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ABSTRACT

SCHOOL CLIMATE AND SCHOOL ORGANISATION: A STUDY IN RELATIONSHIPS.

This work is the product of two years' in-service study of one middle school.

The aim was to examine the major structural dimensions of perceived school "climate", and assess the influence of internal organisation upon that climate.

Initial attention is given to the evolution of the school, its physical structure, environment, staffing and routine procedures.

The central part of the study is concerned to present and analyse the expressed attitudes and activities of the personnel in the school; pupils, teachers and ancillary staff.

Within a broadly "illuminative" paradigm the tactical methodology utilises a variety of research techniques notably questionnaires, personal interviews, participant observation and assessment of the formal records of school life.

The final part of the study reflects upon a period of change at the school which followed upon the appointment of a new headteacher in January 1979. Assessment is made of the organisational changes rapidly introduced into the school and the response of staff to a markedly different style of leadership.

The conclusion summarises the major findings, discusses the interaction between climate and organisation and reflects upon the suitability of the phenomenological approach to such case study analysis.

G.H. BUDD
Chester, 1982.
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INTRODUCTION

A recent paper by Mardle and Walker (1979) which examined the decision making process in schools suggested that the use of a certain organisational vocabulary canalised or limited alternative constructions of reality.

A word utilised rather more often colloquially than sociologically formed the stimulus for the following study. That word was "atmosphere". It is at once a word which everybody recognises yet few define, a word which when combined with a single adjective can communicate a multitude of experiences in a phrase of stunning simplicity. Educationally, Local Education Authority Advisers are heard to admit to a school having a "nice atmosphere" and individual teachers repeatedly emphasise the importance of a "relaxed classroom atmosphere". Exact delineation of the processes and experiences which combine to form this elusive "atmosphere" however is rather more complex and demanding.

Another word often used colloquially in association with "atmosphere" is "climate". Nowhere in the literature considered does there appear to have been made stipulative definitions to distinguish these two words. They are therefore used in this text as synonyms.

It is the aim of this study to examine the organisation of one Middle School here called "Glendale" in some detail in an attempt to illuminate some of the issues, events and procedures which appear to modify an individual's assessment of his particular school "atmosphere" or "climate". Willard Waller (1932) made
the point fifty years ago that schools should be viewed as social organisations in which it was impossible to modify one part without affecting to some extent the whole; and the initial thrust of this study was to identify those decisions which ultimately demonstrate this essential interdependence.

Underpinning this interest in the terms "atmosphere" and "climate" must of course exist a belief that such conditions affect the quality of shared experiences in the workplace. Given the immediacy or frequency of inter-personal communication by teachers as indicated by Hilsen and Cane (1971) in their suggestion that an organisational directive was made every two minutes, it would seem unlikely that staff always have the time to balance their instructions as delicately as they may wish. Given the demands on teachers for spontaneous suggestion and instruction, the responses of teachers might reasonably expect to reflect not only their personality and professional expertise but also their mood. The assertion by Philip Jackson (1968) that the person who enters a situation feeling generally satisfied with the conditions in which he finds himself is more likely than his disgruntled companion to cope successfully with the demands of that situation, is considered particularly appropriate to this present study.

This research is, therefore, concerned in part to describe something of the manner and variety of the communicative processes in one school over a two year period.
and assess the influence of the prevailing climate or atmosphere on individual attitude. The implication here that it is the atmosphere which modifies an individual's responses and not the individual's actions that create the climate forms a significant part of the debate which follows.

Given this interest in the analysis of school climate, the different stages of assessment that follow reflect a subjective interpretation in terms of actor involvement and organisational procedure. Clearly there are environmental influences at work in the creation of any climate, but the focus of this study is entirely intra-organisational. It acknowledges the influence of the cultural and social environment but seeks more to analyse the internal interactions which contribute towards the establishment of individual school climate.

Chapter One examines the literature which relates to this enquiry. The all-embracing terms "climate" (and "atmosphere") demand assessment of a wide range of sociological and socio-psychological literature. The development of Organisation Theory is traced from the initial classical theorists to contemporary phenomenological studies. Attention is then focused on the school as an organisation and upon studies examining the sociology of these organisations. Final appraisal is made of the many variables involved in the evolution of a particular climate and of some of the published test material available.
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Chapter Two attempts to synthesise these many strands into a coherent theoretical strategy for the present study. No one model is perceived as singularly appropriate, although the chosen perspective relies heavily on the Action analysis described by David Silverman (1970) involving day to day observation and interpretation of human behaviour in the organisational setting.

Chapter Three details the methods of analysis utilised in the study.

In addition to the use of all school formal records both children and staff completed two extensive questionnaires and participated in interview situations. The content of these enquiries reflected interest in those areas of school life that both personal experience and relevant literature suggested be explored. The issue of "Control" was perceived as pervasive, and examination of such structural variables as the curriculum, timetable, discipline, incentives and classroom management all further substantiate this influence.

Chapter Four describes the individual school in study.

The evolution, architecture, staffing, curriculum, standards and routines of Glendale Middle School are presented systematically to form a perspective against which subsequent decisions and events may be placed.

Chapter Five presents the results of the assessment of child attitudes in the school, gathered by observation, interview and questionnaire.
Chapter Six reflects the attitude and behaviour of the adult members of the organisation, principally the orientations, concerns and degree of unanimity among the school's teaching staff.

Chapter Seven focuses on perhaps the most pertinent issue of the study: the changes experienced by the school following the appointment of a new headteacher. Interest already referred to by this researcher in the significance of the term "atmosphere" had been stimulated by the leadership of Mr. Greenwood who retired in July 1978. At that time the outline for this study was being formulated, a significant part of which wished to examine how a "non-directive" leadership achieved its aims. The retirement of Mr. Greenwood, however, and the appointment of the new headteacher, Mr. Smith, in January 1979, demanded a re-assessment of this strategy. It was soon apparent that Mr. Smith's leadership style was rather more positive as innovatory procedures were introduced and a hundred page School Policy Document presented to each member of staff in March 1979. Indeed, the emphasis in the school changed so rapidly that this study itself had to accommodate a prevailing wind and focus attention more on the process of change itself.

The children of the school were introduced to such change on the second day of the new Headteacher's authority, when he prescribed against any form of confectionery in the school. The teaching staff, used to considerable consultation before such directives, soon debated the advantages and disadvantages of more positive leadership, often with some vigour.
The theoretical framework for this study had thus to be both broad and flexible enough to accommodate an initial interest in the strategies of non-directive leadership superseded by an appreciation of the organisational structures employed by more authoritarian rule.

It remains of less interest to this researcher to classify a school on a continuum of climate type as to illuminate those procedures and structures which modify that interpretation. The change of leadership and emphasis at Glendale was thus not entirely unhelpful. The increased use of written policy guidelines, rules, procedures and syllabuses afforded definitive criteria and highlighted contentious issues not originally perceived as significant.

Whether the aims were modified towards the affective, instrumental or cognitive demands of school life, the processes of decision making and communication had to continue. The period of change served principally to focus additional attention on these delicate and quintessential functions. The fluidity of these processes of change makes it important that the reader observes the dates of particular questionnaires.

Throughout the text it should also be remembered that the present writer was the Deputy Headteacher in the school during the period of study January 1979 to January 1981.
CHAPTER 1

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Given the two terms "organisations" and "climate", the relevant literature is both abundant and interrelated. The breadth of study ranges from a macro-level appreciation of "Organisation Theory" to the micro-level analyses of life in classrooms.

The following synopsis of such a vast, complex and occasionally tautologous field of sociological enquiry is necessarily selective and partial. It seeks, however, to indicate the principal theoretical issues involved, from which an appropriate paradigm for this study may be developed. Assessment is first made of the more generally applicable theories of organisation followed by analysis of the school as an organisation, its sociology and structures; concluding with an appraisal of literature that examines the composition, presentation and analysis of the elusive "school climate".

Talcott Parsons (1960 p. 17) described "organisations" as:

"Social units (or human grouping) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals". The construction and realisation of these goals involves continuous interaction between different departments, personalities and environmental pressures; indeed the goals themselves might be less than clear to some of the employees. As Parsons suggests, these goals may be "reconstructed" and are thus neither sacrosanct nor immutable.
Robert Michels (translation 1959) was one of the first sociologists to focus attention on such goal-displacement and while the political dimensions to his work are of limited application to this present study, his examination of the nature and power of oligarchic and charismatic leadership is more pertinent. Similarly Weber's (translation 1947) seminal discourse on the nature of bureaucracy and modern legal-rational leadership highlights very relevant structural dimensions, notably those of specialisation and efficiency. More recently, Blau and Schoenheur (1971) indicate how this pursuit of organisational efficiency can be accompanied by an increased insidious control; a feature examined in more detail in the final chapter of this study.

Other classical studies on organisation theory are more difficult to reconcile with life in schools. The principles of scientific management expounded by Taylor (1911) thus appear wholly inapplicable to the non-commercial, materially non-productive world of education.

In contrast to the mechanistic interpretations of scientific management, the human relations school by emphasising the social needs of the individual, focused particular attention on worker behaviour and performance. It was as Roethlisberger and Dickson reported (1939 p. 564) based on the "logics of sentiment" rather than a clinical commitment to production
efficiency and expansion. Although initially more concerned with industrial organisations, this interest in the social welfare of individuals stimulated wider-ranging studies upon the effects of leadership style and group dynamics entirely relevant to the school situation. Work by Lippitt and White (reported in Swanson et al 1952) and Lickert (1961) indicated positive correlations between authoritarian leadership and low productivity but other studies establish this as an over-simplification and introduce significant variables such as personality (Golembiewski 1962) and technology (Sayles 1958). Clearly the student of school "climate" is concerned to analyse not only the variables themselves but their interaction and inter-dependence.

However, certain fundamental dimensions demand recognition and form the structural framework for subsequent interactional analysis. One such dimension is perceived as the decision making process, relevant to both organisational efficiency and personnel morale. H.A. Simon (1957) in his synthesis of classical human relations and economic theories emphasises the social and personal constraints that limit the attainment of optimal choices while Cyert and March (1963) in perceiving four fundamental concepts in the decision making process, offer in two of them - the regulation of procedures and the need for adaptability; an inevitable latent tension. The recent paper by Mandle and Walker (op cit 1979) postulates a middle ground theory of
decision making which, while accepting the essentially
dynamic nature of organisations recognises the need
for some structural parameters. Interpreting
March and Simon's work (op cit 1958) to the school
situation Mardle and Walker concentrate on the
structural characteristics of routinisation,
specialisation and the predominance of satisficing
rather than optimising behaviour. Thus the contrast
is made with Weber's rule-governed organisation; here
the control being "routine" and the problem one of
making the best decision under pressure of limited
time and inadequate information. The dysfunctional
effects of an over-commitment to routine and formal
procedure as described by Merton (1957) and
Selznick (1943) are thoroughly applicable in an
educational context, especially the pattern traced
by Merton where conformity could, depending on the
type of control, develop into "ritualism", retreatism
and eventual rejection of innovation. It is a model
of particular interest to this study of Glendale School
as staff and children adapt to new leadership. The
further development of Merton's work (Blau 1963)
into Functional Theory is considered less persuasive
in the context of the present work. Clearly an
appreciation of the aims of the school is fundamental,
but it is hoped this micro-study can also present the
less predictable nuances of behaviour and consequences
of action.
Whereas Blau does recognise the role of individual spontaneity and the processes of change in the social system, Talcott Parsons (1960) in his development of Systems Theory is rather more rigid and definitive. Given the multifarious demands of the school day it would seem rather unlikely that the decision making process in school could be regulated by the application of universalistic codes and rules. Of more interest is Parsons' examination of institutional role playing. This analysis is considered particularly relevant to the teaching profession where hierarchical position and perceived responsibilities to extra-organisational agencies may influence individual attitude and behaviour.

Katz and Kahn's (1966) development of the influence of the role set upon behaviour is considered more apposite to this study than their examination of external environmental factors. They assert that:

"Associated with each office is a set of activities which are defined as potential behaviours. These activities constitute the role to be performed at least approximately by any person who occupies that office."

The change of headteacher at Glendale provided an interesting opportunity to contrast the behaviour of two consecutive holders of the same office.

Basic to an appreciation of the decision making process in organisations is the concept of power. Within schools it is possible occasionally to distinguish examples of Etzioni's (1964) three main dimensions of
alienative, calculative and moral power. However, as with Hall (1972) the eventual division into nine types of compliance structure is considered rather too rigid and tautologous to be empirically useful.

The concept of "compliance" did feature quite strongly, however, in the original theoretical strategy for the construction of the adult attitude questionnaire utilised later in this study.

The emergence of a sophisticated adaptation of human relations theory in the form of a socio-technical model in the 1960s is perceived of limited relevance in the social world of service organisations. While the future may well see the degree of technology in schools becoming increasingly significant academically and socially, the situation today defies the technological determinism suggested by Burns and Stalker (1961) and Woodward (1969).

Although more conscious of group interaction, Emery and Trist (1969) again regard the type of task at hand as crucial to the development of personal and role relationships in the organisation. It is difficult to apply this interpretation to the continually changing school environment. Similarly Perrow's (1972) perception of organisations as phenomena in which things are done to raw materials seems a rather inappropriate judgement on the nation's school children.
It is easier to perceive an educational adaptation in Perrow's discussion on the tendency of organisations to work towards the avoidance of exceptional situations; an analysis of the extension of rules and regulations to standardise school procedure being empirically feasible.

Although an attempt has been made to present a school-orientated interpretation, most of the literature so far discussed has been concerned more with the universalistic features of organisations.

A review of the school itself as an organisation involves analyses ranging from generalised sociological perspectives to intra-organisational case studies of particular variables.

A particularly comprehensive and apposite study is presented by Pusey (1976) who simplifies school organisation theory into the three major dimensions of the bureaucratic (or structural), the technical and the human relations. As with Merton (op cit) he sees ritualism as the greatest danger in the structural bureaucratic dimension, where the teacher's pastoral and innovative role conflicts with routine and prescribed procedure. Pusey establishes the technical dimensions of school life as that concerned with the curriculum and timetabling - a pre-occupation with which ignores development of pupils' personal and social values. Although supporting Argyris (1964) as to the professionals' need for a supportive climate, Pusey also illustrates how an emphasis on the human relations
dimension might be empirically dysfunctional; excessive face to face personal contact perhaps exacerbating rather than resolving conflict.

Pusey eventually adopts a systems view of the school where these three dimensions are as sets in a Venn diagram, each inter-dependent and interrelated. Tensions and conflict between the three dimensions are seen as inevitable, particularly that between the formal structure (perhaps represented by an authoritarian headteacher) and individual teachers sensitive to criticism. Pusey concludes by relating organisational effectiveness to the degree of congruence between these dimensions of bureaucracy, technology and personality.

To the present researcher this demonstrable congruence/dissonance is the very essence not only of organisational effectiveness but also of the "climate" of the school.

Husgr&ve (1968) while presenting a composite analysis of the school as an organisation similar in scope to that of Pusey, focuses special attention on the distribution of power in schools, the danger of divergent goals and the significance of school organisational rituals. Goal divergence is considered germane to this present study, particularly in respect to individual class teachers' acceptance of procedural innovation.
A problem for the researcher into comparative studies of schools as organisations is the individuality of the terminology employed. Thus whereas Pusey (op cit) perceives structural, personal and technical dimensions, Musgrave concentrates on expressive and instrumental goals and Lambert (et al 1970) adds an "organisational" dimension. It is accepted by these authors that the variables are dynamic and modifiable but this present student of organisation and climate finds the interrelation between such variables devalues their empirical worth. Lambert (op cit) does, however, elaborate on a very relevant issue, notably the influence of the school's informal social order on eventual goal attainment. Attention is drawn to the role of the staff-pupil relations, pupil associations, staff associations and pupil taste. This concentration is again perceived as the substance of our elusive "climate", particularly when considered alongside the degree and style of institutional control exercised in a particular school.

The importance of this informal social order is well documented: Blyth (1965) emphasised the role of meaningful controls perceived as fair by children to whom peer group status is so vital. Blyth also notes the challenge faced by new headteachers, who he believes, should adjust their role commitments to the expectations of the school and local community and take full account of the social structure operative.
within the staff. Hopefully this present study will partly illuminate this process which Blyth laments as rather thinly researched.

This present analysis of Glendale School was to some extent stimulated by the apparent consensus existing between the informal and official orders in the school. As Hammersley (P.40 1976) puts it:—

"Teachers ..... exercise of control depends largely on their getting their authority recognised by the pupils".

Clearly the manner in which such recognition is achieved and maintained is of considerable interest to the student of classroom interaction and a persuasive influence upon the nature of individual school climate.

A corollary of control in schools is the use of rules to establish codes of behaviour. Duke (1978) is particularly critical of the application of such rules by teachers who, it would seem, set down procedures to which they themselves do not conform. Duke asserts that rules can eventually subvert organisational goals especially where there is inconsistency among different teachers. This issue is pursued in the final chapter of the present study. Literature concerned to examine the "sociology of the school" again gives emphasis to the role of sub-cultural influences, the staff and pupil "underground". Shipman (1968) emphasises the need of the authority structure in school to recognise the social implications of decision making. Thus, decisions
taken on purely academic criteria could result in eventual polarisation of sentiment into pro and anti school. Case studies by Lacey (1970) and Hargreaves (1967) into the effects of streaming and the power of the sub-culture clearly demonstrate the "knock-on" effects of organisational or technical decisions. Bell (1979) recently extends this analysis into an appreciation of what he terms decision making by "flight" and "oversight". Viewing schools as highly unpredictable organisations characterised by uncertain goals, an unclear technology and a fluid membership, Bell's thesis is entirely appropriate to a later part of this study where organisational innovations are examined in relation to their effect upon subsequent attitude.

Sub-cultural influences clearly exist not only among the pupils of the school but also within the teaching and ancillary staff of the school. The synthesis of such variables as age, sex, seniority and specialisations demanding skilled leadership to avoid overall goal divergence and dysfunction. The power and compatibility of such reference groups as these is partly examined by Bidwell (1955) who also focuses (1965) on the inherent pedagogical conflict of teachers holding bureaucratic office yet required to sustain a role characterised by inter-personal communication.

Whereas literature is replete with sociological and organisational investigation, the examination and presentation of the term "climate" is sparse indeed.
Given the all-embracing and imprecise nature of the term this is perhaps not so surprising. We may individually recognise and "feel" a climate or atmosphere, but the complexity of its origin and fluidity of expression can confound elegant theoretical interpretation.

Much of the literature already reviewed obviously deals with issues crucial to the development of individual institutions. Hierarchical control, communication, leadership style, pupil involvement, the informal order within schools and the orientation of goals towards either the affective or instrumental domains are all seen as part of the matrix out of which an eventual "climate" is synthesised.

Halpin and Croft (1963) compare the complexities of organisational climate in schools with those of personality in individuals - and the comparison is well made. The writer on school climate might thus have the not inconsiderable task of describing the "personality" of a school and in so doing must make certain subjective judgements as to the relative significance of the numerous variables.

A basic issue explored both in organisation theory and empirical educational research is the relationship between the system (organisation) and the individual. One of the first studies to analyse the effects of this conflict upon organisational climate was that by
Argyris (1957). His study of events in an American Bank suggests that total agreement between the aims of the organisation and the individual is indeed unlikely. His development of the continuum congruence -- dissonance remains a most useful expression of this critical relationship. Getzels and Guba (1957) express the problem in terms of conflict between a nomothetic (institutional role expectation) and an ideographic (personality) dimension. The suggestion is made in this analysis that some conflict might indeed be beneficial to the vitality of the organisation. Here the empiricist faces the dilemma of recognising and defining "conflict" in the school situation. Debate and discussion both informal and formal is established as one of the functions of school life; to establish where disagreement or rejection of a particular philosophical stance registers as "conflict" -- and indeed differentiate between productive and destructive conflict situations, demands a degree of sensitivity unavailable to this present researcher.

Studies concerned with exploring the informal structure of the school and the effect of such on perceived climate, concentrate on the effect of leadership style and teacher involvement. Lippitt (1953) stresses the importance of the style of leadership to the resultant climate, observing that autocratic behaviour involves either apathy and submission, or aggression and
Anderson and Brewer (1946) demonstrate that children's behaviours are consistent with the kind of personality the teacher displays in the classroom, and Wuthal (1946) also assesses the teacher as the single most important factor in the generation of classroom climate. Part of the examination of child attitude and behaviour detailed in Chapter Five of this present study pursues this issue of class individuality and the role of teacher personality.

**Measures of School Climate.**

One of the first measures developed to explore the social interaction between a Principal and teachers was Halpin's and Croft's "Organisational Climate Descriptions Questionnaire (O.C.D.Q. 1963). Teachers' behaviour was studied and categorised along the four dimensions of disengagement, hindrance, esprit and intimacy. Headteacher's behaviour was analysed with respect to aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration.

After factor analysis, six basic climate types were evolved as open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal and closed. Acceptance of these six types has not been universal and the O.C.D.Q. has also been criticised for its concentration on the interactions of principal and staff - to the exclusion of other variables involved in the establishment of an organisational climate (Willcock 1977).

The significance of headteacher - teacher personality
which could be seen to correlate with eventual school climate was examined by Anderson (1964) where a series of headteacher personality traits (e.g. assertive-submissive, calm-emotional) were seen to be associated with levels of morale and commitment by the staff.

An Organisational Climate Index was also developed by Stern (1967) consisting of three hundred questions requiring true or false responses. The six factors isolated by Stern were the intellectual climate, the achievement standards, the practicalness, the supportiveness, orderliness and impulse controls within the organisation. Two major dimensions were seen to be at work, the "Developmental Press" concerned with personal motivation, and the "Control Press" designed to restrict personal expression.

British published measures of school climate are indeed sparse and only that by Banks and Finlayson (1973) attempts a comprehensive assessment. A questionnaire approach to the children aimed to identify four dimensions of emotional tone, task orientation, concern and social control. These dimensions are all derived from asking for children's perceptions about other people's behaviour. A further fifty-four item questionnaire sought to measure teachers' perceptions of colleagues' behaviour and identified seven scales including job satisfaction, personal relations, professional support and community involvement.
A recent study by Willcock (1977) utilised the Banks and Finlayson material to analyse the organisational climate of five British Comprehensive Schools. She notes the inter-related effects of organisational and social climate, observing that involvement by pupils and staff was lower in schools that inhibited individual expression. Schools scoring high on the task orientation and social concern dimensions were those not involved in streaming; academically less able children being subject to more undemocratic use of authority.

"Because of their frustration with their inability to face the limitations of the legitimate avenues of access to schools goals, non-academic pupils may be using non-conformist behavioural alternatives - thus bringing about stricter attempts at control" (Willcock p. 167). There is a familiar ring about this extract, a familiarity that might suggest more widespread concern on this issue. A serious problem in secondary education, it is one which is not inappropriate to this study.

Although Willcock articulated the challenge involved in gaining the support of the pupil sub-cultures, alternative strategies for those facing the situation remain elusive. A more pragmatic approach was developed by Walberg (1969) who postulated that children might be "fitted" to a chosen climate to facilitate their learning. An eminently sensible
proposal unlikely however to gain the essential bureaucratic support.

This review has examined a number of the generic theories of organisation and summarised but a few of the more general works on the sociology and organisation of the school. Attention has been drawn to the variables involved in the perception of school climate and reference made to available published tests and indexes.

The following chapter draws partly on this material to develop a conceptual framework for this present study and introduces the "action" frame of reference as described by David Silverman (1970)
CHAPTER 2.

A THEORETICAL MODEL

The complexity of modern organisations and the individuality of educational institutions, demands a theoretical perspective sensitive both to change and system inter-dependence. No "iron-law of oligarchy" can adequately interpret the social world of service organisations which may vary according to function and indeed within their own structures. Thus the "fishing industry" might be regarded as efficient and successful on the criteria of catching and distributing fish, yet ineffective and bureaucratic on the criteria of stock management and maintaining the quota system. Such contrasts may be observed in the education service with political and economic factors pervasive at times of "re-organisation", yet rather more unobtrusive within the time-tabled activities of the normal school day. This is not to deny the influence of external pressures upon the culture and climate of the school. Current economic restrictions and teacher re-deployment are certainly affecting both material provisions for the children and teacher morale - with an undeniable effect on school climates. However, the thrust of this present study is entirely intra-organisational and while noting the influence of the presenting culture, seeks more to illuminate actions and behaviours initiated by the processes of internal decision making and communication.

We are thus concerned more with studies of "leadership style" and "decision-making" than with the socio-economic theorists characterised by the work of
Joan Woodward (1969). Acceptance or rejection of the "Human Relations" or "Structuralist" schools of thought is however rather more complex and selective.

The influence of the informal social order and social groupings to the establishment of school climate is undeniable. Yet in contrast to this largely affective dimension is the ritualism displayed in school assemblies and staff meetings, together with the legal-rational constraints exerted by the Local Education Authority, management bodies, teacher professional institutions and selection procedures; a system displaying rather more inter-dependence than oligarchy.

Whereas the structuralists broadened the scope of organisational analysis including variables largely ignored by the Human Relations writers, any analysis of the school as an organisation must still recognise the singularity of inter-personal communication and personality. If as Jackson (1968) asserts, we teachers make over one thousand inter-personal exchanges daily then the mood and content of such exchanges demand assessment.

Yet the basis of much of the Human Relations research was industrial, concerned largely with the quality of worker-manager communication where roles were fairly clearly defined. In schools this situation is made rather more flexible with headteachers acting as both fellow professionals and bureaucratic superiors. At the one time supporting colleagues in the classrooms, at another
deploying the bureaucratic strategy to resolve conflict situations.

Research has also shown that the informal social groupings within the work situation are rather more ephemeral than the Human Relations school would suggest. (Dubin 1956. Walker and Guest 1952).

A basic dilemma for this study is the dichotomy suggested by the two terms "organisation" and "climate". The former term invites a structuralist interpretation of the operational challenges faced at Glendale School, whereas the latter term - climate - demands an appreciation of the more substantive and affective dimensions examined more thoroughly in the Human Relations literature.

It was for this reason that Pusey's model (op cit 1976) was earlier described and accepted as a demonstration of the system inter-dependence within the Education Service.

1. The formal structure  
2. The Technology  
3. The Social System.
None of the three dimensions illustrated was regarded by Pusey as an independent variable, the whole being perceived as a dynamic system modified through interaction.

A development of this model might extrude the climate of the school, resulting from the resolution of this interaction and tension where the headteacher represents the formal structure, the organisational procedures the technology, and the personalities the social system. Pusey described the conflict potential between the first and third dimensions in some detail and this present study is concerned to present examples of such tension where the headteacher's desire to "run a tight ship" conflicts with an individual teacher's perception of his own socio-emotional role in school.

Although acceptable as a broad theoretical perspective this Parsonsian interpretation of Pusey's offers, however, rather limited methodological direction. Given the involvement of the present writer in the everyday processes and interactions of one micro-organisation, the preferred paradigm is rather more phenomenological.

As Bolton affirms (1979) the phenomenologists' approach is thoroughly reflexive, concerned with subjective truths from which the investigator cannot remain immune. In this present study the investigator was by role and by choice both participant and observer.
The phenomenological perspective owes much to the writing of the German, Alfred Schütz, who is referred to in literature by Cicourel (1963) and more recently Dale (1973) as one of the founder members of a sociological school opposed to a behaviourist interpretation of society. Here the aim is to concentrate on what actually happens expressed in everyday language generalisations which enable us to gain a subjective understanding of the social world. This concentration on subjective meanings has brought criticism for the phenomenological-ethnomethodological school on the grounds of trivialising events and studying only those features chosen for their personal interest value. (Perrow 1974).

Pivcevic (1972) also instanced the numerous routine functions performed by workers where conscious control and subjective choice is extremely limited.

Certainly the present study arose from personal interest and some of the observations might be regarded as trivial. Here though is the essence of this study's stance. Any accusation of "triviality" is in itself a subjective judgement and one which the present writer would naturally refute. Whereas the approach of what Sharp and Green (1975) describe as "positivistic empiricism" might adopt a statistical presentation of correlation between the organisational variables, this present writer would prefer to note down the first
words used by teacher at morning assembly. Personal philosophy and some sympathy with the ethnographic approach underpins this writer's assertion that the choice made between "Good morning, boys and girls" and "You boy—be quiet" is neither trivial nor inconsequential.

This example might be compared to other more subtle observations made by Nash (1973) and Lacey (1970) who have both drawn attention to the fluidity of teacher-child relationships, and how these may be affected by the seemingly insignificant nuances of behaviour and attitude, communicated only perhaps by gesture or tone of voice.

The presentation of such a strategy poses certain problems. A series of endless quotations upon the same theme becomes tedious and inelegant, and necessitates the choice of representative examples. Similarly, although generally eschewing statistical analyses, certain questionnaire results are best presented in graph form, the compilation of which demands arithmetical accuracy and procedural uniformity. Such graphs and tabulations are thus used to illustrate majority opinion and provide a general overview into which context individual quotations may be placed.

Much of this study is concerned to present the attitudes and actions of individual actors in the context of their organisational framework, accepting that such actions and interactions constitute the perceived climate. The "action" frame of reference described in some detail by David Silverman (op cit 1970) thus becomes a persuasive influence upon the strategy ultimately employed in this study.
In his "Theories of Organisations" Silverman draws a definite distinction between the social sciences and the natural sciences, establishing the contrast between matter that behaves and people who act. Individuals and groups may react differently to the same stimulus depending upon the subjective meanings attributed to it. Although roles and typical behaviour are accepted, such roles and structures are perceived as only a framework for action - they do not determine it. Thus man is accorded considerable autonomy over his actions even within a structured environment and the interaction between individuals may in fact change or disrupt reality. Silverman draws upon Weber in asserting that there are no social facts, and no such thing as a collective personality which acts, only the social acts of individual persons.

The action analysis of organisations detailed by Silverman (op cit p. 154) suggests attention being given to six interrelated areas concentrating on the origins of the organisation, behaviours within the organisation and changes in the involvement, aims and roles of the actors.

In pursuing this analysis the techniques of illuminative evaluation described by Parlett and Hamilton (1972) seem eminently suited to what is unavoidably a subjective study. Thus the aim is more to describe and interpret than measure and predict.
The stages of observation, enquiry and explanation detailed by Parlett and Hamilton form the basic methodology for this present study within which:

"The choice of research tactics follows not from research doctrine but from decisions in each case as to the best available techniques, the problem defines the methods used not vice-versa". (P. and H. 1972. p. 6).

Interestingly, McNamara (1979) makes a similar point to this in his criticism of Parlett and Hamilton's use of the term "paradigm".

"Certain methods are more appropriate for the collection of certain types of information than others and none .... are immune from prejudice, experimenter effect and human error" (McNamara p. 169)

This present study employs a varied methodology to assess a complex social milieu; while accepting the strategies of the social phenomenologist it does not deny the significance of Etzioni's compliance theory, Merton's ritualism, Pusey's system interdependence and Simon's decision making theory.

This writer finds much common ground among theorists involved in the study of service organisations, and in a personally constructed analysis is concerned more to assemble and assess available data from which a theory may be postulated than attempt the verification of a particular stance. This strategy of grounded theory has been well described in literature by Glaser and Strauss (1967).
In formulating the questions for interview sessions and questionnaire surveys there arose a need to establish certain key areas or sub-divisions of school life. Although the terms "affective", "instrumental" and "organisational" are used adjectively in this study, the present writer finds major delineation on these dimensions unacceptable. One example may be illuminative. A decision was made at Glendale for all end of year tests to take place in the school hall. Previously such tests had been taken in individual classrooms.

Now in Musgrave (op cit 1968) "Examination Organisation" is considered in the "instrumental" realm, yet in reality the "knock-on" effects of that decision included:— teachers annoyed at not being consulted, the caretaker given extra duties setting out tables and chairs, the kitchen staff frustrated by delayed meals, children deprived of P.E. lessons, pupils placed in a new environment characterised by separation and silence—and so on.

The social and psychological implications of this "instrumental" decision were undeniable. It was this essential inter-dependence of variables which led this writer towards a broad perspective, to examine as much as possible, with a view to extracting what mattered most to both teachers and children.
A diagramatic presentation of the strategy for this study may appear thus:

```
attitude

aims ↔ actions ←→ climate

organisational procedures
```

Again it should be emphasised that although this illustration and the chapter titles of this study suggest climate to be only the product of interaction between the two elements of attitude and organisational procedure, this is a gross simplification. The "aims" themselves are subject to the pressures of the presenting culture and the architectural design of the building itself might inhibit or promote a particular type of climate.

The stance of this researcher, however, is unequivocal. People make the climate, and the people at the front line are more influential than those in the back-up services. Thus we concentrate on the children and on the teachers and on those organisational procedures and interactions which result in each actor modifying his own social construction of reality.

The study will first trace the historical and social background to the school and its personalities before presenting an analysis of the behaviours, attitudes and organisational procedures witnessed over
a two year period of study. Attention will be focused primarily on the teaching staff, pupils and procedures adopted to implement the stated aims of the organisation. Teachers will be observed, questioned and interviewed in an attempt to establish their feeling of association or "congruence" with the official school policy and degree of conflict they experience in performing their pedagogical role.

Children will be similarly assessed, giving increased attention to their levels of attendance, academic attainment, discipline, school involvement and declared attitudes to elements of the school curriculum, rules and procedures.

The existing (January 1979) organisational procedure of the school will be presented first and a later chapter will detail the changes made over the period of study. Although this data might be separated by chapter headings, an acceptance of the mutual interdependence and interaction between teacher, child and organisational procedure underpins the whole theoretical strategy. There is no single hypothesis to substantiate, the principal parameters for study are set by the physical limits of the school grounds. As Wardle and Walker (1979 p. 204) indicate:

"As yet we have no theoretical framework around which we might develop explanations about teacher decisions".

The framework for this study is thus a personal synthesis of available perspectives. The tactical approach to the study remains essentially "illuminative".
Criticism that such an approach might involve "non-rigorous probes" (Parsons 1976) is readily acknowledged. Given the breadth of this present study and the time limitations faced by a single researcher, this is indeed a very real danger.

Hopefully the variety of probes employed and the degree of collaborative evidence obtained will minimise the effects of some unavoidable subjectivity and selectivity.

The following chapter details the tactical methodology employed and indicates the areas of school life examined.

Subsequent development follows Silverman's thesis; the study of the organisation in terms of its origin, behaviours and changes.
CHAPTER 3.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The previous chapter shows that there is no single theoretical perspective which satisfactorily explains school organisation.

A strategy of combined techniques was therefore employed which, while taking advantage of this researcher's professional position in the school, tried to avoid overt personal presence. Thus whereas "participant observation" was a natural, even unavoidable, feature of this analysis, certain methods of classroom observation as described by Nash (1973) were considered inadvisable for the effect the "Deputy head's" presence might make on that individual classroom. Throughout the study the school staffroom, corridors and playground were constantly observed and specific comment, action, or innovation was noted in the recording diary. The formal records of school life such as log-book, attendance registers, minutes of staff meetings, parental news-letters, past and present school timetables and records of Managers' Meetings were utilised for more specific data.

The aims and objectives of the school were available in the "School Policy Document" drawn up by the headteacher at the direction of the Local Education Authority and detailing aspects of the school curriculum, subject syllabuses, timetable organisation, discipline and general administrative procedures.
Whereas the above sources could provide details of the organisational framework of the school and catalogue actions, incidents and innovations, the main sources of information on the attitudes and orientations of both staff and children, however, were the interview and the questionnaire.

Interviews.

Initially it was intended that all staff and a representative sample of children be formally interviewed on a series of pre-selected issues. This approach, however, was modified following three such tape-recorded sessions with members of staff who all indicated a preference for a questionnaire approach, followed up by interview on the more complex issues. These pilot interviews had not produced incisive material and it was thus decided first to develop a general questionnaire and then to pursue selective topic issue interviews at a later date. Staff interviews thus took place upon completion of the two questionnaires described below and centred upon responses given and issues raised in these enquiries.

Day to day professional exchanges with staff were of course of equal interest as the more formal interview, and provided a basis for generalisations regarding what is later termed the "staff sub-culture".

Interviews with the pupils were utilised not so much to glean information, as to test out the relevance and vocabulary of the questionnaires. Twelve children from each year group were randomly chosen from lists provided by class teachers of the pupils in three different
ability bands. Four children (two of each sex) were selected from each ability band and subsequently used for pre-test procedures and general attitude enquiries. The children were interviewed in groups of four where it was found they responded more readily to peer rather than adult comment.

The appointment of the new headteacher modified attempts to interview members of the school ancillary staff. Such enquiries were deemed ethically inadvisable at this time of change. As with the teaching staff, however, every conversation with the secretary, caretaker and kitchen supervisor was itself almost an interview situation - if regularly rather more candid. Whereas the teaching staff could, hopefully, accept a change of role from that of deputy head to researcher, it was believed the ancillary staff might not.

The Questionnaires

There were four major questionnaires, two applied to the teaching staff and two to the pupils.

I. Teacher Attitude and Experience Questionnaire

**Aim**

1. To provide details of each teacher's experience and subject specialisms.
2. To indicate consensus views among staff on issues relating to child discipline, incentives and controls, timetable organisation, classroom organisation and the role of the teacher.
3. To provide a bank of information as to teacher proclaimed attitude on a variety of educational issues, which might be compared with their subsequent actions.
Pre-test procedure.

This questionnaire arose out of previously personally constructed guidelines for interview situations. Questions were amended on the results of these early sessions and one section on "Change" omitted from the final draft. There was, however, no intended statistical base or correlation analysis; it was essentially a resource bank of staff experience and attitude. Validity lay in the honesty of individual response and the correct interpretation of the questions. Such interpretation was to some extent reinforced by subsequent interviews.

Content.

The five pages, sixty-five item questionnaire left space under each question for teacher responses.

Separate sections dealt with teaching experience, personal orientations, the role of the teacher, classroom organisation, the school curriculum and timetable and the local environment.

Application.

All teaching staff (except the headteacher) completed the papers in March 1979.

Presentation of Results.

Results are presented largely by percentage agreement/disagreement and majority orientations. Most responses were, however, made in sentence form and a number of these are presented as direct quotations in the text, particularly where they are felt to be illustrative of more general opinion.
II. **Staff Association Questionnaire.**

**Aim.**

To assess the degree of congruence/dissonance of the staff with the stated official policies of the school, and examine staff attitudes towards "Change" exemplified by organisational innovations in 1979.

**Pre-test procedure.**

A pilot test was administered to three members of staff as a result of which the test was reduced from twenty-five to eighteen questions. Responses were anonymous (if preferred) and as with the earlier questionnaire the format was discussed with the Headteacher.

**Content.**

Ten statements of official school policy were extracted from written instructions to staff; a further eight statements were constructed by this researcher to examine pertinent issues in the school.

The staff were asked to circle a response to a particular statement on a five point scale - strongly agree - agree - neutral - disagree - strongly disagree.

**Application.**

The questionnaire was completed by fourteen staff in November 1979. Four staff were new to the School in September of that year, two of these being probationary teachers. It was believed inappropriate to ask these teachers to complete the questionnaire.
Presentation of Results

A number of staff requested interviews to clarify their positions before finally circling a particular response on the five point scale. Given this scale, it was possible to build up percentage tables on each response and finally present the degree of association/disassociation with both official school policy statements (Table 6:1 and Figure 6:1) and staff attitude to specific issues (Table 6:2 and Figure 6:2).

Questionnaires Administered to Pupils.

I. School Climate Attitude Questionnaire.

Aim. 1. To provide an indication of child attitude towards five main areas of school life:—Instruction, Controls, Incentives, Relationships and Classroom Management.

2. To examine the degree of acceptance or rejection between selected features of each of these five main areas.

3. To examine any perceived differences in attitude between the children at Glendale in respect of (a) their age or year group, (b) their sex, (c) their academic ability and (d) their individual school class.

Pre-test Procedure.

There was initial discussion with one class from each of the four year groups regarding their feelings towards certain subjects, rules and procedure in school.
Assessment of the vocabulary used (i.e. "smashing", "hate it", "great", "boring") provided the basis for this individually constructed test.

Rather than employ either a Yes/No or five-point scale centred on the word "Like", it was decided to use the children's word responses for positive and negative emotions. A scale was finally evolved using the terms: Excited, Happy, Interested, Calm, Bored, Unhappy, Frightened.

This appeared to embrace a range of emotions without the confusion of similar responses (e.g. "Like a little", "Like", "Like a lot"), it involved the children in actually writing a whole word response rather than just underlining, and used the pupil's own vocabulary apart from the "Calm", and to some extent "Interested" response. An opposite of "Bored" was, however, required and "Interested" seemed the most appropriate. The term "Calm", it was explained to all children, represented "no strong feelings either way".

A pilot questionnaire was administered to twelve children who all completed it satisfactorily in under fifteen minutes, apart from two first year pupils who needed assistance with reading. Subsequent re-test four weeks later revealed an eighty-three per cent agreement on six randomly selected questions. No child changed from a positive to negative (or vice-versa) orientation. There can, however, be no complete
validation of such a test of attitude. Certainly experienced judgement suggests that the questions appeared to be clearly understood by the children, with individual explanations given where there were problems. The atmosphere in the rooms at the time of the enquiry was one of concentration and absorption, the indication being that the pupils appreciated being asked how they felt about things and welcomed the opportunity anonymously to express themselves.

Two questions (18 and 21) were interspersed to "check" responses for absurdities, it being presumed that no children would be "Happy" when arguing with a friend (Q. 18) or "Unhappy" when teacher jokes with the class (Q. 21).

**Content.**

Thirty-two statements were presented which embraced different aspects of school life to which pupils had to respond by writing one of the seven words listed above, in brackets at the end of the statement. Three open-ended statements completed the questionnaire asking the children to indicate what made them happy and unhappy in school and what feature they would most like to change.

**Application.**

The questionnaire was administered to three hundred and twenty-three pupils in October 1979. This involved all children present in the school, apart from the E.S.N. pupils. Absentees were not pursued.
Three hundred papers were accepted for final analysis, twelve of the original being "spoilt" and eleven randomly removed to achieve equal distribution of twenty-five papers from each of the twelve main classes of the school. This final number represented eighty per cent of the school roll of that time.

The children were asked to indicate their class, year group and sex on the questionnaire, but not their names. Each class teacher further categorised the children academically A, B, C or D on the basis of the previous years' English and Mathematics results, this grading (coded) was also indicated on the child's sheet.

All children took the test in silence on the same day.

Presentation of Results.

This questionnaire offered three hundred children a choice of seven responses to thirty-two questions and produced data which, while abundant, demanded careful analysis to illuminate the more relevant features.

The matrix of raw scores was first converted to total percentages on each of the seven possible responses to each question (Table 5:1). By awarding a scoring system +3 for "Excited" responses through to -3 for "Frightened" responses, it was possible to illustrate total positive and negative orientations in graph form. (Fig. 5:1).
The totals obtained by awarding these scores are later referred to in the text as "Intensity Ratings" and were utilised to compare year group differences.

Variety in response according to sex, academic ability rating and school class was pursued through study of six selected questions extracted from the whole questionnaire. The logistics involved demanded some selectivity and the choice of individual questions described in more detail later in the study closely represent overall trends within each of the five main areas of analysis. This method allowed for some detailed examination of individual questions to assess whether majority percentages and average figures were disguising significant differences.

The amount of data yielded by this questionnaire compelled the use of some statistical comparison. It will be observed, for example, that decimal point notation is included in Table 5:1 (p. 68) Such a presentation, however, is the result more of a desire to reflect mathematical accuracy than exemplify the nuances of child response. Decimal points and child attitude appear an incongruous mix, and wherever possible the results of this survey are illuminated in graph form.

High School Pupils' Attitude to Middle School Questionnaire.

Aim. 1. To provide data on perceived Middle School climate from children able now to draw on some comparative experience.
2. To contrast the results of ex-Glendale pupils with those from the other two feeder schools in the area.

Pre-test Procedure.

A list of thirty-eight questions was drawn up and administered to eight children who often returned to Middle School to relate their new experiences. Analysis of these results and discussion with the children resulted in the slimming down of the questionnaire to thirty-one items and the adoption of a Yes/No response rather than five point scale.

Most of the thirty items were cross checked on the questionnaire although in some cases a certain etiquette suggested opposing statements be omitted; thus there is no negative version of "The school was bright and cheerful".

Permission to pursue the enquiry was given by the headmistress of the High School and the individual questions were discussed with the member of staff with special responsibility for the first year intake. The test was, by observation, completed conscientiously but, once again, the researcher faces the validation of proclaimed child attitudes which should be accepted as more descriptive than definitive.

Content.

Thirty-one statements were listed which related to the organisational climate at Middle School.
Ex-pupils were asked to agree or disagree with each statement by ticking either the Yes or No response. These statements concentrated upon Freedom and Controls, Instruction, Timetabling, Relationships (particularly with teachers), School Environment and Classroom Management. One final open-ended statement asked pupils to indicate what they believed to be the main difference between High School and Middle School.

Application.

All first year High School pupils completed the questionnaire in December 1979. Of these sixty-nine were ex-Glendale, forty-two ex-Handley and eighty-nine ex-Barton pupils.

The children were asked only to indicate their previous school on the questionnaire. Preliminary analysis of the earlier Middle School Climate Attitude Questionnaire had suggested limited variation in terms of sex or of academic ability, and the purpose of this enquiry was to assess "whole school" differences, rather than distinguish differences of response in terms of sex and ability.

Presentation of Results.

Percentage responses on all criteria are displayed in Table 5:16 and these results are illustrated in graph form comparing Glendale with average responses of the other two feeder schools in Figure 5:17.
CHAPTER 4.
Glendale Middle School - A Descriptive Assessment.
Evolution and Environment.

Glendale Middle School originated as a two form entry Junior School and received its first pupils in September 1964.

It is situated on the western edge of a large council estate, Seaton, some two miles from the city centre of Chester. Over ninety per cent of the pupils at Glendale live in this council owned property which was constructed during the decade 1960-1970. Although there is some high rise development, the vast majority of pupils dwell in low rise terraced houses with small gardens to front and rear.

Original plans for the Seaton estate indicate playing fields and recreational facilities which have not yet materialised. The present local population of almost twenty-five thousand people have access to two small shopping areas and a library. There is one dental surgery but no doctor. Plans for a swimming pool at the neighbourhood comprehensive school have again been shelved. Both young and old travel regularly into Chester to fulfil their social and domestic needs.

Colloquially, Seaton has acquired the reputation as something of a "tough" or problem area; an assessment which the present writer would feel to be an exaggeration. However, a recent Local Education Authority leaflet advertising the position of headteacher at the Seaton Comprehensive School included the comment
that local parents had "limited educational aspirations", an observation that did not escape the notice of council representatives.

In September 1972 following the addition of extra accommodation, Glendale became a Middle School, one of three to serve the Seaton estate under the direction of the City of Chester Education Committee.

Following local government re-organisation, however, Chester City became part of the larger Cheshire County Council which had preserved the traditional 11+ break from primary to secondary education. There now thus exists the anomalous situation of the Chester district schools operating a First and Middle School system transferring at 8 and 12, surrounded by the rest of Cheshire operating on Infant and Junior lines.

The Middle School in Chester.

The most striking feature about the development of the Middle School both locally and nationally was its initial impetus. Publication of the Plowden Report (1967) and the D.E.S. Building Bulletin No. 35 focused attention on the issue of transfer at twelve or thirteen in 1967. Yet by 1972 (three years before the emergence of Working Paper 55 "The Curriculum in the Middle Years) the City of Chester three tier system of First, Middle and High Schools was operational.

This five year period was characterised locally and nationally by working parties comprising teachers, advisers, elected representatives and Local Education Authority officers producing papers for general
dissemination. The D.E.S. and Schools Council were also active arranging conferences on Middle School Education at the University of Norwich in 1967 and Exeter the following year.

In April 1967 the Chester Chief Education Officer produced an "Interim Report on the Re-organisation of Schools in Chester" (Education Council Minutes 26.4.67) which highlighted a principal area of concern, whether to opt for twelve or thirteen as the age of transfer. National working examples at this stage were few; some persuasive figures such as Sir Alec Clegg in Yorkshire were recommending transfer at thirteen, a view shared by Sir Edward Boyle who was consulted by delegates from Chester in an informal meeting in June 1967. (Ref. Bryan (1980. p.119).

The aforementioned Chester Interim Report, however, conscious of existing structural facilities in the City, was more cautious:

"In fact with transfer at the ages of eight and twelve, the three tier system is virtually identical with a simple change of the age of transfer in line with the recommendations of the Plowden Report. With transfer at nine and thirteen the scheme becomes an entirely new one for Chester and would entail widespread re-organisation". (Interim Report quoted in Bryan 1980. p. 125).
On the 31st July 1968 a three tier system of re-organisation with transfer at eight plus and twelve plus was formally submitted to the D.E.S. by representatives of Chester City Council.

A series of public meetings was held during 1968 to explain the scheme and during the following two years the local Advisory Service set up curriculum development groups to study aspects of English, Mathematics, History, Geography, Art and Crafts. Much of such discussion was based on Schools Council publications although by the end of 1970 the D.E.S. had issued "Launching the Middle School" and "Towards the Middle School".

Attention locally now focused on problems involved in the re-deployment of staff - primary school teachers had, by their replies to questionnaires, displayed rather more enthusiasm for the scheme than their secondary colleagues. Despite a proposed policy of appointing heads of department in the smaller middle schools (Group 5 and below) and two grade A positions and two grade B posts in the larger middle schools, the majority of appeals received by the Local Education Authority came from teachers employed in secondary work who were now offered posts in middle schools. Some secondary staff, however, did recognise benefits involved in the attraction of a broader teaching curriculum and increased promotional opportunities, and
this resulted in some movement of secondary teachers — especially from the Craft and P.E. departments. However no teacher in Chester appointed to work in the middle schools had in fact experienced teaching in such institutions by 1972. (op cit. Bryan 1980).

On the 4th September, 1972, following the construction of extra facilities including a Science Laboratory and Open Plan Art/Crafts, Domestic Science and Woodwork area, Glendale became a three-form entry middle school with a roll of four hundred and fourteen children. Two extra temporary classrooms also had to be erected in the school playground to accommodate these numbers.

Two of the "new" middle schools in Chester were in fact re-designated secondary schools and thus retained excellent facilities, but Glendale was the only middle school to receive a purpose-built extension at that time. All such junior schools were modified and afforded extra facilities but with considerable variety of provision. One middle school is receiving a school hall at the time of writing, having waited ten years to offer children a corporate assembly and reasonable P.E. and dining facilities.

Analysis of the bureaucratic and professional manoeuvres involved in the establishment of the three tier system in Chester while perhaps peripheral to the substance of the present study is nonetheless
revealing. The "hinter-land" of the school as an organisation is clearly displayed through the interaction of local pressure groups and personalities, economics and politics and between local and national priorities.

The reader interested to pursue such enquiries should consult the recent thesis by Bryan (1980) where documentation of these processes is both extensive and thorough.

Interviewed for this present study, a senior member of the Local Education Authority Advisory Staff originally prominent in the setting up of study groups on staffing, acknowledged in retrospect a certain idealistic concern for child-centred educational philosophy and a comparative under-estimation of the economic and architectural limitations of the scheme.

Almost a decade after original re-organisation, this same source - still professionally active - suggested that problems caused by falling school rolls, limited finance and staff selection had inhibited the creation of his "Middle School Ideal". He regarded Glendale Middle School as one of the more satisfactory examples.

Glendale School Building.

The plan (Fig. 4:1) shows Glendale to consist of three main elements. The hall, kitchen, entrance hall and staff room forming one block; the main two-storey building comprising eight classrooms to the west of the
Figure 4.1. Plan of Glendale Middle School.
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main corridor forming another; and the single storey extension added in 1972 upon conversion to middle school status a third block.

Apart from the main corridor area, the school is well provided with windows; the west facing classrooms being particularly light and pleasant with lower floor exits directly onto the playing field. This field overlooks the open countryside and the Welsh foothills, an aspect which contrasts with the terraced housing to the north and east of the school.

This writer shares the view expressed by Bennett and Hyland (1979) in a recent article on open-plan schools that there is no such thing as architectural determinism.

"Architecture can certainly modify the physical environment but not necessarily the activities which take place in that environment. (op cit. p. 164).

The "climate" however is the result of the interaction of a multiplicity of factors and one such contributory factor is believed by this writer to be the school building. Three architectural features at Glendale are considered significant.

Firstly, the decision of the original headteacher, Mr. Greenwood, at the time of re-organisation to press for the enlargement of the staffroom at the expense of a stock room. This was achieved, and provided a spacious area in which staff could relax and socialise;
visitors to the school invariably commented on this feature and the decision of the headteacher to have this work carried out reflects the status he attributed to adult social relationships within the school.

Secondly - and perhaps conversely - the main corridor of the school was under constant pressure of numbers. The school timetable involved considerable movement between classes and "conflict" in a very real sense was experienced at changeover times and at the beginning and end of sessions. Teacher supervision over lively children in this limited area had to be direct and effective. A more helpful feature of this one central corridor was its suitability for visual display material, a use exploited by staff with regularly changed and colourful exhibits usually upon a mutually agreed theme.

A third architectural feature with impact upon the organisation and climate of the school was undoubtedly the extension block. As can be observed from the plan, this block comprised two E.S.N. classes, a library, a classroom, a science laboratory and open-plan area consisting of Domestic Science facilities, Art and Pottery area and Woodwork room. The provision of this extension (and suitably interested and qualified staff) thus enabled all third and fourth year children to receive specialist teaching in those areas normally in half-class units. The significance of this might
be indicated by the fact that in a survey of fourth year boy pupils, woodwork was indicated as their favourite subject, ahead even of games.

Generally the staff at Glendale believed the school building appropriate to its middle school role and attractive in structure.

**Staffing.**

In January 1979 there were seventeen staff in addition to the headteacher. The hierarchy was represented by a deputy head, two scale 3 posts, seven scale 2 posts and seven scale 1 posts. There were also two welfare assistants assigned to the E.S.N. classes.

The majority of scale 2 posts were for "year leadership" plus other responsibilities for either Music, P.E. or Science.

Mr. C. on scale 3 post was responsible for fourth year pupils, English curriculum development and high school liaison.

Mrs. I. also scale 3 post was responsible for Mathematics and girls' disciplinary matters.

Apart from his socio-professional role the deputy head had specified responsibility for school stock, finance, control of movement about the school, timetable compilation and staff duty rotes.

It should be remembered that all staff, the majority (60%) of whom were under thirty years of age.
had been appointed by Mr. Greenwood who retired in July 1978.

During the two year period of study, five of these staff left and were replaced by two probationary teachers and three experienced staff, two of whom had been re-deployed.

Three posts of responsibility which became vacant during this period (1979-81) were all appointed from existing staff.

The Curriculum - September 1978.

Teachers of first year children were expected to cover aspects of English, Mathematics, Environmental Studies, Art, Music, P.E. and Games.

During the second year specialist science teaching in the laboratory was introduced and the children also received swimming instruction.

By the third year specialist teaching of French, Art/Craft, Woodwork and Domestic Science was also added to the curriculum.

All subjects were covered by individual syllabuses generally compiled by specialist staff and often revised following attendance at courses and subsequent staff discussion. Mr. Greenwood had always requested notes of such informal group discussions and inspected schemes of work before accepting them for general use in the school.
Staff were generally encouraged to seek out their own material especially in the form of reference books and text books, and rarely found their requests for finance refused.

The Timetable – September 1978.

Given the fourteen classes of the school, three to each of four year groups plus two E.S.N. units, this allowed three members of staff to be released from specific class responsibilities. The deputy head was one of these, Mrs. I, the scale 3 post, another, and a temporary teacher largely involved in remedial work the third.

During the children's first and second years in middle school, specialist teaching was restricted to aspects of Music, Science, P.E., Games and Swimming. Eighty per cent of these children's learning experiences was directed by their own class teacher.

During the third year the introduction of setting for Mathematics and specialist teaching in French, Art, Environmental Studies, Domestic Science and Woodwork reduced this class teacher-led instruction to fifty per cent, and by the fourth year some three quarters of the children's timetable consisted of specialist led activities. Such pupils were taught by up to seven different teachers through the week.

This use of staff demanded – especially in the upper school – a carefully drawn up timetable of block period allocation. Morning sessions consisted largely of
instruction in the basic subjects with hour long lessons. The afternoon sessions consisted of four thirty-five minute periods many of which were combined to form double periods.

Classes in the upper school (3rd and 4th years) studying in the extension area did so in half-class units, while some were engaged in Woodwork others did Domestic Science, while half pursued Art or Craft the remainder occupied the Science laboratory. Classes for these lessons were divided alphabetically, boys and girls combining for all subjects.

Lower school classes were less affected by this "compartmentalised" timetable, a teacher of the first or second year children wishing to develop an "integrated day" approach with the children could achieve this for three quarters of the school day.

Consensus opinion among the staff was supportive of this timetabling structure and individual responsibilities within it. Such support was not unexpected as Mr. Greenwood had always supplied to new staff a form on which to indicate in star rating fashion their relative interest in particular subject areas. Timetable formation then resulted from an appraisal of these forms, together with group discussion, Headteacher guidance on subject weighting and eventual deputy head compilation.

One feature of the school timetable organisation and structure was that at no time other than morning assembly and P.E. activities was a classroom unoccupied.
Teachers wishing to utilise a spare room for rehearsal or extra remedial work faced a problem that was never satisfactorily resolved.

Class Allocations - September 1978.

There was no streaming at Glendale. Children arriving from the two feeder first schools were divided among the three first-year classes mainly on an age group basis calculated by their month of birth. Care was taken to mix children from both schools and sexes, and by assessment of reading ages the apparently less able children were divided equally among the three classes.

Some withdrawal of children for extra reading took place throughout the four year groups and during the third or fourth year at middle school, pupils were "set" into four or five ability groups only for Mathematics. Otherwise, classes stayed as units except for activity lessons previously described.

Child Attainment Levels.

All fourth year pupils at Glendale, together with similar age group children throughout the area, annually undertook N.F.E.R. tests in Intelligence, Mathematics and English. Results of these L.E.A. directed tests were assessed by officers of Chester Schools' Psychological Service for general information and to assist in the identification of potential remedial problems.
Extracts from some of these results are shown below to offer an indication of the general achievement levels within Glendale Middle School. In the following data, figures for Glendale are calculated averages over the period 1977-1980 inclusive. To afford some comparison, figures for the two other middle schools in Seaton (Handley and Barton) are presented together with the results of Glade Hill School set in a contrasting residential area to the east of Chester. Figures for these schools are for the year 1979 only.

**Percentage Distribution of Standard Scores on N.P.E.R. Test, Culture Fair, Form B Scale 2 1979.**

*(Glendale average of four years)*

**Table 4:1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Barton %</th>
<th>Handley %</th>
<th>Glade Hill %</th>
<th>Glendale %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120+</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 - 119</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 109</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 90</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that this test identifies a certain intelligence potential it would seem from these results that the majority of children at Glendale are not naturally gifted pupils. A similarity with results at Barton Middle School can be perceived but noticeably less identification with Handley and Glade Hill where almost thirty per cent of pupils score over one hundred and twenty compared to only seven per cent at Glendale.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>BARTON %</th>
<th>HANDLEY %</th>
<th>GLADE HILL %</th>
<th>GLENDALE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120+</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 - 119</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 109</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 90</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the concentration of marks for Glendale children appears in the range 90 - 110, in contrast to both those at Glade Hill where more than half the pupils score over 110 and Handley where more than a third do so. Further analysis, however, shows children at Glendale performing rather better than those at Barton and apparently assisting the less able children more successfully than at Handley.


Source: Chester Schools Psychological Service Records.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>BARTON %</th>
<th>HANDLEY %</th>
<th>GLADE HILL %</th>
<th>GLENDALE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>above 110</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 109</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 90</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this presentation of results on Reading Test D.E. it will be seen that Glendale results are again heavily weighted in the 90 - 110 scale range. The contrast with Glade Hill is most pronounced where fifty-one per cent score over 110 compared to only sixteen per cent at Glendale.

Comparison with the more local schools again reveals results marginally superior to those at Barton and rather different in pattern to those at Handley where percentages seem high at both extremes of the presentation.

The purpose in presenting the above data is simply to suggest the general attainment levels operative at Glendale Middle School. It is apparent from these results that the majority of pupils at Glendale are of average ability performing to satisfactory, rather than exemplary standards.

Child Attendance.

The following data extracted from school register returns to the Local Education Authority gives average monthly percentage attendance at Glendale Middle School between January 1978 and July 1980.

**Percentage Daily Attendances, Glendale Middle School, January 1978 - July 1980, presented as average figure for each month of the school year.**

**Table 4:4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93 90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92 92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93 91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These uniformly high percentages appear consistent with more subjective comment made to this researcher by the headteacher and Educational Welfare Officer.

The headteacher (Mr. Greenwood) was proud of the fact that he had "no truants" and the Educational Welfare Officer asserted that Glendale appeared to have fewer problems in this respect than any other school he visited.

Activities for Children

Through each year of this researcher's experience at Glendale there were at least two clubs or societies operating every day of the school week. These varied from games or P.E. orientated activities to those more concerned with the development of musical and artistic skills. All members of staff were involved in at least one such extra-curricula provision.

At least two five-day residential visits to centres of interest in Britain or abroad were features of the summer term and shorter stay visits to Local Education Authority Environmental Study centres were also attended by up to six classes per year.

Although some of these visits took place in vacation time there was never any shortage of staff wishing to become involved.

Through the school year special functions included the Christmas Pantomime and Parties, Summer Fair, Sports Day, Swimming Gala, Year Group trips and a number of socio-educational activities involving parents and children.
Discussion with ex-pupils as they returned to Glendale endorsed the significance of these occasions. School assemblies might have been “boring” but the pantomime and staff v. children cricket match were “magic”.

This chapter has attempted to provide a contextual background to the detailed assessment of teacher and child attitudes which follows.

Further details of the routine organisation of the school are presented in an analysis of organisational change outlined in a later chapter.
CHAPTER 5.

RESULTS. PUPIL ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOUR.

1. Pupil School Climate. Attitude Questionnaire.

The children responded to thirty-two statements about school life by indicating one of seven emotional states: Excited, Happy, Interested, Calm, Bored, Unhappy and Frightened.

Percentage responses to each category were computed from raw scores and are presented overleaf in Table 5:1 (full text of the questionnaire is available in appendix).

Thus it may be observed that in question one, enquiring into children's feelings about having their work displayed, almost seventy per cent recorded "Happy" and eleven per cent "Excited". It might be assumed that the small minority of negative responses resulted from question misinterpretation; until in subsequent interview one child explained how she had felt "shown up" by a teacher displaying her (unsuccessful) work. Although in the following discussion, focus is inevitably concentrated on the large majorities, these negligible minorities may possess their own social significance. Thus, in question twenty-two, one child is recorded as "Frightened" at the prospect of leaving school to go home in the afternoon.

In the following analysis, responses are first assessed for broad trends within the overall groupings of "Controls", "Instruction", "Incentives", "Relationships" and "Seating". Although not all statements fit neatly
Pupil School Climate Attitude Questionnaire
Percentage Responses.  n = 300

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Work displayed</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shouted at</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Winning house team</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Late for school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lose books</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stars for work</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Play-time</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Books to be marked</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Books distributed</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sent to Head</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Choose partner</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sit anywhere</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Come to school a.m.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Argue with friend</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Desks in rows</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Have a test</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teacher jokes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Leave school p.m.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Parental attitude</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Desks in groups</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Class play</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Made a monitor</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Teacher in school</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teacher out of school</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Line up</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ask to leave room</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Told to read</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into such categories, some (17, 22) demanding to be assessed individually, this initial collective approach is believed appropriate to afford collaborative evidence and promote a more lucid synthesis.

Results.

School Climate Attitude Questionnaire (S.C.A.Q)

Controls

Examining first those questions (Nos. 2, 5, 6, 14, 29) relating to aspects of controls in school, the responses are uniformly negative in bias.

Table 5.2. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Controls"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shouted at</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Late for school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lose books</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sent to headteacher</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Told to line up</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two children (0.7%) are faithfully recorded in question two as being "Excited" when shouted at, but the massive majority fall into the "Unhappy - Frightened" category. A similar trend is observed in question five where the children appear to expect some verbal harangue at being late for school; whereas losing a book (question six) initiates less fear, if more unhappiness.

The powerful if unenviable position of headteachers is clearly expressed in question fourteen where almost seventy per cent responded "Frightened" to the statement "You are sent to the headteacher". Such a response might be expected as this is something of a final control measure - but the small minority indicating excitement
at the prospect also deserve attention. Mr. Smith (the new headteacher) was particularly active about the school and asked to see all children's books once a term; many children were sent to him for praise and the award of a "star". Possibly these five children had a clearer idea of their own integrity and standards. Being told to "line up" (question 29) provides less extreme emotions with almost half the children responding "Bored". Observation and common sense would confirm this as a not unexpected result, although the children can again alert the researcher by indicating "Happy" (9%) and even "Excited". This particular question arose out of observing children in the yard at the end of break-time lining up in classes as recently directed by Mr. Smith. The children thus responding positively were initially a surprise. It was then remembered that "lining up" also preceded P.E. and activity lessons. Perhaps a case of order preceding pleasure, rather than curtailing it. Subsequent conversations with the younger children confirmed this alternative view.

Generally the controls are met with a combination of apparent boredom, unhappiness and fear. It would be strange indeed should other schools differ markedly on these criteria, but the degree of fear expressed by the children might nag a little on the philosophical mind when it is recalled just how often children do lose
their books, are late for school, do get shouted at, and are sent to the headteacher.

**Incentives. Questions 1, 3, 9, 26.**

Table 5:3. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Incentives".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work displayed</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winning house team</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stars for work</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Made a monitor</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive side to the schools organisational climate was supported by the formal distribution of team points and stars to the successful pupils. Enthusiasm for the system would appear complete; practically no negative feelings towards house teams (question three), over ninety per cent of children indicating either excitement or happiness. Such a result surprised a number of staff, some of whom were less than enthusiastic for this scheme.

The awarding of stars, another recent innovation, appears to carry the wholehearted support of the children although there is a less emotive response ("Happy" rather than "Excited") possibly because of this being a more academically orientated scheme. This degree of satisfaction rather than elation is again illustrated in question one where almost seventy per cent of children respond "Happy", rather than "Excited" at seeing their work displayed. Although not a formal incentive, many teachers did appoint monitors (question 26) with child attitudes in mind. Again the responses are enthusiastically
positive, with 62% of the pupils happy with such an appointment. A similar enquiry of adolescents might be revealing.

Generally, then, the appreciation of incentives is as consistent as the disassociation from controls. Perhaps other features of school life might elicit more contrasting views.

Instruction. Questions 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 31.

Table 5:4. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Instruction".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Books given out</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Have a Test</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Told to read</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions relate to the regular timetabled teaching of the basic subjects. Individual differences become once more apparent as, for example, in question eight referring to Mathematics where it is observed that 12% of children were interested, but 26% bored; thirty percent were happy, but ten percent unhappy – a very even distribution between positive and negative reactions. This question, along with five other selected representative questions is analysed in more detail later.

Responses to question twelve on English were similarly diverse with perhaps a slightly greater positive weighting than Mathematics. Questions eleven
and thirteen relating to the marking and distributing of books were included to try to assess an overall mood or attitude towards book-work generally, not perhaps related to a particular subject, personality or grouping. The children seem positively disposed with only twenty per cent in the negative response to question thirteen. However, once the work has been completed, there appears a distinct feeling of detachment as indicated in question eleven where almost fifty per cent remain "Calm". Although having a test (question 20) produced more fear than any other emotion, thirty per cent of children remain positively orientated. The initial feeling that such children must surely be the more able proved not to be the case. Reaction to question thirty-one "You are told to read your book" proved surprisingly negative, as reading was assumed to be a reasonably pleasant, even undemanding, pursuit. Yet thirty-six per cent of children indicated boredom. Apart from the obvious indication as to the quality of reading material, there might also, by the use of the term "told to", be an element of control in this statement - which invited less association.

Generally, then, a very mixed if slightly positive overall orientation to questions relating to the curriculum was found. Full interpretation can only be attempted when certain results are further analysed by sex, age and school class.
Table 5:5. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Patterns of Seating"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Can sit anywhere</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Desks in rows</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Desks in groups</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An organisational feature very much within the control of the teacher is the setting out of the children's desks.

Following publication of the Plowden Report, the "family grouping" of desks became very much the norm in the junior school classroom and rigid rows discouraged. This researcher remembers remarking to his headteacher that he wished to adopt lines of individual desks for a while in 1968, to be informed that this should be avoided especially as Mr. Green, the Local Education Authority Adviser was soon due to visit the school!

Analysis of the above responses reveals rather less concern than might have been envisaged. Forty per cent of children positively orientated towards rows, forty-five per cent towards groups. Question sixteen however, reveals eighty-five per cent enthusiasm for the element of choice in where they may sit. Possibly this is an indication of not so much how they are seated as with whom.

It must, of course, be acknowledged that desk placement itself is not indicative of the environmental press of the classroom. Certainly it is one of many factors, but one class in the school which employed a visually democratic random grouping of desks did in
fact utilise streaming within the room, and another teacher employing lines of individual desks asserted that such an arrangement was particularly helpful in practical work. Through the eighteen months of observation the desk arrangement in Glendale classrooms did in fact change from eighty per cent groups to seventy per cent rows.


Table 5:6. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Relationships"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Playtime</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Choose partner</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Argue with friend</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teacher in school</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Teacher out of school</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one child (0.3%) is shown as being "Frightened" at the prospect of going out to play (question ten), with sixty per cent of the sample either "Happy" or "Excited". Teachers expressed little surprise at the twenty per cent of pupils apparently "Bored" or "Unhappy" with prescribed play-times; during the winter months a system of offering fourth year children a choice of either staying in or going outside resulted in all girls choosing to remain in their classrooms. Unfortunately some petty pilfering and classroom disorder brought this experiment to a premature conclusion.

Question fifteen enquired of the children as to their feelings when asked to choose a partner. Rather a regular occurrence in most schools and probably approached in a very organisational and brisk manner
by teachers anxious to get a lesson under way. Twenty per cent of pupils, however, responded negatively to this statement; rather a large number if one assumes these to be mainly the less popular or isolated pupils, self-conscious or introverted. Similarly the high percentage of children remaining "Calm" (30%) and small number (9%) "Excited" indicate this instruction to be received rather less enthusiastically than might have been expected, particularly as such instructions are applied mainly in the popular activity lessons.

Question eighteen was included as one of the check questions on the assumption that children would respond negatively. Seventy-four per cent did so with a further sixteen per cent "Calm".

Attitudes towards teachers were expressed in responses to questions twenty-seven and twenty-eight. Despite the unpopularity of the "Controls" administered by such staff, the children indicated very few negative feelings. Only four children (1.7%) expressed either fear or unhappiness at meeting teachers in school, and less than ten per cent recorded negative feelings outside of school. A significant percentage (44% and 39%) remained "Calm" and similar percentages "Happy" (48% and 41%) These few children responding negatively were concentrated in the fourth year of the school.
Oral Work Questions 4, 25.

Table 5:7. (Extract from Table 5:1) "Oral Work"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Class play</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to categorise these two questions. Although perhaps part of the "Instruction" in the school, quite clearly "Relationships" and social confidence are also involved. The pattern of responses is unique to each enquiry. Thus almost a third of the sample are recorded as "Frightened" when asked to read aloud, a figure which contrasts markedly with the generally supportive attitudes towards English as a subject (question 12). Could this be an indictment of reading standards, teacher insensitivity or pupil withdrawal? Reading standards at Glendale were satisfactory if not exemplary, and observation failed to identify insensitive staff exposing average children to open ridicule. An increased emphasis on written rather than oral work in the new syllabus was however limiting the extent of spontaneous speech in the classroom.

Individual child differences are equally well expressed in question twenty-five where almost twenty per cent of children are "Frightened" at being in a class play yet almost thirty per cent "Excited".
Given then this brief and selective analysis of trends within five main categories, a need arises to present the overall results in more comparative form.

As indicated in the introduction to this study, the desire was to illuminate those features of school life which appeared to have the most import for the pupils. Clearly a child's response "Excited" on the S.C.A.Q. does not guarantee this emotional state on every practical occasion. The condition has to some extent been suggested to the child by the vocabulary employed in the test. However, it is maintained that the pupils could distinguish the relativities operative within the scale, and it was this comparative degree of intensity between responses that particularly interested this researcher. To illustrate the degree of positive/negative reaction, the following procedure was adopted.

Each percentage response on the seven categories shown in Figure 5.1 was accorded a score as follows: Excited (+3) : Happy (+2) : Interested (+1) : Calm (0) : Bored (-1) : Unhappy (-2) : and Frightened (-3). In this way overall figures for both positive and negative responses can be compared while retaining extra "weighting" for the more extreme emotions.

These overall figures are referred to as "Intensity Ratings". Thus the positive intensity rating on question one is 177.6, achieved by totalling the "Excited" responses multiplied by three (33.9), the "Happy" by two (139.4) and the "Interested" by one (4.3).
Table 5:8 (below) gives the positive and negative intensity ratings on all questions, and Figure 5:1 presents these in graph form.

Table 5:8. School Climate. Attitude Questionnaire.
Degree of Positive or Negative Response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Intensity Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Your work is pinned up on the wall</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You are shouted at by the teacher</td>
<td>199.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Your house team wins</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>You are asked to read aloud</td>
<td>117.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>You are late for school</td>
<td>179.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>You lose your book</td>
<td>199.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>You go to Assembly</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>You have a Maths. lesson</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>You get a star or team point</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>You go out to play</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>You hand in your books for marking</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>You have an English lesson</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Your teacher gives the books out</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>You are sent to the Headteacher</td>
<td>236.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>You are told to choose a partner</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>You can sit where you like</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>You come to school in the morning</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>You have an argument with a friend</td>
<td>143.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Your desks are arranged in rows</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>You have a test</td>
<td>125.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Your teacher jokes with the class</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>You leave school in the afternoon</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Your parents return after Open Evening</td>
<td>103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Your desks are arranged in groups</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>You are in a class play</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Your teacher makes you a monitor</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>You say 'hello' to a teacher in school</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>You meet a teacher outside school</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>You are told to line up</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>You ask to leave the classroom</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>You are told to read your book</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>You pick up your paint brush</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5:1. Graph Presentation of Positive and Negative Responses to the S.C.A.Q.
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From the graph the relative strength of positive and negative feelings on each question can readily be compared and the contrasts between questions clearly observed. Examination of the graph reveals:

1. **Extreme Negative Orientation. Questions 2, 5, 6, 14.**
   It will be observed that each of these questions refers to "Controls" or anticipated disciplinary action.

2. **Strong Negative Orientation. Questions 4, 18, 20, 29, 30.**
   Again two questions (29, 30) can be linked with "Controls", one with "Instruction" (question 20), one displaying surprising antipathy towards reading aloud (question 4) and one, the expected response to one of the check questions (question 18).

3. **Extreme Positive Orientation. Questions 1, 3, 9, 16, 21, 22, 26.**
   Of these seven questions, five can clearly be linked with "Incentives"; question twenty-two displaying a not altogether surprising acceptance of the prospect of leaving school, and question sixteen demonstrating the attraction of child-chosen seating positions.

4. **Strong Positive Orientation. Questions 10, 27, 28, 32.**
   Teachers (questions 27, 28) receive considerable support from the pupils with little negative reaction, and the activity sessions of play (question 10) and art (question 32) are similarly well received. The point may be made here that the graph is not representative of the "Calm" category. The degree
of these responses might be estimated by the relative shortness of time on combined positive and negative indexes, but full information can only be obtained from the earlier Table 5:1. Thus "Calm" responses on the questions referring to Pupil-Teacher attitude (questions 27, 28) were 44% and 38% respectively - an unusually high proportion.

5. **Mixed Orientations.**

Obviously all responses were to some extent mixed (although only one child voted negatively on question three), but many criteria display significant proportions on both negative and positive indicators.

Interestingly, all those questions (7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 31) dealing with aspects of "Instruction" are to be found in this "middle ground", equally they all have small but noticeable positive orientations.

The placement of children's desks (questions 19, 24) reveals a less than enthusiastic preference for group formation, and children appear interestingly divided as to their parents' likely reaction after Open Evening (question 23).

Overall response patterns are thus expressed in Figure 5:1; for a more detailed examination of trends the results were further analysed by child year group, sex, school class and ability grouping.
Table 5:9. Year group responses to S.C.A.Q. expressed as overall Intensity Rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4th year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>-173</td>
<td>-149</td>
<td>-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-84</td>
<td>-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-135</td>
<td>-132</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-155</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>-184</td>
<td>-189</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Group Differences.

The intensity ratings given in Table 5:9 were obtained by applying the scoring system (+3 to -3) described earlier to the total year group raw scores on each of the seven response categories. To obtain one final figure the positive and negative scores were reduced by subtraction; thus a positive rating of +50 and a negative rating of -10 would give an overall intensity figure of +40.

Examination of the results shows more similarities than differences. Indeed, some of the ratings are remarkably consistent, indicating generally uniform attitudes towards features of school life rather than specifically different ones dependent upon the age of child. Thus question nine, referring to getting a star for work reads - 1st year - 156; 2nd year - 167; 3rd year - 157 and 4th year - 161. Staff comment to the effect that fourth year children were not interested in pretty stars was thus not substantiated. Some trends are, however, noticeable. The effect of teacher shouting would seem less dramatic as the children mature (question 2). Assembly (question 7) appears less popular with the older pupils, English (question 11), similarly so, with the third year pupils. The headteacher, though never "inviting" (question 14) seems less of an ogre to the older pupils who also show a more pronounced preference for choosing their own seat positions (question 16). Question 17 ("Come to school") reveals a rather unwelcome picture
of first year pupils fairly positively orientated to school but becoming less so in the second and third years.

Fourth year children again show more concern for their peer social relationships by rejecting sitting in rows (question 19) but the younger children seem less concerned on this issue. Older children also indicated more forceful opposition to the giving of tests (question 20), but generally the academic side of school life (questions 8, 12) evoked a fairly consistent response among the children, this despite a definite organisational change in the third/fourth years when the system of setting is introduced for both English and Mathematics.

The downward spiral in reading interest (question 31) appears fairly regular from a reasonably positive response in the first year towards some indifference in the third and fourth year groups. An unwelcome trend—perhaps partly due to the older children recognising an implicit control in the statement or a reflection of the less prescribed nature of the timetable in the early years involving no setting and more time for individual reading. Painting (question 32), although viewed positively by all year groups, appears to lose some interest for the fourth year children, this despite the attentions of specialist teaching for this age group in split class sessions of two hour duration with approximately fifteen children twice weekly.

Summary

It should first be asserted that these results reflect considerably more similarities than differences between the four year group responses.
Trends that may be observed include comparative enthusiasm at the prospect of school by first year pupils (question 17), whereas the older children may be perceived as gradually hardening to criticism (questions 2 and 14), showing greater sensitivity over desk placement (questions 19 and 24) and displaying rather less enthusiasm for reading (questions 4 and 31), painting (question 32), meeting teachers (question 20) and going to assembly (question 7).

Choice of Selected Questions

While examining the total matrix of results it soon became apparent that there were subtle differences in response patterns that average figures and majority percentages tended to disguise. Total coverage of these differences, perhaps by school class or sex, was beyond the scope of this study but a thorough examination of six selected questions seemed more feasible.

Number seventeen was chosen on being a basic and essential enquiry. The feelings of children to the prospect of coming to school in the morning being both a reflection of, and an influence on, the individual school climate. The more children responding "Happy" to this enquiry, the more likely the possibility of a supportive educational climate.

Number seven was selected for further study as it concerned all children in a common daily experience, less influenced by individual teacher personality or class situation. At interview many of the staff considered Assembly very significant in the establishment of morale and corporate identity.
Two questions were selected to represent the academic "Instructional" side of school life.

Children's feelings towards Mathematics (question 8) appeared interestingly divided (Fig. 1) and as children in the upper school were "set" for this subject, offered the opportunity to compare the attitudes of the streamed and non-streamed pupils.

Responses to question twenty-eight "Having a Test" were also diverse with thirty per cent of pupils "Frightened" but twenty-five per cent either "Happy" or "Excited". Further analysis of this question was undertaken to ascertain the feelings of children of differing ability. Question twenty-eight was selected to probe further the attitude of pupils to members of staff ("Relationships" category) and question twenty-nine was chosen as representative of the responses to those questions dealing with aspects of "Control".

Male/Female Responses.

It would seem that most teachers believe that girls in this age group associate with school norms more readily than the boys. Presumably the results of this survey should support this view of willing and diligent female workers. Examination of the whole matrix failed, however, to show a consistent trend of rejection or acceptance on the part of either sex. As with the year group analysis there appeared more similarities of pattern than differences. The following presentation (Figures 5:2 to 5:7) of the relative boy/girl response to the six selected questions typifies the representation as a whole.
Figures 5:2 - 5:7.
Male/Female Responses to six selected questions. n = 300 children.
Female represented by pecked line.

Q.17. You come to school
Q.7. You go to Assembly
Q.8. You have a Maths lesson
Q.20. You have a test
Q.28. You meet a teacher outside school
Q.29. You are told to line up.
Responses to the basic key question of "coming to school" have already been referred to as rather discouraging and we observe on the graph (question 17 Fig. 5:2) the negative bias both among boys and girls. The one divergence on the "Happy" criteria would indeed indicate more support from the girls - but more than half of this total did originate from first year pupils. Apart from this fifty per cent extension on the "Happy" criteria there is little observable difference between the attitude of the two sexes. Responses towards going into Assembly (Fig. 5:3) show an overall positive bias, the "Bored" criteria achieve a somewhat undesirable pre-eminence. Here the two sexes are almost mirrored in attitude with the boys showing fractionally more enthusiasm.

Reaction to Mathematics (Fig. 5:4) does not appear as dramatic by the female sex as "tradition" might suggest with a dozen girls "Excited" by the prospect. Distribution on this question is most even both among the criteria and between the boys and girls. One might expect the governing factor here to be success or ability but as is shown later, this proved not to be the case.

Reaction to tests (Fig. 5:5) does appear to be rather more frantic among the girls with some fifty-four indicating "Frightened" where the boys display a more combative stance in leading the "Excited" or "Happy" scales.

Meeting teacher outside of school (Fig. 5:6) tends, as with question seventeen, to have rather more appeal for the girls than the boys with seventy-four girls expressing pleasure at the prospect; the majority of boys preferring
the more dignified response of "Calm" and not a few (twenty-five) of the older boys straying to the negative bias.

Bored acceptance is fairly clearly illustrated on the graph of attitude to the control of being asked to line-up (Fig. 5:7) with boys and girls indicating their feelings in almost equally proportionate numbers.

Summary.

Analysis of these six questions and assessment of other trends on the matrix suggests that the girls in the school are marginally more content with the prospect of coming to school and meeting teachers, but on factors relating to controls and the curriculum they profess very similar sentiments to those of the boys.

Ability Factor.

It would seem reasonable to expect the able child to demonstrate more association with the school's norms that the less able. A hypothesis particularly appropriate when related to academic criteria. Alternatively of course a certain mis-guided peer pressure might aim to re-direct the more talented, with consequent individual psychological stress for the able academic.

It would, however, seem safe to assume that examination of the six selected questions might reveal more contentment and satisfaction among those children placed in the higher English or Maths. sets than the lower.
For the purpose of this survey, all children were banded into four groups A, B, C, D on the results of end of year tests in Mathematics and English. Discussion with each class teacher enabled a general pattern of approximately five children from each class assigned to the A and D bands, and seven or eight placed equally in the B and C bands. The results are displayed in Figures 5:8 to 5:13 in individual graph form for ease of comparison. Each response "Excited" through to "Frightened" is sub-divided into column graphs representing the four ability bands. Thus, following a hypothesis that academically successful children might be happier coming to school than the less successful, we examine Figure 5:8 reflecting responses to this question. Remembering that there were approximately twenty per cent more children allotted to the B and C grades than the A and D, a histogram indicating little ability factor influences would assume the general shape of the "Unhappy" category in Figure 5:8.

**Figure 5:8**

S.C.A.Q. Extracted Question:

"You come to school in the morning"

Responses by four different ability bands.
The distribution of band A children in Figure 5:8 on the "Bored" and "Unhappy" criteria tends to question the contented academic hypothesis. In numerical terms only nineteen top ability group children out of a sample of forty-eight respond positively to the prospect of coming to school. This ratio is similar through the other ability groups, with "D" children the least positive but not significantly so. The evidence of this histogram suggests that the "B" group is the most disaffected but the overall pattern of the grouped columns is sufficiently regular to counter the view that "school" means something rather different to each individual child depending upon his or her academic success in that institution.

Figure 5:9 reflects children's attitudes towards Assembly.

Figure 5:9

S.C.A.Q Extracted Question

"You go to Assembly"

Responses by four different ability bands.

It is interesting to observe that the "D" band children now appear the least bored and the most happy!
It might be ambitious to infer that this enthusiasm be attributable to some moral fervour but could there also be an element of social inconspicuousness, of receiving, but of not having to respond or be personally identified? Generally the middle band of children seem rather unimpressed by the occasion ("Bored") but it is noticeable that the "A" children are the most "Interested" suggesting possibly a content aimed somewhat above the level of the average child. Again though there is considerable uniformity on most of the criteria, exemplified by the similarity of the B and C groups on the "Calm" and "Bored" criteria. The apparently "Happy" "D" band was the most unpredictable.

The pattern in Figure 5:10 relating to lessons in Mathematics is again fairly uniform in the centre bands but less so at the extremes.

Figure 5:10

S.C.A.Q. Extracted Question:
"You have a Maths. lesson"

Responses by four different ability bands.
Group "D" is again remarkably "Happy", more than half the sample relating positively to this subject, whereas "A" band appears the least happy and is very heavily represented in the "Bored" category. Observation of the year group variety shows little deviation from this pattern and it would seem acceptable to suggest that teachers of the less able children are succeeding in at least keeping the interest of the children while those of the more able have the greater challenge.

Figure 5:11 examining children's feelings towards "Tests" displays an even distribution about the seven criteria with "B" band children again the most disturbed and the brighter children generally the more "Frightened".

Figure 5:11

S.C.A.Q. Extracted Question:
"You have a test"

Responses by four different bands.

The difference in numerical terms is however not large but sufficient perhaps to dispel any impression of smugness among the successful pupils.
S.C.A.Q. Extracted Question

"You meet a teacher outside school"

Responses by four different bands.

All groups display similar sentiments towards teachers as expressed in Figure 5:12 with the majority of responses concentrated on the "Calm" or "Happy" criteria.

Interpretation of this pattern suggests a degree of pleasant indifference by all children, with the "A" band pupils noticeably more positive in their attitudes than the "D" band.

The control of "lining up" (Figure 5:13 overleaf) provokes a firmly negative response with the majority of pupils clearly "Bored" by the procedure. Here Band "A" seems to display some maturity, if resignation, in accepting the inevitable, while groups "B" and "C" seem fairly equally unimpressed.
Summary.

Examination then of these six selected questions suggests that the more able children are in no way more associated with the norms of school life than the less able. Further interpretation cannot be supported without analysis of similar questions and some comparison involving re-test procedures but this tentative enquiry again suggests more common ground than uniqueness among children of varied ability to the impact of life at school.
Thus far, analysis by sex, age and ability has shown more similarities than differences; possibly the class designation of the child will be a more significant factor in determining attitude to these different elements of school life.

**Influences of School Class and Class Teacher.**

Certainly the work of some authors (op. cit Nash 1973) concentrates more on class atmosphere than school atmosphere. Given the normal junior school one teacher - one class situation it would be only common sense to accept differing atmospheres in the various classrooms; the influence of each teacher's personality producing a special blend unique to the one room. This, however, does not preclude the existence of an overall school atmosphere created by the amalgam of these individual factors and very much affected by the nature and intensity of hierarchical controls within the school as a whole. Remembering also that in Glendale the older children did receive lessons from eight or nine different teachers through the week and some fourth year pupils were not taught at all by their designated 'class-teacher' the effect of school class might be expected to diminish as the children moved up the school. Analysis of year-group attitudes has however already shown little difference.

The individual class responses are shown in percentage form in Tables 5.10 to 5.15. Comparison between classes can readily be made by reading along the category lines. Thus the "Frightened" response to the statement "You come to school in the morning" (Table 5.10) is uniformly zero.
Table 5:10
Percentage responses by school class to extracted question
"You come to school in the morning"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further examination does however reveal considerable differences on other criteria. For example, where only 4% are "Unhappy" in class 2, 48% appear so in class 8. Whereas between twenty and thirty percent appear "Bored" in most classes, this figure reaches 60% in class 6. On the more positive side it can be observed that almost half the children in class 2 and class 11 are either "Excited" or "Happy" at the prospect of coming to school - yet only 12% in class 4, 8% in class 6 and 12% in class 10 display such enthusiasm.

Remembering that the first year children comprise classes 1, 2 and 3 and so on to the fourth year (classes 10, 11 and 12) the orientations seem affected by factors other than age.

Responses on the excited, interested, calm and frightened criteria appear fairly uniform throughout but
on the happy - bored - unhappy indicators there is a much more erratic quality, certainly suggestive of individual classroom climates. It is tempting to assert that such variety is the result of teacher personality but it must be noted that two of the classes (8 and 11) which appear to differ more than others from the "norm" are third and fourth year children, exposed to their own class teacher for less than twenty per cent of the week's work. Indeed there is no apparent "swing" between the younger and older pupils in this respect; the first years noticeably more positive but two of the second year classes distinctly negative. It is suggested that certainly "personality" is a key factor in determining classroom climate - but the personality of peer group leaders - not only that of the adult leader.

Table 5:11 reflects class attitudes to school assembly and again there are distinct variations.

Table 5:11
Percentage responses by school class to extracted question "You go to Assembly"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A comparison of class 5, class 8 and class 12 illustrates this. Class 5 has over fifty per cent positive orientation, class 8 only twenty per cent and class 12 only twelve per cent. This, the "oldest" class in the school displaying mute indifference with sixty-eight per cent of children registering a "Calm" response. Observation of this class and discussion with the teacher did little to disturb this impression. Among the other nine classes, however, there is considerable similarity - especially if the "Happy" and "Interested" categories are assessed collectively. Attitudes to Mathematics (Table 5:12) show considerable differences between the classes.

### Table 5:12

Percentage responses by school class to extracted question "You have a Maths lesson"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing two of the first year classes (2 and 3) there appears almost complete contrast - illustrating the danger of relying on average year group figures which revealed
no such discrepancy. More than half of class 2 are "Happy" with Mathematics but only eight per cent of class 3—where almost half indicate "Bored" as their major feeling. Teacher influence might be relevant here where the young lady class teacher of class 3 admitted a personal indifference to Mathematics.

Differences between the third year children are, however, equally noticeable, especially between classes 8 and 9 where only four per cent register "Happy" in class 8 but sixty per cent do so in class 9. The negative side of the indicator reinforces this contrast with sixty-four per cent of children of class 8 "Bored" but none of class 9. Teacher influence here is masked by the fact that these children are taught by four different teachers in "sets", many of the children from classes 8 and 9 being taught in the same maths. set. On the other hand it has become already noticeable that class 8 appear generally rather negative and might take these attitudes with them whatever the subject. It might be interjected here that the children of class 8 in conversation, demonstrated much affection for their teacher—the youngest male on the staff—and generally very popular amongst the children of the school.

Reaction to question 20 "You have a test" (Table 5:13) appears more uniform especially on the positive orientations.
Table 5:13.

Percentage responses by school class to extracted question "You have a test".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses on the "Frightened" criteria are more varied, where numbers range from eight per cent (class 3) to fifty-six per cent (class 10). Variety among the first year children could be partly attributable to teacher disposition where the teacher of class 3 could be characterised by her gently individualistic attitude to the children, yet the teacher of the more anxious class 11 pupils - a probationary art specialist - could well be described in similar terms. A difference in experience of some six or seven years might be relevant with the probationer unwittingly conveying some of her own (evident) nerves and anxieties to the children.
Table 5:14.

Percentage responses by school class to extracted question
"You meet a teacher outside school".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting a teacher outside school (Table 5:14) evokes a fairly consistent response, although again more warmth is apparent from class 3 and more reserve from classes 8 and 11.

Table 5:15.

Percentage responses by school class to extracted question
"You are told to line-up".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final table (Table 5:15) refers to attitudes towards lining-up and apart from an unusual enthusiasm among class 2 there is expressed a fairly consistent
degree of dispassionate boredom, class 3 and class 4 indicating most displeasure at the control. Class 3's teacher's interview response to a question referring to role conflict among teachers is perhaps pertinent here:—
"I find it difficult to punish children for doing things which I used to be punished for, and would still do now if I didn't have to be grown up and sensible all the time."

**Summary.**

**School Class Differences.**

Although an analysis of year group differences showed comparatively little variety, these individual class results vary considerably.

Responses to questions relating to coming to school, having a Maths lesson and going to Assembly were particularly erratic.

This particular and limited survey suggests that a combination of individual class teacher and pupil personality can produce a climate of responses which children in that class carry with them to different school situations.

The final part of the S.C.A.Q. consisted of three open-ended statements asking the children to indicate what made them happy and unhappy in school, and which feature they would most like to change in school. The aim of this exercise not only was to isolate those factors creating such elation and despair, but also to give the children opportunity to indicate activities which the teacher-directed thirty-two item questionnaire might have omitted. Many of the younger children found this freedom rather baffling - completing the statement "If I could change one thing in school I would ..." with the unhelpful "change it". Overall responses were particularly individualistic but consistent remarks are categorised and displayed in Figures 5:14 to 5:16.

Responses to the "Happy" enquiry (Figure 5:14) concentrate not surprisingly on the activity lessons of art and games with perhaps fewer children than expected preferring P.E. and their own undirected play-times - a case of the young preferring to be organised? Only those factors listed by more than ten children are indicated on the graph, but the full list of categories reaches over thirty, some typified by the rather plaintive "It makes me happy when I can get through the day without being told off." (2nd year boy).
Figures 5:14 - 5:16

Whole school responses to three open-ended statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>games lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art/painting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5:14. It makes me happy when ……

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shouted at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sent to Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5:15. It makes me unhappy when ……

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no sweets rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no shouting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5:16. If I could change one thing in school I would ……
The graph illustrating some of the causes of unhappiness (Figure 5:15) emphasises the distinct power of the authoritarian voice, a power perhaps underestimated by teachers who sometimes feel an errant child has been fortunate to receive "only a telling off". The evidence of this graph and interviews with the children indicate that verbal criticism is not ephemeral. Responses were again more individualistic than uniform with the less predictable but completely honest: - "It makes me unhappy when" - (a) "I fall over"; (b) "it's raining"; (c) "I'm in a bad mood", and (d) - the more interesting "Some-one has been stealing and a teacher brings it up and shows the person up." One is struck by the strength of peer loyalty and desire for fair play here: - The teacher being apparently less worthy than the dishonest child! Given the opportunity to change one feature of school life (Figure 5:16) the children concentrated on one of the innovations by the new headteacher, Mr. Smith, who prescribed against the eating of sweets in school. There was also a surprising amount of antipathy towards the wearing of uniform, (principally among the older pupils) but otherwise a large range of diverse comments ranging from "I would change school dinners into nice ones like my mum's"! to the more impish "I would take all the teachers to the toilet and lock them up." The overall message of these replies perhaps shows that children have not changed as much over the years as some journalists would have us believe.

In this particular school it would seem that a re-introduction of confectionery and a certain mellowing of verbal criticism might generate enormous good-will
among the "work-force".

**General Summary. S.C.A.Q. Results.**

The impression gained from an assessment of the results of the S.C.A.Q. is one of child satisfaction rather than enthusiasm for their school as an institution.

Few children appeared eager to get to school, but once there accepted the basic subject instruction with some equanimity, the more extreme emotions being reserved for aspects of "Control" (negative) and "Incentives" (positive). Children appeared happy with their peer social relationships and positive in their reaction to staff.

The analysis of six selected questions differentiating by age, sex, ability and school class suggested that the factor of individual school class afforded the most singularity.

**Attitude to Middle School Questionnaire.**

The second child questionnaire was administered to the neighbourhood high school first year intake in December 1979 and was designed to elicit their feelings regarding experiences at middle school. It was hoped that the few months in a new school where they had been exposed to new subjects, staff and organisational procedure would give added objectivity and balance to their views. The children would, of course, be looking back and it might be argued that such a retrospective view might be remarkably rosy - contradicting this is the natural enthusiasm of the young for that which is new and the majority of children interviewed regarded
their new school as bigger and better than middle school.

Two hundred responses were obtained, sixty-nine of those from ex-Glendale pupils, the remainder from the two other local feeder schools "Handley" and "Barton".

Contrasts between the responses of the children from each of the three schools were hoped to provide some justification for generalisation about the organisational climate of Glendale Middle School.

All responses were anonymous, no account being taken of age, sex, class or ability. The thirty-one statements required only a "Yes" or "No" response in agreement or disagreement, most of which were cross checked.

Results.

Raw scores and percentage positive responses are indicated in full on Table 5:16. These results are presented in graph form in Figure 5:17 where the contrast between Glendale and the average of the other two feeder schools can readily be appreciated.

The results of this survey would support the view that the vast majority of children were happy at middle school, where they found the teachers considerate, friendly and approachable. Of the seven criteria showing a positive response of over eighty per cent, three refer to such acceptable teacher characteristics. (Questions 13, 24 and 28). The checks of question 15 reinforces this affirmation where there is an eighty-five per cent disassociation from the statement "Teachers were hard to approach". There is a similar disassociation with question 18 where seventy per cent disagree with the statement "I felt unnoticed by teachers".
Table 5:16.

Attitude to Middle School Questionnaire.
High School First Year Intake.
Positive and Negative Responses of Children in Three
Different Feeder Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question - abbreviated</th>
<th>Handley</th>
<th>Glendale</th>
<th>Barton</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Most lessons interesting</td>
<td>29 13 69</td>
<td>48 21 69</td>
<td>52 37 73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Seated in lessons</td>
<td>33 9 78</td>
<td>44 25 63</td>
<td>48 41 53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teacher interest</td>
<td>30 12 71</td>
<td>46 23 66</td>
<td>46 43 51</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teachers strict</td>
<td>22 20 52</td>
<td>20 49 28</td>
<td>40 49 45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>School bright &amp; cheerful</td>
<td>30 12 71</td>
<td>55 14 79</td>
<td>51 38 57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Club activities</td>
<td>30 12 71</td>
<td>38 31 55</td>
<td>67 22 75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lessons hard</td>
<td>16 26 38</td>
<td>14 55 20</td>
<td>20 69 22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Too many rules</td>
<td>19 23 45</td>
<td>28 41 40</td>
<td>33 56 37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Too much lining up</td>
<td>30 12 71</td>
<td>42 47 61</td>
<td>64 25 72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sit anywhere</td>
<td>27 15 64</td>
<td>47 22 68</td>
<td>67 22 75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Different teachers each day</td>
<td>28 14 66</td>
<td>46 23 66</td>
<td>66 23 74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Attractive displays</td>
<td>33 9 78</td>
<td>50 19 72</td>
<td>53 36 59</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Smiling teachers</td>
<td>34 8 81</td>
<td>58 11 84</td>
<td>54 35 60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Well behaved children</td>
<td>32 10 76</td>
<td>50 19 72</td>
<td>53 36 59</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Teachers hard to approach</td>
<td>17 25 40</td>
<td>13 56 19</td>
<td>21 68 23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Rules fair and sensible</td>
<td>34 8 81</td>
<td>50 19 72</td>
<td>65 24 73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Proud of school</td>
<td>32 10 76</td>
<td>51 18 73</td>
<td>58 31 65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Unnoticed by teachers</td>
<td>14 28 33</td>
<td>20 49 29</td>
<td>31 58 35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Periods too long</td>
<td>14 28 33</td>
<td>19 50 27</td>
<td>24 65 27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>School fairly enjoyable</td>
<td>37 5 88</td>
<td>58 11 84</td>
<td>66 23 74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Get away with things</td>
<td>15 27 35</td>
<td>26 43 38</td>
<td>47 42 53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Prefer one teacher</td>
<td>26 16 61</td>
<td>37 32 54</td>
<td>46 43 52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Move about freely in room</td>
<td>17 25 40</td>
<td>39 30 56</td>
<td>50 49 56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Teachers friendly</td>
<td>37 5 88</td>
<td>63 6 91</td>
<td>77 12 86</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Easy to make friends</td>
<td>38 4 90</td>
<td>66 3 96</td>
<td>75 14 84</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Unhappy at Middle School</td>
<td>10 32 23</td>
<td>5 64 7</td>
<td>17 72 19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Assemblies a good idea</td>
<td>32 10 76</td>
<td>43 26 62</td>
<td>35 54 39</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teachers easy to get on with</td>
<td>38 4 90</td>
<td>61 8 88</td>
<td>78 11 82</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Worked hard</td>
<td>34 8 81</td>
<td>59 10 85</td>
<td>73 16 82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Periods too short</td>
<td>8 34 19</td>
<td>7 62 10</td>
<td>14 75 16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Lessons easy</td>
<td>34 8 81</td>
<td>56 13 61</td>
<td>76 13 85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 42  n = 69  n = 89  n = 200
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Attitude to the controls and rules appear more mixed and inconclusive. Three quarters of the children affirmed that "the rules were fair and sensible" (Question 16) but were less positive on the specific issue of lining up (Question 9) where seventy per cent recalled this feature with some distaste. The majority of children did not feel there were too many rules (Question 8) and two-thirds of the children remembered being given freedom to sit where they chose (Question 10). Although teachers were not interpreted as particularly strict (Question 4) two-thirds of the sample felt they could not "get away with things" (Question 21).

On the academic side there would appear to be some support for the recent H.M.I. Report (1978) indicating that perhaps teachers are not extending the younger child for a consistent eighty per cent recall lessons as "easy" (Question 31) and only a quarter of the sample assessed them as "hard" (Question 7). Despite this trend, more than three quarters of the sample regarded lessons as "interesting" (Question 1) and eighty per cent believed they worked hard at middle school.

Children seemed to prefer the opportunity of having more than one teacher through the day (Questions 11 and 22) but recalled having to remain seated for most of the lesson time (Questions 2 and 23).

Three quarters of the sample believed the middle schools to be bright, cheerful environments with attractively presented displays and a similar fraction involved themselves in club activities (Questions 5, 12 and 6).
Schools were largely remembered with pride (Question 17) as institutions where it was particularly easy to make friends (Question 25); indeed a "fairly enjoyable" experience for more than eighty per cent of ex-pupils (Question 20).

The overall impression given by these returns might then be one of satisfaction and comfort to the genial middle school teachers who, it would appear, if not apparently stretching the children academically, certainly carried out their duties in a sensitive and reasonable manner much appreciated by their ex-pupils.

Some of the results regarding the interest content of lessons, the appeal of assemblies and the general impression of enjoyment do not correlate particularly well with those already analysed through the S.C.A.Q at Glendale. The high school pupils' situation of looking back in safety and recalling the better times has already been partly accepted. It should also be noted that the children examined in this sample from Glendale studied under the regime of Mr. Greenwood for ninety per cent of their school life. This particular headteacher laid considerable emphasis upon the socio-emotional role of teachers whereas the more recent Mr. Smith's innovations were more specifically academic in emphasis. This pervasive and delicate contrast is examined in more detail later.

Contrasts in Response.

Examination of Figure 5:17 contrasting Glendale with an average response of the two other middle schools does at first glance show more similarities than differences.
Figure 5:17. Altitude to Middle School Questionnaire.

Percentage Positive Response by ex-Glendale pupils.
n = 200.

Solid line = Glendale
Pecked line = average of Barton and Handley.
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Scrutiny of raw scores does in fact outline more singularity in the results of Barton than either Glendale or Handley but there remain some significant emphases.

It would appear that Glendale teachers are interpreted as less strict than their neighbours (Question 4) although conversely fewer children felt they could "get away with things" (Question 23).

Fewer children took part in club activities but more felt this school bright and cheerful (Architecturally in fact the three schools are not dissimilar).

More pupils recalled lessons as easy (Question 31) at Glendale but eighty-five per cent still believed they "worked hard" (Question 29).

Teachers were particularly well regarded, being remembered as affable and easy to get on with, although the degree of personal interest shown is not so convincing.

Questions 26 and 29 offer perhaps the most encouragement for the teacher at Glendale where eighty-five per cent of ex-pupils believed they worked hard and only seven per cent indicated unhappiness. Pedagogues might doubtless be more inclined to support the evidence of the latter figure than the former.

In concluding this assessment of the two Child Questionnaires the words of the member of the local advisory service are recalled. He described Glendale as a school that was essentially a very happy environment, with pleasant members of staff, well looked after by a
headteacher (Mr. Greenwood) determined to keep a
good school atmosphere exemplified by jovial spirits
in the staff-room — yet a school where the pupils
themselves might possibly have been more academically
extended and involved.

The responses of ex-Glendale, high school pupils to
the questionnaire would add credence to this view.

The pupils' perceptions of the climate at Glendale
are very important, but they provide only one perspective.
The next chapter explores the responses of the teachers.
CHAPTER 6.

STAFF ATTITUDES, ORIENTATIONS AND BEHAVIOUR.

The following data are derived principally from the staff responses to the sixty-five item "Teacher Attitude and Experience Questionnaire" administered in March 1979.

As indicated earlier, it would be quite possible to develop this section on the basis of each individual teacher's responses to questionnaire and subsequent interview, but such biographical presentation would undoubtedly appear repetitive and tedious. The method of presentation preferred as more illuminative is to indicate majority opinion by percentage orientation and select appropriate supportive individual quotations.

The Teaching Staff.

When this study began there were eighteen full-time members of staff at Glendale inclusive of the headteacher. Eight staff held Scale 2 posts of responsibility either for specialist subjects or year leadership. Two members of staff held Scale 3 posts for curricular development and general discipline. Of the eighteen staff, only four were male, all but two of the ladies were married. Teaching experience ranged from two to sixteen years; thirteen of the staff having taught for less than ten years. Only four of the staff were over thirty-five years of age.

No member of staff had worked at Glendale for longer than nine years, there were, however, no probationary teachers. Five of the staff had experienced other work than teaching and a similar number had taught in secondary schools.
Personal Orientations.

Only one teacher at Glendale considered herself of similar socio-economic background to the children taught (question 26) and only two believed that any such diversity might influence teacher effectiveness. The majority felt that they did meet a wide cross section of society (question 28) which helped to offset certain cultural or "class" differences. Interestingly, the five members of staff who had had previous work before teaching perceived their social world as rather more narrow since entering the profession. As Mr. C. explained:— "Since entering teaching I've felt the gap widening between myself and the type of guy represented by most of our parents".

Mr. B. related how a child in his class perceived him as "Better than all the other teachers 'cos you're dead common."

Eighty per cent of staff entered teaching positively (question 31), four teachers admitted an element of drift following University failure and career teachers' persuasion. The majority of staff felt there was little conflict between their own personal values and their role as a teacher (question 32). Five staff did qualify their responses by professing difficulty in restraining spontaneous remarks or displaying, as Mrs. J. put it:— "A sneaking sense of amusement at some of the naughty antics." Two teachers felt they were probably too easy going and one of secondary experience regretted the absence of tutor groups where teachers and children met socially without the constraints of classroom discipline. Other staff indicated the importance of after school activities
when they felt as Mrs. A.: "The children accept me more as a human being than a teacher."

Although as indicated above, there seemed little conflict between personal values and the teacher role, sixty per cent of staff did believe they had a "school self" and a "home self" (question 33), where the domestic version was less organised and more spontaneous, less restricted and more untidy.

Occasionally the children noticed teachers stepping out of role and warmly accepted it. Miss G. described the occasion when she pulled a wry face at a departing M.M.I. to the amusement of the class, one of whom proclaimed the gentleman to be "too nosey anyway."

Opinion was very much divided upon discussing teaching outside of school (question 35). Twenty per cent were keen to become so involved, others maintaining that: "Teaching is a conversation killer" (Mr. C.) and preferring to avoid educational arguments. A different stance was taken by Mrs. J. who avoided discussing her work because: "I am deeply involved with the children and prefer not to discuss teaching casually outside of school."

 Asked to state what they believed to be the most demanding part of their job (question 36) one third of the staff indicated "discipline", one third "lesson preparation and marking", and the remainder a combination "never being able to finish" (Miss T.); "Assemblies" (Mrs. M.); "Being enthusiastic all the time" (Mrs. J.) and "those aspects which don't directly involve the teaching of children" (Mr. C.). Asked to pursue this statement Mr. C. explained that in the middle school, the pressures for doing the extras such as planning trips and...
visits, concerts, pantomimes, displays, assemblies and inter-school liaison always seemed more pressing and immediate than the introduction of a new theme for a class lesson. Observation by this researcher at break-times and lunch-hour supported this view of teachers very much involved in such activities rather than routine classroom lesson preparation.

Generally it appeared that those activities involving other teachers or adults either as observers or participants received a disproportionate part of the individual teacher's available time.

Few members of staff felt conviction that they were influencing children's attitudes for life (question 38). Only three were unequivocal on this issue, the majority feeling that once outside of the school, teachers' influence was minimal and superficial. Mrs. S. asserted that: "Attitudes were more important than anything else," but Mrs. J. believed that although teachers certainly affected attitudes, she was not convinced that it was always right to do so. Pressed further on this stance, Mrs. J. indicated that insensitive teaching could promote conflict between the school standards and those pertaining at home.

The majority of staff felt that the influences of the home and peer group were very much stronger than those of the school. Four staff believed the school influence particularly strong in the early years but declining after the age of ten.

School Timetable: (March 1979).

All staff expressed the view that the present school
timetable fully utilised their individual interests and abilities, and believed there to be adequate consultation before implementation. A large majority of staff regarded the subject weightings to be "about right" (question 44) with only two staff expressing a need for more flexibility.

Teachers in the lower school felt they could generally extend successful lessons but those in the third and fourth years were equally clear they could not. Some regretted this, believing with Mrs. A. that: "Interest and continuity are powerful motivators." The majority of staff, however, favoured a set timetable which they felt preserved the essential subject balance and avoided saturation by an individual teacher's subject orientations.

The use of specialists was supported (questions 47 and 48) particularly in the upper school; the majority of lower school teachers maintained that such children would also benefit from occasional lessons by specialist staff. Several did qualify such support by stressing the pastoral role of the teacher of the 8-10 age group. Miss T. maintained that: "We teach children not subjects, the children need security and time to develop successful topics, there should be as much integration as possible."

Those in favour of specialisation cited the added knowledge, enthusiasm and expertise of such teachers as being more likely to extend the older children.

No teacher professed a desire to alter radically the subject weightings of the current school timetable. Comment was reserved for avoiding odd half-hour lessons, adding extra remedial periods, extending Music and Drama
and curtailing Domestic Science. The established pattern of basic subject emphasis in the morning session followed by activity and topic lessons in the afternoon should be continued. Later discussion with staff regarding the value of setting and the acceptable degree of such revealed considerable differences of opinion.

Agreement was total on the use of setting for Mathematics in the upper school. Only fifty per cent were in favour of extending this to include English and thirty per cent in favour of the use of setting in the lower school. Opposition cited the importance of having a class teacher for at least some of the time at middle school and that such responsibility for English was an ideal opportunity. Senior staff also emphasised the personal difficulties that arise in allocating specific sets to specific teachers each year. Some staff could be faced with children of limited ability for several years while others regularly received the more able. A school should be seen to be aware of this problem.

Class Organisation and Controls.

It was pointed out to staff that questions on this issue referred to techniques normally employed or preferred with a single mixed ability class; not for specialist lessons or selective groups.

Eighty per cent of the staff favoured an informal random grouping of desks (question 9) and observation around the school in March 1979 confirmed this pattern. (Yet by July of the following year only two teachers were continuing with this system).
Reasons given in favour of such informal groups were primarily social and organisational:

"It allows the more timid to relax" (Mrs. S.)

"It's easier for group topics" (Miss T.)

"The children learn to live and work together" (Mrs. M.)

Two teachers indicated it was physically easier to move around when the desks were grouped. Children were initially allowed to sit where they chose (question 11) and later moved if certain combinations proved behaviourally unsuccessful. Forty per cent of staff deliberately mixed boys and girls and a similar percentage at some time employed ability groupings within the class base (question 12).

Three quarters of the staff believed that "class lessons" comprised eighty per cent of their weekly timetable; in only three cases did the amount of time given to group and individual work exceed that assigned to full class lessons (question 21). The structure of the timetable itself supported this emphasis.

A teacher of History given one hour a week with each of the fourth year classes would be unlikely to develop practical sessions and varied group activities. The lower school showed an average twenty-five per cent commitment to individual and group topics but the overall trend remained that of subject instruction to whole class units. Attempted verification of these teacher estimates with four classes (one per year group) over one week in April 1979 by means of observation and discussion with teachers and children indicated an even higher percentage of class directed lessons (90%).
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Given opportunity to express their "personal ideal" of balance between individualised and class teaching, however, all but two staff afforded group and individual work at least a third of available time. Such time was, however, to be spent in teacher directed activities, no teacher was willing to allow more than ten per cent of available time to "child-chosen individual work".

Although apparently thus employing a subject orientated teacher directed method of teaching, the majority of staff favoured a relaxed informal atmosphere in the classroom.

Only three teachers felt that children should ask permission to leave their seats (question 24), no teacher felt that children should stand by their desks before being told to sit by the teacher (question 22) and only two indicated corporal punishment as a method of punishing disobedient children; the majority favouring extra work, withdrawal of privileges or a verbal harangue (question 25).

Forty per cent of staff did, however, express the view that the children should be "quieter than they are for most of the time".

Child Welfare and Incentives.

Asked to indicate what they believed to contribute to child happiness at school (question 53) the majority of staff stressed the importance of relationships both between children and between teachers and children. Less emphasis appeared to be placed on curricular content and more upon security, fairness and a sympathetic ear.
"A friendly relaxed atmosphere", was expressed on five responses.

A similar enquiry as to the most common complaint by children (question 52) elicited responses indicating that children were most upset by perceived unequal opportunities, unequal punishments, having to go outside when it was cold, having nowhere to sit outside and there being too many rules. Only one teacher indicated children being unhappy as a result of academic situations, i.e. when involved in a subject in which they were weak.

Asked to give personal priority to five ways of improving child morale (question 54) (1) By changing desk placement; (2) By displaying work; (3) By giving status (monitor, etc.); (4) By a personal social chat and (5) By praising in front of the class; all but two members of staff gave first priority to either praise or the social chat. Eight members of staff made giving praise their first priority. Displaying work was considered of least significance. Although fifty per cent of the staff felt that children volunteered to do jobs primarily to please teachers (question 56), four did indicate a genuine desire for neatness and order on the part of some children and Mrs. A. was impressed by "The enthusiasm of children in performing mundane and menial tasks", this being Mrs. A's first year in the middle school following three years' secondary experience.

All staff favoured the use of team points and stars given for either outstanding work, helpfulness, effort and good manners (question 20). Three teachers believed that stars should be phased out in the upper school and
a similar number expressed surprise that the older children should display such enthusiasm for the system.

Teachers seemed to strive to achieve fairness of distribution recognising the dilemma of rewarding either consistent quality or occasional departure from mediocrity.

"I must admit I give them for quality regardless of ability which seems a bit unfair", reasoned Mr. B. thus consistently rewarding the more able, while Mrs. J. approached distribution rather differently:-

"I tend to give them to those children who have tried hard, I suppose the best miss out in my class".

Stars and team points were also utilised in marking written creative work - where only two staff employed a graded system - the majority favouring individual discussion and written comment at the conclusion (question 19). Mrs. J. employed a two-tier system whereby the child received a comment or star but the teacher inserted a particular grading (e.g. B+) in her own mark book.

Displays of work.

Glendale was well equipped with display boarding both in classroom, corridor and entrance hall. Much of this had been added to over the years through School Fund finance and erected by school staff.

All staff believed that display of children's work was important in creating a warm bright atmosphere (question 15) that mellowed the harshness of the brick and glass construction of the school. There was similar agreement expressed at interview when staff described the importance they placed on the quality of display material.
observed in other schools. The majority of staff affirmed that they considered displays very much the external "face" of a school — sometimes rather deliberated over in a window-dressing sense to impress visitors — but nonetheless worthy of such attention for the effect it had on children within the school.

Only two members of staff felt that displays had little impact (question 15) although all teachers qualified their total acceptance by stressing the need for artistic impact, colourful presentation, child involvement and freshness.

Responses to the enquiry as to how work was selected were more varied. Forty per cent stressed the importance of displaying work denoting effort by the average child, an equal percentage emphasising the importance of choosing only "the best".

Three quarters of the staff believed children studied displays whether or not they themselves had been involved, but many doubted that written poems and stories were ever in fact read by other children.

Several staff also felt with Mrs. H. that:— "Five minutes after it's up and they've seen it I suppose it becomes a bit like wall-paper". The point might be made here that wall-paper itself can be the cause of considerable domestic debate.

School Building.

The staff considered the building compact, light and generally attractive (question 40). Most comment was supportive of the craft facilities in the new extension, although those members who taught the basic subjects in
this open plan area in morning sessions, proclaimed a preference for enclosed areas.

Teachers on the lower corridor were particularly pleased to have direct access to the school playing fields and those on the upper floor were unhappy about stairways with attendant fire and disciplinary problems. Eight staff mentioned the lack of space on the one main corridor as causing unhelpful crowding at the beginning and end of sessions.

Given the opportunity to add something else architecturally to the school, majority opinion favoured changing-rooms and showers; others specifying drama studios, library extension, and separate dining room/gymnasium facilities. Three staff considered the play areas too flat and featureless. A more landscaped approach partly under cover with: "Hoods and crannies to avoid direct supervision" (Mrs. S.) were requested (question 41).

Presented with the opportunity of either extending a small staffroom or adding a stock room all but one of the staff opted for the staffroom extension. Majority opinion was quite emphatic. "A relaxed and comfortable staffroom can invigorate weary staff" (Mrs. H.) "It is vital that staff have somewhere to meet and do not feel isolated" (Miss G.)

Eighty per cent of responses indicated that a happy staff made for a happy school.
**Local Environment.**

Although two members of staff had at one time lived within the school's catchment area, no teacher expressed a desire to now reside in the Glendale district (question 59).

All felt that the local amenities were exceptionally poor for such a large residential population. Teachers cited the lack of leisure facilities and doctors' surgery as the two major weaknesses.

The majority of staff believed that parents held values broadly similar to their own (question 61) although several expressed the belief that most parents were more concerned with child attitude and happiness than academic excellence.

All but two of the staff believed that parent-teacher contact was "too distant" (question 63), and more liaison was desirable. This liaison should be "professional" rather than social and teachers should retain an element of "social distance". While accepting parental help in school activities Mrs. P. emphasised that:— "Teachers' professionalism should never be undermined"; while Mrs. H. affirmed that the school should definitely expand parental contact functions although:— "I don't like the type of events most of our parents like".

On the rather more general question of whether "society" respects the job teachers are doing (question 65) the staff were divided almost equally. Those who felt there was congruence between society and themselves expressed some concern over the growth of "accountability"; others
considered the media particularly unhelpful emphasising the apparent hypocrisy of pedagogic critics. On a more local level this was expressed by Mrs. H:— "Parents expect standards they don't set behaviourally at home".

Summary

The evidence of the staff of Glendale Middle School demonstrates considerable commitment to, and involvement in, the school's aims, policies and activities. Responses regularly emphasised the importance of fairness, objectivity and academic vigour in promoting child educational welfare.

The staff were shown to be experienced but generally young; aware of the dangers of teacher pomposity but anxious to avoid familiarity.

They displayed expected individual differences on matters of discipline and classroom internal organisation but were uniform in their acceptance of the timetable, its subject weightings and degree of specialisation.

Staff were equally happy with the amount of consultation and subsequent personal subject responsibilities. The majority of staff employed formal class teaching methods but within an atmosphere that was neither restrictive nor authoritarian. Although critical of the amount of time consumed by corridor and class displays, staff were agreed upon the importance of this feature. Staff were similarly happy to work in a structure that was light, airy and comfortable and provided with good staff facilities, but were less complimentary of the local environmental facilities for the children of Glendale.
The Staff Association Questionnaire.

This second questionnaire was administered in November 1979 and its very inception is indicative of change within Glendale. Innovations and decisions by the new headteacher highlighted issues not regarded as such at the time of the first more general questionnaire. The results of that survey revealed little dissonance, but then class teachers were reflecting upon years in which they had enjoyed considerable personal autonomy. The aim of this second more specific survey was to assess staff association with the number of significant organisational and procedural changes. The eighteen item questionnaire included ten statements indicative of policy either endorsed at staff meetings or written into the "School Policy Document".

Table 6:1

Staff Association with stated School Policy, November 1979, by Percentage of 5 point scale.  n = 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q No.</th>
<th>Statement - abbreviated</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Standards maintained only if staff keep to timetable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Testing of children should take place in hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teacher should keep to set books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Light entertainment should be avoided on school trips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Use of ball point pens should be discouraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Children should stand by desks before lessons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Study basics only before drama, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>No sweets or crisps to be eaten</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Work presentation should be standardised</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Stars and Team Points to be given</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high degree of congruence between school policy and staff values should be expressed by significant percentages on the positive side of the preceding table. Only in the case of the distribution of points and stars can such association be perceived. On this question no staff appear to object and only a minor percentage occupy the neutral position. Only question four relating to the taking of end of year tests in the hall displays a similar higher degree of support than disagreement.

Resistance to change appears most strongly on matters relating to curriculum control. The new school policy tended towards set textbooks for each year group and responses to question five indicate total rejection of such imposition.

An increased concentration on the basic subjects was expressed by the statement in question twelve extracted from the new English syllabus:—

"It is essential to be sure that basic items contained in the syllabus are well assimilated before launching out on any programme of drama and self-expression". Only thirteen per cent of staff agreed with this assertion, explaining to this researcher that they considered drama and activity lessons as valuable, not only in their own right, but also in establishing relationships and an atmosphere conducive to later more formal work. Observation over the past three years had, however, revealed little regular drama work in the school; the majority of such work being concerned with imminent assemblies, concerts or pantomimes.
Six teachers admitted to "never doing drama".

Staff also expressed disagreement (66%) with the statement in question one maintaining that only through careful adherence to set timetables and teacher forecasts of work could standards be maintained. These innovatory forecasts of work asked teachers to express in writing their intended work for each subject area in half-termly cycles. Staff felt such schedules, demanded in July for the Autumn Term, inevitably restrictive and formalising. Mrs. C. explained:— "It's easy to put Exercise 7 Page 41 of "Using Good English", but more difficult to explain how you're going to wait for a misty October afternoon for work on Autumn leaves".

The new School Policy Document included examples of the preferred layout of children's mathematics and English work; date - margin - page division, etc. As expressed in responses to question sixteen over fifty per cent of staff felt such standardisation unnecessary.

Question seven reflected staff meeting discussion over suggested school trips. The new headteacher, although very supportive of educational visits generally, was precise in his rejection of the value of Fun-fairs. Thirteen per cent of staff agreed, over forty per cent opposed such restriction believing that although not worthy of a visit in themselves, they could still be utilised at the end of a more educational outing for purely recreational purposes.
Questions eight, eleven and thirteen refer to specific instructions to the children.

The use of ball-point pens (question 8) was to be discouraged in favour of cartridge pens and "Pental" types. Staff were fairly equally divided on this issue, teachers who disagreed (60%) stating that schools should utilise those tools the children will inevitably use.

Question eleven refers to written and oral staff instruction that children entering rooms should first stand before being instructed by the teacher to sit. Staff meeting discussion on this issue had revealed no staff in favour of such procedure but it was nevertheless included (and underlined) in the later School Policy Document. Responses indicated a thirteen per cent agreement; sixty per cent disagreement.

The rule that no sweets or crisps were to be consumed in school at any time was implemented on the second day of the new headteacher's authority. Only two teachers are shown to support such a ruling although forty per cent remain "neutral". Initially as with the "stand at desks" issue there appeared total opposition by staff but with time (six months) there appears to be a slight drift towards "official policy". Almost half the staff however remain in the position of presumably enforcing a school rule in which they do not believe. Later conversation and interviews with staff revealed the difficulties of such a position - not infrequently resolved by humour: "I offer the children a sweet if they get ten out of ten on a spelling test" (Mr. R.)
Mrs. J. expressed the dilemma more seriously when outlining the difficulty of children when caught with sweets by one teacher and punished, caught by another and asked to share them out (observed incident).

**Summary**

Staff attitudes to these ten statements of school policy can best be summarised in graph form. Figure 6:1 presents the degree of congruence – dissonance. To construct this graph points were awarded on a scale of +2 (strong agreement) to -2 (strong disagreement). Thus taking question sixteen as an example, two staff (13%) strongly agreed (2 x 2 = 4 points), four staff agreed (4 x 1 = 4 points) giving a positive orientation of 8 points. The negative orientation was represented by eight staff (53%) disagreeing (8 x 1 = 8 points) and no staff strongly disagreeing, giving a total of -8 points. Thus there is equal positive and negative representation of question sixteen referring to the need for standardisation in the presentation of children’s work. (Figure 6:1 overleaf).
Figure 6.1.
Graph Presentation of Staff Association with Stated School Policy - November 1979.

<table>
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n = 15. Points given

- Strongly Agree 2 points
- Agree 1 point
- Neutral 0 points
- Disagree -1 point
- Strongly Disagree -2 points

The ideal bias on this graph should (presumably - unless conflict is considered helpful to the vitality of the institution) be thus concentrated on the right hand side of the vertical zero line. Only in the case of question eighteen, however, does this clearly occur. The tension in the remainder is quite evident, with considerable negative average orientations. As already intimated, the
institution was undergoing considerable change within a short period of time and an element of resistance to any form of change can be assumed to form some element of the above presentation. It should, however, also be observed that such changes were not cosmetic or ephemeral. Hierarchical involvement ensured that continual pressure was exerted.

Staff Attitude to Specific Issues.

The remaining eight questions on the Staff Association Questionnaire were included to ascertain staff attitude towards specific educational issues at the time of writing not explicitly covered by School Rule, Policy Document or Staff Meeting Minute.

Sufficient informal guidance, comment and inferences had been made, however, for the staff to be quite certain of the trend of official policy on these issues. They are included in this chapter on the basis of staff expressed concern, these statements being regarded as fundamental to the maintenance of school morale - and are of consequent interest to this researcher into the determinants of individual school climate.

Table 6:2 (overleaf) gives percentage responses to these eight issues on a five point scale.
Table 6:2.
Staff Attitudes to Specific Issues. Selected Eight Statements from Staff Association Questionnaire Nov. 1979.
Percentage orientation on 5 point scale. n = 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q No.</th>
<th>Statement - abbreviated</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Headteachers should compile syllabuses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Setting should be extended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A timetable should be flexible</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Corporal punishment effective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Subject specialists should compile syllabuses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Staff Christian names to be avoided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Class teacher choose own text books</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Some child choice of lesson activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions two and ten in Table 6:2 refer to an issue pertinent, even singular, to middle school education; that is the compilation of syllabuses. Teachers in infant and junior Schools might not expect individual responsibility for drawing up syllabuses, conversely those in secondary schools might register surprise should the headteacher compile syllabuses in a variety of subjects. Caught in this division it might be expected that syllabuses in the middle school be first developed by specialist staff and presented to the headteacher for ratification or amendment.
Such a system had been employed at Glendale until 1979 when the Policy Document introduced new syllabuses in English, History and Geography with modifications in Art, Science, Domestic Science and Mathematics. Some staff had been consulted; general discussion was invited after distribution.

Staff reaction appears overwhelmingly in favour of specialist responsibility with only two teachers believing the headteacher should develop the syllabus (question 2) and only one member of staff expressing doubt that the subject specialists should not have such responsibility (question 10. One teacher = 7%)

During 1979 setting had been extended in the third and fourth years to include English as well as Mathematics. The majority of staff indicate that further extension be avoided; the headteacher made it clear that he believed streaming a successful policy.

Responses to question six indicate one hundred percent demand for timetable flexibility – yet each subject specialist was anxious to preserve his own specified two hours per class per week! Neither had the timetable composition changed dramatically over the year, so there is an implied criticism of an established pattern. Lower school staff were, however, now expected to be teaching the exact subject indicated at the exact time specified; rather than juggle their subject weightings through the week.

The statement on corporal punishment (question 9) "A teacher who slaps an errant child has probably performed an educative function" was originally intended
to probe general staff attitude and was phrased to reflect the use of the terms "slap" and "smack" which were utilised in official notes to staff. The majority of staff were understandably reluctant to express specific opinion on this issue expressing qualifications over the type of offence deserving of a particular punishment; over fifty per cent of staff, however, believed such action "non-educative".

The apparently much lighter note concerning the use of staff Christian names aroused surprisingly strong emotions. Again there had been a change of emphasis in the school. From the informal use of Christian names by Mr. Greenwood to the carefully formal full titles by Mr. Smith.

Although never utilised in the classroom situation Mr. Greenwood had consistently adopted Christian name terms at breaktimes, lunchtimes and through formal staff meetings. Staff responses to the headteacher had, however, always been more formal, only the deputy occasionally using the Christian name. From 1979 every teacher was always afforded the prefix Mr. Mrs. or Miss when referred to by the headteacher.

It would appear that one teacher preferred such formality (question 14).

The staff express complete support for individual choice of text books (question 15) and seventy per cent support for giving children some opportunity each day to choose their own activity (question 17).
It has been stated earlier that official policy favoured the use of "set books" and a prescribed curriculum.

**SUMMARY.**

The results of this survey may again best be summarised in graph form adopting a scoring of +2 to -2 as utilised on the previous example.

**Figure 6:2.**

Staff Attitudes to Specific Issues. Nov. 1979.

Staff Association Questionnaire. n = 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Q Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph (Figure 6:2) illustrates strong conviction that specialist staff should compile the syllabuses (questions 2 and 10), the timetable should be flexible (question 6), class teachers should choose their own books (question 15) and children should have a choice of lesson activity (question 17). Opinion is more divided on the effectiveness of corporal punishment (question 9) and the value of setting (question 3).
Reflection

This concludes the analysis of staff attitude. The preceding pages might indicate an institution typified by considerable expressed opposition to observable trends and policy. This, in fact, was not the case. The questionnaires certainly indicate how the teachers "felt" and interviews endorsed these feelings, but there were few frictional staff meetings and no concerted action to defeat unpopular innovation.

Disagreement was voiced and some change re-directed or averted but this researcher would assert that the short-stay intelligent observer would be unlikely to note a discordant atmosphere — rather a businesslike, efficient, orderly and formal educational institution.
CHAPTER 7.

Conflict and Consensus in a Period of Change:

Mention has already been made of some of the changes in school organisation which followed upon the appointment of Mr. Smith as headteacher in January 1979.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present these changes systematically; outline the method of their introduction and indicate certain points of contention.

Basic to this examination is the belief that the changes introduced manifestly altered the climate of Glendale Middle School. Whether to the school's advantage or disadvantage is for subsequent professional analysts to determine; but for the purposes of this study the relevant facts are that such organisational changes did occur and this researcher's recorded comments of teachers, ancillary staff, parents and children indicate their considerable impact and effect. The synthesis of these views was that the school had become more formal, less personalised, more predictable, less spontaneous, more controlled, less relaxed, and more academic and less social. It should be emphasised that the innovations were almost wholly internal. The children were from the same catchment area, the school building had not been altered, the staff had remained reasonably stable (five changes in two years), I.A.S policies had not been radically reviewed, parental pressure had not increased, school managers no more involved, external examinations unchanged. Certainly Government financial restrictions had been felt at Glendale both in the practical sense of
a restricted capital and the appointment of two teachers through re-deployment, and less tangibly by a certain sag in morale as staff perceived the stringency of the educational budget contrasted with the multi-million pounds oil and defence budgets. However, such external factors had been evident for some years. The real changes at Glendale were internal and particularistic. They are listed below in abbreviated note form for ease of comparison.

Organisational Changes at Glendale Middle School.

**System pre 1979.**

**School Policy**

No formal written statement of general aims and objectives.

Subject syllabus available in most subjects.

Administrative notes for staff guidance on hours of work, supervisory duties, responsibilities of different members of staff.

**Syllabuses.**

**English**

Largely undirected. Emphasis at discretion of class teacher. Guidelines distributed following group discussion. General use of two basic text books, but individual choice of additional material. Varied basic reading schemes with Griffin Pirate Readers and Wide Range Schemes predominating. Regular use of local library for fiction.

**System post 1979.**

Comprehensive one hundred page "School Policy Document". This inclusive of syllabuses, administrative procedures, evaluation techniques, work layouts and I.E.A. extracts on Primary School Philosophy, Discipline, Supervision and Evaluation.

General thrust towards formalised structured teaching.

"There is no place at Glendale for band-wagon philosophies" (page 1).

Establishment of "Flamingo" Reading Scheme followed by "Scholastic" sets. Classes asked to cover grammar, comprehension, spelling and creative writing each week.

Gradual introduction of single set text books for grammar work. Introduction of set readers for each year group plus choice from Scholastic Scheme.

Infrequent use of local library.
Pre 1979.

Mathematics.

Comprehensive syllabus detailing work for each year group. Emphasis on Alpha-Beta series followed by S.M.P. with basic arithmetic work from K. Hesse. Additional texts by staff choice. Basics stressed as important but variety encouraged.

Environmental Studies.

Integrated History, Geography, Social Studies course suggesting range of topics for each year group. Also guidance notes on General Knowledge, Map-work and Local Studies. Linked with Science syllabus.

Other Subjects.

Science, French, Art, Woodwork, Domestic Science, P.E., Games.

Post 1979.

Similar syllabus but more emphasis on number work especially in lower school with extension in use of "Hesse" series. Less use of Alpha-Beta series. Less practical and group work. Continued use of S.M.P. with older pupils.

New syllabus establishing separate areas of study in History and Geography. Chronological division of History work by year group (e.g. 3rd year 1603 - 1840). Regional emphasis in Geography.

Science largely unchanged although less liaison with Environmental Studies.

French, Art and Domestic Science new staff responsibilities reflecting personal orientations.

P.E. and Games - timetable changes involving separate lessons for boys/girls in upper school, but syllabus retained. Swimming discontinued by I.D.A.

All subject instruction specified by hierarchy throughout the week. Mathematics and English each morning, History, Geography, Art, Craft, Reading in afternoons. P.E. plus Country Dancing one longer session rather than two shorter. Extra staff on Games supervision. Sex separation for craft/needlework. Continued withdrawal of reading groups. Headteacher involved in some teaching. Set reading and story times 3.0 - 4.0 p.m. every day.

Timetable.

1st/2nd year classes.

Only Games, P.E., Music and Science (2nd year) timetabled by hierarchy. Expected that Maths and English be covered each day; remainder of timetable at discretion of class teacher, to be displayed on classroom wall.

Staff with own classes for eighty per cent of week. No setting or streaming but daily withdrawal groups for English.
Pre 1979.

3rd/4th year classes.
Mathematics "set" into four or five groups four times per week.

English similar time but teachers take own classes.

All other subjects timetabled by hierarchy, following completion of staff "preference sheets".

Staff average thirty per cent of week with own classes, teachers taking an average of six different groups of children per week.

Child Evaluation
End of year tests in Mathematics and English set by subject leaders following group discussion, taken in normal classroom base. Schonell and Daniel/Black Reading Tests administered annually. Results entered on child record cards together with comment regarding ability and attitude by teacher.

Tests in other subjects at discretion of individual teachers.

H.F.R.R. tests for fourth year pupils in Reading, Mathematics and Intelligence (Culture Fair) set by H.F.R.

Communication
Staff: Monthly staff meetings starting at 3.30 p.m. Agenda by headteacher and deputy.

Use of Christian names throughout. No minutes but informal notes by headteacher.

Administrative notes handwritten by deputy as required. Formal subject area discussion groups at lunchtimes and subsequent note of recommendations to headteacher. Majority opinion influential - oral communication preferred.

Post 1979.

Mathematics and English sets on four mornings per week. Less time for teacher with own classes.

Similar weightings for Environmental Studies (History/Geography), Science, Craft, Art, Domestic Science, Games and P.E.

French extended into third year.

P.E. one hour sessions separated by sex.

Subject specialists assigned through the school in P.E. and Environmental Studies where previously some class teacher discretion.

Proposed two tests annually in basic subjects - but only end of school year to date. Mathematics, English and French papers taken in school hall. New class record sheets requesting A.B.C.D.E qualifications by staff of child achievement levels in all subjects and particular aspects of these subjects, e.g. adjectives, adverbs, full-stops, commas, etc., in English; four rules of number in Mathematics; regional studies in Geography; eras in History; skills in P.E. and Games. All test results also included. Subjective attitude comments by teachers discouraged. H.F.R.R. tests as before.

Monthly staff meetings starting at 3.45 p.m. Minutes typed and duplicated. Surnames (Mr. and Mrs.) throughout. Administrative notes typed or handwritten by headteacher, fewer by deputy. Increased emphasis on written communication; less emphasis on study group recommendations. Weekly timetabled meetings with deputy head.
For 1979.

Parents: Notes to parents by headteacher as and when required. Meetings in school for parents of first year children. Booklets distributed. Involvement by headteacher in social/emotional problems of individual parents. No P.T.A. but good attendance at bi-annual Open Evenings and other school events.

Children: Discussion of school events, sports results, informal comment on current affairs after morning assembly.

Assembly

Four days per week. Two of these by children in class rotation. One by headteacher, one by deputy or senior staff. Children seated informally in class groups. Teachers nearby. Some chatter before commencement of Service and at conclusion.


Supervision of Pupils

Two staff per day on yard and dinner duty. Children called into school by class from random positions on yard. Dinner supervision of two sittings by volunteer staff involved mainly at commencement of meal — table allocation and saying of Grace. Staff expected to be in school ten minutes before and after stated school hours (written statement). Similar emphasis on good time-keeping at break-times.

Post 1979.

Monthly news-letter to parents outlining forthcoming events and explaining school policy. Invitations to study child record sheets. Proposal of P.T.A. Two events held to launch this but no formalisation as yet. Two Open Evenings. Expanded booklet for parents of first year children.

Weekly meeting where all school events discussed and special achievements recognised. Informal comment after assemblies discouraged.


Hymn — prayer — activity/discussion — prayer — hymn — exit to music.

Same number of staff on duty. Rotas. Lower school called into class lines before entering building. Some sex separation encouraged with older pupils. Increased supervision at lunch times, adult presence required throughout meal. Staff asked to stagger own meal-times to assist in this.

Emphasis on "corporate responsibility" regarding behaviour of children in corridors, toilets, coming in and out of school.
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Pre 1979.

Punishment.
No written guidelines. Majority of staff give extra work, withdraw privileges or verbal harangue. Corporal punishment discouraged although cane preserved in headteacher's room (used twice in five years).

Teacher Record Books.
Weekly forecasts of work in each subject area inspected and signed by headteacher. Mark books at discretion of individual staff.

Times of School Day.
9.10 - 12.15 p.m.
1.25 - 4.00 p.m.

Extra Curricular

Major School Events
Two Open Evenings, Sports Day, Swimming Gala, Pantomine, Summer Fair.

Classroom Management.
Majority of desks arranged in informal groups.

Post 1979.

Preventative measures outlined in School Policy Document emphasising efficient preparation and organisation. Written instruction that teachers responsible for own discipline, refer problems to Deputy Head. Limited corporal punishment such as slap or smack suggested. Cyn slipper preserved by headteacher - some corridor patrol with such.

Forecasts of work schedules in each subject area for half-termly periods requested by headteacher in advance (in July for Sept. - Oct.). Also weekly diary of completed work inspected and signed by headteacher.

9.0 - 12.0 (whistle blown at 8.55 a.m.)
1.30 - 4.0 p.m.

As before plus extra club/society activities in Astronomy, Wild Life Study, Model Making, Climbing and Films. Some expectation expressed that extra-curricular work be undertaken.

As before with proposed extension of parent functions. Orientation of Pantomine towards Concert; separate performances for lower and upper school.

Majority of desks in rows.
Fre 1D79#
School Stock.
Distributed weekly by
Deputy Head at written
request of staff.
Key available from
Deputy at other times.
Visits and Trips.
Two or three five-day
residential visits per year.
Two shorter stay visits to
local out-door Education
Centres. Day visits at
discretion of individual
staff.
Display Boards.
Corridor and Entrance Hall
displays on discussed
themes. Usually changed
half-ternly.
Combination of child and
teacher efforts.
Class Indication.
By year group 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 :
plus initial letter of
teacher surname. Thus 3B
a third year class taken by
Mr. Brown.

Pre 1979.

Post 1979.

Same system. Stock-taking
indicating a thirty per cent
increase in use of lined
exercise books over previous
year. Less use of blank
page books and art materials.
As before but with increased
emphasis on day visits in
connection with time-tabled
work. Teacher forecast
sheets to include details of
proposed visits.

Similar use of general theme
although Entrance Hall now
expressive of general work
within the school. Less
frequent changing of material
except before Open Evening
when usually linked to recent
class visits.
System of numbers 1 - 14
(similar notation for School
Policy Documents. Each
folder numbered rather than
named - although the Secretary
later added names for her
convenience.)

Such then were some of the organisational changes
instigated between January 1979 and July 1980. The aim
in presenting these changes has been to concentrate on the
more permanent innovations which in the view of this
researcher have eased Glendale away from a climate which
existed prior to 1979. Certain rules and regulations
already referred to in a previous chapter (Staff Association
Questionnaire) have not been included, nor indeed have a
number of innovatory measures which proved ephemeral.
These included a system whereby all children had to take their break-times in the hall when the weather was wet (discontinued following duty staff remonstration) and a system of offering fourth year children a choice of whether to go out or stay indoors at break-times (discontinued through increased classroom malpractices, pilfering, etc.)

All the changes were initiated by a new headteacher quite clear in his resolve to create a disciplined school characterised by rigorous standards in work presentation and performance. "There's none of this wandering about from place to place here - I want to know what every child is about all of the time", Mr. Smith assured parents of the new intake at an evening meeting.

The headteacher pursued this assurance by regular inspections of all children's work, daily inspection of all classrooms and personal involvement in the teaching timetable. His commitment was total and all-embracing: - "I don't feel I can be really intimate with all factors like I could at my previous school, perhaps because Glendale is larger", Mr. Smith regretted, in conversation with a deputy head already quite convinced that it would be impossible for anyone to be more totally involved than this headteacher.

The impact of these changes varied from individual to individual:

Staff Attitude to Change.

Mrs. N. was most concerned by the diminished autonomy of the class teacher and left the school; the only teacher to do so during the period of study for
reasons other than promotion or pregnancy. Mrs. J.
felt the formality of being called by her surname
throughout the day the single most frustrating change.
Mrs. H. however, welcomed the general change of
emphasis and maintained that it was pleasing to observe
"less familiarity" both between staff and between staff
and children. Mr. R. maintained he now had to work
"far too hard" yet four other staff expressed the view
that although there was more obvious hierarchical
pressure, their classroom work seemed rather less
demanding. These teachers cited the increased use of
textbook exercises for this situation.

The staff were almost united in feeling that they
could not relax in their work expressing antipathy
towards perceived hierarchical surveillance. This is
not to imply any value judgement on the desirability
or otherwise of being able to "relax". Clearly there
is a case for too much and too little relaxation. The
point is made to reflect comment by fourteen of the
eighteen staff. A minority of staff experienced little
difficulty in accepting the new regime, finding their
philosophies and organisational procedures supported by
the emerging climate and more "relaxed" by the increased
use of written objectives and work schedules.

The majority of staff tended — with perhaps two
exceptions — to accept a policy of what might be termed
"strategic withdrawal". Mr. G. put the position thus:-
"People don't question and argue like Mr. Smith seems
to want them to do. I don't feel many support the recent
policy decisions but they'd rather be seen to accept them,
while going their own way in the classroom." Such a
position was identified in the staff sub-culture where comment would be made to the effect that:— "Oh! she's joined the low-profile set". This term "low-profile" probably exemplified the position of the majority of staff (typified, it was said, by the deputy head!)— withdrawing to their own specialisms or classrooms, neither overtly critical of innovation, nor as energetically supportive of school activities as they had been in the past.

Just as two or three staff found their views dovetailing with official school policy, there were also two who most regularly expressed their disagreement. Their views were cogently expressed and often resulted in a modification of the official policy to the evident relief of the "low profiles". Interestingly, one of these teachers was promoted within the school by Mr. Smith to the surprise of many staff. Such an appointment tended to confirm Mr. Smith's proclamation at staff meetings that he welcomed constructive argument, yet few staff accepted such regular invitations to debate issues and thus modify policy.

Most of the innovations detailed at the beginning of this chapter were introduced by the "School Policy Document". This statement of intent was required by the L.E.A. in 1978-79 and was to include details of the individual school philosophy, syllabuses, administrative procedures and methods of child evaluation. The new headteacher perceived the finalisation of this document as
very much a priority, and as described earlier produced a comprehensive one hundred page fortnight result two months after his arrival at the school.

**Debate over School Policy Document.**

Staff were issued with numbered ring folders enclosing these sheets and asked to read the document carefully before the next meeting. In practice it appeared that most staff concentrated on those sheets pertaining to their own subject areas—and subsequent questioning by this researcher in relation to the "Staff Association Questionnaire" revealed that many pages remained unread six months after its distribution.

It was, however, immediately noted at the first official staff meeting, that the instruction regarding children having to stand at their desks before being told to sit by the teacher, was included and indeed under-lined. As this issue had arisen informally some two weeks' earlier where all staff present had expressed disfavour at such a ruling, the teachers were surprised to find its inclusion. For the first time in their experience, majority opinion had indicated one way, but the headteacher had disagreed and re-affirmed the official policy. This issue was to make a profound early impression on the staff at Glendale.

Pursued over the year it was noticeable that the majority of teachers continued to allow children to enter the room, sit down, arrange their books and await instruction. Four teachers, however, did heed the "standing" rule after some nine months had elapsed, two of these being the probationary teachers.
This researcher would be surprised if more staff did not ultimately conform; although the issue was considered such a personal domain by six teachers that they asserted nothing would impose it upon them.

The curricular changes as outlined in the School Policy Document were generally accepted by the staff, while expressing some regret as to the degree of syllabus control. Dissent was offered the chance to elucidate by Mr. Smith: "You don't have to stick rigidly to the syllabus, if anyone wants to do something else just come and discuss it with us." (Diary note of staff meeting). This response tended to conclude the discussion. Support was evident for the extensive and thorough revision of the English syllabus and the introduction of the "Scholastic Reading Scheme", but less enthusiasm was displayed for the History and Geography syllabuses where specialist staff felt the established "Integrated Studies" approach had been abandoned without sufficient prior discussion. Teachers felt the constrictions of the chronological year group studies in History (e.g. 2nd year 1485 - 1715) a regressive move.

Discussion and debate on such curricular matters was not however extensive or incisive. The distribution of this new document with its definitive comment on syllabus content and administrative procedure did not generate either enthusiastic support or vehement denunciation. Most staff accepted it for what it was - a written guideline demanded by the I.E.A. Individual staff had yet to personally take any action - only read it.
the staff sub-culture believing that eventual personal manipulation or circumnavigation of the less desirable issues was entirely feasible.

A positive response to one item in the School Policy Document was, however, demanded in July 1979 when staff had to complete the new child record sheets.

Debate over Child Record Sheets.

Confronted with having to rate child ability in dozens of different aspects of English and Mathematics on a five point A.B.C.D.E. scale there was some consternation and confusion.

"If I have set four children and rate my best child A in division, what does the teacher of set one rate her children?", asked Miss S. and this was to be a recurring enquiry. Two staff meetings ensued where Mr. Smith rightly asserted that those sheets had been in the Policy Document for four months and no-one had yet questioned them. Discussion became fluent with staff asking how it was possible to rate children accurately on a five point scale on (say) the ability to use commas and full-stops. Other staff maintained that certainly at some point in the term an individual child would be classed "A" in one of these categories but six weeks and a holiday later their forgetful natures might deserve a "D" in the same category. Mr. Smith was adamant that the Record Sheets were "County Policy" and entirely appropriate to the situation. It was then requested that a member of the Advisory Staff be invited to the school to further outline the thinking behind such a presentation.
The visit was arranged and two weeks later the I.E.A. Senior Staff Adviser chaired a calm and reasoned meeting, the result of which was to endorse the type of Record Sheet developed by Mr. Smith, but afford staff the freedom to utilise a three point scale or, in some cases, tick or cross individual aspects of study and award an overall grade in (say) English grammar.

Some compromise had been achieved: the headteacher supported; the staff, to some extent, accommodated.

Undoubtedly this event was something of a watershed in the development of the new climate at Glendale Middle School. Conflict flared briefly both between staff, and between some staff and the headteacher. It was apparent that Mr. Smith believed that there was some concerted opposition by the staff to his overall programme, although it was argued by the deputy that this was not in fact the case — only a rejection of the rigidity of the Record Sheets themselves.

From statements by staff, observation and personal involvement, it was clear that many staff now perceived the new climate and proceeded to adopt postures that would ease their acceptance of it.

Staffroom Behaviour.

Throughout the five years of this researcher's experience at the school, there had been remarkably few cliques at Glendale. Lunch-time conversation was essentially light and banter predominant. Exchanges tended to take place across the whole room and involve all staff.
By the end of 1979 it was clear that groupings had emerged - the senior staff and deputy, the more mature ladies, the probationary teachers, the young unmarrieds, two or three "independents". Most lunch hour and break times consisted of small group discussions and conversations, often conducted in the same area of the staff room. Exchanges across the room became fewer, repartee more restrained, innuendo less "acceptable" and academic comment more guarded. Numbers in the staffroom at lunch time dwindled, and two of the groups began leaving the premises once or twice a week for lunch out. Use of the staffroom during free periods had also been somewhat restricted in accordance with the Policy Document statement (page 28) that such time should "In the first instance be utilised for the preparation of work-display material".

Child Attitude and Behaviour.

Change, of course, did not only affect the staff. The children were confronted with it quite swiftly by the abolition of confectionery and a change in the hours of the school day. Earlier evidence has documented the impact of the no sweets rule and the children continued to complain about the unfairness of this - especially when apparently extended to include several school trips.

Diary notes contrasting November 1978 and November 1979 record an increased number of children late for school, an increased number awaiting disciplinary action at lunch time, and increased truancy.
Children being late for school could, of course, be attributed to the earlier start; the increased misbehaviour to extra vigilance on the part of ancillary staff, and truancy to a keener analysis on the part of the headteacher. This last feature only involved three or four fourth year pupils, but previously the school had always prided itself on the non-existence of truancy. Attendance figures contrasting 1978 and 1979 however, show very little difference with average weekly attendance of 92.1% in 1978 and 91.2% in 1979. The incidence of child misbehaviour was pursued by this researcher with members of staff by putting the question that given the increased controls and generally tighter organisation, surely an improvement was to be expected? Only two members of staff had perceived improvement in pupil behaviour through 1979 and six suggested that the increased controls simply resulted in increased exhuberance when such controls were relaxed - at lunch time and break time.

The numbers of children sent to the deputy head for disciplinary action following misbehaviour in such as toilet areas again showed a twenty per cent increase between March 1979 and March 1980 (one month diary notation) and those ancillary staff responsible for cleaning such areas were adamant until July 1980 that "they're getting worse."

However careful the research in these areas, it must of course be admitted that very few conclusions may be drawn upon the contrasts between two very limited periods.
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Furthermore, it might be expected that children adjusting to a new regime would themselves be temporarily unsettled, and the first year of new command might well prove atypical.

These brief paragraphs might not be sufficient to indicate future trends, but might yet suffice to demonstrate that the extra structure and controls had yet to achieve their desired effect.

The Ancillary Staff.

Comment from caretakers, cleaners, lunch-time supervisors and the canteen staff was explicit and descriptive, but difficult to express in qualitative terms. Whereas members of staff could accept a desired change of role from deputy head to "researcher", the ancillary staff were unaware of such a distinction and expressed themselves with familiarity and vigour.

Ethically this researcher's position precluded anything but the most benign enquiries and it was finally decided not to include specific interviews with these members of staff. This is not to deny their importance. The school secretary, chief caretaker and canteen supervisor had each worked at Glendale for more than ten years and had become very much involved, even identified, with the school.

Unsolicited comment was fairly uniform on how the school had changed, emphasising the increased shouting by teachers, the absence of informal asides by teachers, the exact delineation of their duties, and increased apparent aggression on the part of the children.
The school secretary maintained that:— "I don't know what's wrong with them (the children) — it's so much noisier now, they weren't this bad with Mr. Greenwood and he didn't bother". As with the teaching staff, however, there was no lack of support and co-operation by these ladies at extra-curricula school functions.

Given the list of organisational changes at the beginning of this chapter, it would be illuminating to identify the more significant. Such judgement could, however, only be personal and individualistic; this researcher can but emphasise the significance of the apparently less influential as commented upon by staff at interview. A certain de-personalising of the school was probably the recurring theme. Evidence for this was given citing the (a) absence of informal comment after assembly, (2) absence of Christian name terms by the headteacher, (3) the use of numbers rather than names on record books and classrooms, (4) the duplicated notes to staff rather than oral communication and (5) the increased hierarchical direction of activities, once considered the preserve of the individual class teacher. Mrs. I. working in the semi open-plan area of the school:— "I used to teach with the Science Lab. door open and other staff used to pop in for a word or two, but now I close myself away and feel guilty if I'm talking to some-one else".

Instances of such "retreatism" were again evident towards the end of the period of study (Dec. 1980) when each member of staff who had taught at Glendale for more
than four years was asked to comment on any perceived change in the climate of the school over that period. Staff were asked to direct attention to levels of pupil and teacher achievement, discipline, commitment, innovation and school efficiency.

All responses asserted that there had in fact been a noticeable change of climate in the school and the majority suggested this was only to be expected with a change of headteacher.

Consensus opinion referred to a general "tightening-up" of discipline, syllabuses and general school efficiency but there was less agreement on the effects such procedures were having on the achievements and commitment of pupils and teachers.

Miss T. believed children were receiving a "sound basic education but there were complex problems for the individual not keen on the system".

Mrs. M. appreciated a more formal and disciplined school and regarded the more rigid schemes of work as helpful in adding direction to her teaching. Reservation was, however, expressed as to the degree of such direction: "A good system of communication is essential to staff contentment and I find this seems to be less efficient than before". The amount of structured guidance and the related effects of such a direction was a recurring theme: Mrs. S. was particularly concerned: "Work undertaken in the afternoons has been dictated to such a degree that any sense of
adventure of excitement has disappeared ... this lack of interest by teacher and child has made discipline harder work."

The issue of more overt discipline in the school was of concern to many teachers. A view expressed by Mr. B. is typical of three other responses: "Children in lessons are better behaved although much less enthusiastic ... I have noticed, however, a drop in self-discipline at unsupervised times, the children are given less trust and less responsibility and have become less responsible themselves."

One of the senior teachers reflected on a perceived loss of corporate morale: "When I first came into teaching (from industry) the most noticeable feature was the degree of consultation among all levels of responsibility. I believe that made for good relationships and regret the present feeling of individual staff going their own way which has developed over the past year". (Mr. C.)

All staff were agreed that the cause of the change in emphasis was leadership personality.
CONCLUSION.

Chapter four examined the evolution and organisation of Glendale Middle School and described its generally favourable architecture, satisfactory staffing ratios, progressively subject centred curriculum, rather average pupil attainment levels and generally supportive tradition of pupil involvement.

Chapter five presented pupil attitudes to the milieux of school life principally through the use of questionnaire and interview techniques. The results of this survey demonstrated predictable support for the organisational incentives offered to the children and equally predictable distaste for elements of control. Pupils were shown to be positive in their reaction to staff and equally relaxed in their peer relationships. Attitudes to the instructional elements of school life were generally supportive with only ten per cent of pupils apparently either "Unhappy" or "Frightened" at the prospect of either an English or Mathematics lesson. However, less than a quarter of the pupils responded positively to the prospect of coming to school in the morning. The most emotive issues were shown to be those dealing with the school rules, notably the restriction on the eating of sweets.

More detailed analysis of certain selected questions indicated slightly less positive attitudes on behalf of older pupils, very little difference between male and female pupils, no greater degree of support by the more
able pupils but considerable variety of response by individual class groupings.

Chapter six described the staff as initially confident, relaxed and satisfied with their roles in school. Later assessment, however, revealed tension and withdrawal as a new regime asserted its priorities.

Chapter seven examined this tension in more detail and chronicled the organisational changes which had contributed to a perceived modification in the climate of Glendale Middle School.

The staff asserted that leadership personality was the prime factor in determining the new climate and undeniably the new headteacher was both natural leader and forceful personality. Given the restricted size and maximum social contact afforded by a school of four hundred pupils and eighteen staff, the capacity to exert power at all levels of the organisation was such that pressure could achieve results. Another organisation, another leader, might find modification less attainable.

The style of leadership now demonstrated by Mr. Smith was certainly entirely different to that of Mr. Greenwood. When interviewed for this study, the retired headteacher stressed the importance he placed on innovation emerging from staff interest. Mr. Smith interpreted the responsibilities of legitimised power rather more directly.

The children in the school had no illusions regarding a change in emphasis.
A morning assembly with Mr. Greenwood was often concluded with light reference to how Liverpool F.C. had fared over the weekend and the headteacher would accept a buzz of conversation as the children filed out. Mr. Smith, however, kept strictly to the theme of the assembly and commanded silence throughout, a standard that demanded daily remonstration.

Similarly high standards were sought by Mr. Smith at lunch time where a personal dinner position on the staff table would always be manoeuvered to face the children. Indeed a catch-phrase much utilised by Mr. Smith:— "Never turn your back on the enemy", was also regularly suggested at morning assembly to children as they moved about the stage. Doubtless all teachers could be caricatured by reference to their idiosyncratic vocabularies. One of Mr. Greenwood's favourite adjectives was "marvellous", the staff 'underground' of that time believing such a term of praise was utilised rather generously. Yet two experienced teachers at interview suggested that the generally supportive attitudes of the children pre-1979 owed much to this confidence boosting, praise orientated rhetoric.

The contrast in styles could be further illustrated by the appearance of the headteacher's room. Mr. Greenwood's preferred usage included the display of children's work on the main area of pin-board and a desk situation overlooking the field with chair adjacent to those of visitors. Mr. Smith utilised the pin-board for copies of each teacher's timetable and sited his chair behind the desk.
These more personal and delicate contrasts are presented in this conclusion to give substance to the comments of both staff and children.

This researcher would, however, reiterate the dangers of generalisation. Although certainly the children perceived the two organisational leaders in simplistic "hard" or "soft" terms, it should be remembered that the more authoritarian regime of Mr. Smith also extended the number of school trips and visits, expanded the provision of extra-curricular clubs and societies, extended school-home communication and introduced new visual aid material to the school.

This researcher's experience would suggest that the more relevant enquiries regarding organisational change be addressed, not to "What" was introduced but as to "How" it was introduced.

The limits set by the case analysis approach of this study restrict the degree of qualitative judgement available to this researcher. The need for comparative data both chronologically and from other schools is quite obvious. Two issues, however, emerged from the analysis of staff attitude and behaviour which are regarded as quintessential. The first reinforced the assertion by Blau and Scott (1963) that effective leadership refrains from closely checking on subordinates and provides challenging demands to stimulate interest. The second emerged from the results of the Staff Association Questionnaire which reflected Aitken and Hage's (1970 p. 518) statement that: "A second and
equally important aspect of the distribution of power is the degree to which staff members participate in setting the goals and policies of the entire organisation".

The introduction to this study focused attention on the perceived significance of school climate and the degree to which individual behaviour might adjust to that climate.

In this case analysis of Glendale Middle School the climate was undeniably modified by an individual, and other individuals modified their behaviour to accommodate the emerging climate of increased uniformity, formality, objectivity and routine. There was no individual, pupil, teacher, caretaker or cook who did not contribute towards, and become part of, this interactionary process. All perceived the climate of change and modified their personal role interpretations accordingly.

The evidence presented in this study suggested that the structures and procedures adopted by the new regime to raise the academic standards of the children produced social, emotional and professional tension.

Analysis four years hence of child attainment levels, discipline and commitment to the school should suggest whether this era of tension was either cautionary or necessary.

A more reflective and theoretical appraisal of this study suggests the following criteria be considered in any follow-up work. Whereas the nature of this present study was exploratory, subsequent analysis might
concentrate on those issues of decision making and communication perceived here as particularly relevant. The methodology employed could similarly be more selective, reducing the number of questionnaire items yet pursuing the individual results in rather more detail.

Such analysis would be facilitated by the naming of child responses so that assessment and association could be made on individual and group basis to perceive how declared attitude corresponded with observed behaviour, attainment and involvement.

Subsequent research might well be directed towards an in-depth analysis of individual pupil responses, particularly of the less predictable non-conformist responses where perceived associations might be indicative of sub-group uniformity.

The assertion by most staff that headteacher personality modified the climate of the school, while undeniable in functional terms, does of course disguise the complexities of organisational structures. Indeed Mr. Smith once emphasised to this researcher that a chapter of the study be devoted to an assessment of the environmental and cultural constraints that defined the extent of headteacher autonomy. Certainly the staff were to become familiar with hierarchical references to the importance of parental interpretation of school policy. Innovation, it seemed at one stage, was governed by whether the decision could be "justified to parents" (staff meeting note).
Yet these external pressures and cultural norms were surely equally as pervasive while Mr. Greenwood was headteacher.

Examination of just three of the innovations recorded during 1979 is rather more illuminative.

The decisions to ban sweets, change the hours of the school day and introduce new child record sheets were all personally initiated and concluded by Mr. Smith. These autonomous decisions had the effect of temporarily alienating the children, some parents, the District Education Officer, the Chairman of the School Managers and a majority of the school staff.

This student of school "climate" perceives such evidence of temporary alienation as illustrative, not only of the degree of personal autonomy available to the primary school headteacher, but also of the inter-related effects of the decision making process. The "oversight" (op. cit. Bell) inherent in the above decisions is perceived as fundamental to the establishment of school climate.

It would be interesting to pursue long term evaluation of Glendale, to assess whether some of the divisive organisational "means" employed during this two year period of study, are ultimately partly justified by their success in satisfying the declared aims of scholastic achievement. Any degree of unhappiness experienced during the period of re-alignment would, of course, be irreparable.
Whereas the above presentation of facts, figures, opinion and observation might adequately and honestly summarise a two year period of enquiry, a more reflective stance admits to some inevitable omissions and misdirected concentration.

Acceptance of the term "climate" into the initial research strategy, while central to the original impetus for the study, perhaps expanded the scope of enquiry beyond the reaches of a single researcher.

Enquiries which had hoped to serve as jumping-off points for more thorough and precise analysis proved by their length and generality to be rather more frustrating than illuminative. In this sense, the presentation of adult attitudes and actions is perceived as rather more satisfactory than the questionnaire-dominated child enquiries.

The illuminative approach proved far easier to sustain with eighteen adults than four hundred children; acceptance of published test material might have reduced the logistics but as indicated earlier no single text fulfilled requirements.

Similarly, no single theory could adequately embrace or tie in the multifarious dimensions to the study. The synthesis adopted and the illuminative tactics employed could not at vital stages restrict and direct attention to the more salient issues. Thus, while the child questionnaire reflected general degrees of enthusiasm or antipathy, future more productive enquiry might concentrate on a limited number of children and
pursue in depth observation of group dynamics and classroom behaviour.

A more general and pervasive issue concerned with the adoption of an ethnographic and illuminative strategy was that of ethics, and the weighting of contrasting forms of data.

Given the dual role of this student as professional teacher in the school and social researcher, the ethical debate was particularly sensitive. An issue not pursued in the chapter concerned with "Change" was the tension between the new headteacher and his incumbent deputy. Some tension cannot be denied, for despite every effort to retain "impartiality" the very act of collecting details of staff and child attitudes in the first year of a new headteacher's authority was a contributory factor. Given this researcher's "inside" role both staff and children were only occasionally aware that formal research was taking place. Thus much apposite and pithy comment was naturally spontaneous and unqualified. The issue for the researcher is then to deliberate whether such comment is honestly "typical" or just a release of temporary frustration. Accepting perhaps that the statement is typical and reflective of more generally held beliefs, the ethical issue might yet preclude its usage in the text. An example of such a dilemma might be served by comment made conversationally by the school secretary late in the period of study and referred to in the previous chapter. Discussing children's behaviour she had remarked:— "I don't know what's the matter with them now, they're so noisy;
they weren't this bad when Mr. Greenwood was here and he didn't bother".

Evidently to the school secretary the children were indeed noisy and comment by other adults would support this contention. Whether it was proportionately more noisy than two years earlier is a typically more subjective judgement. As an illuminative statement it is entirely relevant and could be illustrative of the recently imposed extra supervision failing in its purpose. Yet it is so dismissive, casual and critical the serious researcher hesitates and searches for collaborative data. Yet the problem remains to compare or weigh the significance of such comment against (say) a linked response on a five point questionnaire that indicates "yes" the children are "more noisy" than two years earlier. Obviously all sociological enquiries pose ethical dilemmas and the ethnographic in service study particularly so; but those faced in this study were sufficiently pervasive and personal as to raise doubts as to the wisdom of pursuing such social climate investigations where personality and role perceptions are so obtrusive and sensitive.

If the most revealing and pithy comment is omitted, is the remaining data rendered second class?

This is not to deny or denigrate the need for further research into this topic – but rather to suggest that such investigation might be more fruitful when undertaken by an impartial team rather than an involved individual. Yet the visiting team may fail to gain
the conversational information so freely available to this researcher.

The comment by one ancillary staff member that the teachers no longer engaged in casual banter or occasional asides is considered particularly illuminative. There had been no directive to preclude such social exchanges yet gradually teaching and ancillary staff became more distant. Speculation might here suggest that the organisational climate of the school was thus affecting the social climate of the school, and an awareness that there might be two distinct dimensions to "climate", the organisational and the social, gradually evolved with this study. Analysis and presentation of these two dimensions might form a study in itself, but in this present work there is evidence that the organisational climate (or organisational "tactics and communicating process") affected the social climate rather more than the reverse case. The ladies in the canteen who maintained that now they "just did a day's work and went home", and the teachers in the staff room who wore more conversationally restrained, wore withdrawing as a result of more official regulated and impersonal procedures.

Again it must be emphasised that this is one case study of a fairly small organisational unit where a committed and positive leader could be omnipresent.
It is at this point that the phenomenological and illuminative approach is relevant, but limited. It is relevant in that recognition is given to the importance of individual perception and the nature of human interaction. It is limited in that it fails to take adequate account of the individual's different status and role within the organisation.

Much of this study illuminates this challenge faced by teachers as they adjust to the different demands of professionalism and bureaucracy.

Given the subjectivity of the term "climate" it has to be recognised that precise measurement and accurate prediction is unlikely. Climate is essentially the result of interactions, person with person, person with circumstances; to "prove" that a certain action will assuredly produce a given response is to reduce human beings to the level of machines. Perhaps it is as well that, as with the weather, we are not wholly able to control our social and organisational climates.
APPENDIX.

Pupil Questionnaire 1. School Climate and Attitude.

READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY. Think of how you usually feel when each of these things happen. Choose the one word from the list which best describes your feelings and write it in the brackets at the end of each sentence. Do the same for each sentence choosing the most appropriate word.

The words to choose from are:—

*Excited* *Happy* *Interested* *Calm* *Bored* *Unhappy* *Frightened*

Remember there are no right or wrong answers, only what you yourself feel on these occasions.

1. Your work is pinned up on the wall.
2. You are shouted at by the teacher.
3. Your house team wins.
4. You are asked to read aloud.
5. You are late for school.
7. You go to assembly.
8. You have a maths lesson.
9. You get a star or team point for your work.
10. You go out to play.
11. You hand in your books to be marked.
12. You have an English lesson.
13. Your teacher gives the books out.
14. You are sent to the Head-Teacher.
15. You are told to choose a partner.
16. You can sit where you like in the room.
17. You come to school in the morning.
18. You have an argument with a good friend.
19. Your desks are arranged in rows.
20. You have a test.
21. Your teacher jokes with the class.
22. You leave school in the afternoon.
23. Your parents come home after parents evening.
24. Your desks are arranged in groups.
25. You are in a class play.
26. Your teacher makes you a monitor.
27. You say "hello" to a teacher in the corridor.
28. You meet a teacher outside school.
29. You are told to line up.
30. You ask to leave the classroom.
31. You are told to read your book.
32. You pick up your paint brush.

COMPLETE THESE SENTENCES WITH THE FIRST THOUGHT THAT COMES INTO YOUR HEAD:—

1. It makes me happy in school when ......

2. It makes me unhappy in school when ......

3. If I could change one thing in school, I would ......
Pupil Questionnaire 2.

Attitude to Middle School.

Children were asked to indicate YES or NO to the following 31 questions.

1. Most lessons were interesting.
2. I had to remain seated for most lessons.
3. Most teachers took an interest in me.
4. Most teachers were strict.
5. The school was bright and cheerful.
6. I took part in club or team activities.
7. Most lessons were quite hard.
8. There were too many school rules.
9. There was too much lining up.
10. I could choose where to sit in the classrooms.
11. I had several different teachers each day.
12. There were attractive display boards.
13. Most teachers smiled and laughed a good deal.
14. Most children were well behaved.
15. I found it hard to approach most teachers.
16. The school rules were fair or sensible.
17. I was proud of my school.
18. I don't think most teachers noticed me.
19. Timetable periods were too long.
20. School was fairly enjoyable.
21. We could get away with things with most teachers.
22. I enjoyed having the same teacher much of the time.
23. I felt I could move around the room during most lessons.
24. Most teachers asked us to do things in a friendly way.
25. I found it easy to make friends.
26. I was unhappy at Middle School.
27. Assemblies were a good idea.
28. Most teachers were easy to get on with.
29. I worked hard at Middle School.
30. Timetable periods were too short.
31. Most lessons were easy.

The main difference between High School and Middle School is:-
Teacher Questionnaire 1. Experience and Attitude.

Staff were given space below each question to respond accordingly. Responses were further developed at interview.

**CHRONOLOGICAL**

1. How many years teaching experience?
2. In what types of school? please specify.
3. Any other type of employment since personally left school? If yes, please describe.
4. How long at Glendale Middle School?
5. Which age ranges taught as class teacher? e.g. 2nd yrs.
6. Which, if any, subject specialisms taught?
7. How many different classes taught throughout the week?
8. What specialisms pursued at college?

**CLASS ORGANISATION**

9. How set out children's desks?
10. What advantages perceived in this system?
11. What factors are involved in who sits where?
12. Any ability grouping?
13. Is seating arrangement reasonably stable or modifications made for different lessons?
14. How is work selected for class display? i.e. individual talent or effort?
15. What impact do you feel wall or corridor displays have upon children?
16. Do children show any interest in display material to which they personally have not contributed?
17. What factors influence your choice of class monitors at the beginning of the year?
18. Is it worthwhile including "characters"?
19. Please describe any form of marking or grading system applied to creative work (e.g. stories).
20. What are your feelings regarding the distribution of stars, points, etc.
21. Please allocate percentages to, firstly, the system of class organisation generally adopted, and, secondly, what you might employ given abundant energy and motivation.

22. Do you expect the children to stand upon your entry to the room?

23. Do you think the children should be quieter than they are for most of the time?

24. Do you think they should ask permission to leave their seats?

25. How do you punish disobedient children?

PERSONAL ORIENTATIONS.

26. Is your own socio-economic background similar to that of the children at Glendale Middle School?

27. Do you think that any apparent difference affects your effectiveness as a teacher?

28. Do you feel you meet a wide cross-section of society?

29. What are your personal interests/hobbies?

30. Given a chance of a new job/career, what would you choose?

31. Was teaching a deliberate choice of career or was there an element of drift?

32. Are there occasions when your role as a "teacher" conflicts with personal values? e.g. on punishment or personal relationships with children. Please amplify — anecdotes.

33. Do you believe that you have a "school self" and a "home self", or little difference.

34. If a marked difference, in what way?

35. Asked socially about your work, what are your sentiments? e.g. reasonably keen to describe teaching or reluctant to admit even the type of job.

36. What do you feel to be the most demanding part of the job?

37. Does the school hierarchy offer sufficient support for the individual teacher?

38. Do you feel you are influencing children's attitudes for life?
39. How do you see the teacher's influence upon the children compared to parents – peers – mass media?

40. What features do you like about the physical structure of Glendale Middle School?

41. If you could add any design features, what would you choose? How significant do you feel the size or the quality of a staff room is to a school? Given an opportunity to extend a tiny staffroom or add a stockroom, what choice might you make?

TIMETABLE.

42. Is your personal timetable set by yourself or superiors?

43. Given free choice, how would you modify it?

44. At present do you consider the timetable about right, too loose or too rigid?

45. Are you able to modify your timetable to extend successful lessons?

46. Given the freedom to extend as above, what advantages and disadvantages do you perceive?

47. What advantages can you see in specialisation?

48. How would you personally involve specialists in the Middle School?

49. Please comment on the balance of specialisation in class teaching as employed at Glendale Middle School over the past few years.

50. Any subjects too much or too little weighting?

51. Given a situation as father or mother rather than teacher would you prefer your child in one class or many teachers 8-10 or at 10-12+ of age? Reasons.

CHILD OBSERVATIONS.

52. Given moans and complaints by children, what appears to be the most common type?

53. What contributes to child happiness at school?
54. Do you feel it possible to help children in above sense by:

- changing desk placement
- displaying work
- giving status (monitors etc)
- personal social chat
- praising in front of class

55. Please make above 1 - 5 likely value to child (1 high) please add to list if you wish.

56. When children volunteer for jobs do you see this to please teacher or to achieve peer status?

57. Can you think of any anecdotal evidence when the children perceive you stepping out of role?

58. Similarly any evidence of different relationships in different areas of school life e.g. maths, lesson to after school activity?

LOCAL ENVIRONMENT.

59. Would you like to live in our catchment area?

60. What facilities do you feel to be missing?

61. Do you believe the majority of parents values to be broadly similar to your own?

62. What features of their child's development are parents most concerned about on parents' evening?

63. Do you feel present parent/teacher relationships about right - too distant - too familiar?

64. What are your feelings regarding teacher socialisation with parents?

65. Do you feel "society" respects the job you do and supports your standards?
Teacher Questionnaire 2. "School Association"

Staff were asked to circle one response from S.A. A N D SD to each of the following twenty five questions.

1. Teachers retain today a large degree of independence and freedom of action in the classroom situation.
2. Standards in school may only be maintained if set timetables and forecasts of work are carefully observed.
3. The headteacher should compile the syllabuses in the Middle School.
4. Setting (or limited streaming) should be extended throughout the school.
5. All year tests of children should take place in the hall.
6. The books suggested for each year group should be adhered to at all times.
7. A timetable should be flexible enough to allow a class teacher to develop "spur of the moment interests".
8. Visits to fun fairs and other places of entertainment are best avoided on school organised trips.
9. The use of ball-point pens should be discouraged.
10. Children need teachers more for social interpretation and leadership than knowledge and instruction.
11. The present child record sheets are reasonably accurate and helpful.
12. No child should be allowed to stay in the classroom during break or lunch times.
13. Club activities should be seen as a reasonable part of a teacher's professional responsibilities.
14. A teacher who slaps an errant child has probably performed an educative function.
15. Subject syllabuses in the Middle School should be compiled by staff leading that discipline.
16. Children entering classrooms should stand by their desks until told to sit by the teacher.
17. It is essential to be sure that basic items contained in the syllabus are well assimilated before launching out on any programme of drama and self-expression.
18. Each teacher should suggest alterations and additions to the syllabus.

19. The concept in education of a body of knowledge to be imparted to children is hardly viable in our rapidly changing world.

20. No child should eat crisps or sweets in school.

21. Children should not hear staff addressed by Christian names.

22. A class or subject teacher should utilise those books he or she individually finds appropriate.

23. Presentation of work should be standardised throughout the school.

24. Children should have some time each day to choose from a range of selected activities.

25. Children should be encouraged to work to a higher standard by the regular distribution of awards - stars, etc.

RAE SCORES

These are available from the author upon request.
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