2. Square root transformations on six of the variables, and logarithmic transformation on the remaining variable, successfully resolved issues with all outlying cases.

Checks of multivariate normality indicated two multivariate outliers with \( p < .001 \), and these were deleted. Both cases were female class teachers who endorsed extreme responses on each of the survey instruments; in addition, their responses appeared to differ dramatically from other teachers in their respective schools. Further evaluation indicated that assumptions of linearity, normality, and multicollinearity, were met. However, the Levene test for equality of variances indicated heterogeneity on both the Self-Actualising and Competitive culture variables, and results for these should be interpreted with caution. Of the original 153
cases (17 school administrators and 136 class teachers), 151 were retained for
analysis.

Table 9.1 presents the results of MANOVA for the leadership variables,
indicating a main effect for Status regarding differences in perceptions of
transactional and transformational leadership, $F(2, 148) = 7.00, p < .001$. Means and
standard deviations are presented in Table 9.3, which follows shortly, and shows that
school administrators rated themselves more favourably on transformational
leadership compared to class teachers. In line with the above, the effect size ($\eta^2$) for
transformational leadership was large, compared to a medium effect size for
transactional leadership. The reverse was true for transactional leadership, where
class teachers rated school administrators as more transactional compared to the
administrators’ self-rated leadership style.

Table 9.1
Perceived Differences For Leadership – Teachers Versus School Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>1, 149</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>1, 149</td>
<td>12.318</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A main effect was also revealed for organisational culture, where results of
MANOVA indicated significant differences between school administrators and
teaching staff according to Status, $F(12, 138) = 1.999, p < .05$. Table 9.2 presents the
results of MANOVA for the organisational culture variables, followed by Table 9.3
which presents the means and standard deviations for both the leadership and culture
variables. Effect sizes were medium to large for all significant between-groups
differences, as indicated by $\eta^2$. Of the 12 organisational culture variables, six were significantly different at $p<.05$ or greater. Of these, Humanistic-Encouraging from the Constructive cluster, and Perfectionistic from the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, were each significantly different between groups. Responses for school administrators were, on average, higher compared to teaching staff for the Humanistic-Encouraging scale of the Constructive cultural cluster. Conversely, school administrators scored lower for Perfectionistic on the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, compared to class teachers. All subscales from the Passive-Defensive cluster, including, Approval, Conventional, Dependent, and Avoidance, revealed significant between-groups differences. In each case, school administrators disclosed lower responses than teaching staff, suggesting that they view themselves as less passive and defensive than teaching staff.

Table 9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1, 149</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Actualising</td>
<td>1.986</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td>5.129</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>1.836</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>1, 149</td>
<td>9.627</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>4.675</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>7.069</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>7.394</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>1, 149</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td>6.621</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.3

Disaggregated Raw Score Means And Standard Deviations For Study 3 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class Teachers N = 134</th>
<th>School Administrators N = 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture - Constructive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualising</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic-Encouraging</td>
<td>*30.16</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive-Defensive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>*21.58</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>*24.67</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>*23.52</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>*17.46</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive-Defensive Cluster (range = 8 to 64)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership (range = 0 to 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>*1.67</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>*2.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups on OCI subscales see Section 9.4.3.
9.5 Discussion

The objective of Study 3 was to explore a potential gap between school administrators and teaching staff regarding their perceptions of school leadership style and organisational culture. The hypothesised difference in perceptions was unequivocally supported for both the leadership and culture variables. Results revealed that school administrators rated themselves more favourably as leaders, and rated their school culture as more Constructive, compared to teaching staff. In contrast, teaching staff rated school administrators relatively lower on transformational leadership, and higher for transactional leadership. For both leadership styles, results represented a difference in perceptions according to status in school hierarchies. While teachers rated school administrators as transformational overall, their perceptions differed as a matter of degree compared to leaders’ self-rated style.

The same theme emerged for the organisational culture variables in that school administrators viewed their schools’ culture as substantially more Constructive relative to teaching staff. Not surprisingly, the reverse theme was apparent for negative cultural elements, especially the Aggressive-Defensive cluster, where school administrators viewed their school as less focused on perfectionism compared to teaching staff. Interestingly, all facets of the Passive-Defensive cultural cluster were perceived as less negative by school administrators compared to teaching staff. That is, teachers generally viewed their school’s culture as being oriented towards approval, conventionality, dependence, and avoidance, compared to school administrators, suggesting that these aspects operate as significant negative
undercurrents in their workplaces. In terms of both leadership and school culture, however, Hypotheses 4(a) and 4(b) were supported.

The findings for Study 3 are consistent with assertions made by Mannion (1998) and Davis and Wilson (2000), that positive leadership style may not be sufficient on its own to support teaching staff. While teachers rate their principals’ leadership style as transformational, their perceptions of leadership differed in both strength and direction compared to school administrators. Moreover, positive leadership may not always translate to cultural norms for collegiality and trust in organisational objectives (Boyle et al., 1995; Mannion, 1998). Results indicate, therefore, that the effects of transformational leadership may do little to ameliorate expectations for compliance and conformity, as revealed in results for Passive-Defensive organisational culture.

The results may also reflect a favourable attributional bias on the part of school administrators, or signal differences in work design and interpersonal demands according to status. According to Van Der Linde (2000), the work of teachers is characterised by substantial responsibility with limited freedom to leave the classroom for more than a few moments. In any conception of workplace stress, this combination of factors is likely to produce strain reactions arising from the chronic stress associated with absence of choice. Teachers may have fewer options than school administrators to manage the unremitting demands inherent in their job role. This is not meant to suggest that the work of school administrators is less difficult, but rather, they have more autonomy and, potentially, a greater sense of control over stress-inducing work factors. As a result, the perceptions of school administrators may be more favourable in terms of their leadership role and school’s culture. This proposition may echo Wilkinson’s (1993) contention that educational leaders may
unconsciously perpetuate the status quo, regardless of intentions to the contrary. If the perceptions of school administrators are less negative than their teaching colleagues, there may be less impetus to accurately interpret the chronicity or gravity of within-school problems.

In contrast, other authors suggest that individual level factors may affect the type of environmental factors that teachers choose to attend to (Leithwood et al., 1996), or are able to manage (Czubaj, 1996). While not directly assessed in this study, the weight of evidence suggests that the negative evaluations reflected in results for teaching staff could also be a product of chronic stress, as suggested both in the findings of Study 2 and in prior research (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Boyle et al., 1995; Friedman, 1991). Given that positive or transformational leadership, and(or) collegial support, are not always effective in ameliorating teacher distress, other factors appear to be influential, which could be related to teacher stress. While teachers acknowledge the positive aspects of school leadership and organisational culture, their experience of the work environment may engender reliance on passive-defensive coping, possibly as a means of survival. This phenomenon has been labelled elsewhere as ‘communities of coping’ (Korczynski, 2003), and reflected in Grady’s (1993) metaphor of schools as ‘prisons’ and ‘House[s] of Horror’. Implicit in this outcome is recognition that the depth and breadth of the problem may be beyond the reach of school administrators and teachers alike. In addition, teachers may hold little hope that their principals can influence systemic issues, and may adopt a passive and defensive stance in response to the impasse.

Essentially, findings for Study 3 provide further evidence that teachers may discriminate between system level and person level (student, leader) factors. Results for each group suggests that each may harbour quite different beliefs about the
effectiveness of, and satisfaction with, their school’s leadership and culture. While teachers generally endorsed their principal’s leadership style as positive, for this sample at least, perceptions of school culture were largely negative compared to school administrators. Teachers’ perceptions of culture emerged as Passive-Defensive, perhaps highlighting their acceptance - willing or otherwise - of conventional hierarchies, and compliance with cultural norms for approval, dependence, and avoidance. Because school administrators were differentially positive about both their leadership behaviour and their schools’ culture, it could be argued that more rigorous evaluation methods are needed for principals to corroborate their perceptions. Potentially, this may lead to data driven approaches that reduce subjectivity and positive halo effects that impede meaningful interventions.
CHAPTER TEN

Summary and Conclusions

10.0 Summary Of The Program Of Research

This final chapter reviews the major findings of the program of research, and integrates key findings from each of the three studies presented in earlier chapters. Theoretical and practical implications are also discussed, followed by the limitations of the research design and a summary of the recommendations for future research.

The aim of the program of research was to investigate the relationships between referral rates for student misbehaviour, and school level factors including leadership, culture, and teacher stress, as combined predictor variables. The central objective was to explore whether the direction of effect from the combination of school level factors could distinguish high versus low or medium rates of student referrals for misbehaviour. As such, the direction of effect was hypothesised to be the reverse of that reported in the education literature. That is, most studies report student misbehaviour as a contributing factor to each domain of interest, rather than a potential outcome, as proposed here.

As a first step, behaviour management staff were interviewed to assess whether they had observed effects from each school level factor as being influential in the management of students with behaviour problems. Following this, the combination of leadership, culture, and teacher stress were analysed to investigate whether student referral rates could be differentiated in quantitative terms. Tests of the individual pathways were also performed to clarify the relationships found. Finally, differences between school administrators and teaching staff regarding
perceptions of leadership and culture were examined, to further clarify findings in Study 2. Overall, the results of the present study provide qualified support for the stated aims. Interview data from behaviour management staff provided support for the proposed direction of effects, and Study 2 provided empirical support for the majority of hypothesised relationships. Further, clear differences between school administrators and teaching staff were found in Study 3, which may explain some of the unexpected findings in Study 2. While some relationships remain unclear, important aspects of the theoretical model were supported.

A secondary aim was to apply models and measures from the field of organisational psychology, to improve both the methods and rigour of the investigation. This decision was taken in response to criticisms regarding methodological problems in related research, three of which were addressed in the present research. First, a number of studies reported in the educational literature are of poor design, and lack empirical rigour, being little more than opinion papers or theoretical essays. A second related limitation is the use of methods and measures with limited regard for issues of reliability and validity. Third, education studies often examine discrete populations, such as students, teachers, or school leaders, in connection with specific outcome variables such as academic achievement. Few examine the inter-relationships among both the variables of interest and each group within the school community. The model tested in the present research attempted to answer each of these issues. Figure 8.10 depicts the theoretical model of inter-dependent relationships in prediction of referral rates for student misbehaviour.

The model shows that leadership is significant in prediction of school culture, teacher stress, and student referral rates. School culture is also significant in prediction of teacher stress and student referral rates, but requires further investigation
(see Study 2 Results, Section 8.4). This arises because culture type was clearly associated with student referral rates, but only one aspect of Constructive culture (Affiliative) was found to be weakly associated when combined with leadership and teacher stress. Some apparent uncertainty regarding individual pathways probably occurs because of weak loadings found for a number of the culture scales in discriminant function analysis, and may reflect differential results for teachers and students depending on how the relationship between variables are modelled. However, regression analyses clearly supported transactional leadership and the Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive culture types in prediction of student referral rates. In contrast to assertions in previous research, however, teacher stress was not associated with student referral rates. Figure 8.10 presents a conservatively specified path model of the relationships investigated. Key findings for each of the studies will now be discussed.

10.1 Major Findings

10.1.1 Observations Of Behaviour Management Staff

Study 1 was a qualitative exploratory study where a series of focus group questions were presented to behaviour management staff from two Brisbane metropolitan education districts. Behaviour management staff were approached in the first instance because they are well positioned to observe the populations of interest in relation to the question under investigation. The aim was to explore whether the direction of relationships among variables had been observed as, 1) school leaders to students, 2) school culture to students, and 3) teacher stress to students. The resulting qualitative data were then content analysed, and results revealed a number of themes.
For example, in response to the question regarding leadership and effects for students, participants reported observations of task-focused leadership, coupled with inconsistencies between actions and espoused values. These results bear out findings in prior research where leadership has been reported as task-driven, or transactional in nature, and associated with a reduced ability to incorporate diversity in school communities (D’Arcy, 1994; Griffith, 1999; House & Aditya, 1997; Kowalski, 2000; Todd, 1999). Similarly, observations in respect of school culture were uniformly negative, where behaviour management staff observed cultural norms for compliance and a focus on outcomes over people. In line with previous research, results suggest that the needs of individuals may be overwhelmed by pressure for regimented control and departmental mandates for accountability (Gaziel, 1997; Heck & Marcoulides, 1996; Wren, 1999). Not surprisingly then, teachers were viewed as suffering chronic, sometimes severe, stress, and more likely to revert to reactive strategies in response to problem student behaviour. It was also clear that participants recognised the effect of teacher isolation on positive coping and effective problem-solving, as well as the limited options available for remediation. Observations regarding the sources of teacher stress were consistent with a wealth of related research (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Boyle et al., 1995; McCormick & Solman, 1992; Punch & Tuetteeman, 1996; Smith & Bourke, 1991; Van Der Linde, 2000). However, the main difference between this study and other investigations was that participants’ observations were sought in relation to the relationship between teacher stress and management of student misbehaviour. This compares to other studies where misbehaviour is generally viewed as causal in teacher stress.

Additional themes were also noted indicating that students, teachers, and school leaders alike may experience difficulty managing school systems characterised
as achievement-driven, compliance-oriented, under-resourced, and poorly structured to support the human needs of school communities. Overall, reports by behaviour management staff indicated that the hypothesised direction of effects from school leadership, culture, and teacher stress, have been observed in relation to management of students with behaviour problems. It is also important to acknowledge, however, that the unique position of behaviour management staff to observe school level influences on students may also skew their perceptions. This arises because they work exclusively with those students who have already been identified as a ‘problem’. Nonetheless, their observations offer tentative support for the hypothesised direction of effects as leader to student, culture to student, and teacher stress to student.

10.1.2 Tests Of Proposed Model

Study 2 attempted to measure the strength and direction of effects from each variable of interest, in terms of the relationships to student referral rates. A cross-sectional design was employed, with quantitative measures of each variable. Two approaches were taken to analysis, the first being discriminant function analysis, to assess the combined influence of the leadership, culture, and teacher stress variables, and their association to student referral rates. The second approach utilised a number of regression strategies, to examine the strength and direction of effects for the pathways between each variable. With each approach, similarities and differences were found in relation to Study 1 findings.

In line with expectations, both leadership styles were significant in discriminating among student referral rate groups in discriminant function analysis, although transactional leadership was most influential in regression analyses. Results of the combined model (in discriminant function analysis) indicated that transactional
leadership was most likely to co-occur with high student referral rates, compared to transformational leadership, which was associated with low and medium referral rates. Consistent with findings reported in prior research, both transactional and transformational leadership were also significant predictors of organisational culture and teacher stress (Hipp, 1996, 1997; Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996; Jason, 2000; Koh et al., 1995; Todd, 1999). Findings for each leadership style were in the expected direction in both sets of analyses. For example transformational leadership was positively associated with Constructive culture, while inverse associations were found for both defensive cultural types, and with Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation. Transactional leadership, on the other hand, was positively associated with Aggressive-Defensive culture and Emotional Exhaustion, and with all categories of student referral rates in multinomial logistic regression.

Such findings are also consistent with the extant literature (Abel & Sewell, 1999; Bourke & Smith, 1994; Davis & Wilson, 2000), as well as theoretical models of leadership in terms of the influence on organisational culture and the subjective experience of followers (Begley, 1994; De Witte & van Muijen, 1999; Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996; Silins & Mulford, 2002). Because leadership influences the evolution of culture, the values and beliefs of leaders have the potential to penetrate the organisation, and be a benefit or a burden, depending on individual style. The education system is somewhat unique, however, given that school administrators are themselves the followers of departmental leaders. This last issue was identified by both behaviour management staff in Study 1, and Griffith (1999), where principals were viewed as captives of the school system. Nonetheless, leadership emerges as a key factor in the present research, in line with research evidence cited elsewhere.
Organisational culture, measured as Constructive, Passive-Defensive, and Aggressive-Defensive, was significant in prediction of teacher stress, but only the defensive cultural types were significant predictors of student referral rates. That is, only a few individual scales of the culture types were associated with student referral rates in discriminant function analysis. This may suggest that certain key elements of organisational culture, and in particular, the norms and values they reflect, influence the rate at which students are referred for behaviour problems. The notion is consistent with findings reported in the education literature, where student outcome factors have been linked to specific cultural values, such as achievement and virtue (Synott & Symes, 1995), orderliness, teamwork, and participation (Gaziel, 1997), inclusion, participative decision-making, and community spirit (Mok & Flynn, 1998; Zollers et al., 1999). Depending on the studies reviewed, culture has been reported to either ameliorate or exacerbate outcomes for both students and teachers, and highlights the important influence this variable exerts on school communities. The present research found evidence for a significant association between student referral rates and negative, that is, Passive-Defensive and Aggressive-Defensive school cultures. While student misbehaviour has not been previously measured in direct relation to school culture, the weight of evidence found here supports an association.

In contrast to results found for school culture, teacher stress was non-significant in prediction of student referral rates in both discriminant function analysis and regression tests of the path model. That is, teacher stress did not contribute to discrimination amongst referral groups, a finding that was fully confirmed in regression tests of individual pathways. In addition, the relationship between leadership and teacher stress was substantially mediated by school culture, suggesting that teacher’s experience of culture is of central importance to their job satisfaction.
and stress coping (see also Table 8.15). While an association was not found between teacher stress and student referral rates, relationships for other variables were much clearer, and significant results for leadership and culture in relation to teacher stress are highly consistent with previous research (for example, Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Davis & Wilson, 2000; Leonard et al., 2000; McCormick & Solman, 1992; Van Der Linde, 2000). Thus, while teachers may endure substantial stress from school environment factors, of ventral importance to the present research are present findings that suggest teachers do not externalise their stress to students.

In summary, while most hypotheses were supported, overall support for the proposed model was challenged somewhat by unexpected findings for teacher stress. Discriminant function analysis provided some evidence for the predicted direction of effects for student referral rates, which were explicated further in regression tests of individual pathways. Consequently, results were largely congruent with those found in content analysis of the qualitative data. Combined with results of discriminant function and regression analyses, this indicates that the combination of leadership and culture are likely to be important in prediction of student behaviour referrals. Leadership emerged consistently as the most influential variable in both analytic approaches, while certain elements of culture may have been more influential than others in the school setting. Culture is therefore an area for future research, where the nuances of culture type could be investigated in more detail. This last issue is particularly salient when schools operate in an environment characterised by tension between humanistic goals and bureaucratised routines. If, as Wilson (2000) asserts, the symbolic aspects of organisational culture are ‘dependent’ and less amenable to observation, more work may be needed to unravel the specific influences occurring for this variable. Further clarification of the links between leadership and culture may
then surface, and in particular, whether the influence of transformational leadership is somehow limited in the educational setting, especially in relation to student outcomes. The same may be said for teacher stress, given that culture mediated the relationship between leadership and most Emotional Exhaustion, a key component of the stress reaction. Further, the non-significant relationship between teacher stress and student referral rates highlights the likely importance of school environment factors in approaches to behaviour management. Consequently, it may no longer be useful to characterise student misbehaviour in simplistic terms as an individual, student level phenomenon.

10.1.3 School Administrators’ And Teachers’ Perceptions Of Leadership And Culture

Study 3 explored differences in perception of leadership style and organisational culture, between school administrators and teachers, again using a quantitative cross-sectional design. Results indicated that school administrators viewed their leadership style as more transformational and less transactional, compared to teachers. Further, school administrators viewed their schools’ culture as more Constructive, and less Passive-Defensive or Aggressive-Defensive, compared to teachers. These results may offer some insight regarding Study 2 findings in relation to student referral rates, where the findings for teacher stress were contrary to the assertions of other authors. In Study 2, teacher stress was considered an intervening factor between referral rates and school leadership and culture. However, the results of Study 3 highlighted the need to separate teacher level influences from those of school administrators, where sample sizes permit.
For example, differing roles and work demands may influence the perceptions of each group, depending on their respective positions in school hierarchies. Study 3 findings suggested that the experience of each group clearly differs. One explanation may be that a sense of entrapment is engendered for teachers by a work role that couples great responsibility and limited choice (Van Der Linde, 2000). Essentially, the demands of teaching may be experienced as more burdensome than those for school administrators, largely because teachers have fewer options to alter the circumstances of their work. Consequently, teachers may report more negative perceptions of the school environment, regardless of their principals’ best intentions to improve conditions. In addition, because the socialisation of teachers grooms them to quietly endure difficult school cultures, important information may remain inaccessible to leaders, leading to disparate perceptions of school functioning (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Friedman, 1991). Thus, while teachers endorsed their school leaders’ style as transformational, there are substantial differences in how teachers and school administrators view both leadership and school culture. This issue may be important when considering avenues for school improvement initiatives, especially those aimed at teacher wellbeing that may have flow-on effects for students.

10.1.4 Summary

In summary, the present research offers some evidence that school level variables, including leadership and school culture, may influence the rate at which students are referred for behaviour problems. School leadership, for example, may have a positive or a negative effect on school culture, teacher stress, and student behaviour referrals, depending on the leaders’ individual style. School culture, on the
other hand, appears to be important in relation to both teacher stress and student referral rates, where results revealed a substantial relationship. In addition, teachers may differ from school administrators in terms of their perceptions of school culture and school leadership style. However, culture has the potential to reduce the influence of leadership for teachers, suggesting that school culture exerts a substantial independent influence on the experience of teaching staff. While cultural type did emerged as important for student referral rates, some (scale) elements of culture may be more important than others. In contrast, leadership emerged consistently in relation to student referral rates, compared to teacher stress, where findings were unexpectedly non-significant.

10.2 Implications For Theory And Practice

The findings reported here provide support for applied models of transformational leadership and organisational culture in explaining the problem under investigation. Most importantly, greater rigour has been added to measurement of the leadership and culture variables, compared to a considerable portion of related educational research. Given that the findings are largely consistent with those reported elsewhere, and using competing or unspecified models of the same variables, greater weight is added to claims made in respect of both leadership and culture in the school setting. An additional contribution is the use of models and measures from the discipline of organisational psychology, which supports the utility of this approach in the educational context.

In terms of teacher stress, a further contribution is made for this important area of research. Because leadership and culture were found to have both a direct and mediated influence on teachers’ stress, further support is found for a relationship
between these variables. In addition, key predictor variables, including leadership and culture, were found to have significant associations with referral rates for student misbehaviour, in both analytic approaches. The present research, therefore, provides empirical evidence that the intractable ‘problem’ of student misbehaviour may be more than a product of individual student history, family dysfunction, and socio-demographic factors. A second key finding is that teachers may actually distinguish between student behaviour and school environment factors, in their perceptions of work-related stress.

Importantly, the consistent findings for leadership in each study and analysis, suggest that school administrators are central to school outcomes generally. This should have implications for the recruitment of principals, because their influence appears to penetrate each layer of the school community. Given that leadership is also linked theoretically to culture, a principal’s style may be important in the development of school cultures that support teachers and students alike. Both groups are subject to circumstances over which they have limited control, and both are likely to suffer stress as a result. Consequently, it may be useful to consider options for recruiting principals, not just on the basis of seniority and teaching experience, but in terms of their capacity to positively influence the school environment. Further options may include quality training of teachers to manage more than the technical aspects of their teaching role, such as school community building, developing supportive collegial networks, and balancing personal and work needs. Embedded in the above is recognition of the school environment as being a key entry point for initiatives to support teachers in their vital work. This author acknowledges, however, that the issues confronting education are enduring, system-wide and sometimes appear
insurmountable. Nonetheless, at least some avenues for remedy are evident, such as leadership and school culture, and are supported by a growing body of evidence.

10.3 Limitations

There are three principal limitations that may have influenced the outcomes of this investigation. The first pertains to sampling, and the second and third to research design. In terms of sampling, difficulties were encountered in securing a sample size sufficient to fully assess the proposed model. The number of teachers available for survey completion was severely hampered by the level of acceptance shown by each school’s principal. Some principals were eager to assist, and others – while acknowledging the value of the project – viewed the request for participation as an imposition on time and resources. In the first situation, where two principals set aside time for most staff to complete the survey battery simultaneously, high response rates were achieved for each school. This compares to the remaining schools where staff were required to be approached through the school’s internal mail system, most of whom were also encouraged to participate by their principals.

The different approaches resulted in considerable disparity in group sizes amongst participating schools, and especially between those schools where staff completed the battery in one sitting and those who did not. The disparate response rates suggest that the sample may be biased in favour of those who have a vested interest in complying for personal or professional reasons. Sampling issues were further compounded by restrictions on collation of student data, where any links between specific teachers and students was expressly disallowed. This last issue also curtailed the analytic options available for investigation of the research question.
In addition, while great care was taken to ensure the collection of student data was as thorough as possible, two conditions may have influenced the accuracy of source materials. First, variations in the methods of recording behavioural incidents in each school may have affected the amount of source data available. For example, the different levels of time and effort expended to write a note to be filed when convenient, versus accessing an electronic system via a (typically) shared computer, may have either facilitated or hindered staff’s willingness to comply with EQ and(or) school policy. Second, the accuracy of student data may have been influenced for the two schools where behavioural event data was pro-rated. This arises because some school terms are, anecdotally at least, renowned for being more difficult than others for behavioural issues. As a result, the effect of pro-rating the observed behavioural events may have under-estimated the number of actual events. Although every effort was made to ensure that the above did not influence results unduly, caution is still recommended with regard to generalisation of results.

The second limitation concerns the cross-sectional design of Studies 2 and 3. Cross-sectional research is aimed at collecting a number of observations at one point in time, and restricts interpretation of findings to what is known for a particular sample at the time, and consequently limits what may be generalised (Babbie, 2001). This is not to say that such findings have no value. It simply highlights that the data may be subject to influences operating at the time for the sample that may not be salient for other populations. When the resulting data are subjected to analysis, the product is, therefore, largely descriptive, and correlational at best. As a result, inferences must be drawn with caution, and generalisations made with even greater care. Nonetheless, the cross-sectional design strategy is appropriate for exploratory
research, as is the case here, and forms a legitimate basis for future research based on
the relationships found.

Lastly, the model tested in Study 2 (see Figure 8.10) was explicitly aimed at
quantifying the direction of the relationships between the variables of interest. The
primary goal was to address a gap in education studies where student misbehaviour is
consistently cited as causal in teacher stress, without having been expressly quantified
in terms of either the strength or direction of association. However, the principal
focus was on the implications for students. Consequently, the collection of data from
teachers and school administrators was central to answering the research aims only in
relation to outcomes for students. As a result, the research presented here addresses
the stated aims within the narrow frame specified. As such, the results provide some
empirical basis to re-consider how student behaviour is related to school level factors,
but does not preclude the potential for the testing of other models.

10.4 Directions For Future Research

Because the results reported here are based on the findings of cross-sectional
research, there is considerable merit in further testing both the temporal stability and
generalisability of the relationships found. For example, there is potential to consider
an experimental methodology, including pre-and post- measures with manipulation of
one or more school environment variables. Ideally, the methodology should aim to
include class level data for students and teachers, to enable greater precision in
evaluation of the relationships among variables. This issue is particularly important
given the unexpected findings for teacher stress (refer to Figure 8.10 and Study 2
Results in Section 8.4). Following from this, and if the data permits, it may also be
useful to assess whether teacher stress mediates the relationship between school
culture and student referral rates, thus highlighting additional pathways for intervention. Conversely, studies of teacher stress could benefit from quantification of student misbehaviour as a possible mediating variable between leadership, culture and teacher stress.

Further work is therefore recommended in respect of these findings, and especially in relation to the teacher stress variables. Notwithstanding the limitations stated, the research presented here offers important new information regarding a largely untested ‘problem’ in the school setting. While findings for leadership and culture support those reported elsewhere in the literature, there is now some new evidence to strengthen an argument for school-based interventions at the level of school leadership and school culture. Although the findings for teacher stress were unexpected, those found for leadership and culture generally indicate that benefits may accrue for students with problem behaviour. The importance of this cannot be under-estimated, both for school administrators and teachers who daily confront the challenge of difficult students, but especially for the students whose experience of school may be more important than is currently known.
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Letter to Principals for Access to Schools

Chief Investigator: Ms Andrea J. Quinn
School of Applied Psychology
Griffith University
Ph: 3875 3365 or 0419 653 340

Project Title: School leadership, workplace culture, and teacher stress: Implications for problem students.

Dear Principal,

I am conducting a program of research that examines links between workplace culture, school leadership, teacher stress, and the management of emotionally and behaviourally disordered adolescents. It is expected that the research will highlight new pathways for management of an identified area of concern for teachers, that of student misbehaviour. This research forms part of my postgraduate thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy in Organisational Psychology. In line with the foregoing, I extend an invitation to yourself and your staff to participate in the study identified above.

Overview of the Study

The frequency of school referrals for behaviour management, suspensions, and exclusions, will be evaluated in relation to measures of teacher stress and workplace culture. In addition, differences in leadership style will be explored as a means of explaining variance in workplace culture and teacher stress. Data collection will be achieved through focus group interviews for Principals and Behaviour Support Services staff, and surveys for teaching staff, and will require approximately 30 to 45 minutes of participants' time. The anonymity of participants will be fully protected for the duration of the research, and individual results will only be known to the researcher. Each participant, including Principals, will be fully apprised of the nature of the research through a 'Participant Information Package' and 'Research Consent Form' (copies attached), and participants' withdrawal of consent will be respected at any stage of the data collection.

I look forward to the opportunity of working with yourself and members of your staff, and will be happy to adapt my timetable to meet the needs of the school to ensure minimal disruption to the school day.

Andrea J. Quinn
B.Beh.Sc.(Hons.)
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Participant Information Sheet and Research Consent Form

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

Chief Investigator: Ms Andrea J. Quinn
School of Applied Psychology
Griffith University, Mt Gravatt, 4122
Ph: 3875 3378 or 3216 8380

Project Title: School leadership, workplace culture, and teacher stress: Implications for problem students.

The investigator conducting this program of research warrants that principles governing the ethical conduct of research will be upheld in all respects, and that the interests, comfort and safety of all participants will be protected.

This form, and the information it contains, have been given to you for your own protection. It contains an outline of the experimental procedures and possible risks. Your signature on the Research Consent Form will indicate that:

1) you have read the contents of this document,
2) you understand that all the data you provide will be kept in the strictest confidence, and that you will remain anonymous when the results of the study are published,
3) your participation is entirely voluntary. At any time you may withdraw your participation without comment or penalty, and without jeopardising any involvement you may have with Griffith University,
4) your participation in focus group interviews may be audio-taped to preserve the integrity of your contribution, and you are free to refuse such recording without penalty,
5) you are aware you may direct any inquiries or questions to Mr Bob Dick on (07) 3875 3308 or Dr Liz Jones on (07) 3875 3365, at Griffith University's School of Applied Psychology. You may also direct any concerns or complaints regarding the ethical conduct of this investigation to Griffith University's Research Ethics Officer, at:
   Office for Research,
   Bray Centre, Griffith University,
   NATHAN, 4111
   Phone: (07) 3875 6618.
6) you will receive feedback regarding the study via an executive summary supplied to your school or team leader, and that,
7) you agree to participate in the research procedures as set out in the attached Research Consent Form entitled “School leadership, workplace culture, and teacher stress: Implications for problem students”, as part of a postgraduate thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy in Organisational Psychology degree for Andrea Quinn.
RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

Project Title: School leadership, workplace culture, and teacher stress: Implications for problem students.

This study is the basis of a dissertation in the degree of Doctor of Organisational Psychology at Griffith University, and will be conducted by Ms Andrea Quinn under the guidance of Mr Bob Dick and Dr Liz Jones.

Objectives:

The research program aims to investigate the relationship between school leadership, workplace culture, teacher stress and outcomes for emotionally and/or behaviourally disordered adolescents. The frequency of school referrals for behaviour management, suspensions, and exclusions, will be evaluated in relation to measures of teacher stress and workplace culture. In addition, differences in leadership style will be explored as a means of explaining variance in workplace culture and teacher stress.

Rationale:

The issue of student misbehaviour is consistently acknowledged in the literature as a factor in teacher stress. However, strategies to address the problem have focused on teacher and student level variables, rather than viewing the issue contextually. When contextual variables are investigated, school leadership and workplace culture consistently emerge as significant factors in the amelioration or exacerbation of teacher stress and behaviour management. Nonetheless, much of the existing research maintains a narrow focus on curriculum issues and academic achievement. Because evidence suggests that there is little relationship between discipline policy and the frequency of student misbehaviour, efforts at reducing teacher stress by reducing student misbehaviour may be misguided. Instead, it is suggested that it may be more appropriate to investigate environmental variables. Following from the above, the present research will explore links between three levels of variables, 1) organisational (school leadership and workplace culture), 2) teacher (perceived stress) and 3) students (behaviour management referrals).

Data collection procedures:

As a participant, you will be asked to, 1) engage in a focus group interview, and/or 2) complete a number of surveys. Both the focus group questions and the surveys will target areas of school leadership, workplace culture, and teacher stress. Approximately 30 to 45 minutes of your time will be required, and at no time will your identity be divulged.

Risks and discomforts:

There will be no anticipated physical risk, but there is some risk of emotional or mental stress being experienced during the data collection. At any time you may withdraw your participation and/or request to debrief with the researcher, Andrea Quinn (3875 3378).

Benefits of the study:

It is anticipated that participants will receive the following benefits from taking part in the study:

- increased insight into the elements of occupational stress
• increased understanding of different leadership behaviours
• increased understanding of the various elements that comprise workplace culture

Enquiries:

Any questions arising from your participation in this project are welcome at any time. Please direct them to Andrea Quinn on (07) 3875 3378. If at any time, you are not satisfied with her response, you may direct your enquiries to Dr Liz Jones (3875 3365) or Mr Bob Dick (3875 3308) at the School of Applied Psychology. If you have any concerns regarding the ethical conduct of this project, you may contact Griffith University's Research Ethics Officer on (07) 3785 6618.

Confidentiality:

Your survey results will only be revealed to the investigator, and to yourself if you so request (please provide a contact number). When the results are published, your anonymity will be fully protected.

Acknowledgement:

Please accept my thanks for your consideration of participation in this study. Your assistance is a vital part in the completion of my Doctorate in Organisational Psychology, and is greatly appreciated. Please ensure that you have read and understood the previous information. Your signature below, and return of the completed surveys, will indicate your acceptance of the above conditions.

And again, I acknowledge your time is valuable – thankyou!

Freedom of consent:

Your signature below will indicate your consent to participate. Please read the consent statement (below) fully before signing.

I agree to participate in the 'School Leadership, Workplace Culture, and Teacher Stress: Implications for Problem Students' project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project/study will be carried out as described in the information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I realise that whether or not I decide to participate is my decision and will not affect my present or future studies, treatment by, or present or future association with Griffith University. I also realise that I can withdraw from the (project/study) at any time and that I do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

Agreement to participate:

I ______________________ have read and understood the above information, and agree to participate as outlined in the foregoing.

Signed _______________________________ Date _________________
Age _______Designation ______________________ (teacher, HOD, AVT, etc.)
Length of service in years__________ Thankyou!
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INTRODUCTION

This manual provides a description of the procedure for coding focus group interview statements. An overview of the coding procedure is followed by detailed examples of each valence and referent code. An example of the scoring sheet is also included.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MATERIAL TO BE CODED

Participants were provided with a definition of organisational culture and asked to discuss three interview questions in an untimed focus group. Written transcriptions of each (audio-taped) focus group interview were then segmented for the purpose of numerical coding. Each speech segment is then coded as a response unit, and consists of a complete statement embedded in sections of transcribed speech.

DEFINITION OF A RESPONSE UNIT

Response units represent speech segments and constitute the contents of each box on the scoring sheet. Speech segments are defined as the smallest units of homogeneous content and are discernible via breaches in structure and/or flow within sections of transcribed speech. Standard punctuation may or may not indicate a structural breach. However, each speech segment must be able to stand independently of content in contiguous segments.

DEFINITION OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES

There are three types of coded response categories:

1. valence codes - positive or negative
2. referent codes – for example, innovation, people orientation, task (the full range of referent codes will be expanded later)
3. other – applied to neutral speech segments where valence is indeterminate

CODING PROCEDURE

Each transcript is first read in its entirety to enable coders to apprehend the context of the interview. Response units are pre-coded with a ‘phrase identification number’ which is listed on the record form (example appended to the manual). Phrases are then coded according to, 1) the appropriate referent code, and 2) positive or negative valence. Where valence is unclear and/or an appropriate referent code cannot be decided, response units are coded ‘other’ for each domain under investigation (i.e., culture, stress, and leadership). Referent codes are abbreviated on the record form thus:
Table C1

Coding record form abbreviations for referent codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRRT</td>
<td>Innovation and risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO</td>
<td>Outcomes orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>People orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO/C</td>
<td>Team orientation, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG.</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB.</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Other, neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEH’L</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH.</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Other, neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Focus on task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R’SHP</td>
<td>Focus on relationships, people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Other, neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Robbins, Millett, Cacioppe & Waters-Marsh, 1998)

DEFINITION OF VALENCE CODES

1) Positive (+ve) valence is coded when the response unit contains positive perceptual information relevant to the referent code, for example:

“The DP in this school is really supportive of kids with problems”.
(People Orientation – positive valence)

2) Negative (-ve) valence is scored when the response unit contains negative perceptual information relevant to the referent code, for example:

“If they don’t fit in, there’s no flexibility”.
(People Orientation – negative valence)

3) Where valence is indeterminate relevant to the referent code, a neutral response is entered, for example:

“There’s an expectation that kids will behave”.
(neutral valence, could be construed as either positive or negative – coded as ‘Other’)

DEFINITIONS OF REFERENT CODES

Referent codes have been developed around theory-driven models for each of the domains under investigation. Examples of each are provided to facilitate coding decisions.

**CULTURE**

**IRRT**

Innovation and risk-taking: the degree to which teachers are encouraged to be innovative, explore alternate solutions, and take risks with their role.

*Positive:* “In some schools it’s OK to do whatever it takes.”
*Negative:* “S/he doesn’t feel s/he fits the culture ‘cos s/he’s teaching differently to other teachers at the school.”

**AD**

Attention to detail: the degree to which teachers are expected to be precise and attend to detail.

*Positive:* “You have a sense of wanting to do it well, because you know you’ll be recognised for your effort.”
*Negative:* “There’s a belief that there’s only one right way to do the job, and you’re slack if you don’t do it that way.”

**OO**

Outcomes orientation: the degree to which school management focuses on results rather than on the techniques and processes used to achieve outcomes.

*Positive:* “We know what our principal expects – but he’s happy to help us get there in our own way.”
*Negative:* “They’re expected to account for every minute so principals and DPs can keep control of everything.”

**PO**

People orientation: the degree to which the decisions of school administrators take account of the effects for teaching staff.

*Positive:* “The DP in this school is really good at supporting the kids, especially when he knows there’s problems at home.”
*Negative:* “If the kid doesn’t fit in, there’s no flexibility.”

**TO/C**

Team orientation, collaboration: the degree to which work activities are organised around teams rather than individuals.

*Positive:* “One thing they tried at my school was getting teachers to meet together about supporting a certain kid.”
*Negative:* “They’ve got common rooms, but the timetabling means they never see each other to feel supported.”
AGG. Aggressiveness: the degree to which teachers and administrators are aggressive and competitive rather than easygoing and cooperative.

Positive: “In one school I work at, the DP will actually go into the classroom and help – especially the new teachers, like it’s OK to still be at the learning stage.”
Negative: “If there’s a lot of noise coming from one room, then other teachers think that person can’t handle their class – so people feel like they’re being judged.”

STAB. Stability: the degree to which school activities emphasise maintaining the status quo in contrast to growth – in other words, the degree to which the school monitors and responds to change in the external environment.

Positive: “Even though the system keeps changing from head office, this one principal is, like, we’ll work with anything they give us to manage behaviour problems.”
Negative: “Some teachers sort of tick the boxes against the behaviour management policy and say they’ve done their bit, it’s time to kick the kid out.”

OTHER Other, neutral: content and/or valence is indeterminate.

STRESS Behavioral: descriptions of actions or statements that reflect the behavioural sequelae of stressful situations.

BEH’L Positive: “Some teachers will make light of what the kids do – you know, they don’t act as if the kid’s attacking them personally by being naughty.”
Negative: “I was talking to a teacher the other day who reckons stress leave is for wussies – but this guy drinks like a fish and smokes a pack a day – sure, he’s not stressed !”

PSYCH. Psychological: statements that indicate feelings or beliefs that may be the psychological sequelae of stressful work.

Positive: “If teachers feel they can cope with the demands, then they believe they can nip things in the bud, no worries.”
Negative: “The teacher might say that this kid’s not gonna win over me – it becomes a power play for them.”

OTHER Other, neutral: content and/or valence is indeterminate.
### LEADERSHIP

**TASK**
Focus on task: statements concerning the behaviour of school administrators as it pertains to task issues, such as, outcomes, rules orientation, efficiency, structure, directives.

**Positive:** “The DP is the sort of person that will do whatever he can to make sure the system works so you can get your job done – it’s like a safety net, you can rely on it.”

**Negative:** “It’s like the place is a concentration camp and students are born little adults; if they get out of line, we’ll just make more rules to show we’re dealing with things.”

### R’SHP
Focus on relationships, concern for people: statements concerning the behaviour of school administrators as it pertains to relationship issues, such as, process orientation, respect, trust, interdependence, a supportive approach to staff.

**Positive:** “The principal has really led the way with his beliefs – like having an open door policy for taking the kids with problems”.

**Negative:** “The other school I work at has a fractured Admin’ team, and the principal’s just not interested in ‘behaviour kids’ – it’s the teacher’s problem”.

### OTHER
Other, neutral: content and/or valence is indeterminate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Transcript No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHRASE</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>IRRT</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
</tr>
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<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
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<td>-ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>+ve</td>
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<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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|--------| |
Appendix D

Transcribed Focus Group Interviews
The issue I'm trying to tease out is about workplace culture, which is why I've got the definition up there. So when people are thinking about the idea of culture, it's defined as the shared values and beliefs that interact with the school's organisational structures. We're talking about things like norms, and ways of being, and ways of practice within the school, and some of the control systems that produce behavioural norms in those systems. So based on that definition, what's your response to the following questions, the first one being - in your opinion, what is the relationship between culture in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems?

GROUP

I think if the values and beliefs are not shared, then you end up with inconsistent and ad hoc behaviour management.

There's also a difference between what they espouse is their values and beliefs and the way members of the school often exhibit it. There's often a difference between what they say and what they do.

Mmm - definitely.

And also what's written down.

AQ So that seems to be a shared view.

Yeah - very much so.

If I can just expand a bit - is that alright?

AQ Yes, please feel free to expand on it, it's what I'd like to get from the group.

One of the very basic differences I see as I go around schools, is that a lot of schools will say, "Oh yes we're very supportive with behaviour, we take a developmental approach to behaviour", so when things actually happen there's no developmental perspective. It's a case of "They should do this because I told them so" - so it becomes a power thing. And whilst they might accept that kids take a couple of years to learn to read, or they take a couple of years to learn to do math, they don't accept that kids would have to take time to learn how to behave. There's an expectation that they will behave. And I find that's the most common difference between what's espoused and what actually takes place.

(Murmurs of agreement)

I think I'll say that ....you certainly see a different way of managing children according to beliefs and values - that the managers of the students have.

I don't think the behaviours are any different ...(unclear).but certainly where the culture is one of support, and where it is shown in practice, the staff are much more supportive of each other, and the students seem to respond. We still get management problems, or behaviour problems, but the impact they have on the school, I suppose, is different.

Some of the schools that I visit in the Corinda district, they're schools that are seen to be, not exclusive primary schools, but certainly schools in the community where members of the community are well-to-do or they're a privileged lot. And when you notice that some children move into the community that are not of the same socioeconomic background, or the same culture, they're rarely accepted into the
Organisation Level Influence on Referral Rates for Student Misbehaviour

...And I don't think it's a deliberate thing on anybody's part, but it's because they've got the feeling, well this child really doesn't fit into this community even - you know - and rather than try to accommodate the differences, sometimes I get the feeling - or sometimes the evidence is there - that they want this child to move on out of the school, out of the community, because he'd be happier in his own place. And if it was a person of their own community who was acting out in a similar way, it would be because they're having difficulty and we need to help them. So I think in that way the culture of the school would be...(unclear) ..come up as the school as being challenged.

Like when you're under stress, that's when, where I was talking about ..(unclear) from the rhetoric of support to the rhetoric of control and power. And I think it's exactly what you're saying (name suppressed), if you came in from another socioeconomic group, and began making waves or anything like that, it'd be - right, if he starts to cause problems or stresses the situation…

If he didn't make any waves, they might not be noticed like the other children, they're not ostracised but they're not fully accepted either, you know, and I think that's - a lot of the kids I work with have difficulty with behaviour because they don't feel as though they have been accepted. There's that fear of non-acceptance - there's no hostility towards them, but they're not accepted into the group. I think that's one of the common factors of a why the children I work with misbehave.

Also, when I speak with them sometimes too, the different culture of the schools affects the different perceptions of what is a behaviour problem.

Yes, yes (murmurs of agreement).

In some of the schools and some of the people you work with, you say - that's not a behaviour problem -

Yes - where's the behaviour problem - show me where…

What is that ?
Oh - there's that boy over there - he didn't do his homework last night. And I'll tell you I'm exaggerating a little bit - but, behaviour is relative.

Yeah...yeah…

Behaviour, when it's seen within different communities, is relative - but, that doesn't mean to say that the schools don't have the same right to access to support, because - or that they need a bit of fine tuning, that's fine too. We can do that, but, the culture of the school, or the climate, dictates which is unacceptable behaviour and which is behaviour that can be tolerated.

AQ It's kind of like the thresh-hold point for the interpretation of deviance.

Mmmmm...Yes - it changes.

The only thing that I'd add is that with the shared values in the schools, and the problems that the children come to school with from the family background aren't addressed in a collaborative way. So the family and the student and the administration and the teachers don't get together to help the kid, or at least advise the parents what is the best course. I don't know if that fits really well with the culture.

AQ Shall we move on to number two. In your opinion, what is the relationship between the level of teacher stress in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems ?

GROUP

(Laughter - all)
Extremely high correlation. Extremely high.

Extremely.

(more laughter)

On any of the surveys that the union has done, and any that the Uni's have done, I've seen behaviour - student behaviour is right up the top.

With teacher stress.

(talking over each other)

Well - the major factor of teacher stress is student behaviour. And you go to the staff room, and they're not talking about - oh they occasionally talk about difficulty with the curriculum - but it's mostly about student behaviour. And what are we gonna do about it? Why do we have to put up with this? What's going to be done?

More control stuff - rather than problem-solving stuff, it's just control stuff.

The other side too, is when the kid starts to improve or they can see some practice that's put in place to help improve that child's behaviour, the stress level drops down and they become more enthusiastic and happy within themselves, and that translates across the board.

Yep.

And I think the question there is about the management of student behaviour, not just the student behaviour, but the management of student behaviour, and a lot of people - well I don't say a lot - but some teachers believe that it's the administration's job to manage student behaviour, and they also see that these people aren't doin' it, and I send him to the office, and he comes back with a big grin on his face...

Just the same...

Nothing has changed - so there's certainly unhappy - they don't know what to do about it themselves, but they're unhappy about the way that student behaviour is being managed in the school, and...

AQ And that's like an interaction between the system and the individual teacher and that can escalate their stress levels - is that what you're seeing?

Oh yes, if they don't see that they're getting any support...

If they don't perceive that they're being supported...

That's worse off, that makes it almost intolerable for them, and some schools have got a closed door policy - you know, they don't want to know about it. They say they're "made" to come out and have a look at what's going on - they don't know what to do about it either.

AQ So if some of the teachers are stressed, what sorts of things do you see them doing to manage behaviour, apart from just referring them on to admin.?

Oh, they're more likely to revert to really reactive strategies - they don't think things through, they avoid, and they confront in an angry way.

And they become sick.

Oh yes - a good point (general agreement).
And they're unable to implement any type of management plan with consistency, because their stress levels get in the way. (unclear)

Their reasoning ability goes.
(unclear)

It's almost like before they get to that stage, they've developed elaborate punishment plans.

Yes, yes…

I'll punish more - what I need to do is punish this kid more.

And they know it doesn't work - but under times of stress, we revert to old habits. Even though the old habits don't work.

And the other thing is - they might have one or two behaviour problems, and that might be causing them a lot of grief, but then they might have twenty-six other really great kids that they feel that they're drawn between. They're giving them time and attention and focusing on what they see as the negative aspect of their class - and so, you know, that's a conflict.

AQ That's another thing that can escalate their stress levels too, because they don't know how to resolve that tension.

Yes, yes…

It all becomes negative…

Mmmm…yeah…

And then they can't think positively, they can't think of anything good that's happening - and that just escalates it.

They also I think, take it on personally - that um, you know, I've done all this for this kid and he's still - you know - swearing at me and doing whatnot (unclear) - so they take it personally. This kind of kid's really um…

AQ There seems to be a mythology amongst teachers that if "I can't control my class, I'm not a good teacher", and so they tend not to admit they're having difficulty.

Yes, yes, they've felt as if they're very much under attack.

That's right, yeah…

AQ OK, so the last one - in your opinion, what is the relationship between the style of leadership in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems. I wish we could record the body language…

(Laughter)

I think when we see collaborative consultation and shared problem-solving, and a 'we' mentality, then we see effective management of very very difficult situations and behaviour problems. When we see an 'us and them' way of management, where the principal and the staff might recommend that things happen and not collaboratively consult with people about how that should happen, then we go through not terribly good outcomes for student management.

And the 'boss style', the 'boss style' of leadership doesn't work with those sort of kids (unclear).

But I do think that teachers want their principals to be firm…

Strong…
They want them to make some good firm decisions, but I don’t think they see they add to the stress - to the stress if things seem to be - at least to the teachers - wishy-washy. Nothing really happening, or not knowing what's going on, or...

People have to walk the talk, you know, if the principal and the teacher decide that this is the course of action, and the principal says, ”Yes that fits with our behaviour management policy, and that's the way to go”, then they have to be able to back that up when it happens. So that they will follow through every single time, and support the teacher.

**AQ** So this relates to what (name suppressed) was saying before about the espoused theory and what they actually do.

Yes, yes, mmmm….

A lot of the programs are plans that they've put on paper, but everyone asks, ”Does this happen, does this happen?”. It often gets blurred. Blurring often ends in "No".

**AQ** Any other comments on leadership?

Openness - that they're open to suggestions, and um, seek out information from other sources - they're looking to solve the problem (unclear)…and if there has been an outcome.

What you said before too - well somebody said - about teachers not, teachers feeling under threat though at times, I think that sometimes happens with leaders too. Some principals don't like hearing it if you're having difficult issues, and they aren't very…(unclear)

It is a very isolating job, the principal job, there's not a lot of avenues for them to get support…

There's a lot of expectations placed on principals…

Mmmmm….

The school based management which is the thrust of the department really does make the principal's role vital.

Puts a lot of stress on them…yeah…

Certainly we're seeing in some of the schools we work in where there are a lot of difficult children and um, you know, the whole system's stressed, and the principals particularly just have such a lot to do - you know, they really do need more support than they're….

**AQ** So how does that translate to what they do with behaviour management?

Just so many things to be done, it's so broad, so varied, it's so time consuming, there's just an expectation that principals will be available to do three nights a week. That things like behaviour management become just another thing that's on top of everything else…

There's a greater expectation I suppose that there's a closed door policy (unclear)…saying "Well, that's your problem, not mine, I've got enough on my plate".

And I guess when they're already stressed, to have - usually there's management issues probably become a crisis, it's just turning stress to the whole system.

Mmmmm….

Simple things like time management and so forth they turn around and then take a proactive and problem solving approach to something like behaviour management that's more difficult than the knee jerk reaction.
Mmm...yes...

And you need the time to be able to plan it and do it properly.

One of the schools we work in, um the principal is, has no deputy, the school has a number of the difficult children, and it's getting more, and it seems to be that because she manages them so well. And the trouble is it's going to get to a stage where there's far too many for her to manage by herself, without numbers or without getting a deputy or something - and just the ask on her is incredible. She is there - she starts at eight, working and meeting the parents about some issue from yesterday and whatever, and it goes on through the day - we all work at the school, we never see her get a break...

She needs a break...

...and just about always she's dealing with the students, the parents, and it's usually behavioural issues. Now I just don't know how long she can keep going like that, it's a real concern. And yet, the way the department is, the ways it's structured - she's got to keep going, or go over. It's a numbers game and she doesn't get the support she should have.

And it's almost the unwritten rule that if she goes under that shows that she wasn't really up to the job anyhow.

Yes....yes...that's right.

She's more her life's gone because she's doing the job so well, and she's doing all these extra things...

Yep, that's right...

She is proactive...

She's working really hard at it...

It's wrong....

The structure's a part of it - whatever our opinions are that they're affecting us whatever, the structure's are designed to support students and teachers - but there's really nothing to support principals.

And on the other hand it takes a long time if people are doing a really poor job, for that to be addressed. And it seems like you're waiting for the crisis (unclear)...

Mmm....mmmm...

AQ Is there anything else you can think of in relation to culture and behaviour management? Any of those issues, leadership, teacher stress?

Something I was thinking of before, it's still in the documents as (name suppressed) was saying earlier. About it being there in the writing - I still think generally, I work with a lot of teachers, and it's still taking a long time to filter down to teachers. That attitude of supporting students with behavioural difficulties.

They're not seeing it as a teaching opportunity...

No...

I think that as a general teacher culture, (unclear) there are - there's some great teachers out there, but I still think generally, and when I go to union meetings and the things they say, it's still like, "Let's get rid of these children, let's exclude them, let's keep them out"...

They're just naughty - they should know better.

Or - they do know better, but they're choosing not to - they're out to get me, they're out to get me.
They're doing it deliberately.

Yeah….yeah….

Rather than seeing them as having a, well I call it a disability.

Teachers almost by definition are people who are academic, or deemed reasonably academically successful - and have usually been compliant in the dominant culture or the system whatever that's the school.

Mmmm….that's true.

So, they don't really understand learning problems, they don’t understand kids who are not part of that culture really - it's natural.

It sounds like a criticism, but they're doing their best.

Yeah…

But it's a natural thing - we can't expect them to have that sort of affinity for a group of that they've had no experience of being a part of.

Yes…

AQ Would it be different do you think, if the school's culture was more supportive of the teachers themselves ? Would they manage the student misbehaviour differently ?

Definitely, yes, I think.

Well, I think I do see it in some of the schools - that does happen, but the - it is more accepted that these children are having difficulties and it is their job, and they take that on board, and that comes back to leadership - the support for teachers. And it's just the little things - I was just in the staff today, and teachers were so happy because the school had organised one day where they could sit and have morning tea together as a teaching staff, by using teacher aides and specialist teachers who aren't part of the ordinary staff. On that one day - it was just an organisational leader thing - and they feel so much more supported.

They feel valued.

And valued, because of it - and it gives them one opportunity to be together - they're only small things.

They're the things that help create that shared belief, culture, within a school isn't it - the opportunity to speak together.

I know there's a fair bit of rhetoric to it, you know schools and their culture should reflect the culture of their school community and so forth. I know that's what some people are saying, but I wonder how realistic that is and for example, in the Inala schools, I don't know how realistic it is to expect a group of fifty or so teachers to share the culture of the Inala community, when most of them wouldn't choose to live in the Inala community to start with. And I think that maybe we need to look at more realistic ways of not so much sharing the culture, but maybe sharing parts of the culture or - or looking at the culture in terms of how our culture is supportive of that culture - a more realistic way rather than just espousing that the old line that, you know, we'll all - we have a community culture in this school that reflects the community when it really doesn't. And the school's got to…I mean the school can't…

(unclear)

The school's under pressure or whatever, I can't think of the proper way - but it's under pressure - from the needs and requirements of the Education Department, as well, which is another engine for cultural change, or cultural atrophy, um, in the school.
Or even just to appreciate that they - their values are different, but they're still worthwhile values that they have and that they're using them for the betterment of their children - that their best interests are at heart, that sort of thing, instead of - they're different.

Yeah - a more realistic way of looking at it and accepting that maybe our cultures are different, the culture of the teacher and the culture of the families of most of the kids in the class might be different. But there's some common ground. If we can recognise the common ground - well let's look at the way that my culture can help your culture.

END OF INTERVIEW
**16/6/2000 - FOCUS GROUP 2**

**INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT**

**AQ** In your opinion, what is the relationship between culture in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems? (Discussion of what question means.) Give examples, but also speaking generally.

**GROUP**

I can see that other schools …very structured. New schools are … this is the way it’s going to be, this is the expectations and if you don’t fit in, there is no real flexibility. But I have seen that change because of teacher push and people now speaking out and wanting some changes so its not just leadership dominance. OK, let’s provide a little bit of flexibility, let’s cater for the individual. That’s creeping in now although there is still a surface that says, ”This is the way it is, this is the way it’s going to be”.

I spent 6 years working in rural schools in this same role and none of this … kids not fitting in culture…because they didn’t have another school down the road to send the kid to … had to be able … the school adapted to fit the child more than the child adapting to fit the culture. There’s are a huge difference coming from the rural schools back into the Brisbane, western suburbs culture school.

**AQ** That’s an issue of directionality.

Is it directionality or is it the beliefs of the Principal who knows that, geographically, there’s nothing they can do … they have to.

So lack of choice means the school has to change, not the child in itself?

Yes. Whereas here - I’ll copy some words of a friend of mine – “Hit the road Jack, you don’t fit this school so you might as well move on to the next one”… is never said, although it was said quite blatantly to this one person. The other issue with behaviour management and culture … I ran into a teacher, a very stressed teacher on Wednesday, and this fits this too, and promptly burst into tears when she saw me and said, “I’m so pleased to see you I just wanted to, I just wanted to see the behaviour management people”. People, not me … and she is running a class in one of the middle class western suburbs schools, and she feels that she doesn’t fit the culture of the school because she’s not teaching the way the other year level teachers teach in that school. The behaviour management strategies are different, the way she teaches the core competencies is different, she feels she doesn’t fit the culture in that school.

It’s a big issue with that at the moment, this seminar on Friday, whenever I bring up now about other schools and say, “How supportive are we?” , and they immediately think “Oh yeah, we’re pretty supportive!” - of the kids but they are not of each other necessarily, they haven’t built in that supportive attitude to their colleagues and that’s a part of our behaviour management strategy.

It is part of our role, if you look at the supportive school environment document, it’s support of our peers as well. And I always come from that angle particularly when the children … I don’t see are particularly naughty… you see, you look at why the teacher thinks the kid is naughty, is it because they don’t fit the culture or is it because the teachers don’t fit in that culture?

(Talking over the top of each other)
And that happens … particularly this school … if you are a highly academic type of person and you … no you don’t really fit this culture because the culture of this particular school is that we give kids lots of chances because we know about their socio-economic background. And so this is the reverse of what we were talking about earlier … that some of the other school cultures where we know what their background could be or is it they don’t have to rise to the expectations of the teachers, then they don’t need to push or whatever, and yes, you are expected to give this kid some many chances so … which is of course teachers feel that is not necessary…and they are not fitting into the culture and then they get stressed or they fall against the wrath of the leadership of the school and whatever …. So there is conflict there.

There is the culture of behaviour management too that you shouldn’t have to … what you’re not capable of … and whether that’s organisation or leadership, or whether that’s going into your next area or what … I don’t know … but there’s a big culture that says, “I can’t help with this”, particularly with supply teachers and contract teachers … they do not like to ask for help with behaviour management because they are scared of having a black mark against their name as supply or contract teachers.

That’s exactly what…says that they need to be aware of … to build into the school culture is that you support those students, you support your supply teachers and you support your new teachers to the school ‘cause there is quite a lot of teachers who have just moved into their new school and they are not coping because they don’t have the power.

(Talking over the top of each other)

Because the culture is different.

Oh Yes, definitely, especially as there are such a big percentage of ESL kids and the … and that culture some older teachers are not able to take on the world … they particularly want a certain type of school, but if they get placed in that school and they haven’t had that choice … so they find that very hard to adapt.

AQ Sorry, I give the point...

GROUP

Well not necessarily the old teachers, …

It’s not just the old teachers …

No no no, new teachers coming in …

The argument is that it’s the older teachers.

Yeah, but it’s not.

And also, when we look at the culture of schools these days … where one particular staff member here is always saying … that the average age of teachers in schools these days is over 40 … so we have got an older age group.

Yes, so you can look at that as well … the culture of the teacher population, as well as the changing student population and what their needs are, and so you put all that together. I don’t think that we are bad, although we say we have behaviour management policies, where we have whole school environment and we have our AOP’s and all that type of thing. I really don’t think it’s … their realistic.

…is practiced.

The behaviour management policies that were supposed to be written and checked, I’m just thinking of one school I worked in the rural sector, where any child who swore … this is the culture of the school … and the community because it was a community plan … any child who swore was to be sent home. Well there was hilarity up and down the rural shires for that because all the schools were saying …
well by morning tea-time we wouldn’t have a kid in the school. Or a teacher. That was a culture that came from a very German community. Interesting.

I kind of see also a bit like S is talking about … and I suppose what L is saying too about wanting to move kids on when they don’t fit the culture. I also see a big difference between theory and practice when we … we all know these jargon words that have been around for awhile … like support and all of that, but in actual fact it doesn’t happen. So I think it’s kind of… that’s put upon the schools and then reflect that and so much is reactive as result. Therefore, because the teachers are being put upon, they then feel the Administration is being put upon, they put upon the teachers and the teachers put upon the kids … and like … we know that way of operating doesn’t work and that’s going to cause kids that might have an emotional or behavioural problem considerable stress … and the teachers as well, but we keep doing it like that. Like S is talking about supporting, they’ve been talking about supporting colleagues for so long, and yet it still doesn’t happen. In schools, I’ve always thought the 1st and 2nd year teachers, specifically 1st year teachers, should perhaps be given a half timetable so that…(murmurs of agreement)… well, if it’s in primary school and only actually with kids two days a week, or 2 and a half days a week so that they get time to work out their own stress.

Be mentored ….

Yes, be mentored

Like an apprenticeship …

And read and all of that, and actually watch good operators in action instead of becoming stressed and automatically being expected … and if you’ve got informed, and assertive administrators in your school … they know those type of things are reported, but because of staffing they can’t do it. But at least they kind of talk about stuff … and I suppose provide some support. I think the culture’s critical, but I think it’s largely determined by Education Queensland who wants to do things on the smell of an oily rag … you know?

I think a lot of the culture is determined by the community that the school is in.

It’s the area that it’s in, it’s the community, and who it’s been set up for and then of course, who’s up there on the Admin’.

And I agree with what you’re saying M, that that culture doesn’t just come from EQ, that comes from the Treasury.

Well, that’s what I meant.

When you said community I didn’t think you meant the Treasury, I was thinking you meant…

I do.

Whereas I think it’s more a government thing, that the government really wanted to put it’s money where it’s mouth was, you know, each school would have a psychologist, each school would have a behaviour management support person, each school would have an ESL specialist.

Yeah, all of that.

All of those things that have been cut.

And … I was aware working in environment for 12 months and doing other bits and pieces and I came back and … it ended up I was away for about 15 months all in all by the time I got back to full time work. It struck me just coming back just what stressed places schools are and (murmurs of agreement)… everybody is always rushing and you always … we…

Controlled. And a lot of external controls.
A lot of my time is spent with teachers as well as kids. Like I sometimes neglect seeing kids on particular days because a teacher … something has happened … or a parent. And so therefore, sometimes I might only see two kids, where other days I’d see five. But because of that stress … and they sometimes don’t have anybody else to talk to or they are pouring out problems. But just talking about an issue and that stress is … and for the whole it’s all … onto people.

It’s mainly because teachers don’t feel they have the power. They don’t have the respect from the community. They are accountable every second of the day. They are getting so much more workload as far as responsibility of ringing parents and working together with other people as well as being with the kids. And the kids have changed.

So, how does that impact on management of student behaviour? It means it’s not as good as … no where near as good. It’s deplorable.

AQ Who’s then taking the onus of control of management of students?

Yeah.

AQ When teachers are not feeling supported?

GROUP

Well, it’s what your saying … you don’t fit this school … you’re off.

That’s really … I was just thinking we were probably getting off the track there, so we are saying we all agree on what the culture is like … how does that impact on managing students? Well, we are probably just skirting around the edges aren’t we?

We have a system in place that’s supposedly to the best benefit of the kids and family, but really it’s all just band-aiding.

Yes, that’s right.

Little boxes … well if this doesn’t work, let’s go to the next box and see, open the lid, see if that works, if it doesn’t, we’ve got another lid to open up and then we can say, “We’ve done it all, nothing left, too bad about the kid or parent”. You know, shove them off to the next school.

The other thing is part of that also, we don’t have time to really get into the nitty gritty’s, S and I have both talked about at our level, trying to say, run a self-esteem program with some girls or boys, run an anti-bullying thing, you know, stuff like that, just with some little select groups. Because with Year 8 and 9 your curriculum is much freer, it doesn’t matter if they miss English for a few weeks or whatever, but we don’t have the time to do that. We’re also not at the one school enough … you know what I mean? So, I just feel like I’m skirting round the edges. Sitting in a spot that the school can then say, “Well, we’ve gone from the Guidance Officer and we have involved the behaviour management person” … tick off a box.

(Group agreement and mumbling)

We are talking about the ‘at risk’ kids and I realise that the culture of the school is also the kids that are doing OK or pretending to do OK, and that’s where as M was saying, we want to be proactive, we love to do more proactive stuff, and I’ve taught social skills to a whole Year 9 level and tried … and then have that go throughout the whole school so that teachers take that on board and run with things. But it just doesn’t seem to keep going and there isn’t the time or energy or whatever and they are the social skills that the kids … we take for granted that they know … but depending on the culture of the school or where you’re at … they haven’t got it, or it isn’t reinforced at home, or it’s just neglected or whatever and yeah, we would love to have behaviour management as a proactive thing that we can address it before it arises, but in our particular field it’s not being used that way.

Some of it.
A little bit of what we do.

Some manage to do it with teachers, or we model or we do some social skills, but not as much as we would like to, and we really would love to do that rather than be the reactive person that goes to the kid when he’s been suspended for 6 – 20 days… and then we have to re-integrate them back into the system, and that’s all the culture of that. “Oh yeah, we’ll give them another chance”, and then you’ve got to move on; you realise that when you’re at this stage and next time you do the wrong thing, that’s it and so what are we doing… this is high school… pass them on from one to the other.

Just getting onto just one more specific thing and I was thinking of when S was speaking … it made me think of. I suppose when you’re looking at the leadership (and I can’t remember the term.. you’ll probably know it … in Glasser terms, you know the high level of leadership ?

Boss management.

No, not boss management. That last day we did, we had to think of it.

AQ Are you thinking of Demings stuff?

No, it could have been Demings. You know the really.

They are pretty inspirational.

Yeah, that’s it! Well, I kind of … on that day we had to identify … like if we knew any leaders that fit into that type of thing … and I suggested that one I know might … a school Principal. And when I think of it, comparing that school with another school which just has a new Principal who was very … the school was on the verge of closing, and I suppose this fellow sees it as his mission that he’s got to make the school work now. However, I see already, just by a few things that have been happening, that he pigeon-holes things … this lot will be there, this lot will be there, you will work this way … it’s going to encounter a lot of resistance, but in terms of my own role, I think it will be harder for me there, even if I had the time and the resources and the support of the teachers, to suggest anything innovative. Whereas at this other school, because they are much more open and much more flexible and aren’t in the practice of pigeon-holing quite as much… they don’t pigeon-hole me full stop. I feel quite confident there. If I had the time and the resources, if I went along and said, “Right, can we experiment with self esteem programs with Year 8 boys?” , or some crap like that … I’m sure they would say, “Yes”. So, I do think that even within the constraints, that there are big differences and that the agenda is set still by the school Principal. Even within those constraints.

Yep, I believe that and the schools I do I know exactly which ones I feel comfortable in, which ones I have to work harder in, you know …

To work in a particular way…that’s culture. And we are just itinerants, so people who are caught up in that all the way, well they can go positive or they can go negative. They can be slack or they can be really good teachers so that affects the kids in turn doesn’t it?

AQ You’ve actually mentioned in passing several times the issue of leadership and things that affect the teachers, would now be a good time to move on?

(Agreement)

AQ The next area I want to ask you about is in your opinion, what is the relationship between the level of teacher stress in your school and the management of students with behaviour problems?

GROUP

So the level of teacher stress and the management?

I would say that the main complaint is when a teacher feels stressed or has problems in the classroom, they want backup, and if they don’t have the backup then they usually blame Admin’, and even if they
are able to send them up there but we don’t get feedback and so on … so it’s a communication link and what is happening or isn’t happening and then they get more stressed, because if it’s not happening then feel they are not being supported. Whereas if there is a management process and there is good feedback, well then, they feel at least, yes, something is happening and there are going to be changes.

That goes back to what M was saying to about that’s very much becomes a systems thing because I think that even a good Principal in terms of culture, behaviour management, leadership is constrained by lack of finance. And where’s that one coming from? And also within the Education Act, there is very little that can be done other than the least to most intrusive situation where you are going from your proactive schools to your reactive out the door. There really isn’t much room for anything else and that’s a real systems thing. That falls in very much with a systems thing. This little boy who I went to visit this morning is a Year 1 kid with a file this big. He’s a Level 3 ascertainment on everything. A Level 3 BIP… so he gets nothing underneath the system’s ascertainment, but truly, he is a child that the class teacher needs a huge amount of support for, and the kid needs support for, and they are truly frustrated by this system with the particular child. It’s a classic example where the system has pigeon-holed him in a Level 3. There is nothing they can really do.

If we had global help for developmental delay we could probably get …

But then within the school they should formulate a culture where they could get a support teacher within that class. (Agreement) And so it’s got to be managed within the school and there should be a learning support centre or a resource centre.

Should, should, you see how many times.

They should be able to ask for help, and it doesn’t always happen and that goes back to often personalities I think too. Like in high schools it’s the DP’s that do a lot of the counselling and the timetabling and the interactive ….

The DP in this school is very good …

Yes. It’s the timetabling and so on, and who can we spare and what’s the priority needs and so on and there’s a lot of frustrated teachers who feel they can’t communicate the needs because they’ve had a clash once before, they don’t get on with someone, and so it’s once again a communication.

AQ So that’s exacerbating their stress as well?

It really is, yeah. I’ve tried it once and it didn’t happen, so I’m not going try again. And not many of them try another avenue or go somewhere because they feel powerless and so they get stressed and their workload or their workability diminishes and the rest of the kids suffer and so on because they might have a very difficult class with a few difficult kids in it, and it’s losing that power and losing that support. And there is so much of it going on out there, and they know, Admin’ know, that there is nothing they can do about it because there isn’t the staff and there is no other outlet for timetabling or shifting the kid into another class or whatever. It isn’t an easy thing.

So the actual thing is what we are looking at is the relationship of teacher stress levels with the management … right? So the teachers are feeling really stressed, their ability to deal with behaviour management is definitely reduced. And considerably minimised, so the more stressed they are, the more problems they are probably going to have, and the chances of problems escalating and becoming really serious problems are much greater.

AQ For the student or the teacher?

GROUP

Both. Because if the teacher is feeling reasonably in control, just perhaps a little bit stressed, but mostly in control, and I can cope with these demands and I enjoy being here … all of that, they are still going to have student management issues, but they are going to be in much better frame of mind to be able to cope with things and nip stuff in the bud. Whereas if the teacher is stressed, the chances of that happening are very minute.
Yep, and in high school it might not just be with that one class, it might affect all the other class he or she has got where they don’t have any difficulties.

AQ So it would be a spill over?

GROUP

Yeah, I’d say so. And even just ringing up parents, where they might have waited a little bit longer, but they will get on the phone, and then there could be major problems.

It’s also going to spill over into their collegiality, or lack thereof, in that they are going to … everything is going to kind of inflate. Exactly, so they are going to be unhappy with what’s happening … they have stress, so they are going to be having massive problems in the classroom. Their attitude is going to increasingly become negative, that’s going to spill over in the staff room, whether it’s primary or secondary level, and it’s all going to spiral.

They get support at first, but then it’s like the kids, once they keep going, “Well, we’ve done all we can, so let’s leave it alone”; and then you get the absenteeism and illness.

And there is this thing we were saying before that …

For the kids and the teachers …

… people, whether you are a permanent or a contract teacher, you don’t like to admit to having problems. And the way in the past a lot of teachers with behaviour management problems in the class, the way Admin’ and the culture dealt with them was to move them to another school and their reputation followed them. And instead of some support thing … for those teachers.

And the mindset that you are not coping like L said before, it should be out in the open … “Look I have got a difficult class, what can we do about that?” And if there is more communication and support that way, they might be able to resolve that. But if you are not competent and it sets in even more, when yeah, he or she gets stressed, and is showing incompetency, whereas before they may not have been.

That’s right.

But, you see, there’s another side to that is that you are coping, you are handling behaviour management problems beautifully.

That’s the other side.

And, there’s that that happens, or when a new bod comes in, first year teacher, or experienced, they get all the dreadful classes, and they are usually on contract, the kids play up because they always play up anyway and teachers go out on stress. There’s no relationship build-up so the kids suffer once again because there is no continuity of learning.

So, in answer to that question, there is a very strong negative relationship I suppose, I don’t know how you say it in statistics terms but between teacher stress and their management skills …

And yeah…and it’s also very difficult for us to approach those types of teachers because you know that the kid is right when he comes complaining that, “I hate this teacher and she picks on me”, and all that … and she is picking on him because she’s got to that stage, so then sometimes I have to go up to a teacher and explain the student’s side … you know … “Could you try this?”, or, “What’s happening in there?”, and they can’t always do it rationally - “Oh, but he’s not going to win over me, I’m going to get him to do this”, and you can see the stage that they are at … it’s a power play.

Particularly if they are not going to win over me.

I don’t know if teacher’s say that. That they think that the kids got … and yeah, the kid is feeling just as helpless at the other end, and there is nothing resolved. It’s very difficult to get that back in order.
So, teacher stress is something that everybody suffers, and how can we be proactive and stop it before it starts?

And it has a really detrimental effect on the behaviour management.

It’s interesting … this teacher that I ran into the other day she has gone on 2 weeks stress leave. Her house was burgled on the weekend and when she rang the DP to say that she really needed to take some time off, and the primary source of her stress was the classroom, and he said, “Rubbish, you’ve just been burgled, that’s the primary cause of your stress”.

(Laughter)

“You don’t have a difficult class.”

That’s poor isn’t it, at least acknowledge the fact that she is having difficulty and maybe that other person wouldn’t be…

To be strong enough to say, “No, I would have handled the house being burgled if I wasn’t stressed”…

And I know teachers out there that are doing permanent part-time now because they need less hours of contact time. Not that they don’t need the money, they would love to have the extra time and the money and everything, but they have decided, “No, less contact time is the way I’ll cope”. And there is lots of people out there with families and they have had to make that choice. It is not because of their families, it’s the same as you were just saying … it’s because they know for their own sanity and less contact time in classes. So they are thinking of themselves, which is the right way to go.

Because we do need healthy teachers out there.

(Murmurs about networking)

There is not enough networking. Once again it’s systems thing, because when I first started in behaviour management, we used to meet all of South East Queensland used to meet, the behaviour management people, and share their issues. That stopped because we were doing that in work time.

To me, that gets back to departmental culture … in that, like this, schools are like that on staff.

(Murmurs and laughing)

AQ  In your opinion, what is the relationship between the style of leadership in your school and management of kids with behaviour problems?

GROUP

It’s sometimes interesting to be asked into a school to do a program on bullying.

(Laughter)

AQ  It would be really good if you could put your inferences out there for the tape.

GROUP

(Laughter and more murmuring)

END OF SIDE ONE

GROUP

Back to the departmental issue.
We were all in-serviced on it.

Was behaviour management. Behaviour management was the umbrella under which we all functioned. Suddenly, behaviour management was not the buzz word, it was… but none of us were ever consulted or asked about that. We were told what was going to be the new focus and the new agenda. Now that’s a financially driven … yep … it’s a politically driven thing.

Silent leadership in school … management of students with behaviour problems. It gets back to what you were saying about ….

Yeah, and how they all mellow then …’cause then once lawyers come in or parents are being very powerful, then they do have to speak to their prospectus, is what it’s about. The school writes a prospectus that says, “This is the way we will handle behaviour management issues”, and most of them now, as much as they don’t want to … have it all in stages and levels and so on, and it’s become like a policy document. And so often they have to go back to that and say, “This is where you’re at”, and the kids hate the levels and sometimes it’s very difficult for them to see an end, and if they’ve got to work down the levels, it isn’t fair and kids don’t cope that way. But it’s a way of being accountable and showing they are following the things and this is what the kid did, so this is where it is. So it depends on who the leader is who is handling the issue. In my case mostly deputies, and sometimes the Principal goes in and then this one particular one actually surprises people sometimes ‘cause once he gets the kid in there he is quite good to the kid, but outwardly he seemed to be very much a thumbs down, power-over type of person, but I have seen them very gentle with kids. And the deputies, most of the deputies I see, it depends on the mood they are in sometimes, and the deputies at high schools do have a whole train full of kids out the front that they have to see for issues from truanting to drugs, parent issues to anything to just plain bashing around in the playground. They do try to fit it in, but I have seen some really good work done by them if they have the time, and then the process of you have to make up time, go to detentions, go to the Guidance Officer, do this, do that, and to do a good job of that well, it is very difficult. And so sometimes I can see a leadership role of, “No, this is the way it will be and that’s it”, and the kid doesn’t understand, or the kid is in the wrong place at the wrong time and so they do get damaged and hurt and that can happen and there are plenty of kids and adults walking around out there that hate school for that reason.

That’s right.

They are anti the teachers and the system, and the way it’s handled by leaders is very important – critical - but sometimes you can understand.

AQ Sometimes they might be stressed too.

GROUP

That’s the thing. And I was just thinking too when we were talking about transformational leaders, I think they need constant and regular updating of their skills, because if they are to take on board some of these things we have talked about, or that we know work, they have to be convinced of that themselves and they have to be given time to practice it etc. And as S was saying … it sometimes depends on whether they’ve got the time. Sometimes things are handled really poorly in school. An issue will occur on a Tuesday for example and just because of other things happening and other people being out of school, or whatever, the deputy may not get the time to deal with that kid and that situation until the Friday. Or even the following Monday, and that’s really poor practice in itself, apart from, as S was saying … there are those type of things, but also regular and constant up-skilling about this type of thing is critical. And I think that some of them think that because they are now a deputy or a Principal, they don’t need to be up-skilled about behaviour management issues anymore, because they are up there and they know it all, but excuse me, most of them, a lot of them, have a big gap there. And so, even what I’ve said about this particular school, I was thinking about a transformational leader, I think even though there are bigger issues that that school is very good at, I still think that they could do with more information and innovation about behaviour management at a school level. Because it’s been a bit minimised in it’s importance in that everybody is a behaviour manager. And because it’s all so complex there now, I mean every school.
And we go back to classroom management, but then, what I’m finding is there should be a middle management, like the HOD’s or the year level’s and if they get more power, and so that’s why sometimes I think the Admin’ needs to delegate more. And if the power comes from the middle level, then it will most probably spread a little bit more. That’s going to be restricted because when do you … that’s where they have the levels and you take it up to that level, whereas a lot of times it goes straight up to the top and it shouldn’t, it should be going through that middle management and departments and then may not even escalate that high.

A lot of deputies don’t like that. I hear a lot of deputies that have said (we keep referring to deputies because that’s a secondary level) but a lot of deputies say they get really annoyed when kids get sent to them for swinging on a chair or for something stupid and little. That’s really the role of the teacher to deal with, or as S said if it’s worse, it should go to a HOD, or a year level co-ordinator or whatever they have in the primary school year level. If the school … what’s going to get back to stress and time … if the deputies have the skills, the time, … they can go to that teacher and say, you sent me that kid yesterday for whatever … that really isn’t my problem, that’s your teaching strategies … so that once again is if they are really good leaders, really expert … the behaviour management is going to be to me, a lot more effective at the classroom level, and that’s going to minimise a higher level problem.

And that means meetings and the system set up, and I’ve been at schools where they have tried to do it, but if not everybody takes it on board, then it doesn’t happen. If it’s just one or two people against it and they don’t follow on, the kids know and then it falls to bits. And this new school’s ‘Working it out’ program, and it all looks good, they’ve got the time out room and they’ve got the buddy teacher and everything. The teachers get fed up of doing it and following it through and so it’s not happening now. So the kids see that it’s not happening so there goes your behaviour management plan.

So that goes back to what do the leadership do about it ? Are the leadership confident, skilled enough to bring them along and say it’s in our best interests….

Reviewing, and more reviewing, and even staff meetings are happening once a fortnight in some of the high schools and so that’s a chance to talk, and we invite people to talk. So we’ve got to get more skilled in being able to stand up there and giving your opinion and let the leaders take that on board, and I have heard it said, “Thank you for bringing that up”, but we’ve got to be open and that the Admin’ does not say, “Oh yeah, but ….”, so it is the skills and the communication of the leaders as to whether things are going to work or not and it’s so important that those leaders take it on board to value their teachers.

And then we get back to how stressed are the teachers, how stressed are the Admin’ ? It’s all part of … “Do we give them a staff meeting in school time because people feel so put upon ?”. It comes back to again a systemic thing and to a situation where because the schools are so stressed, they are short staffed, everyone is rushing, no wonder people get resentful of being kept back for regular school meetings. Sometimes they have the most conscientious, but they have kids and have to be home for others coming home from school or whatever. They might be studying at Uni so they have to go to Uni two nights a week and so the stress thing then comes into it. It’s not so bad for people at our stage and careers to have to stay back. We can commit to that outside hours. But people who are doing study at Uni, got young kids or babies, or elderly parents.

It’s not just the young ones. A friend of mine is a teacher and he has two elderly parents to deal with, but he has to be …

It’s all part of each other. I just think teaching stems back to systemic stuff, more funding, more teachers, better conditions.

Looking at conditions, even simple things like toilet paper.

A desk.

It’s pathetic what we do and have to sit at and put up with. (Murmur of agreement)

END OF TAPE
AQ We’re talking about culture. Thinking about the questions for this group, the idea of culture will be defined as the shared values and beliefs that interact with the schools - that you work with - with their organisational structures and their control systems to produce behavioural norms. Is that clear? The sorts of things that the schools believe and the norms that they have, that they hold, that contribute to how they function in the school environment. Any of the schools that you work with. In your opinion, what is the relationship between culture in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems? (Discussion of what question means.) We are looking at the relationship between culture in the schools that you work with and the management of students with behavioural problems.

GROUP

(Talking over the top of each other at first).

AQ What about the re-intergrations in the schools ... to pick up some of the feelings and norms of the teachers.

GROUP

I think some of the schools that children come from have an opinion of ... disobedience and often they present our school as this punishment place where you get locked in a room if you don’t do what you are told. Often they will tower over students ... and I think our culture is about how the students... we tell student teachers that they have been chosen to come here so they can learn skills to manage classrooms so ... teach them a learning framework ...?

I think a lot of the schools that these student teachers come from have had these children in detention rooms and look upon largely proving to keep the kids out to give the playground a break, and when the child has actually come in here to us a lot of teachers tend to think, well, they’ve got 6 months break, whereas they’re not coming from seeing it from a child’s point of view and how we’re actually helping this child. I sometimes think that it’s a feeling that nothing is really going to happen with this child except we keep this child here for 6 months and then release him back in, whereas we are actually working with this child to help them learn the strategies.

AQ Sort of the belief that they are in a respite centre within the school system?

GROUP

And it picks centre’s ... not like some schools ... some schools will come with, “We’ll send the student, the student will learn something, our teachers will come and learn something and then we’ll try right back there”. It’s a whole system thing, where other schools will say, “Well, we’ll send them to you, you fix them up and then he’ll come back and fit into our system, we won’t do any changing”.

What guarantee will you give us when this child comes back to us, they’ll be fine. That’s asking if in 6 months time it’s going to rain on a Wednesday. You can’t predict ....

AQ The expectation is of sending that girl away as a villain and they come back as all sunshine and light.
GROUP

Yes.

But when you think we have a student now that’s started being, having problems since Grade 2 and he’s now Grade 7, what’s happened in the interim between Grade 2 and Grade 7? So what’s happened for the past 5 or 6 years? He’s dragged from one school to the next school and then passed the… that’s what I find difficult. I believe that a lot of the kids… when they… Special Ed. What do they propose to…

AQ In what way aren’t they catered for in schools? Can you be specific in your case?

GROUP

I was assured that when Special Ed. was cut, that those schools would have the availability of teacher aides and special teachers and things like that to make up for the gap where you have these students in special schools because you can’t expect if they are naughty or having behaviour problems, the teacher is spending more time with them so then they get I think pushed more into the back because the teacher can’t expect ….

I think the pure time frame. I just don’t think right down to each child has had inappropriate behaviour and comes back, for example, on suspension and a safety contract is put in place. I mean, the amount of time that’s spent here on their re-entry, drawing up that contract and that child is really really drawn into the formation of that contract whereas I think the logistics in a regular school, you just haven’t got the time. And the child gets quite a shock. I think that when they come here the amount of time that is taken whereas before it’s come in, read this, sign on the dotted line and off you go. And the fact that we can follow through right to the end whereas in regular school there comes a point in time when they say, “We haven’t got the time for this, send him home”.

AQ So they are very flexible about that, what you are suggesting is a possibility?

GROUP

I think that they’re geared also purely for practicality of their numbers whereas here this is, we can really concentrate on that, whereas that’s just one area they have to concentrate on.

AQ That’s to do with the structural issues between Tennyson and the schools that the kids are going back to?

GROUP

I think they’re getting more and more of sharing the schools because of the sort of students we’ve got this year are…. the schools refer them to us as a time bomb, medical stuff, legal, psych’ assessment… we’re trying to get parents to do this, we try and engage the… system and… as successful as they would like it to be. And by placing the child in our environment, we’ve got 10 students and 5 teachers ratio, we can do a lot of that investigation and liaison… and help get interventions that are better. And so then they can be transferred out to the school. Some of those schools that think like that see themselves as we are a continuation of their team and they stay involved while the child is here and then take it out again.

AQ So there are some of the schools …. They are great. What about some of the other schools?

GROUP

Some schools…some of the kids that come here …. They’ve run out of what they can do for them. One school in particular said they warned the kids and they changed and when the child was re-integrated the first thing he was told was that there were no more schools?
One of the schools, one of the students that I had was re-integrated too, they had a money system which really to me is even more materialistic. And they had banking days, and the children were given some paper money and stuff and they earned their money by doing certain things, so to me it was bribery personified and then they would have banking days, so there was this real battle on to see who would have the most money. And then at the end of it they went shopping with this amount of money that they had. They even had little bank books and they had a kid that had a hat on, a bank hat and they went banking and they had … it was scary to think that these children were being externally controlled to that degree, and to me the school was controlling with monetary things. Of all things, in this day and age, I don’t think kids need that.

Some of the schools have levels of behaviour. I haven’t got them all worked out, but one school I integrated to there were 3 levels of behaviour. Each one has a different colour and if you’re not on the right colour your not allowed on the excursions.

AQ That’s a very punitive approach.

GROUP

Some of those places have the kids aspiring to a standard of behaviour. They don’t know - like the reading agreement goal, you know, so that the model of good citizenship, so I think that could be…I think we’re leaning towards more…we have to start using terms for the children like do you want to be responsible, or trustworthy and so we are getting that reputation as part of our management with children, so that if you set a goal for yourself to … persist with the goal so that you give structure for living really.

I think it’s about getting the children to really think about what do they want, what do they have to do to get that, all around there are choices and they’re doing it for themselves, whereas I look at banking money and that, they were not doing it for themselves.

And there was such competition and it wasn’t an individual thing. It was a pure competition between everybody else. To me that’s not…

AQ The cultural issue here is about the competition and winning?

GROUP

Not self development.

Well … then they know upon what themselves were doing. It was just there in the whole scope of things within the classroom, and I don’t think the child ever thought for one minute that the reason they had this money was because they had done really well in their work and their choices, and it was more the greatness was in the money in their hand not in the feeling that they had - which I think is a real shame, they’re not getting that feeling.

I think it’s important for a lot of our kids to get some sense of self because a lot of the kids that we have here are kids who are failing in the system ‘cause there is not the support. The system doesn’t address their needs - the children who have experienced failure…so they don’t want to risk doing things that they might fail at.

When even the student being able to cope with a difficult …. Having a conversation with adults that they’ve been …. So … some students come in and find it really difficult to think that an adult wants to spend time with them - that I find is really heart-wrenching, and some students come here and have got no idea of even having to … I don’t think they’ve ever been spoken to for a long time politely or nicely, or whatever you’d like to call it, by an adult, like say an adult in authority, meaning one of the staff in the school, and asking how do you feel? They find it really difficult.

So it’s a matter of respecting.

I think failure of people respecting, staff respecting students.
Not having an understanding of children, so maybe I think a lot of them actually act out and choose anger to mask it off their feelings.

AQ  Is that the teachers or the students?

GROUP

The students - the students do that and the teachers haven’t the understanding that this the anger is the emotion - acting out is the emotion for something they… and they haven’t found out.

AQ  Should we move on to the next one? In your opinion what is the relationship between the level of teacher stress in schools and the management of students with behaviour problems?

GROUP

…I think teachers have tried lots and lots of things and these students in particular don’t respond for a long time, or respond for a little while, and then stop responding. So, I think the system has the expectation of teachers that they should be able to manage these students.

Some people…students as well. It’s all… common because of the way they…

(Talking over the top of each other)

AQ  This is about the relationship between the level of teacher stress in schools and the management of students with behaviour problems.

GROUP

I think that the hardest thing that I … of knowing that they’ve only got the kids from 9.00 o’clock until 3.00 o’clock when they can say, “What a shit-ful life you’ve got outside the school”, and that is one of the hardest things that I have actually had to deal with (repeats herself) … and that’s still one of the things that I grapple with and sometimes … yeah …. And also, coming terms with how you know our own kids sit at home and have everything and some of these kids have nothing, but I can’t afford to…these kids in on that because if you did you’d be a lost cause.

That can be teacher stress. Other teachers blame the teacher because of the way that kid behaves and it’s always, “Your class, or that student”, as though it’s your personal responsibility.

It’s important for the stress levels of the teacher to network to try and keep that reduced …so that he or she is not alone, and to be able to bounce ideas off others. I think that it’s really important, some people like teachers tend to … bottle up the problem they may have with this child and it grows and grows and they … because what the psychologists say, it becomes a personal thing, whereas if there was a really sound network there for that teacher and they realised that, you know, this is quite … it’s not uncommon, they discuss and talk about it.

AQ  So if they don’t have a sense of support from amongst their colleagues then they’re likely to over personalize the issues with the kids?

GROUP

And I think that’s important too, that the teachers are able to use… to get through to these children …. Not always going to work and so the teacher, well all the staff, need to have the freedom to be able to experiment, to make mistakes without coming into blame.

AQ  Will we move onto the next one?

GROUP
And also the children’s health … it demands so much energy from staff that these people start to burn out because you have to be so calm, so consistent in regards to how you come to work, or what’s happened to you. You’ve been kicked 16 times, you’ve still got to be there and calm and well, and then the 20th kick or the 20th spit or swear, then that takes a lot of energy out of teachers.

You need to be able to say that, “At this particular time I’ve had enough and I just need a break - you know - I need to just lose myself for 5 or 10 minutes”… whatever, if you’ve been through a really horrendous debrief or a time away or whatever, that’s just because I can’t cope. “I need a walk up the road or sit down, I don’t care what it is, but I feel that we need to be able to say, I need time out”.

5 minutes some days can be the equivalent it seems like an hour, just to have that …

That complete … and any, and realise that everybody deals, and I think with circumstance and trauma in different ways, but … we know people… we can be there for them…

Just to come through ….someone and I have been talking through a bit over the last couple of days, is that when so much happens with these kids and there is so much chaos around them, then a lot of people involved can cause miscommunication, and we need to have the time to be able to clarify that and talk that through, and we don’t have the time to do that …. And we are really stressed and misunderstood and you end up blaming and people start to get defensive and cranky.

**AQ** What about leadership in the schools in relation to kids ....

**GROUP**

I think it’s important to feel that the leadership as in being …

**AQ** Administration, Principals and deputy’s.

**GROUP**

I think it’s important that the leader keeps strong and the support structure there …. I mean I can think of schools where I’ve been where the Principal has been a great person, but once in that leadership role, a very much a fence sitter, not wanting to be the one to make the decisions, where they come into a staff meeting and deliver the problem and then sit back for the solution, or run around instead of have a meeting - and things do get very distorted, and not wanting to …. Because of being so worried about hurting anyone’s feelings, trying to be everyone’s great friend, and I think sometimes a leader needs to lead, and I’ve found that very much in a couple of schools I’ve been at. And that does have a big effect, but I mean …

**AQ** Talk about the effect.

**GROUP**

Schools can change overnight by the leader OK, and I think you have to have someone who is strong to point that direction and it sometimes becomes clouded. If everybody sits back about that person - who should call it - and clearing things sometimes…and I think that’s really important, particularly with difficult children. You need someone. (talking over the top of each other). I think it gets passed right down. I think, definitely, the students really feel it. I think a leader is somebody, that no matter how big the school, tries to personalize to a certain degree with the students. I’ve seen Principals never ever learn probably more than 6 kids’ names in the whole school, and to me that says something. I think the leader needs to go down to the people too and those people are the students. It’s not just the staff, it’s the students, and that leader needs to be seen, needs to be involved and at the same time when the inappropriate behaviours arise, needs to be there to be the support, apart from the teachers. I think that the leader needs to support the staff because without that support, the students will see straight through that. The staff will see straight through that.

I think it’s hard to be a leader in an environment where behaviour is …. In as much as you want to be … everybody being part of decision-making. Sometimes it’s really hard to … that lack of … and be
that other person whose got to come down and make that decision, and I think maybe … sometimes it’s the staff … we probably notice the feelings of the Principal, feelings …. trying to keep everybody happy. Yeah I think that should be part of all of us and we…to choose when and where that will happen. And I think being a leader in the school of all females will be a hell of a job ….

(Laughter)

AQ I guess you need more male role models in the school too.

GROUP

Yeah, you do but just having all females is a bit, it gets a bit heavy sometimes …

It ruins relationships and that’s something that’s really important to us all.

You’ve also got to advocate for public principles and sometimes it takes ……. Sometimes… which will go against..relationships.

I think being decisive is the seed.

AQ Being decisive is important but there’s still great difficulties in balancing decisiveness with equity for the teaching staff and the department and students.

GROUP

I think in times when things just tend to go round and round and round and round, you need then, someone to come in and say, “Right, this is what’s going to happen”, because I think sometimes a decision can’t be reached by a group of people, I think you need a person come in and say, “No, this is what’s happening, we’re not getting anywhere, this is how it’ll go”.

You get a lot of people that are very strong minded that … the area ….

You need a strong opinion and being able to share those opinions and what we were talking about this afternoon and what’s … to me, to be able to share those, have an opinion, but people are taking a decision. That’s what’s being to me … and … do lots of talking and lots of you know …. just come up with all good stuff and good ideas, what do you think, but suddenly when a decision is being made, and then that’s leadership.

As a leader in that environment …very strong-minded - almost a zeal about something, fighting and advocating, so stick strongly to ideas and so it does make it difficult sometimes to get to a decision ….. as a leader it ….. how do you do that?

And lead and also … feelings of confidence in their work, how do you do that...allowed to make decisions and have the competence and the confidence and still feel a part of that and not make decisions that put that down. So there is a fine balance.

How can you say that working in schools ? I guess it happens in schools because you’ve got to have bigger teams and you can make small teams within that. ….

AQ How does this … those sorts of practice models work in terms of kids’ issues, particularly kids with problems ?

GROUP

In schools where I’ve worked… where you’ve got special needs committee’s, interest, when anyone interested can join that, they take on a leadership for that particular area and the Administration actually see them as a leader within the team.

AQ So where the leadership is divided … your suggestion is that it works OK ?
GROUP

As long as the communication is really clear all the way down the line, up to the Principal, and also to the other members of staff and the parents.

AQ So the model itself is OK but there is other factors that impinge on it’s workability? Do other people agree with that? The idea of dividing control down the line is a good model to work with schools?

GROUP

Seems to be working…

There is no expert in everything, it’s all looking at everyone is … in their particular area and being willing to take that leadership from whoever has it.

AQ But do they have committee’s and lines of authority in relation to kids with behaviour problems, or is that just shoved onto you guys? Talking about these committees and for special needs, do they also have those sorts of committees to manage kids with problems, or do they just shuffle the kids ....

GROUP

Well, regular schools I’ve been in, there’s like reading teachers working in conjunction with the classroom teacher, and the Principal and the deputy they would all work together. Normally you find the Guidance Officer and the remedial teacher, the support teacher there will work together quite confidently, and then go back to the classroom teacher…and they will spin that off to the Principal and then…decision about that student which is then taken to a staff meeting which is then discussed.

Another thing that I did a lot with ……

END OF SIDE ONE

The AVT’s would actually attend the special needs meetings, so that after a couple of years of working in those school, all the teams that would be involved in the special needs committee have the skills of good case management and would problem-solve things that could be done at the school…and also involved in a lot of the in-service of the teachers

AQ So it’s about trying to …. is there anything you would like to add at this point or do you want to get off home?

GROUP

I think as long as people are always in agreement, ‘cause I think that once you stop talking then…individual differences…

I think that being able to make… to be able to always keep asking yourself and others, “What else, what else, what else”; it more or less finds ….there’s got to be something else.

And not…if you say to somebody, “What happened there or what did you do that for?” You don’t understand it …. that’s part of…being able to brainstorm a bit and being able to talk about it without people feeling …..

I miss that reflective team. I think the teams that get through all the hard times are the teams that can be reflective with each other and everyone.

But I think that when you’re under stress, then the reflecting of each other becomes more of a … people take it as a negative type of thing and the barriers go up and people get very defensive, whereas
when we’re not as stressed, not as thingy, that’s taken more of a positive discussion point as opposed to a negative …… I forgot what I was going to say.

AQ  Now do you want to stop it there?

END OF TAPE
AQ When talking about culture, culture is defined as the shared values and beliefs that interact with your school’s organizational structures and control systems to produce behavioural norms. i.e. that’s the way we do things around here. So based on this definition, what is your response to the following question. In your opinion, what is the relationship between culture in your school and the management of students with behavioural problems?

GROUP

Well I guess I can talk about 2 schools that I work with … it’s taken a good 7 years but, the school has made a real .. the boss has really led the way in his beliefs, like an open door sort of policy for taking in kids with behaviour problems from other schools, having exclusions come in, giving kids a chance. And I mean, it’s not just the boss at this school, it feeds all the way through the hierarchy, but basically leaving it. And in turn, over 7 years … as I said this morning, there’s been this change in perception by staff towards people like me, they don’t see me as a threat, or as anything but another teacher that’s going to help. They’re more willing to say, “I’ve got problems with students in my class”, without the threat of, “I’m a pathetic teacher, I can’t control people”. So, I think a lot of times it depends on who’s steering the ship as to the in-service people get. Then…the general messages … like the boss sends a general message that the whole sort of equity, social justice thing, is really big in our school and the fact that students have a right to education. The other school I’ve worked with is totally different, with a fractured Admin’ team (without saying too much and incriminate myself) - but the Principal not accepting that whole interest in ‘behaviour students’. The Principal does quite different things, like approaching my naughty boys in the school ground and outrageously accusing them - like telling one boy, “You’re a heroin addict and I know you smoke dope”, and all this without a shred of evidence. And the staff know that and so there’s not as much of a real interest in the students as people. There’s not a real … the behaviour management workshop we just had … the teachers that need to come from that school didn’t! Even though it’s a school with high need, it seems even that means the Principal’s not that much into behaviour management to send the people that the … Principal is feeding that down the line, and of course there’s other teachers that are interested in helping these students, but I think if ‘something stinks go the head of the fish’ often … that’s only from my experience at the moment.

(Laughter)

I’m just wondering … I think the basic philosophy of the Principal can have a big effect. His or her modeling of attitudes, of behaviour towards parents, behaviour towards these students can impact upon the staff’s beliefs.

AQ I love the comment about if ‘something stinks, go to the head of the fish’ – do you mind if I use it – without identifying you of course?

(Laughter)

I can see different, … across the schools that I work there are a whole lot of different cultures. I’d see some schools that are in a cultural denial … very strongly. Some are into the denial model, some are into panic mode, and that’s the cultural panic where if someone does something wrong it’s, “Oh I’ve got to do this and got to do that”, and it’s over-reactive stuff, and then there’s others in between. I haven’t had time to think about it. The denial model is huge, and I think that there’s an element of
denial existing in a lot of the school’s and it’s a huge concern for me … denial, cultural denial is behaviour that at school there’s nothing wrong with the school. We’re likely to see behaviour problems, therefore we don’t rate as a school. I’m curious about what the implication is that the students from that school and how much students or teachers…

Other schools where there is … you can see the tension and stress between staff and whatever … which is a bit harmful … It varies again very much on who the individuals are, who the individual teachers are within the structure, whether they follow the lead that comes from above, or whether they can work out their true position within themselves and set up their own network, and how they respond. The other one that disconcerts me is the panic one, because what you have is that the reality of what the child’s needs are sometimes…what the issues, what esteem, whether it’s emotional or behavioural, it isn’t often… it’s kind of like this, “Get in, got to do something”, rather than where the big picture is concerned. The other issue I would see in terms of cultures are teachers concerned about behaviour with compliancy, who is around the school culture - in itself push for compliancy rather than recognition of individuals. Another one is I would be concerned about is power-brokers and how they determine what happens. And another one is … a concern for me in the sense of that behaviour management stuff is directed at ‘in your face’ behaviours so therefore, anything that is not ‘in your face’ - so particularly me dealing with emotional abuse, sexual abuse, particularly the girls where their withdrawal is not recognised in behaviour management - so I think we don’t deal with those areas.

OK, I’m in agreement with the first speaker, that the school leader sets the tone. I think, by and large, that’s the case. But in some schools, and I think perhaps the smaller ones, although I’ve seen it in the larger schools, there can be one perhaps two teachers, who are really on a different wave length, who really don’t respect the rights of children, who have their own baggage and issues and they take it out on kids. And I’ve seen it happen where the Principal, and even the other colleagues to that person, find it difficult to get a word in or to even approach and say anything about it and this stuff continues to go on. So there’s two cultures. The culture of most say ‘fair go’ to the kids, but there’s a culture of one that is very, very destructive, and there can often be barriers to having impact on that person.

…. to me there are often 2 cultures within the schools, the culture of the staff and the culture of students. So, in some schools, staff are really more concerned in looking after their own wellbeing than they are looking after the wellbeing of the student.

I think too, it could be spread between the school and the classrooms and depending on you know…on how committed many of your teachers are to increasing…you know, they have a lot more success with these kids.

AQ So in terms of workplace culture, you’re saying is happening in the schools is separate cultures in, say, one classroom, as opposed to the whole school.

GROUP

I guess it’s like a dysfunctional family…. coming down from Admin’, from the Principal. It also takes a long time, and it’s like a new Principal comes into a school…but his position, the power, that school means eventually he will have to … that’s what I’m saying … the culture. Plus the influence ….

A lot of times those people that dig in and say… particularly aggressive and don’t believe in including ‘behaviour students’ in their classroom. What happens basically is they end up getting the transfers. They’re the teachers that transfer-hop that generally get where they want to go. As you said, it’s their beliefs and their impact has been a little pocket of that culture that’s….everything at one of my schools and it’s infectious and it can actually infect the whole department and that’s the sort of thing … they have to be quite stern because of Work, Health and Safety stuff … it’s one bad seed can actually generate this whole negativity and it’s starting to sort of be … we’ve had to plant another male in that environment to try and defuse some of the negative … you know … it’s brutal … it’s brutal reactions and aggressive, and verging on swearing at the kids and you know, and descriptions to me that are highly aggressive like … “I don’t need that little fucking thing”. That’s the anger. My job of course - I have to try and work with someone like that and be very careful … it’s like a keg of TNT. And so it can be even in the best system harmonious … it’s changing people’s beliefs.
And the culture changes...there’s no uniform culture like the way...if we have uniform policy, it comes from above...and we’re supposed to be a uniform policy, whereas a child could do something and get a suspension and exclusion whereas another school it could be totally different.

The two schools I work at are actually...oh, great...one’s smaller, one’s 1500 and one’s 500. Totally different. And the teachers, “Oh that other school...we’ve heard this and that bad reputation”. I’ve never been in a school in Logan district where I’ve heard this bad bad language and disrespectful like, having to open a door for me and just looking at me and going “Uhhgh!”; you know like, ... is that the small school?

Different schools, different cultures. Different needs, different kids, different backgrounds.

In the two schools that I work at, one has a student services building and all the support staff, the learning/special needs, the school nurse, the behaviour management, two Guidance Officers, one’s a part time, and the school chaplain, are all operating basically out of the one physical building at that school. It’s very easy to develop networks, to have meetings together, to find out whose doing what with this particular student...so you’re likely to have overlapping staff. So you’re basically managing students in a case managed sort of way. We have regular meetings to talk about new kids that have arisen within the last couple of weeks, as to big problems or whatever, whereas at the other school it’s a different situation. They have different people working support in different parts of the school, and it shouldn’t necessarily be that they can’t work together while I think the physical proximity certainly helps that...In new schools in the future it might be an idea to think about it, a structural set up where everyone is working together as part of a support team and complementing each others’ particular skills and services that they provide. And at the other school that doesn’t have that, well, you don’t know what they’re doing. You don’t know what the other person is doing unless you ask, and I’m only a new person in the school so when I...I’ve got to be careful of not interfering into another person’s work to the extent that this is their own little empire and they look up their students in that particular field. I’ve developed a good relationship with the people in the Special Education department with the needs support people, so we’ll be working together there and of course a lot of the students there are ASD students so that means involving specialist ASD, AVT’s and things like that. So it is about working together collaboratively as much as possible and then another little concern I’ve got about school cultures is that sometimes you could be working with a student and of course they’ve done things wrong, you keep working with that student, but then unbeknownst to you the Administration will make a declaration that this kid’s reached the end of the line. We’re never sure when that’s going to happen, so as far as we’re concerned we’re always there to try and bring about some improvement in that student’s behaviour, but the Admin’ has this other agenda...and that’s not always something that we know about, but...we just turn around and say...that’s it. Goodbye. That upsets a lot of us sometimes because they’ve made decisions too late to be reversed. We might have made some great in-roads in terms of changes in that student’s behaviour, or the student’s actually made those changes, but once the Admin’ has made the decision, that’s it.

And your support becomes only an issue... (talking over the top of each other in agreement).

It must be really hard for you people in secondary where you...I was just thinking we’re talking culture in general terms, whereas cultures in schools, but there is also in the classroom. And in secondary, because your kids are really what you call multiple people there isn’t...like culture in the classroom as such is there, ‘cause you just... Really hard.... ‘cause at least, I suppose, in primary there’s a chance of an individual teacher... granted what we’ve got to build something of a culture around...

(Talking over the top of each other).

But it’s managed quite differently by individual teachers.
GROUP

A high correlation.

AQ  Quite positive?

GROUP

A very high correlation … and which comes first, the chicken or the egg’? Is it a case of many years of being worn down by difficult situations, or perhaps not quite as high a correlation. The number of teachers going through a lot of their own personal stages in their life, but then a couple of difficult kids are sort of the last straw for the camels back. If at that stage too … I heard somebody say recently that they thought that teachers were en masse chronically depressed. I wouldn’t quite go that far, but it certainly opened my eyes and I thought … there is at least an element of truth in that. Teachers are faced with whatever it is they are faced with in their own life, and then they come to school and then are barraged not only by the kids they feel are confronting them but perhaps the school system and certainly society as well. Now of course that may not be true … it may be coming the other way or it may be both factors impacting on each other. Ultimately teachers when they are depressed are over-reacting to a child’s interaction with them. Or in the many cases extremely under-reacting.

I have issues with that … it says that I think every occupation, everybody in any occupation brings their own personal baggage to their job so teachers are no different to anyone else, but they’re in a situation where they’re essentially fighting, where perhaps 30 other people in the room are also bringing their baggage from a situation, and they’re required to manage that baggage because they are the one and only grownup. That’s quite different from people who go to work where everybody brings their baggage still but they’re all grownups and are expected to manage their own baggage. I think that is stressful but, I also think that it depends very much … the stress is not necessarily dependent on what they brought from their home life to the school, also the support they perceive themselves as getting …. So people cope well with behavioural problems even in large numbers if they perceive themselves to be supported and label themselves as that, as opposed to the problems. Does that make sense?

And the people who I give support equally have issues because, on the one hand they want to be supportive, and on the other hand, they don’t want to be dumped on themselves, and they also have to consider the fact that they should be allowing people … even expecting to create situations where people should be managing their own circumstances. So there’s conflict and lack of communication. One party wants support and their idea of what that should be…and yet I don’t believe that both parties don’t want the same thing.

AQ  What about other people’s observations of teacher stress?

GROUP

Possibly part of the teachers’ stress could be that they need … they realise they need help, and they want help, but they don’t want to ask for it because they don’t want to be seen as incompetent.

…..some teacher said to me, “I’m not going to … I don’t see any past students there … because they record who ….what class the teacher comes from and I’m going to be made to look like I’m incompetent”.

So the fact that coming from the culture of catching people doing the wrong thing …

Feeling unsupported by Admin’ and feeling like an….and I think it happens lots of times in a lot of schools that the Admin’ basically do, maybe, in their efforts to support the students, do blame the teachers … the teachers feel blamed often by Admin’. It’s your fault and your not managing your classes, and I think there’s a lot of people that feel unsupported in our so called supportive school environment, but in policy. In reality there are people who aren’t feeling supported anywhere in the school system … it’s a really hard … very hard for people taking time off …. A boy said to me the other day … the lady who’d been away on leave came back and within the first week one of my naughty boys said that she nearly kicked a hole in the wall … like actually split the wall. Now that’s after having leave so …. there’s some people not handling it at all.
What strikes me … we always talk about the management of students with behavioural problems, and there’s no real service designed to manage the teachers ….

(Talking over the top of each other).

AQ  The argument is that the research focuses on managing students so that the teachers can feel better, but I’m actually saying that perhaps that’s the wrong direction and we have to look at the other direction.

GROUP

Well you’re talking about RTC … that’s time out for teachers.

I don’t know who would police that … so you need to write …. What are you doing ?

(Laughter).

What are the services available for teachers who are stressed and doing crazy things to kids ? If you’re lucky maybe a supportive Principal or a deputy who just happens to be that way inclined … who hasn’t been trained or told that’s your job to be the personnel manager for your stressed staff. Some of them just do it and those teachers who have someone like that in that position are lucky. But if you haven’t, and you have somebody who is disapproving of your bad management because you’ve got a heap of naughty kids that you try to send to the office, then it would really get bad …. They are really alone, really isolated and then more likely to get stuck into the kids because they are at the end of their tether.

I was talking to a teacher at one stage and it was to deal with the teacher’s management skills in the classroom, the person asked for help, and as we talked we were sort of plotting all the issues in this person’s life and then all these things impinging on her feeling of stress and she said, “Is any of this going back to the Admin’?” She wanted to check it out with me that they wouldn’t find out because then …. So there was that fear from above …. So that only adds to the stress.

And the only way that would be … well the Principal would stop up and said “Right, there’s… performance in this school … we’re going to make you or we’re going to support you to cope well, but we’re still transfer you”.

I think it … at one school, I mean I was horrified with the staff … the school … intimidation, bullying, back chatting, you know, like not even supporting your fellow worker … so if you’re not getting support from the Admin’, you’re not getting supported by your Head of Department, you’re not getting supported by the person sitting in the same space as you. If they’re looking at you as being incompetent, then who the hell is supporting you. It’s just us. Well it is us. At one school from outside … the school nurse, and in some cases the guidance officer … it’s a pretty hard situation if you’re feeling that alienated, and you are … what other occupation do you walk in a room and shut a door and you’re alone with 30 other people ?

… how do you get to know someone when you’ve got 6 lessons a day, or you’ve had … we don’t even … at high school we don’t even have lunch together. I’m thinking of a primary school.

Big high schools, you don’t know enough of your class … so you don’t know people … which department you are unless someone makes a specific effort to organise …

Another point we you talked about umm lunchroom and staff room. Sometimes people go in there, there’s not the support structure of … people are either doing their work and the heavy pressure jobs…whatever their doing … the things that worry me…kind of set the scene and some … like a life sentence basically.

(Talking over the top of each other).

… perpetuated. That really frightened me. How do you challenge …
I guess it’s stressed teachers who come in and say, “Oh, you should have seen him today”, sort of stuff, and there’s that negative image that scares other people also stressed who pick that up and that kid is viewed that way forever, and to change that culture in the classroom.

I want to challenge that …

Challenge it … yeah, and that’s sometimes what we’re doing and it’s very very hard.

And there’s not too much of that other thing like when you were talking about the teacher that…we simply listen to the teacher going on about all these terrible kids in her class on and on and on … and … she just looked blankly and everyone else was going yeah, yeah, yeah. That question doesn’t get asked sometimes, that same kind of thing does it? You know, like … non reflective … went to…first reflection stuff … which is another issue.

AQ Moving onto the last question, I know we touched on this a bit ... let’s now look at the relationship between the style of leadership in your school and the management of kids with behaviour problems.

GROUP

Pretty critical.

Oh yes.

Open door.

I think you get things like … people with autocratic or authoritarian leadership ends up with a disempowering model where the kids don’t learn anything and the teachers don’t.

So there’s no … you get this boom boom, do this, do that. There’s the other one where there’s kind of wishy washy kind of stuff and you end up with the power broker who takes over and control…how the management behaviour …

END OF SIDE ONE

And I don’t want to … ‘cause I haven’t been in the school long enough to…there are people who…that approach and no…. actually learning by their repeating behaviour, actually see affect and cause of affect and…

I see it schools… the collaborative process … but then, you know, like the pseudo-collaborative discussion and meeting, and in the end the staff are disempowered anyway because they know after the staff meeting when they’ve all been talking and in little groups, blah blah, they all know the boss will make the decision anyway. Pretending to be inclusive. That doesn’t happen at every school but that’s just one little slant on collaborative decision making that I’ve seen.

Being ultimately responsible to the kids and the students because that’s where the biggest impact is.

At one of the schools I work at each deputy is responsible for a year level, so if there are any behavioural problems with Year 8’s, they all get sent to one person rather than whoever happens to be there at the time, so therefore you get that greater consistency in the way you deal with that and the students … that deputy will keep all the records about the student and what happens and there will be a file and there will be some sort of continuous kind of focus and working with that student … where the alternative to that is more the more piece-meal approach … where it’s dealing with the issue of the moment and maybe that will bring back that information? Instead of … bring back that consistency.

...lack of information … as the decision makers and they don’t have all the data necessary to make effective decisions….it’s disappointing everybody and creating, I guess, negative responses…they
didn’t have the information to make an appropriate decision at the time. So it’s frustrating the way decision making happens.

That’s an interesting thing in terms of leadership … I noticed students with behaviour problems, it’s also connected to the culture because I am aware of having worked with a Principal who had a wonderful give-and-take approach to leadership which went to one school … attempted to …. Which in a way for a Principal, you know the person at the top is kind of … could be seen as giving away some of their power … it wasn’t … connected to the whole school power, but to see that and to understand that and to realise that it will take time is pretty insightful. I think to have done that and have it worked successfully in one school and then attempt to bring that same leadership style to another school and it didn’t work because the overwhelming culture of the staff in that school was too high to break through in the sense of having worked to a very autocratic school previously … to have this person come in and to give them the freedom to make decisions made it … they couldn’t, they just couldn’t do it … they resented it even. You should be out there being the power that is in charge.

….that sort of thing comes down to culture because the staff members that have dug in the trenches and have been at the same school for the past 50 years and have built their empire and therefore built their whole … perception about school … they sort of haven’t moved on … they’ve created their empire and … this is the way this school is and I’m part of this school and I’ve been at this school for 20 years and …. I wonder how it would be if there was a moving on … like instead of saying “OK I’m lucky, I’ve got this school I’ll just stay here till I’m 60”, if there was that 5 years even if you’re moved to a school beside you … ‘cause you know how they get set in their ways?

But the thing of interest in this particular situation was that while the Principal coming in very carefully researched individual people’s attitudes to the school and without, I don’t think everyone realising it, but I know he spoke to every single person in that school about how they thought of that school and what they thought would happen and how they liked to see things happen and he did that in a very subtle way. But the mistake he made was never ever working out to see if he had a collaborative or a whole school attitude to anything and I don’t think he realised until later on, but that caused a problem. There were the entrenched people who … or a smaller pocket getting larger every year of people who were new to teaching or were certainly new to the industry or whatever with fresher ideas or different ideas and, but it was very hard for them to make in-roads as well because of the entrenchment of those who were there … idea of where the whole group taking it somewhere wanted to go.

You see that’s a dynamic in itself, where you fit as the new person, not necessarily new and young, but the new person coming into the school and …learning not to mix with the tuckshop lady…even it gets to that level when you don’t mess with the tuckshop lady at this school, and you don’t mess with the registrar at that school, and you learn that just as we’re visitors to the school, it doesn’t take you long to know who is the top dog in what area and who …

It is a bully, bully girl.

They are the ones that go to the top.

I’m…and the people there got to be Principals or Deputies were those people who had that strong value style, but mostly it amounts to who could knock others into shape. And I think that culture is still with us.

It is too.

And as you say … so entrenched to the extent that the people in the system almost want that … almost want that … this is what they understand and that’s what I want.

(Murmurs of agreement).

Bossing you around. But we all know that those teachers who manage a class with an iron fist think they’ve got it all under control, but that class is somewhere else just playing merry hell. They’ve only got discipline when the discipline figure is in front of them and there’s no self-discipline. And I think a lot of those people, or their culture is still throughout our system. They’re at the top, they’re outside the schools, this is talking about the culture in schools, but I think we’re still….
(Talking over the top of each other).

Spraying, vandals, it comes out somewhere. They might be the nice little kid there, but you haven’t seen how many files have gone out of your cupboard, or how many louvers are broken or who wrote, “Mr so-and-so … sprayed in the toilet or scratched it on …

A bully-boy culture comes out somewhere.

Yeah.

It comes out.

While we say…leadership and management of behaviour issues … I think we’ve all seen the teacher who reacts regardless, that maybe even worse than the culture of the school… my goodness where does she get that from? Or, which is what keeps me going are the ones that do listen and change and adapt regardless of the school culture. So there are …you say their…but it’s really nice…disregarding of that and do what’s best for their students in their subject and for themselves.

Yeah, but in some … there’s still a lot of the put-down stuff in the culture.

It’s interesting … it would change from school to school, but in certain schools where, and we mentioned earlier, that we had the entrenched staff, that core of staff that had been there for a 100 years. Their culture is more over-riding than the leadership style.

New leadership are crucified when they come in.

That’s right. So weak, in spite of their efforts to provide group power, team power can’t get through that power that says, “No, you’re weak, I want you telling everyone” … when you do that of course, when you tell them what to do (or what I think you should do anyway), but it’s not … it’s almost desperate that show of power and, funny enough, if you connect that back to earlier, number 2 question, because a lot of people rising up now are less and less in that category, those that teach with experience … with great amounts of stress that their body of power and comfort are seriously threatened, and they’re still the ones with all the power and they think, “I’m …”, but their life is hell too, because they’re unable to take that step to the next phase and how things should be done, so they’re deeply stressed. And yet they’re perceived as being the ones with the talent… the ones who are doing more the kind of bully stuff. They’re actually quite distressed themselves.

END OF TAPE
Appendix E

Behavioural Event Coding Manual
## BEHAVIOUR DATA CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT – MAJOR</td>
<td>Assaultive behaviour that results in actual injuries; including lacerations, broken bones, puncture wounds, and injuries occasioned through the use of weapons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT – MINOR</td>
<td>Assaultive behaviour that results in injuries of a less serious nature; including hitting, kicking, punching, and verbal and/or physical threats indicating intent to cause injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAPON</td>
<td>Weapon found on person; including knives, guns, and sling-shots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> If used to occasion actual injury, record as 'Assault – Major'; if used to threaten injury, record as 'Assault – Minor'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLYING</td>
<td>Harassment, threats and intimidating behaviour arising from differences pertaining to age, size, weight, appearance, gender, race, culture, religion, and socio-economic status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL HARASSMENT</td>
<td>Harassment, threats and intimidation pertaining to non-consensual sexual behaviour; includes threatened rape, uninvited touching/fondling, taunts related to sexual orientation and/or characteristics of genitalia (e.g. penis/breast size).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUANCY</td>
<td>Unexplained absence for all or part of the day; includes full days, part days and individual classes and other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEARING AND OTHER LANGUAGE OFFENCES</td>
<td>Includes the use of inappropriate and/or obscene language and/or non-verbal gestures of an offensive nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISRUPTING CLASS</td>
<td>Persistent behaviour which disrupts the smooth functioning of classrooms, and which results in a referral to school administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Record occurrence where class disruption is the predominant feature – may include any of the behaviours listed herein as individual occurrences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **DISOBEDIENCE** Includes a range of behaviours where the predominant feature is a failure to conform to proscribed standards. For example:  
  - failing to follow instructions  
  - disobeying rules  
  - failing to submit work as required  
  - direct insolence |
| **SMOKING** Actual smoking as observed, and/or sufficient evidence to draw conclusion of recent smoking (e.g. strong smell of cigarettes on clothing, or possession of cigarettes). |
| **DRUG USE** Actual drug use as observed, (e.g. glue-sniffing, possession of marijuana) and/or sufficient evidence to draw conclusion of recent drug use (e.g. disorientation, blood-shot eyes, slurred speech, smell of marijuana on clothing, drowsiness, agitation, etc.). |
| **ALCOHOL USE** Actual alcohol use as observed, and/or sufficient evidence to draw conclusion of recent alcohol intake (e.g. smell of alcohol on breath, apparent intoxication observed as poor motor coordination, slurred speech, disinhibition, etc.). |
| **OTHER** Any other behaviour recorded as a referral to school administrators. For example:  
  - suicide attempt  
  - dangerous behaviour (affecting self and/or other)  
  - unsafe behaviour (affecting self and/or other)  
  - property offences – vandalism, theft |
| **SUSPENSIONS** Actual occurrences. |
| **EXCLUSIONS** Actual occurrences. |

**NOTE:** All behavioural events to include specification of gender.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr/Stud</th>
<th>Assault Major</th>
<th>Assault Minor</th>
<th>Weapon</th>
<th>Bully'g Harras't</th>
<th>Sexual</th>
<th>Truant</th>
<th>Swear'g Class</th>
<th>Disobey Rules</th>
<th>Smok'g Drugs</th>
<th>Suspect Alcohol</th>
<th>Suspend</th>
<th>Exclude</th>
<th>TOTAL p/student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Test Battery
Organisational Culture Inventory

School______________________________

Every organisation has its own culture and set of expectations for its members. For example, some organisations are "competitive" and members feel that they must out-perform one another; other organisations are "cooperative" and members are more likely to feel they should work together as a team.

Please think about what it takes for you and people like yourself (e.g. your fellow teachers and HOD's) to "fit in" and meet expectations in your organisation. Then, using the response options below, indicate the extent to which each of the behaviours listed on the following pages is expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a slight extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent are people expected or implicitly required to...?

1. Point out flaws
2. Show concern for the needs of others
3. Involve subordinates in decisions affecting them
4. Resolve conflicts constructively
5. Be supportive of others
6. Do things for the approval of others
7. Go along with others
8. Win against others
9. Work to achieve self-set goals
10. Accept goals without questioning them
11. Never challenge superiors
12. Do what is expected
13. Oppose new ideas
14. Help others to grow and develop
15. Give positive rewards to others
16. Agree with everyone
17. Stay conscious of fashion
18. Make sure they are accepted by others
19. Be seen and noticed
20. Explore alternatives before acting
21. Take on challenging tasks
22. Be a good follower
23. Please those in positions of authority
24. Be hard to impress
25. Look for mistakes
26. Oppose things indirectly
27. Encourage others
28. Back up those with the most authority
To what extent are people expected or implicitly required to.....?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Switch priorities to please others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Compete rather than cooperate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Never appear to lose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Set moderately difficult goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pursue a standard of excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Work for the sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Follow orders...even when they're wrong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Check decision with superiors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Question decisions made by others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Remain aloof from the situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Refuse to accept criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Help others think for themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Be liked by everyone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Out-perform their peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Be a &quot;winner&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Maintain an image of superiority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Turn the job into a contest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Think ahead and plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Take moderate risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Willingly obey orders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cooperate with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Deal with others in a pleasant, friendly way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Think in terms of the group's satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Personally take care of every detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Not &quot;rock the boat&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Avoid confrontations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Make a &quot;good impression&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Be non-committal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Make &quot;popular&quot; rather than necessary decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Take few chances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Emphasise quality over quantity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Use good human relations skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Treat people as more important than things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Use the authority of their position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Never make a mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Treat rules as more important than ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Lie low when things get tough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Never be the one blamed for the problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Be concerned about their own growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Resist conformity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Motivate others with friendliness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Be open, warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Stay on the offensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent are people expected or implicitly required to…..?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Build up their power base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Personally run everything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Set unrealistically high goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Be precise…even when it's unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Keep on top of everything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Always follow policies and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cast aside solutions that seem different or risky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Not get involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Wait for others to act first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Be spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Be tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Act forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Play “politics” to gain influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Be hard, tough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Maintain unquestioned authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Do things perfectly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Appear competent and independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Persist, endure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Fit in the “mould”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Push decisions upward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Be open about self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Enjoy their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Think in unique and independent ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Maintain their personal integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions focus on your organisation and how you feel about working there.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Do you clearly know what is expected of you as a member of this school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Do you receive inconsistent messages regarding what is expected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Do you feel you comfortably “fit in” as a member of this school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Does your job require you to think and behave differently than would otherwise be the case?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Would you personally go out of your way to make sure a student feels good about the service you've provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Are you satisfied being a member of this school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Does the school respond effectively to the changing need of its students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Do you expect to be with this school two years from now?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Does your school have a reputation for superior service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Would you recommend this school to someone as a good place to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Would you recommend this school to potential families seeking the service it offers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Leadership - Rater Form (MLQ)

School_________________.

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of your school administrator/s as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person/s you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My school’s administrator/s…

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fails to interfere until problems become serious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviation from standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Avoids getting involved when important issues arise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Talks about their most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is absent when needed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her/them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Waits for things to go wrong before taking action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spends time teaching and coaching (me)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shows that he/she/they is/are a firm believer in &quot;If it ain't broke, don't fix it.&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Acts in ways that builds my respect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Concentrates his/her/their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Keeps track of all mistakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Displays a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued…
| 27 | Directs my attention towards failures to meet standards | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 28 | Avoids making decisions | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 29 | Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 30 | Gets me to look at problems from many different angles | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 31 | Helps me to develop my strengths | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 32 | Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 33 | Delays responding to urgent questions | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 34 | Emphasises the importance of having a collective sense of mission | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 35 | Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 36 | Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 37 | Is effective in meeting my job-related needs | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 38 | Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 39 | Gets me to do more than I expected to do | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 40 | Is effective in representing me to a higher authority | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 41 | Works with me in a satisfactory way | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 42 | Heightens my desire to succeed | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 43 | Is effective in meeting organisational requirements | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 44 | Increases my willingness to try harder | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 45 | Leads a group that is effective | 0 1 2 3 4 |

Please go on to the next section overleaf....
Teacher Stress Rater Form (MBI)

The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their job and the people with whom they work closely. In the following section, there are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, check the “0” (zero) box in the space provided. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by checking the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. The rating scale is given below:

**How Often:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never (0)</th>
<th>A few times a year or less (1)</th>
<th>Once a month or less (2)</th>
<th>A few times a month (3)</th>
<th>Once a week (4)</th>
<th>A few times a week (5)</th>
<th>Every day (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For example* – if the statement was “I feel depressed”, and you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would check the “1” box. If your feelings of depression are fairly frequent (a few times a week, but not daily) you would check the “5” box.

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work
2. I feel used up at the end of the work day
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job
4. I can easily understand how my students feel about things
5. I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects
6. Working with people all day is really a strain for me
7. I deal very effectively with the problems of my students
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 toward 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 some students
16. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me
17. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students
18. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students
19. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job
20. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope
21. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly
22. I feel students blame me for some of their problems

*Almost there – please turn over to include some demographic details....*
# Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your sex:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Your age: ____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Are you:
- Australian
- Indigenous
- Asian
- European
- British/UK
- American
- Other (please state which) ________________

Marital Status:
- Single
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Separated
- how long married __________

Children:
- How many? __________
- Living with you? ____________

Education:
- Bachelor’s degree
- Teaching Diploma
- Master’s degree
- Doctorate (PhD)
- Post-graduate Diploma
- Secondary School
- Some post-graduate study
- Other (please state) _______________________

What is your primary assignment? (Check only one answer)
- Regular classroom teacher
- Special needs teacher
- Head of Department
- Other (please state which) _______________________

Years working in education?
- Less than 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 2 to 4 years
- 4 to 6 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 10 to 15 years
- More than 15 years

Phew! You’ve arrived at the end ....thankyou.
Appendix G

Frequencies of Behavioural Events per Event Type and School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>School 1 $N_f$</th>
<th>School 2 $N_f$</th>
<th>School 3 $N_f$</th>
<th>School 5* $N_f$</th>
<th>School 6 $N_f$</th>
<th>School 7 $N_f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Assault</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truanting</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing/Profanity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupt Classroom</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insolent/Disobedient</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect Drug Use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect Alcohol Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (state which)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusions **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Frequencies also reflect the size of different school populations.

* School 4 recanted permission to collate student data.

** For reasons of confidentiality, suspension and exclusion data has been removed to prevent calculation of IRSED scores (see Chapter 7, Section 7.2.2).
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