Youth'07

The Health and Wellbeing of Secondary School Students in New Zealand

The Social Climate of Secondary Schools in New Zealand



September 2009



Title: Youth'07: The Social Climate of Secondary Schools in New Zealand.

ISBN 978-0-473-15741-8 (paperback)

ISBN 978-0-473-15742-5 (electronic)

To be referenced as:

Denny, S., Robinson, E., Milfont, T., & Grant, S. (2009). Youth'07: The Social Climate of Secondary Schools in New Zealand. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

The AHRG investigators on the Youth'07 project are:

Simon Denny, Terry Fleming, Peter Watson Department of Community Paediatrics Shanthi Ameratunga, Elizabeth Robinson, Jennifer Utter Section of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Population Health

Terryann Clark, Robyn Dixon School of Nursing

Sue Crengle, Te Kupenga Hauora Māori, School of Population Health

Sally Merry Werry Centre for Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Department of Psychological Medicine

David Schaaf Pacific Health, School of Population Health

Acknowledgements

A big thank you to the students and staff who participated in the survey. Without their patience and help the Youth'07 Health and Wellbeing Survey would not have been possible.

To the Youth'07 project team: Sue Grant, Ruth Herd, Taciano Milfont, S. Langitoto Helu, Catherine Jackson and Tania Milne.

We would also like to thank Ross Galbreath and Val Grey for their help in preparing this report.

The Youth'07 project was funded by the Health Research Council of New Zealand (grant 05/216), the Department of Labour, Families Commission, Accident Compensation Corporation of New Zealand, Sport and Recreation New Zealand, the Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand, and the Ministries of Youth Development, Justice, and Health. Support for the electronic communication of the Youth'07 project was provided by Vodafone New Zealand.

Contact details:

Dr Simon Denny (Principal Investigator) Adolescent Health Research Group School of Population Health Tamaki Campus The University of Auckland Private Bag 92019 Auckland, 1142

Phone: 09 373 7599 ext 89400 Email: s.denny@auckland.ac.nz

Further publications by the AHRG are available at www.youth2000.ac.nz







The Social Climate of Secondary Schools in New Zealand

Contents

Executi	ve Sumn	nary	2			
Introdu	iction		4			
Why ex	amine s	chool climate and environments?	5			
The Su	rvey		6			
	Ethical	procedures	6			
Selection of schools, staff and students						
Survey methods						
	School	climate measures	8			
School decile and catchment						
	Interpreting the results and graphs					
Results			15			
	Part I: S	School Climate	15			
		Teacher perceptions of support for students	15			
		Teacher perceptions of support for teachers	16			
		Teacher perceptions of students	17			
		Student perceptions of school climate	18			
		Student connectedness to school	19			
		Student safety	21			
	Part II:	Teacher Health and Wellbeing	23			
		Teacher safety	25			
Conclu	sion		26			
Useful	Useful links					
Referer	nces		28			
Appendices 20						



Executive Summary



This report presents information on the social climate of secondary schools in New Zealand. The report uses data from Youth'07 The National Survey of the Health and Wellbeing of New Zealand Secondary School Students. Ninety-one randomly selected schools from throughout New Zealand participated in a school climate survey as part of this student health and wellbeing survey. The school climate survey aimed to describe the school environment in terms of support for students and staff, relationships between staff and students and safety of students and staff.

Staff and students from participating schools completed a senior management survey, staff survey and the student health and wellbeing survey. This report presents information from the staff and student surveys by school decile, type of school (co-ed, girls' or boys' school), size of school and locality (urban or rural). The report also describes the health and wellbeing (including stress and burnout) and safety of teachers from throughout New Zealand.

This report has found that the social climate of schools in New Zealand varies widely among schools and between different type, sizes and decile of schools. In the study, teachers from small-sized girls' schools had some of the best ratings of their school climate in terms of supports for students, support for teachers and teachers' perceptions of their students (academic orientation, helpfulness and student interactions etc). In contrast teachers from small-sized boys' schools rated their school climate, including supports for staff and students and student characteristics, among the lowest. Specifically, teachers from small-sized boys' schools perceived their students to have poorer academic orientation, poorer teacher-student interactions, and more student disruptiveness than teachers from larger co-ed and girls' schools. However, these findings need to be interpreted with caution as there were only a few small-sized boys' schools in the sample.

Overall smaller schools did better in terms of supports for staff and students than larger schools. Students from smaller schools reported better school connection and were more likely than students from larger schools to report feeling part of their school. Students' perceptions of their safety was better in small schools compared to larger schools and students from smaller schools were less likely to report problems getting along with other students than students from larger schools. Students from small-sized boys' schools were also more likely than other schools to report that their school encouraged students of different ethnic groups to get along.



There were few differences by school decile on levels of supports for teachers and students. However teachers from lower decile schools perceived their students more negatively across a range measures including: student helpfulness, student sensitivity, student disruptiveness and their achievement orientation than teachers in higher decile schools. However, student reports of teachers taking an interest in their culture were higher among low decile schools and urban schools than those of students from higher decile or rural schools.

Overall, students' ratings of their school climate showed a different pattern to that of the teacher ratings. Students from low decile schools were more likely to report positive academic orientation by students at their schools and more positive interactions with teachers. Students from low decile schools were also more likely to report feeling part of their school and that people at school cared about them, than students from higher decile schools. This was in contrast to teacher perceptions of their school climate which were generally poorer in low decile schools.

Students' perception of their safety was more positive in small schools compared to larger schools and in co-ed or girls' schools compared to boys' schools. The proportion of students who reported being bullied was highest in boys' schools and lowest in girls' schools.

Stress and burnout among New Zealand secondary school teachers was high when compared internationally. Teacher burnout tended to be higher in low decile schools compared to higher decile schools and among teachers from girls' and co-ed schools compared to teachers from boys' schools.

Almost one-quarter of teachers reported being afraid that a student would hurt them at some point during the past school year. Twenty percent of teachers reported that a student had threatened to hurt them in the past school year and 8.5% of teachers reported that a student had attempted to hit them or actually hit them during the past school year. For some teachers these episodes were occurring frequently.

This report has identified several concerning aspects of the social climate of secondary schools in New Zealand that may negatively impact on the health and wellbeing of both students and staff. For example, teachers in low decile schools had poorer perceptions of their students and that may have an impact on their effectiveness as teachers. Student and teacher safety has also been highlighted as areas of concern with high rates of bullying and threats among both students and staff. Improving the social climate of secondary schools requires whole school approaches with active support from their communities, outside agencies and the Ministry of Education. Strategies which focus on academic success for all students, good relationships between staff and students and school environments that are physically and emotionally safe will result in a more positive school climate and thus a better school experience for both students and staff.



Introduction



This report presents information on the social climate of secondary schools in New Zealand. The report uses data from Youth'07 The National Survey of the Health and Wellbeing of New Zealand Secondary School Students. Ninety-one randomly selected schools from throughout New Zealand participated in a school climate survey as part of this student health and wellbeing survey. The school climate survey aimed to describe the school social environment in terms of support for students and staff, relationships between staff and students and safety of students and staff. Participating schools also completed a senior management survey, and a staff survey, as well as the student health and wellbeing survey. This report presents information from the staff and student surveys by school decile, type (co-ed or single sex school), size of school and locality (urban or rural). The report also describes the health and wellbeing, including rates of burnout, and safety of secondary school teachers from throughout New Zealand.

Youth'07 is New Zealand's second national health and wellbeing survey of secondary school students, following on from the first survey conducted in 2001. Both these surveys are part of the Youth2000 project, which is run by the Adolescent Health Research Group (AHRG) at The University of Auckland. The aim of Youth2000 is to provide information on health and wellbeing issues among secondary school students - information that is current, accurate and representative of young people growing up in New Zealand.





Why examine the social climate of schools?

There is increasing recognition of the importance of school environments on the health and wellbeing of students attending school. Students spend a considerable amount of time in school settings, so it is not surprising that the physical, social and policy environments of their schools have an impact on their health by helping to shape what is generally known as school climate. There is now a growing body of research that examines the influence of school environments on students' health and wellbeing (Catalano et al., 2004; Kasen, Johnson and Cohen, 1990; McNeely, Nonnemaker and Blum, 2002; Patton et al., 2006; Resnick et al., 1997). School environments have been shown to influence a wide range of health outcomes among students, such as emotional wellbeing (Shochet et al., 2006), cigarette use (Moore, Roberts and Tudor-Smith, 2001) and healthy food choices (Fox et al., 2009; Kubik et al., 2003). School environments can also influence behaviours such as bullying (Espelage and Swearer, 2003; Twemlow, Fonagy and Sacco, 2004), truancy (Gottfredson et al., 2005) and educational achievement (Anderson, 1982; Lee and Bryk, 1989).

Of particular importance is the concept of school connectedness which refers to a student's sense of belonging and feeling a part of their school. School connection is also influenced by students' perception that adults at school care about them and their learning and that their school is a safe place both physically and emotionally (Libbey, 2004). School connectedness has been shown to increase the likelihood of academic success and reduce the likelihood of health risk behaviours and emotional distress (Resnick et al., 1997).

Although schools do influence student health and wellbeing they are not the only influences. Families and communities play an important part, along with the wider economic, cultural and social contexts that help determine the health and wellbeing of young people. But the effect is not all one way; schools themselves and their school climate are also influenced by the background of students in each school which can differ greatly depending on the type of school (private vs public) or the neighbourhood socioeconomic characteristics of families in each school area.

This report describes the social climate of secondary schools in New Zealand in terms of the perceptions of teachers and students of the social environment, support for learning, school connectedness and physical and emotional safety within their schools.





The Survey

Ethical procedures

Before starting the survey its design was checked by The University of Auckland Human Subject Ethics Committee. The responsibility of this committee is to advocate on behalf of research participants, and to ensure that the way in which researchers at the University of Auckland conduct their research is of the highest ethical standard. Thus before we began the methods and the questionnaires we used for conducting the survey had all been scrutinised by an independent group of academics and community representatives. We then obtained consent to carry out the survey from the principal of each participating school. A few weeks before the survey was conducted at each school, information materials about the survey were sent to each school for distribution to staff, parents and students. They were assured that participation in the survey was voluntary and that all information collected would be anonymous and confidential. All participating students and staff gave their own consent to being surveyed.

Selection of the schools

The Youth2000 surveys aim to provide information that is representative of most young people growing up in New Zealand. For the Youth'07 survey we randomly selected 115 schools in New Zealand (from those with 50 or more students in years 9 to 14) and then in each of the schools that agreed to take part we randomly selected students and invited them to take part. The survey therefore, did not include young people who do not attend school.

In total, 91 (79%) of the 115 schools selected agreed to participate in both the staff and student surveys. Of the participating schools, the majority were state funded, co-educational and large. Thirteen schools declined to participate, a further 6 schools withdrew their agreement to participate during 2007 and 5 schools completed the student survey but declined to participate in the staff survey. Of the non-participating schools, 16/24 (67%) were in Auckland, Wellington or Hamilton, 14/24 (58%) were state schools, 17/24 (71%) were co-educational, and 21/24 (88%) were large schools.



Variable	All Sc	hools	Eligible S	Schools*	Surveyed Schools	
variable	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	475		389		91	
Authority						
State	317	66.7	271	69.7	65	71.4
State integrated	91	19.2	84	21.6	21	23.1
Private	67	14.1	34	8.7	5	5.5
Type of school						
Boys' schools	46	9.7	46	11.8	15	16.6
Girls' schools	62	12.8	62	15.94	11	12.1
Boys/Senior Co-Ed.	3	0.6	3	0.8	1	1
Co-educational	364	76.6	278	71.5	64	70.3
School Size						
Small (up to 300 students)	181	38.1	110	27.2	22	24.2
Medium (301 to 700 students)	136	28.6	136	33.7	32	35.2
Large (over 700 students)	158	33.3	158	39.1	37	40.6
Decile						
Low decile (1-3)	124	26.1	89	24.1	15	17
Medium decile (4-7)	197	41.5	175	47.4	49	55.7
High decile (8-10)	113	23.8	105	28.4	24	27.3

Table1: Characteristics of participating schools

 * schools with students in years 9 - 13 $\,$ > 50 students



Selection of students

To be eligible to participate, students had to be 18 years or younger. In total, 12,549 students were invited to participate in the survey. Threequarters (9,107) agreed to take part. This represents about 3% of the total 2007 New Zealand secondary school roll. The reasons that students did not take part in the survey included: not being at school on the day of the survey, being unavailable during the time the survey was conducted, or not wanting to take part in the survey.

Five schools declined to take part in the school climate survey reducing the total number of students whose responses were used to analyse the school climate to 8,828 – equivalent to a response rate of 74%.

Table 2: Demographic characteristics ofparticipating students

Variable	Number	Percent		
Total	8828	100		
Age band				
13 years and younger	1815	20.5		
14 years	2042	23.1		
15 years	1909	21.7		
16 years	1686	19.1		
17 years and over	1369	15.6		
Gender				
Female	3976	45.0		
Male	4843	55.0		
Ethnicity*				
NZ European	5,990	67.9		
Māori	1658	18.8		
Pacific	1148	13.0		
Asian	1279	14.5		
Other	789 8.9			
*students were able to pick mo	ore than one et	hnic group		
Geography				
Urban	7254	84.3		
Rural	1369	15.7		

Selection of staff

All staff of participating schools were invited to take part in the school climate survey. In total 2903 teachers and 129 non-teaching staff (e.g. support staff, librarians school guidance counsellors etc) completed the school climate survey. The response rate was 74% out of a possible 3945 permanent full time teachers in the 91 participating schools.

Table 3: Demographic characteristics ofparticipating teachers

Variable	Number	Percent					
Total	2903	100					
Age band (years)							
Less than 30	395	14.3					
30 to 39	630	22.8					
40 to 49	741	26.8					
50 to 59	822	29.7					
60 plus	175	6.3					
Gender	Gender						
Female	1630	56.6					
Male	1250	43.4					
Ethnicity							
NZ European	2,528	86.5					
Māori	243	8.3					
Pacific	85	2.9					
Asian	91	3.1					
Other 47 1.6							
Teachers were able to pick more than one ethnic group							
Time in teaching							

Time in teaching		
0 to 10 years	1152	40.29
10 to 20 years	690	24.13
20 to 30 years	653	22.84
more than 30 years	364	12.73
Involved in extra-curricular activities		
less than one hour per week	427	14.9
2- 4 hours per week	1221	42.5
5 - 7 hours per week	422	14.7
8 - 10 hours per week	132	4.6
more than 10 hours per week	119	4.1
Total participating in extra- curricular activities	2321	80.8



Survey methods

1. The Staff survey was a self-report pen and paper questionnaire that took 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The administration was coordinated by a Youth'07 project team member in conjunction with the school liaison staff member. Most surveys were completed during a staff meeting (67%) or at school but not during a staff meeting (27%). A small number of teachers completed the survey at home (6%). A Youth'07 project team member was present at the staff meeting in 40% of schools to explain the survey and answer any questions; otherwise the school liaison staff member performed this role.

2. The student survey was carried out using internet tablets - essentially small hand-held computers. At the start of the survey students were given an anonymous code that enabled them to log-in to the questionnaire on the internet tablet. The survey questions were displayed on its screen and also read out through headphones. Response options were also read out when the corresponding text on the screen was selected. This 'voiceover', as well as the on-screen questionnaire, were available in both English and Māori languages, with students able to toggle between the two. Students answered the questions by using a small stylus to touch the appropriate response on the screen. Students could choose not to answer any question or section of the survey. The branching program meant that students were not asked detailed questions about issues that were not part of their life experiences. Questions about school climate were incorporated in the student health and wellbeing questionnaire.

School Climate measures

Staff and student school climate questionnaires were developed and piloted for use in the Youth'07 school climate survey. The goal was to measure school level environments which encompass a broad range of attitudes, behaviours and relationships within the school setting that contribute to school climate. A review of existing literature identified three core themes that are now regarded as important influences on student achievement and wellbeing: academic and social support for teachers and students, relationships between staff and students and between students and the safety of staff and students.

A questionnaire pool was then formulated based on the literature review and existing school climate measures (Brand et al., 2008; Brand et al., 2003; Fisher and Fraser, 1990; Thomas et al., 2004). Focus groups with educational researchers, teachers and health professionals were conducted to assess the question pool, scope and face validity. They also identified further areas for inclusion (support for sexual diversity, effective communication between staff and senior management, dealing with disruptive students etc).

The initial version of the staff school climate questionnaire consisted of a pool of 85 questions that were designed to cover a range of dimensions related to school climate.



Table 4: Teacher School Environment Questionnaire

Scale name	Source
Support from colleagues I feel accepted by other staff.	
I feel that I could rely on my colleagues for assistance if I needed it.	Thomas
I feel I have many friends among my colleagues at this school.	
I often feel ignored by other staff. (r)	
Effective health and welfare services The health and welfare staff (e.g., guidance counsellor, nurse, social worker) are generally available to help students.	
I feel comfortable referring students to the health and welfare staff (e.g., guidance counsellor, nurse, social worker).	Thomas
The health and welfare staff provide effective assistance for students who need help.	
I have referred students to the health and welfare services (e.g. guidance counsellor, nurse, social worker).	
Support for ethnic diversity Most staff have a good understanding of working with students from other ethnic groups. The staff at this school have the skills required to address the needs of an ethnically diverse student population. Staff are encouraged to learn effective skills for working with students from other ethnic groups. The pools of students from different ethnic groups are addressed effectively at this school	Thomas
The needs of students non-different ennic groups are addressed enectively at this school.	
Innovation culture and vision Staff are encouraged to be innovative in this school	
There is a high degree of consensus within the staff with regard to what the school is trying to achieve.	Thomas
Staff at this school like to try new strategies to increase student competencies.	
New and different ideas are being tried in this school.	
Support for sexual diversity The staff at this school support students who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender.	
This school meets the needs of students who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender.	
Some staff lack the skills needed to work effectively with students who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. (r)	New
The needs of students who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender are inefficiently addressed at this school. (r)	
Communication between staff and senior management There is effective communication between staff and senior management in this school.	
There are regular meetings that keep everyone in this school informed.	New
Senior management make a point of keeping staff informed about events in this school.	
There is lack of communication between staff and senior management at this school. (r)	
Dealing with disruptive students There are effective mechanisms for dealing with disruptive students in this school.	
There are support staff who are able to help with disruptive students in this school.	New
The needs of disruptive students are not addressed well in this school. (r)	-
This school puts special emphasis on dealing with disruptive students.	
Staff participation in decision-making Staff are frequently asked to participate in decisions concerning administrative policies and procedures.	Fisher and
Staff have little say in the running of the school. (r)	Fraser
I he senior management ask for help from staff in finding solutions to problems. Staff are able to voice their concerns about problems in this school.	



Professional Development Staff at this school have access to professional development/training	
Staff at this school keep up to date with professional development/training.	
This school provides resources and time for professional development/training.	New
Professional development/training is not a part of this school's culture	New
The senior management encourages staff to share what they have learnt in professional	
Family involvement Staff value parent/family participation in school activities	
This school creates opportunities for interaction between staff and parent/family.	
Parent/care-giver participation is encouraged at this school.	New
The senior management encourage parent/family participation through a range of school	
activities.	
Student sensitivity Students in my classes generally	
respect viewpoints different from their own.	
recognise each other's individual strengths.	Brand
respect cultures different from their own.	
enjoy working together.	
are concerned about community/ social issues.	
Student disruptiveness Students in my classes generally	
disrupt what others are doing.	
are inattentive.	Brand
bicker and quarrel with each other.	
are restless.	
call out answers out of turn.	
Teacher-student interactions Students in my classes generally	
share their concerns with me.	
ask for comfort or support when needed.	Brand
express their feelings.	
talk about homes and families.	
oin class discussions.	
Achievement orientated Students in my classes generally	
are motivated.	
care about what they do.	Brand
are concerned about achievement.	
like to be challenged academically.	
compete with each other in a positive way.	
Safety problems How often have you been afraid that a student will hurt you at school?	
How often have you brought something to school to protect yourself?	Brand
How often has a student at school threatened to hurt you if you did not give them your money or something else that belonged to you?	brana
How often has a student attempted to hit you or actually hit you when you were at school?	
Student helpfulness Most students are friendly to staff.	
Most students are helpful and cooperative with staff.	Thomas
Strict discipline is needed to control many of the students (r)	

The staff and student questionnaires were piloted in 2006 with approximately 250 students and 129 teachers from three secondary schools across the wider Auckland region. Focus groups were undertaken with staff and students to assess the acceptability of the methodology and questionnaires. The staff questionnaire was shortened by removing poorly performing questions (i.e. did not correlate well with what they were intended to measure) within each scale. The final staff questionnaire contained 70 questions that assessed 16 dimensions of school climate.

The student school climate questionnaire needed to be shortened further as it was part of a wider health and wellbeing questionnaire with limitations of questionnaire length. The school climate questions were reduced to one question from each domain based on the question with the highest item-factor loading. The student questionnaire contained 7 questions on school climate (Table 5).

School Climate questions in Student Health and Wellbeing Survey	Source
Teachers go out of their way to help students	Brand
Students try to get the best grades that they can	Brand
Students in this school have trouble getting along with each other	Brand
Teachers are very strict here	Brand
Students in this school have a say in how things work	Brand
Some teachers have shown a special interest in my culture or ethnic group	Thomas
This school encourages students to get along with students from different ethnic groups	Thomas

Table 5: Student school climate questions

Response options for both the staff and student school climate questions used a 5-point Likert scale where

- 1 = strongly disagree,
- 2 = disagree,
- 3 = neither agree or disagree,
- 4 = agree,
- 5 = strongly agree.

Scores for the staff school climate scales were calculated from the mean of the response items corresponding to each scale. For the student survey the percentage of students who responded positively (agree or strongly agree) within each school are used for comparisons.

Questions from the student health and wellbeing questionnaire were used to examine how school connection, academic expectations and safety varied by school characteristics. Similarly staff health and safety issues are also examined in relation to school characteristics. Further information on the student health and wellbeing questionnaire is available from <u>www.</u> <u>youth2000.ac.nz.</u>



School Decile

Schools were assigned to one of three groups according to their decile: low decile schools (school deciles 1 - 3), medium decile schools (school deciles 4 - 7), and high decile schools (school deciles 8 - 10). A school's decile indicates the extent to which the school draws its students from low socio-economic communities. Decile 1 schools are the 10% of schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities, whereas decile 10 schools are the 10% of schools with the lowest proportion of these students. A school's decile does not necessarily reflect the overall socio-economic mix of the school (Ministry of Education, 2009).

School Catchment

School catchments were classified according to the percentage of students whose home address was situated in a rural area. Students were asked to provide their home address, from which we ascertained the census meshblock number for that neighbourhood. Only the meshblock number was retained; students' names or addresses were not recorded to protect student confidentiality. From the meshblock number for the neighbourhood where each student lived we determined whether it was rural or urban. This is based on Statistics NZ definitions where towns are defined as urban communities when their population exceeds 1,000. School catchments were classified as predominantly rural when more than 50% of the students participating in the Youth'07 survey were from rural areas.

Interpreting the results

This survey is one of the largest surveys of the school climate factors in New Zealand and it is hoped that it will provide valuable information for the purposes of planning and programme development for schools and policy-makers. However, caution needs to be taken when interpreting the results, especially in relation to whether the findings reflect the wider school population and in interpreting differences between types of schools.

Analyses for this report started with bivariate comparisons of school climate measures and school characteristics. These comparisons are shown in the tables in the appendices. Multivariate comparisons are used to explore interactions between different school characteristics (such as school types, school size and school decile) and the school climate measures. Significant interactions were further explored with cross tabulations of the school characteristics. For example, the "dealing with disruptive students" scale showed a significant interaction between school type and school size (p = 0.002). Examining the cross tabulation of this scale by school type and school size showed that in girls' schools the effectiveness of dealing with disruptive students was highest in small schools (mean = 3.81) and lowest in large schools (mean=3.36) whereas in boys' schools this was reversed with the small boys' schools having the lower mean score (mean = 3.17).

These results are discussed in the text but are not shown in the tables due to the excessive space required to present these findings. All differences commented upon in this report are statistically significant. However care needs to be taken when interpreting these results due to the small numbers of schools (Table 9 appendices) and the number of comparisons being made. Attempts have been made to highlight findings that are significant both from a statistical perspective and also where differences are meaningful from a practical perspective.

For further details on the wording of questionnaire items and for the procedures outlined above, please refer to the Youth'07 Technical Report (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2008) available from www.youth2000.ac.nz.



How to interpret the graphs

Box plots (Figure 1) are used to show the distribution of school climate measures by various school characteristics (i.e. school size, school decile, type of school etc). The line in the box is the median (middle score) for the school characteristic shown along the vertical x-axis. The top and bottom of each box is the upper and lower quartiles respectively with the box itself representing the middle 50% of scores. The 'whiskers' at the top and bottom of the lines represent the range of scores excluding outliers and extreme values. Outliers and extreme values, shown by circles and asterisks, are defined as values that are 1.5 and 3 times (respectively) the height of the box (the interquartile range) either above or below the top or bottom of the box.



Figure 1: How to interpret graphs used in this report





The Results

Part 1: School Climate

Teacher perceptions of support for students

Five scales from the teacher school climate survey examined teachers' perceptions of the support available to students within each school. Scales covered: dealing with disruptive students, supports for ethnic and sexual diversity, effective health and welfare services and family involvement. Of these five scales, effective health and welfare services scored the highest (mean = 3.97, range 2.7-4.5) and support for sexual diversity the lowest (mean = 3.09, range 2.67 - 3.72) among the 91 schools. There was a large range of scores on dealing with disruptive students and on effective health and welfare services. Support for ethnic diversity was generally rated higher by teachers in low decile schools compared to high decile schools and lower in boys' schools compared to other schools. Support for sexual diversity was rated lower in boys' schools compared to girls' and co-ed schools. Effective health and welfare services were perceived by teachers to be better in larger schools compared to smaller schools.

Teachers from smaller schools rated family involvement higher than teachers from larger schools, although among boys' schools this was reversed with teachers in larger-sized boys' schools rating family involvement higher than teachers from small-sized boys' schools.

Overall teacher ratings of their schools' support for students were highest in small-sized girls' schools (mean = 3.73) and lowest in small-sized boys' schools (mean = 3.28) see Figures 2 and 3.



Figure 2: School size and support for







Teacher perceptions of support for teachers

The support for teachers within each school was assessed by five scales covering support from colleagues, innovation, culture and vision within the school, communication between senior management and staff, participatory decisionmaking by staff and professional development. Support from colleagues was rated the highest (mean = 4.16, range 3.42 - 4.75) among these domains while participatory decision-making was rated the lowest by teachers (mean = 3.5, range 2.47 - 4.25). Communication between senior management and staff showed the greatest range in scores (range 2.44 - 4.83) while support from colleagues showed the least range in scores.

Overall, there were similarities to staff perceptions of student support: teachers in small-sized girls' schools rated support for teachers the highest (mean = 4.19) and teachers in small-sized boys' schools rated this support the lowest (mean = 3.45). Among specific scales of staff support, teacher ratings of their schools' innovation, culture and vision was higher in smaller schools than in medium to large schools (Figure 4) and higher among girls' and co-ed schools than boys' schools (Figure 5).

Figure 4: School size and innovation culture and vision



Figure 5: School type and innovation culture and vision



Communication between staff and senior management was rated higher by teachers from small-sized girls' schools compared to other schools and by teachers from medium to high decile schools compared to low decile schools. Participatory decision-making was rated higher in medium and high decile schools compared to low decile schools. However, teachers from large schools that were medium to high decile rated participatory decision-making lower than teachers from smaller schools in the medium to high decile range. Teacher perceptions of their schools' professional development was rated higher among teachers in high decile schools compared to lower decile schools whereas teachers in small schools and boys' schools tended to rate professional development lower than teachers from other schools.



Teacher perceptions of students

Teachers were asked to rate characteristics of the students in their classes. This included measures on student helpfulness, student disruptiveness, student sensitivity, teacherstudent interactions and achievement orientation of students. Of these, student helpfulness was rated the highest (mean = 3.86, range 2.88 - 4.71) and student disruptiveness the lowest (mean 2.67, range = 1.8 - 3.57). Achievement orientation of the students showed the largest range of scores (range 2.76 - 4.60) in schools throughout New Zealand, while teacher-student interactions showed the lowest range of scores (range 2.84 - 4.15).

Overall, teacher perceptions of their students were rated highest by teachers in girls' schools and teachers in boys' and co-ed schools rated their students the lowest (Figure 6). This was especially so for small-sized girls' schools which had the highest ratings by teachers of their students overall. Specifically, teachers in smallsized girls' schools perceived their students to be more sensitive, more helpful, to have better academic orientation and better teacher-student interactions than teachers from larger co-ed or boys' schools. Figure 7 shows teacher-student interactions among different types of schools.



Figure 6: School type and teacher

Figure 7: School type and teacher-student interactions



There were also differences by school decile. Teachers in low decile schools rated their students lower overall than teachers in higher decile schools (Figure 8). In particular, teachers in low decile schools perceived their students to be less helpful, more disruptive, less sensitive, and to have lower achievement orientation than teachers in higher decile schools perceived their students to be (Figure 9).

Figure 8: School decile and teacher perceptions of students







Figure 9: School decile and teacher perceptions of student disruptiveness

Student perceptions of school climate

Students were asked to rate their school on 7 aspects of the school climate on a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, strongly agree). The percentage of students who responded positively (agree or strongly agree) within each school are used for comparisons. There were large variations between schools in the percentages of students who responded positively to these questions on school climate. For example the percentage of students who agreed that teachers in their school went out of their way to help students ranged from 35.7% to 100% and the percentage of students who agreed that students in their school tried to get the best grades ranged from 15.0% to 78.6%. There were also large differences between schools in the proportion of students who agreed that their school encouraged students to get along with students from different ethnic groups (range 0% - 35.7%).

Overall, students' ratings of their school climate showed a different pattern to that of the teacher ratings. Students from small-sized boys' schools were more likely to report that their teachers went out of their way to help students and were also more likely to report that students tried to



get the best grades than students from largersized girls' or co-ed schools. Students from low decile schools were also more likely to report that a teacher went out of their way to help students and that students at their school tried to get the best grades than were students from higher decile schools (Figure 10).

Figure 10: School decile and achievement orientation



Students from larger co-ed schools were more likely to report problems getting along with other students than students from smaller single-sex schools (Figure 11).





Student reports of their teachers being strict were used as an indicator of discipline and were higher among urban schools and single sex schools compared to rural or co-ed schools (Figure 12).





Two questions were asked in relation to ethnic pluralism and identity. Support for ethnic pluralism was assessed by a question on whether their school encourages students to get along with students from different ethnic groups. Small-sized boys' schools were more likely than other schools to report that their school encouraged students of different ethnic groups to get along. Support for ethnic identity was assessed by a question on whether a teacher had taken a special interest in their cultural or ethnic group. Student reports of teachers taking an interest in their culture were higher in low decile schools and urban schools than in higher decile or rural schools. Students' perceptions of participating in decision-making in their schools did not vary much by school decile, school size or type of school.

Student connectedness to school

School connectedness refers to a student's sense of belonging and feeling a part of their school. Students were therefore asked about aspects of their connection to their school and their attitudes to education. This included questions on belonging, relationships with staff at their school, academic expectations and truanting from school. Students' responses to these questions are aggregated by each school and used for comparisons. There were large variations between schools for some of these questions. The largest variation between schools was for the percentage of students at each school who had been stood down (excluded from school for misbehaviour) which ranged from 0% to 52.0%.

Students from smaller schools were more likely than students from larger schools to report feeling part of their school – 87.0% in large schools compared to 92.0% in small schools (Figure 13).





Students from low decile schools were more likely to report feeling part of their school and more likely to report that people at school cared about them (Figure 14), than students from higher decile schools. Students from coed schools were less likely to report teachers being fair than students from single-sex schools (Figure 15).







Figure 16 shows that students from girls' schools were more likely to report being expected to do well compared to co-ed or boys' schools. There was a large degree of variation especially among co-ed schools compared to single sex schools. In addition students from smaller schools were also more likely to report being expected to do well than students from larger schools.





Students from low decile boys' schools were more likely to report being truant from school than students from high decile boys' schools. Students from larger schools were more likely to report being truant than students from smaller schools – except for small boys-only schools where students were much more likely to report being truant than students from larger boys' schools.



Student Safety

Students were asked questions relating to safety, including feeling safe at school, being afraid people at school would hurt or bother them, being bullied and whether they had been in a serious physical fight in the last year. Again there was a wide variation between schools in the proportion of students who experienced issues with safety at school. For example, the proportion of students who felt safe at school all or most of the time ranged from 61.0% to 100%. Also the proportion of students who had been in a serious physical fight ranged from 1.8% to 56.0%, although this question did not specify where the fights occurred and the responses may have included fights outside of school.

Students' perceptions of their safety were better in small schools compared to larger schools (Figure 17). There was no clear relationship between school decile and students' perceptions of their safety. Lower decile boys' schools had a higher proportion of students who felt safe all or most of the time compared to higher decile boys' schools. The findings were reversed among co-ed and girls' schools where in these schools there was a higher proportion of students who felt safe in the higher decile schools compared to lower decile schools.





The proportion of students who were afraid someone would hurt or bother them at school was higher among boys' schools than co-ed or girls' schools.

Bullying was defined in the student questionnaire as: "when another student or group of students say, write, text or message nasty and unpleasant things to another student. Or the student is hit, kicked, threatened, pushed or shoved around. Bullying also means when a group of students completely ignore somebody and leave them out of things on purpose."

The proportion of students who reported being bullied at school weekly or more often ranged from 0 to 23.1% between schools. The proportion was highest in boys' schools and lowest in girls' schools. Boys' schools also showed the largest variation in bullying rates and girls' schools the lowest variation (Figure 18).

Figure 18: Bullying at school and school type



The proportion of students who reported that teachers in their school almost always took action to stop bullying varied widely between schools – from 23.6% to 88.5%. Teachers from girls' schools were reported to be more likely to take action to stop bullying compared to co-ed and boys' schools. Teachers from higher decile schools were also reported as being more likely to take action to stop bullying than teachers from lower decile schools. When students were asked how likely students in their school were to



take action to stop bullying, students from girls' schools were more likely than students from co-ed or boys' schools to take action to stop bullying and students in lower decile schools were more likely to take action to stop bullying than students from higher decile schools (Figures 19 and 20).











The Results

Part II: Teacher Health and Wellbeing

Teachers were asked questions about their health and wellbeing. Questions covered: overall general health, physical activity, cigarette and alcohol-use and burnout and emotional wellbeing (Table 6).

Overall most (92.4%) teachers reported their health as good, very good or excellent. Physical activity was important for 56.5% of teachers and more so among male teachers compared to female teachers. The importance of physical activity was also higher among younger teachers compared to older teachers.

The prevalence of daily cigarette use among teachers was 6.4% overall with little differences between genders or ages. Alcohol-use on 4 or more occasions a week was reported by 18.3% of teachers with an increasing prevalence with age. Using alcohol 4 or more times a week was reported by 7.4% of teachers aged 20 to 29 years compared to 25.8% of teachers aged 50 to 59 years and 30.3% of teachers aged 60 years and over.

Variable	Health good, very good or excellent of life (Definit		cal activity is aportant part e (Definitely)	Smo	ke cigarettes (Daily)	Alcohol consumption (4 or more times a week)		
		%		%		%		%
	n	95% CI	n	95% CI	n	95% Cl	n	95% CI
Total	2664	92.4	1628	56.5	185	6.4	528	18.3
Gender		1				I		
Female	1499	92.6 91.4 - 93.9	810	50.1 47.6 - 52.5	104	6.4 5.2 - 7.6	282	17.4 15.6 - 19.2
Male	1145	92.1 90.6 - 93.6	807	64.9 62.2 - 67.5	80	6.5 5.1 - 7.8	243	19.6 17.4 - 21.8
Age								
20 to 29 years	365	92.9 90.3 - 95.4	267	68.1 63.5 - 72.7	30	7.6 5.0 - 10.3	29	7.4 4.8 - 10.0
30 to 39 years	516	92.0 89.7 - 94.2	322	57.4 53.3 - 61.5	41	7.3 5.2 - 9.5	69	12.4 9.6 - 15.1
40 to 49 years	558	91.3 89.1 - 93.6	340	55.5 51.5 - 59.4	42	6.8 4.8 - 8.8	119	19.4 16.3 - 22.5
50 to 59 years	532	93.0 90.9 - 95.1	306	53.6 49.5 - 57.7	27	4.7 3.0 - 6.5	148	25.8 22.2 - 29.4
60 plus years	160	91.4 87.3 - 95.6	86	49.4 42.0 - 56.9	11	6.3 2.7 - 9.9	53	30.3 23.5 - 37.1

Table 6: Teacher Health



Burnout among teachers was assessed by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory. This scale encompasses three dimensions of burnout – personal or overall burnout, burnout related to work and burnout related to dealing with clients (in this case students). Scores range from 0 to 100 with higher scores indicating higher levels of burnout. Overall thirty-two percent of teachers were experiencing high levels of personal burnout i.e. score over 50. This proportion is high compared to other occupations in international studies. For example, in a large survey of occupations from various health and social service workplaces including hospitals, psychiatric wards and prisons, the overall proportion of workers experiencing personal burnout was 22% (Kristensen et al., 2005). Amongst teachers in this school climate survey, a greater proportion of female teachers (35%) experienced personal burnout compared to male teachers (28%) (Table 7). The burnout related to work and students showed similar patterns but was lower compared to personal burnout with 28% of teachers experiencing work-related burnout and 27% experiencing student-related burnout. However, the proportions of teachers in New Zealand experiencing work-related and student-related burnout were much higher than among health and social welfare occupations in the study referred to above where the work-related burnout was 20% and client-related burnout was 17% (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Variable	CBI - personal burnout [*]		CBI - Work-related burnout [*]		CBI - Student- related burnout [*]		WHO-5 Wellbeing ⁺	
, and a set		Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent
	n	95% CI	n	95% CI	n	95% CI	n	95% Cl
Total	2865	32.0 30.3 - 33.7	2864	28.2 26.6 - 29.9	2863	27.1 25.5 - 28.8	2845	79.6 78.2 - 81.1
Gender								
Female	1624	35.2 32.8 - 37.5	1623	30.3 28.1 - 32.6	1622	25.1 23.0 - 27.2	1608	77.1 75.1 - 79.2
Male	1241	27.8 25.3 - 30.3	1241	25.5 23.1 - 28.0	1241	29.8 27.3 - 32.4	1237	82.9 80.8 - 85.0
Age								
Less than 30 years	393	33.3 28.7 - 38.0	393	27.7 23.3 - 32.2	393	23.9 19.7 - 28.1	391	77.5 73.4 - 81.6
30 to 39 years	629	35.3 31.6 - 39.0	629	31.0 27.4 - 34.6	629	28.0 24.5 - 31.5	625	77.0 73.7 - 80.3
40 to 49 years	738	32.4 29.0 - 35.8	738	28.0 24.8 - 31.3	738	25.9 22.7 - 29.0	730	77.7 74.6 - 80.7
50 to 59 years	817	31.0 27.8 - 34.1	816	28.9 25.8 - 32.0	815	29.3 26.2 - 32.5	813	81.8 79.1 - 84.5
60 plus years	174	25.3 18.8 - 31.7	174	21.3 15.2 - 27.3	174	24.1 17.8 - 30.5	174	88.5 83.8 - 93.2

Table 7: Teacher Burnout and Wellbeing

* Copenhagen Burnout Inventory - Scores >50 indicate significant levels of burnout

⁺ World Health Organisation Wellbeing Index scores >13 indicate good or better emotional health

The proportion of teacher experiencing burnout varied considerable among schools (Table 14). All three dimensions of burnout tended to be higher in low decile schools compared to higher decile schools. The proportion of teachers in girls' schools experiencing burnout was lower than in co-ed and boys' schools, especially for student-related burnout. Smaller schools and rural schools also tended to have lower overall levels of burnout than larger urban schools.

The World Health Organisation Wellbeing Index (WHO-5) measures the level of wellbeing based on indicators of: positive mood (good spirits, relaxation), vitality (being active, waking up fresh and rested), and general interests (being interested in things). A greater proportion of male teachers indicated good wellbeing on this scale compared to female teachers, and older teachers had better wellbeing compared to younger teachers (Table 7).



Teacher Safety

Teachers were asked about safety issues with students at school. This included being afraid a student would hurt them, whether a student had threatened them and whether any student had attempted to hit or had actually hit them.

Almost one-quarter (24.0%) of teachers reported being afraid at some point during the past school year that a student would hurt them. This did not vary by age or gender of the teacher. Nearly twenty percent (19.7%) of teachers reported that a student had threatened to hurt them in the past school year and 8.5% of teachers reported that a student had attempted to hit them or had actually hit them during the past school year. Male teachers were more likely to report being threatened by a student (25.6%) than female teachers (15.2%) and were also more likely to report that a student had attempted to hit or had actually hit them (10.0%) than female teachers (7.3%). Being threatened and being hit did not vary by age of the teacher. For 5.4% of teachers these situations were occurring frequently where during the past school year they felt unsafe, or were threatened or were hit on three or more occasions. This did not vary by age or gender of the teacher.

Variable	Has been afraid that a student will hurt them at school during the past school year		A student has threatened to hurt them during the past school year		A student has attempted to hit them or actually hit them during the past school year		Has felt unsafe/ been threatened or hit three or more times during the past school year	
		%		%		%		%
	n	95% CI	n	95% CI	n	95% CI	n	95% CI
Total	695	24.0 22.5 - 25.6	569	19.7 18.2 - 21.1	247	8.5 7.5 - 9.6	156	5.4 4.6 - 6.2
Gender								
Female	415	25.5 23.4 - 27.7	247	15.2 13.4 - 16.9	118	7.3 6.0 - 8.5	82	5.1 4.0 - 6.1
Male	274	22.0 19.7 - 24.3	319	25.6 23.2 - 28.0	125	10.0 8.4 - 11.7	73	5.9 4.6 - 7.2
Age								
20 to 29 years	87	22.1 18.0 - 26.2	75	19.1 15.2 - 23.0	30	7.6 5.0 - 10.3	20	5.1 2.9 - 7.3
30 to 39 years	134	23.9 20.4 - 27.5	117	20.9 17.5 - 24.3	41	7.3 5.2 - 9.5	27	4.8 3.1 - 6.6
40 to 49 years	147	23.9 20.6 - 27.3	112	18.3 15.2 - 21.3	58	9.4 7.1 - 11.8	34	5.5 3.7 - 7.4
50 to 59 years	145	25.3 21.7 - 28.8	112	19.4 16.2 - 22.7	44	7.6 5.5 - 9.8	31	5.4 3.6 - 7.3
60 plus years	37	21.1 15.1 - 27.2	34	19.4 13.6 - 25.3	16	9.1 4.9 - 13.4	6	3.4 0.7 - 6.1

Table 8: Teacher safety at school



Conclusion



This report has highlighted that in many schools staff and students are together building positive school climates which optimise teaching and learning for everyone, such as when staff and students cooperate to actively discourage bullying.

This report has also identified several concerning aspects of the social climate of secondary schools in New Zealand that may negatively impact on the health and wellbeing of both students and staff. In particular, teachers in low decile schools had poorer perceptions of their students and that may be impacting on their effectiveness as teachers. Student and teacher safety has also been highlighted as an area of concern with high rates of bullying and threats among both students and staff in some schools.

Improving the social climate of secondary schools requires whole school approaches with active support from their communities, outside agencies and the Ministry of Education. Strategies which focus on academic success for all students, good relationships between staff and students and school environments that are physically and emotionally safe will result in better school experiences for both students and staff.



Useful Links

Resource \	Nebsite
Youth2000 – Youth Health Information and Statistics	www.youth2000.ac.nz
General Health and Wellbeing	
Health information for young people	www.youthline.co.nz
Sport & Recreation NZ (SPARC) SPARC for teachers	www.sparc.org.nz/education/sportfit/overview www.sparc.org.nz/dashboard/school-teachers
Heart Foundation - School Food Programme	www.nhf.org.nz/index.asp?pageID=2145820280
ERO Review of Sexuality Education	www.ero.govt.nz/ero/publishing.nsf/Content/sex-ed-jun07
Sexuality Education Family Planning – training for teachers	www.fpanz.org.nz/EducationTraining/ TrainingforTeachersandCommunityWorkers/tabid/201/Default.aspx
Mental Wellbeing	
Mental Health Foundation Education Packages for Schools Coping with depression	www.mentalhealth.org.nz www.mentalhealth.org.nz/page.php?p=155&fp=6&sp= www.depression.org.nz/HelpMe/?SubGroupName=ResourcesHelpMe
Suicide Prevention	www.spinz.org.nz www.moh.govt.nz/suicideprevention
Internet Safety in Schools	www.cybersafety.org.nz/kit
Drug Education NZ Drug Foundation	www.educating.co.nz/services/drugeducation www.nzdf.org.nz/drug-education
Alcohol - ALAC Alcohol & young people	www.alcohol.org.nz www.alcohol.org.nz/InfoForYouth.aspx
Coping with grief	www.skylight.org.nz/young-people.aspx
Advocacy for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Takataapui and Fa'afafine young people and their families/whānau.	www.rainbowyouth.org.nz
Structural	
Ministry of Youth - Youth Development & Youth participation	www.myd.govt.nz
Strengthening Youth Development in Schools	www.myd.govt.nz/Publications/youthdevelopment/ makingithappenstrengtheningyouthde1.aspx
Māori Student Achievement (Te Kotahitanga) Ka Hikitia	www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/Māori_education/9977 www.kahikitia.minedu.govt.nz/kahikitia/What+is+Ka+Hikitia.htm
Youth Law	www.youthlaw.co.nz/default.aspx?_z=126
STA Health & Safety in Schools	www.nzsta.org.nz/RexDefault.aspx?PageID=6c95540a-758a-4d16-8796- 03061080c234
Making Schools Safe for People of Every Sexuality – PPTA Guidelines	www.ppta.org.nz/cms/imagelibrary/102066.pdf

Parent Involvement in School

Team Up (Secondary)	www.teamup.co.nz/secondary/default.htm	
Bullying (Secondary)	www.teamup.co.nz/search.htm?query=bullying&filter=s	

References

Anderson, C.S. (1982). The search for school climate: a review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.

- Brand, S., Felner, R.D., Seitsinger, A., Burns, A., & Bolton, N. (2008). A large scale study of the assessment of the social environment of middle and secondary schools: the validity and utility of teachers' ratings of school climate, cultural pluralism, and safety problems for understanding school effects and school improvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46, 507-35.
- Brand, S., Felner, R., Minsuk Shim, A.S., & Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*, 570-88.
- Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K.P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C.B., & Hawkins, J.D. (2004). The importance of bonding to school for healthy development: findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health, 74*, 252-61.
- Espelage, D.L., & Swearer, S.M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: what have we learned and where to from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365-383.
- Fisher, D.L., & Fraser, B.J. (1990, April 16-20). Validity and use of the School-Level Environment Questionnaire. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.
- Fox, M.K., Dodd, A.H., Wilson, A., & Gleason, P.M. (2009). Association between school food environment and practices and body mass index of US public school children. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 109,* S108-17.
- Gottfredson, G.D., Gottfredson, D.C., Payne, A.A., & Gottfredson, N.C. (2005). School climate predictors of school disorder: results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 42, 412-444.
- Kasen, S., Johnson, J., & Cohen, P. (1990). The impact of school emotional climate on student psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *18*, 165-77.
- Kristensen, T.S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K.B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work and Stress, 19*, 192-207.
- Kubik, M.Y., Lytle, L.A., Hannan, P.J., Perry, C.L., & Story, M. (2003). The association of the school food environment with dietary behaviors of young adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*, 1168-73.
- Lee, V.E., & Bryk, A.S. (1989). A multilevel model of the social distribution of high school achievement. *Sociology of Education, 62*, 172-92.
- Libbey, H.P. (2004). Measuring student relationships to school: attachment, bonding, connectedness and engagement. Journal of School Health, 74, 274-283.
- McNeely, C.A., Nonnemaker, J.M., & Blum, R.W. (2002). Promoting school connectedness: evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Journal of School Health, 72*, 138-46.
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *How the decile is calculated*. Retrieved 1st Sept, 2009, http://www.minedu.govt.nz/ NZEducation/EducationPolicies/SchoolS/SchoolOperations/ Resourcing/OperationalFunding/Deciles/ HowTheDecileIsCalculated.aspx
- Moore, L., Roberts, C., & Tudor-Smith, C. (2001). School smoking policies and smoking prevalence among adolescents: multilevel analysis of cross-sectional data from Wales. *Tobacco Control, 10,* 117-23.
- Patton, G.C., Bond, L., Carlin, J.B., Thomas, L., Butler, H., Glover, S., et al. (2006). Promoting social inclusion in schools: a group-randomized trial of effects on student health risk behavior and well-being. American Journal of Public Health, 96, 1582-7.
- Resnick, M.D., Bearman, P.S., Blum, R.W., Bauman, K.E., Harris, K.M., Jones, J., et al., (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm. Findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 278,* 823-32.
- Shochet, I.M., Dadds, M.R., Ham, D., & Montague, R. (2006). School connectedness is an underemphasized parameter in adolescent mental health: results of a community prediction study. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *35*, 170-9.
- Thomas, D.R., Anderson A., Kool, B., & Moore, D.W. (2004). *Evaluation of the Healthy Community Schools Initiative in the AIMHI Schools. Final evaluation report.* Auckland: The University of Auckland.
- Twemlow, S.W., Fonagy, P., & Sacco, F.C. (2004). The role of the bystander in the social architecture of bullying and violence in schools and communities. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1036,* 215-32.



Table 9: School characteristics

School				Schoo	l Type					Schoo	l Size		
	•	Bo	ys	Ŝ	ed	Gir	sl	Sm	all	Med	ium	Lar	ge
Characteri	stics	Number	Percent										
	Low	4	25.0	11	17.5	0	0.0	4	18.2	4	13.3	7	19.4
Decile Band	Medium	7	43.8	38	60.3	4	44.4	11	50.0	21	70.0	17	47.2
	High	5	31.3	14	22.2	5	55.6	7	31.8	5	16.7	12	33.3
	Small	2	12.5	17	26.6	3	27.3	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı
School Size	Medium	8	5.0	19	29.7	5	45.5				ı	ı	
	Large	9	37.5	28	43.8	3	27.3	,	ı	I	I	I	ı

Appendices

Table 10: Response rates by school characteristics

Response Rates	Q	Numb Scho	er of ools	Number of students	Ave numl partic studei sch	rage ber of ipating nts per nool	Ave respoi by se (Stue	erage nse rate chools dents)	Ave propo total (popu	rage rtion of student Ilation	Number of Teachers	Ave num partic teach sch	rage ber of ipating ers per nool	Ave respoi by s (Teac	rage ise rate chools :hers)*
		Number	Percent		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range		Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Total		91	100	8828	97	20 - 382	75.5	50 - 96.6	14.3	9 - 36	2903	31.9	5 - 103	68.6	17 - 100
	Low	15	17.0	1298	86.5	20 - 208	69.2	52 - 83	13.4	9 - 26	501	33.4	7 - 70	74.2	35 - 100
School Decile	ledium	49	55.7	4168	85.1	20 - 343	75	50 - 96	14.3	9 - 36	1456	29.7	6 - 89	68.0	17 - 100
	High	24	27.3	3066	127.8	22 - 382	79.1	63 - 95	14.6	11 - 20	841	35.0	5 - 100	67.0	26 - 100
	Boys	16	17.6	1637	102.3	25 - 360	75.9	66 - 87	13.7	12 - 16	460	28.8	10 - 58	60.8	21 -100
School type (Co-ed	64	70.3	6311	98.6	20 - 382	74.6	51 - 97	14.4	9 - 36	2108	32.9	6 - 103	69.6	17 - 100
	Girls	11	12.1	880	80.0	22 - 176	79.9	57 - 95	15. 0	10 - 20	335	30.5	5 - 47	74.3	35 - 96
	Small	22	24.2	642	29.2	20 - 45	78.7	50 - 97	17.1	9 - 36	328	14.9	5 - 28	78.3	37 - 100
School size M	ledium	32	35.2	2110	65.9	27 - 98	76.2	52 - 94	13.7	9 - 17	861	26.9	13 - 47	6.99	17 - 100
	arge	37	40.7	6076	164.2	80 - 382	73	57 - 93	13.1	10 - 17	1714	20.7	18 - 103	64.5	21 - 100
School	Jrban	79	86.8	8241	104.3	20 - 382	75	51 - 96	14.1	9 - 36	2634	33.3	5 - 103	67.3	17 - 100
Catchment	Rural	12	13.2	587	48.9	20 - 111	78.8	62 - 90	15.5	11 - 23	269	22.4	10 - 55	77.2	40 - 100
*Because all	teache	rs were inv	vited to p	articipate th	e teacher	response r	ate is the	e same as th	ie propor	tion of tota	l teaching sta	ff who pa	rticipated		



	Clin
	lood
	er So
	each
	11 : T
	able
A	
EN S	
	7

30

able11 : Teacher School Climate Survey

Support for students		Total	D	ecile Bar	pt	Sc	hool Ty _l	эе	Š	chool Siz	e	Sch Catch	ool ment
	Mean	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
Dealing with disruptive students	3.50	2.16 - 4.32	3.32	3.54	3.53	3.60	3.46	3.58	3.62	3.50	3.42	3.48	3.58
Support for ethnic diversity	3.44	2.83 - 4.19	3.58	3.43	3.38	3.34	3.46	3.49	3.46	3.38	3.48	3.46	3.31
Support for sexual diversity	3.09	2.67 - 3.72	3.09	3.11	3.06	2.97	3.12	3.09	3.13	3.04	3.11	3.09	3.11
Effective health and welfare services	3.97	2.70 - 4.50	3.90	3.95	4.07	3.87	4.00	3.95	3.82	3.97	4.07	3.98	3.94
Family involvement	3.81	3.17 - 4.67	3.59	3.82	3.89	3.71	3.82	3.91	4.06	3.82	3.65	3.78	3.97
Support for students (overall)	3.57	2.97 - 4.13	3.50	3.57	3.59	3.50	3.57	3.61	3.62	3.54	3.55	3.56	3.59
Support for teachers		Total	Ω	ecile Bar	p	Sc	hool Ty _l	эе	Ň	chool Siz	e	Sch Catch	ool ment
	Mean	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
Support from colleagues	4.16	3.42 - 4.75	4.10	4.17	4.16	4.04	4.18	4.18	4.28	4.09	4.13	4.14	4.25
Innovation culture and vision	3.83	2.84 - 4.71	3.68	3.85	3.86	3.62	3.87	3.88	3.98	3.79	3.76	3.81	3.93
Communication	3.82	2.44 - 4.83	3.57	3.87	3.86	3.74	3.84	3.81	4.03	3.78	3.72	3.79	4.00
Participatory decision making	3.50	2.47 - 4.25	3.36	3.55	3.50	3.44	3.52	3.46	3.72	3.48	3.38	3.46	3.75
Professional Development	4.03	3.18 - 4.74	3.84	4.03	4.14	3.91	4.04	4.13	4.25	3.96	3.96	4.00	4.24
Support for teachers (overall)	3.87	2.93 - 4.61	3.71	3.89	3.90	3.75	3.89	3.89	4.05	3.82	3.79	3.84	4.03
Teacher perceptions of		Total	D	ecile Bar	p	Sc	hool Ty _l	эе	Š	chool Siz	e	Sch Catch	ool ment
students	Mean	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
Student helpfulness	3.86	2.88 - 4.71	3.46	3.81	4.11	3.78	3.81	4.26	4.02	3.84	3.77	3.83	4.05
Student disruptiveness	2.67	1.80 - 3.57	3.08	2.69	2.43	2.72	2.72	2.29	2.58	2.66	2.72	2.69	2.51
Student sensitivity	3.35	2.61 - 4.40	3.16	3.31	3.51	3.22	3.32	3.74	3.41	3.36	3.31	3.37	3.27
Teacher-student interactions	3.62	2.84 - 4.15	3.47	3.62	3.66	3.36	3.62	3.95	3.74	3.61	3.55	3.62	3.61
Achievement orientated	3.55	2.76 - 4.60	3.18	3.50	3.82	3.47	3.50	3.98	3.67	3.52	3.52	3.55	3.60
Teacher perceptions students (overall)	3.55	2.88 - 4.41	3.25	3.52	3.74	3.43	3.51	3.93	3.66	3.54	3.49	3.54	3.62

Aggregated teacher responses to 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree or disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree)

Climate Survey
tudent School
Table 12: Si

Student perceptions of		Total	Ď	ecile Bar	p	Sc	hool Tyl	эс	Ň	chool Siz	e	Sche Catchi	ool ment
school climate [°]	Percent	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
School encourages students of different ethnic groups to get along	67.7	41.4 - 96.7	67.4	68.6	65.0	68.3	67.6	67.4	67.8	69.8	65.9	67.5	68.8
Teachers go out of their way to help students	59.8	35.7 - 100	65.0	57.0	59.0	64.0	58.0	64.0	65.0	61.0	55.0	60.0	57.0
Students try to get the best grades	43.7	15.0 - 78.6	51.2	39.2	45.4	48.5	41.2	51.2	44.0	46.4	41.1	44.9	35.4
Students have trouble getting along	25.4	0.0 - 53.2	33.7	26.6	19.4	24.3	26.4	21.2	19.5	25.5	28.7	26.1	20.7
Teachers are very strict here	28.4	5.0 - 69.4	30.7	26.6	29.7	35.1	25.4	36.0	27.7	31.6	26.1	29.2	23.3
Some teachers have shown an interest in my culture	26.7	4.0 - 66.2	42.8	24.9	21.3	30.9	26.8	20.3	23.2	28.6	27.1	27.8	19.7
Students in this school have a say in how things work	45.4	23.8 - 66.7	45.8	45.9	42.8	46.4	45.5	43.3	44.9	47.2	44.0	45.1	46.9
Student connectedness		Total	Ď	ecile Bar	p	Sc	hool Tyl	эс	Ň	chool Siz	e	Sche Catchi	ool ment
to school	Percent	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
Students feel part of their school	89.0	78.0 - 100	93.0	88.0	88.0	91.0	89.0	88.0	92.0	90.06	87.0	89.0	89.0
People at school care about them (some or a lot)	92.0	82.0 - 100	93.0	92.0	91.0	92.0	92.0	94.0	93.0	93.0	91.0	92.0	92.0
Teachers are fair - most of the time	48.6	8.0 - 91.7	41.8	48.0	50.7	50.8	46.8	55.7	49.6	49.6	47.2	48.7	48.1
Expected to do well by people at this school	92.0	79.0 - 100	93.0	91.0	92.0	91.0	91.0	95.0	91.0	93.0	92.0	92.0	92.0
Students plan to get more training or education	63.7	37.5 - 91.7	57.1	61.2	70.7	64.0	61.2	78.4	59.8	64.5	65.4	64.6	58.1
Students who have skipped school for a full day or more without an excuse	25.3	4.5 - 48.2	36.4	25.5	19.7	25.8	26.2	19.1	19.2	26.0	28.4	25.8	21.8
Students who have been stood down from school	12.7	0 - 52	21.2	12.6	8.5	15.3	13.3	5.4	14.0	13.6	11.1	12.8	11.8
*Aggregated student responses - proportic	on of studer	nts who agree or :	strongly a	gree									





Table 13: Student Safety at School and Wellbeing

School safety	Total		Decile	Band		School	Type		School	Size		School Catchm	ıent
	Percent	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
Feel safe at school all or most of the time	84.0	61.0 - 100	82.0	83.0	88.0	84.0	83.0	92.0	89.0	85.0	81.0	84.0	87.0
Afraid someone will hurt / bother at school 3 plus times this year	9.6	0 - 21.3	9.2	10.2	10.0	12.8	9.8	6.0	9.0	9.6	10.6	10.0	8.8
Bullied at school weekly or more often in the last year	6.6	0 - 23.1	6.0	6.9	6.9	9.6	6.6	2.6	6.8	7.1	6.2	6.6	7.2
Teachers take action to stop bullying - almost always	49.4	22.6 - 88.5	43.6	49.8	50.3	47.4	48.6	56.5	53.9	52.6	43.8	49.0	51.6
Students take action to stop bullying - almost always	23.2	7.6 - 59.3	29.7	21.9	21.2	18.2	22.9	32.7	27.8	24.9	19.1	23.6	20.6
Percent of students who have been in a serious physical fight in the last 12 months	20.7	1.8 - 56.0	30.8	19.7	17.8	29.6	20.3	9.6	21.8	20.5	20.1	21.1	17.9

Table 14: Teacher Burnout and Wellbeing Relative to School Type

Teacher burnout and wellbeing	Tc	stal		ecile ban	q	Š	chool Typ	υ	S	chool Siz	¢)	Sch Catch	ool ment
	Percent	Range	Low	Medium	High	Boys	Co-ed	Girls	Small	Medium	Large	Urban	Rural
CBI - personal burnout	32.1	0 - 61.5	35.7	32.6	29.2	31.9	33.3	25.4	29.6	33.4	32.5	32.5	29.7
CBI - work-related burnout	28.3	0 - 63.2	31.8	29.8	24.2	24.7	30.1	22.7	26.3	28.9	28.9	28.1	29.2
CBI - student-related burnout [×]	27.0	0 - 63.2	29.7	28.9	22.5	28.8	28.1	18.0	21.5	28.3	29.2	27.4	24.4
WHO-5 Wellbeing ⁺	79.6	61.5 - 100	79.1	78.4	81.6	82.8	78.4	82.3	82.0	79.1	78.7	79.6	79.6
* Copenhagen Burnout I	nventorv - S	cores >50 inc	dicate signi	ficant levels	of burnout								

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory - scores >30 Indicate significant levels of purnout + World Health Organisation Wellbeing Index scores >13 indicate good or better emotional health



Adolescent Health Research Group www.youth2000.ac.nz