

QUANTIFYING AND PRIORITISING RESILIENCE PROMOTING FACTORS: TEACHERS' VIEWS.

Murray Oswald, Bruce Johnson and Sue Howard.

In her review of the research on resiliency Bernard (1995) highlighted the findings of longitudinal studies which showed that half to two-thirds of children "growing up in families with mentally ill, alcoholic, abusive or criminally involved parents or poverty stricken" overcame such disadvantages and successfully adapted and transformed their lives. However, while this capacity for resilience is suggested as being biologically-based, Bernard points to the need for "certain environmental characteristics" to exist for an individual to develop a range of personal skills and successful coping strategies to overcome risk and adversity. The focus of research into what constitutes resiliency has been the search for those factors that make some children relatively immune to and capable of rising above cruel vicissitudes of their family and other circumstances, while other similarly placed children are negatively affected by similar conditions.

Researchers into the nature of resilience have identified a number of protective factors, or what Rutter (1987) termed as "protective mechanisms" (Garmezy, 1985, 1994; Gore & Eckenrode, 1994; Rutter, 1987). These key protective factors are said to be located both externally in the social/environmental life space of the child and internally, as personal attributes and qualities of the individual. Several authors have reported on the presence of external protective factors in a number of environments including the school, the family, peer groups and the community at large. Each of these contexts are said to possess distinctive attributes which can serve to counteract the potentially negative outcomes on children's lives of deleterious circumstances and instead promote the development of resilient qualities (Bernard, 1991; Wang, Hartel & Walberg, 1993, 1994; Wang, 1997; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimer & Ousten 1979; Pence, 1998).

Werner & Smith (1988) and others identified a range of important roles *families* can play in providing protective assets. These included consistency in parenting role models, being supportive and available when needed, providing an harmonious living environment, having strong beliefs and standards of behaviour, and celebrating and valuing important life stages, such as birthdays (McCubbin, Tompson, Pirner & McCubbin, 1988; McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988). The studies by Rutter, et al (1979) and Werner & Smith, 1988) recognised the significant contributions made by *schools and their teachers* in offering external protective factors. Such schools are characterised by being caring, attentive and stable environments which are success-oriented in their predisposition, and which acknowledge achievements including sporting, musical and artistic, as well as academic. They show genuine personal interest in students and have teachers who are positive role models and mentors. Bernard (1991, 1995) pointed to the fact that such schools also provide opportunities for children to develop those internal assets for resiliency such as problem-solving skills, autonomy, purposeful, constructive and optimistic outlooks on the future, effective communication and relationship skills. Bernard (1995) further summarised the contributions to these external protective factors made by schools and teachers under three main categories or protective processes, viz., caring and supportive relationships, positive and high expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation.

Bernard (1991) and Pence (1998) referred to the role of *communities* in acting as sources of protective assets, especially for children in disadvantaged areas where pressures from peer groups, and the social milieu in general, may pose potential risk factors. Wang (1997)

advocated the strengthening of social, health and other community services to provide a strong supportive social framework for fostering resilience.

A number of authors have focussed on the important roles that *peers* play in providing support, care and attachment needs (Glasser, 1965; Kohn, 1993; Myrick, 1997). Educational programs have been designed which are inclusive of 'peer power', acknowledging the significant influence of peer relationships. A study by Johnson, Howard & Oswald (1999) found on interviewing both teachers and students that peer relationships were an important factor contributing to resilience. Of particular relevance was their finding which indicated that children spoke of their peer relationships first and foremost in their descriptions of protective mechanisms. As part of these interviews, teachers were also canvassed regarding their views on the characteristics of resilient and non-resilient children, and what teachers might do to help children who have it tough to cope more effectively. It was apparent from the pool of teachers' comments that there were two broad perspectives expressed by teachers. Some teachers believed they could play a significant role in the lives of children they taught and make valuable contributions to the adjustment of their charges. In contrast, others believed they could make little impact during the time a child was in their class, and that as an adult and teacher they lacked the power or influence to change matters. These teachers were describing personal views of what might be described as their "teaching efficacy", or their beliefs about the extent to which they can be effective with their students as powerful influences in their lives (Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy, (1990). As Woolfolk (1993) noted, teaching efficacy is one of the few personal characteristics of teachers, which correlates highly with student performance and academic success.

RATIONALE OF STUDY:

Bernard (1995) has given a detailed summary of the critical roles which schools and their teachers play in developing resiliency in children at risk. She has argued that resiliency is achieved through providing protective factors such as caring educational settings, positive and high expectations, and positive learning environments that are relevant and practical.

Recognising the significant roles that teachers play in developing resilience in children, a questionnaire was designed to identify what they believed to be the most potent influences in such development. Apart from parents, teachers are in contact with children for a significant portion of a child's daily life. This degree of contact provides teachers with opportunities to observe, relate with and exercise influence over students' learning and development.

As noted earlier, prior research has highlighted the five key protective factors which are major influences in developing resiliency in children, viz., *the family, schools, community, peers and the individual child's characteristic predispositions* toward dealing with difficult life situations. Further, a number of those qualities or predispositions which are characteristic of children who are resilient have also been described in the literature, the most important being the following eight:

- having stable relationships with peers
- possessing well-developed problem solving skills
- considering realistic future plans
- having a positive sense of being able to achieve and deal effectively with tasks
- experiencing success in one or more areas of their life
- being able to effectively communicate
- possessing a strong attachment with at least one adult
- acceptance of responsibility for themselves and their behaviour.

These eight qualities were combined with the five factors in the construction of the questionnaire, designed to identify what teachers believed to be the extent to which each of the five protective factors contributed toward developing the eight qualities associated with resiliency in children.

An additional set of questions asked teachers what strategies they used to foster resilience and help children cope. On the basis of the previous interview results with teachers reported above, it was hypothesised two divergent views would be expressed, - one positive, and a contrasting view that little could be accomplished by a teacher in helping children to cope with deleterious life situations (Johnson et al 1999). It would seem that the "teaching efficacy" beliefs that teachers held might be an important ingredient in the development of resiliency in children at school.

METHODOLOGY:

With the assistance of the South Australian Department for Education, Training & Employment (DETE) a random sample of one thousand, one hundred and eighty teachers (or 20% of the designated population) was obtained from Metropolitan Adelaide junior primary, primary and secondary schools. Only teachers who were at least half-time employed were selected. Envelopes containing an information letter, a DETE approval letter, a copy of the questionnaire were sent to principals of schools which had sampled teachers on staff, requesting permission for the survey to be conducted in the school. The envelopes to principals also contained additional sealed letters with questionnaires and a covering information letter addressed to the sampled staff members. Each principal was asked to have these letters distributed to the selected staff, thereby indicating the principal's support for the survey to be conducted. Questionnaires were returned using the self-addressed envelope with each sample package. Confidentiality was met by all questionnaires being recorded against a code number and onto a data file.

The questionnaire comprised of two sections:

A Teachers' views on factors which influences the development of resilience in children.

Eight major resiliency characteristics were listed, and under each of these were the five statements relating situations involving the school, home, community, peers and the individual self as sources of protective factors. Teachers were asked to rank from one to five the extent to which they believed each of these factors contributed to the development of resilience (see Appendix I for questionnaire). Each of the descriptive statements was selected from the content of interviews from a previous survey with teachers and children about the nature of resilience (Dryden et al 1998).

B What teachers do to foster resilience:

This section comprised eighteen questions asking teachers what they believed they could or could not do to help students "at risk" to cope with difficult times in their lives. The items were also selected from the survey results referred to earlier of responses given by teachers about their capacity help children "at risk", and in developing resiliency (Dryden et al 1998). The questions were designed to gauge the extent to which teachers believed they could have a positive influence on students' lives and foster those behavioural and attitudinal characteristics congruent with resilience.

RESULTS:

Sample characteristics:

Of the one thousand one hundred and eighty teachers who made up the sample, four hundred and seventy seven or 40.4% returned their questionnaires completed. This group comprised 62% females and 38% males, both having median ages of 46 years, and an average age of 43 years. More females were represented at the junior primary and primary levels, but there was a significant difference between the numbers of males to females holding senior positions, with a strong bias favouring male appointments.

Teachers' views about what influences resilience.

Table 1 summarises the results of means tests on the eight qualities (variables) associated with those resiliency strengths in children identified previously as the sources of protective assets, viz., the self, school, family, community and peers. Items were scored with a '1' for "the Least Influential" through to '5' for "the Most Influential". Items having low mean scores lie toward the "Least Influential" end of the response scale while the higher mean scores indicate those items identified by teachers as being of greater influence in promoting resiliency qualities.

(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE)

All forty items were ranked from the highest to the lowest mean scores (See Table 2). The ranking orders provide a picture of the relative influence value given to each of the particular items. Those questions referring to the self and the family yielded consistently high mean scores (with an overall average of 3.4 for self-related items and 3.3 for family-related items). In contrast, the community-focussed questions were consistently given low rankings, with all such items having a mean of less than three. The results suggest that teachers view these factors as limited sources of influence, in comparison with other factors listed.

(INSERT TABLE 2 HERE)

Particular attention is given to those items with the highest means, these being the qualities teachers believe to be the most potent and influential agents for encouraging resiliency. Foremost in this group are five self-related items, (mean score in brackets) viz.,

- *They are motivated, they are prepared to take risks and they have good basic skills and abilities (3.7)*
- *They believe in themselves as competent individuals (3.7)*
- *They willingly engage in discussion with others (3.5)*
- *They care about themselves and others (3.5)*
- *They value and seek adult support/ (3.4)*

Three items in this group relate to the role of the family. viz.,

- *The family promotes student's responsibilities as well as their rights and stresses the consequences and outcomes of personal behaviour (3.5)*
- *The family encourages them to "have a go" and try different things (3.4)*
- *The family values and practices regular discussion and conversation (3.3)*

Two items emphasised the role of the school, viz.,

- *The school promotes students' responsibilities as well as their rights and stresses the consequences and outcomes of personal behaviour. (3.4)*
- *Teachers are accessible and interested adults to whom students can turn to for support (3.3)*

Teachers identified the protective assets of being effective communicators, having a strong attachment to at least one adult, holding a personal belief in being able to achieve and be successful, and the acceptance of responsibility, as the most important in developing resiliency in children. In contrast, the ten lowest ranked items are almost entirely those referring to community roles. Teachers rank these as playing a lesser part in developing resiliency qualities.

While there were no significant differences between the rankings of the mean scores by female and male teachers, some contrasting views were evident when comparisons were made between teachers of different school levels (Table 3).

(INSERT TABLE 3 HERE)

The most notable feature in the above results is the shift in emphasis regarding particular items across year levels. The Junior Primary teachers place higher importance on the influence of schools, and less is given to the family. However, Primary and Secondary teachers consider the school much less influential than either the "Self" or the "Family" related factors.

Teachers also recorded differences in their identification of what they believed to be the key qualities associated with resilience in children (Table 4). Teachers at all school levels emphasised the importance of children accepting responsibility for themselves and their behaviours, of having a strong attachment to at least one adult, and possessing a positive sense of efficacy, ie., in believing they can achieve in particular tasks (Table 4).

(INSERT TABLE 4 HERE)

The forty items were next reduced to more manageable sets using factor analysis, with SPSS Varimax rotation. Five factors were identified, viz.,

Factor I: positively correlated with *community*-referenced items and negatively correlated with Factor II: *family*-referenced and Factor III, *self*-referenced items.

Factor II: positively correlated with *family*-referenced and negatively correlated with Factor I and

Factor IV, *friends/peers*-referenced items.

Factor III: positively correlated with *self*-referenced items, and negatively correlated with Factor I

Factor IV: positively correlated with *friends/peers*-referenced items and negatively correlated with Factor II.

Factor V: positively correlated with *school*-referenced items, and showed no negative correlations.

The second part of the questionnaire asked teachers how they might respond to children having difficulty in coping with their tough times. Table 5 summarises the means of responses to the eighteen items, ranked from the highest ('Frequently' or 'At Every Opportunity') to the lowest ('Never' or 'Seldom'). There was little difference in the ranked positions of means recorded between genders. However, there were significant differences between genders regarding the actual levels of commitment indicated to acting in ways to foster resiliency. On most items the means of female scores were significantly higher than those of males. On only three items, viz., "*I encourage my students to work hard and achieve*", "*I assist my students in problem-solving strategies*" and "*I emphasis the importance of playing sport and keeping fit*", did the male teachers respond at the level of "Frequently", or with results similar to those of female teachers. In contrast, 50% of female responses had a mean score of 3.9/4.0 (i.e., "Frequently") or higher. These results suggest that male teachers may be less inclined or willing to interact with students at a helping level, or perhaps lack confidence in doing so.

Factor analysis of the items (using SPSS Varimax rotation) gave two major groupings. (The items making up each of the two factors are shown in Table 5).

Factor I: This consisted of items 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, which were a cohort of responses reflecting a willingness to often engage in behaviours associated with "helping" or "counselling" and "offering to assist".

Factor II: This consisted of items 4, 7, 11, 12, 17, which were a cohort of responses having an emphasis on "giving advice" "telling" and "directing". Further analysis did not show any other gender differences or departure from these above patterns.

Discussion:

A number of researchers have stressed the important role that teachers and schools play in providing protective assets for children who need to develop and maintain their resilience for coping with stressful life events. Werner and Smith (1988) found that apart from the family

circle, teachers played significant roles as positive models in the lives of resilient children. Caring teacher-student relationships were a source of support for children wanting to succeed especially when traditional structures providing care had deteriorated. Noddings' research summarised the effects on students of schools with high and positive expectations. Such schools have high rates of academic success and lower rates of problem behaviours. Schools with structures which are caring, have high expectations, and provide opportunities for meaningful involvement and responsibility, have the "power to serve as a protective shield" for resilient children (Bernard, 1995, Noddings, 1988).

The findings from this current research gives support to the observation by Garmezy (1991, p.427) that educators need to be more aware of the significant contributions they make to providing "a positive shield to help children withstand the multiple vicissitudes that they can expect of a stressful world". The global picture provided from the pattern of responses from the teachers surveyed in this study suggests that teachers:

- recognise and believe that certain personality qualities and strengths possessed by children enable them to be resilient
- acknowledge the role of the family environments in contributing to the development of children's

resiliency

- are prone to undervalue the potential or actual roles they might play - both as supportive individuals and their schools as caring institutions - in providing protective factors for building resiliency in children.

Part explanation for this undervaluing of their influence may be indicated in the perceptions and particular implicit notions teachers hold about what part schools play in developing resiliency in children. A recent interview survey of teachers' understanding of resilience found that teachers located their conceptions of what builds resilience to specific aspects of the school life and context, viz academic success and good conduct on the part of students (Howard, Johnson and Oswald, 1998). This tendency is also illustrated in the current results, where the questionnaire items mentioned earlier on which there is consensus by male and female teachers are contextually (school) based. Resilience building is seen as a product of student endeavour and academic effort, rather than dynamic relationships with others and the quality of the school milieu.

The pattern of teachers' responses to questions regarding what they believe to be the major influencing factors for the development of resilience gives some added insight into the range of dimensions they apply when conceptualising resiliency. As suggested from the results (Table 1) many teachers believe the most influential factors which foster the development of resiliency are the personal predispositions and "character strengths" of the particular children concerned and secondly, the role of the family. Dryden, et al found from interviews with teachers about their beliefs concerning what made for resilient versus non-resilient children, that they frequently referred to the personal, inherent qualities possessed by an individual (" they have either got or they haven't, it's part of their nature"). This view that resiliency is solely biologically based, rather than to some degree learned or acquired through experiences, is at variance with other evidence already cited above. As the research has shown, relationships with significant others and environmental influences can be powerful and positive contributors to the fostering of resiliency in children at risk. Dryden et al found from their interviews with students that they were very much aware of the important roles teachers played in helping children at risk. When asked for their views on how children who "had it tough' in their lives might be helped, a number of students indicated that

teachers were generally looked to and were seen as key influences in "making a difference" for these children (Dryden et al, 1998).

Teachers tend to adopt one of two main approaches when faced with situations where there is an opportunity to help students who are having a tough life to cope (Table 5). One approach employs those qualities and skills that are commonly associated with humanistic counselling styles, emphasise listening and supporting. The alternative approach is that belonging to the more familiar teacher-oriented and teacher-directed domain. The findings suggest that male teachers have a greater preference than female teachers do for adopting this latter approach, preferring mainly to exhort their charges to work harder, or to give practical advice on problem solving approaches. In contrast female teachers seem more predisposed to adopting approaches where they offer to listen, support and counsel. These latter styles of interacting with students communicate caring, empathy and understanding, qualities, which are more likely to provide support and facilitate resiliency.

The characteristics underlying the sets of inter-related variables associated with promoting resiliency were clearly identified by the teachers, who tended to follow a rather systematic approach in describing their views throughout this questionnaire. Teachers are well placed through their daily contact with children to act as influential figures and "significant others" in children's lives and to especially help those children who find life's circumstances to be stressful and a threat to their well-being. It is evident from the results of the present survey that apart from those at the junior primary level, teachers tend to undervalue the degree of influence and help they are potentially able to exercise in providing those "protective mechanisms" for students at risk. Resiliency is a multifaceted construct, with fluid rather than fixed attributes, determined by the presence of one or more protective factors in the child's life, and influenced by context and time. Teachers and schools are major contributors within the network of protective factors and thus need accurately recognise and value the contributions they can effectively provide in the fostering of resiliency in children at risk.

REFERENCES:

- Bernard, B. (1991). *Fostering Resilience in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School and Community*. Portland, Oregon, Western Center Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- Bernard, B. (1995). *Fostering Resilience in Children*. ERIC/EECE Digest, EDO-PS-99.
- Dryden, J., Johnson, B. R., Howard, S., and McGuire, A. (1998). *Resiliency: A Comparison Arising from Conversations with 9-12 Year Old Children and their Teachers*. Paper given at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April, 13-17
- Garnezy, N. (1985). 'Stress resistant children: The search for protective factors', in J. E. Stevenson (Ed) *Recent Research in Developmental Psychology, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, (Book Supplement No. 4).
- Garnezy, N. (1991) 'Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty'. *American Behavioural Scientist*, V34, No. 4, March/April, 416-430.
- Garnezy, N. (1994). 'Reflections and commentary on risk, resilience and development', in R Haggerty et al (Eds) *Stress, Risk and Resilience in Children and Adolescents: Processes, Mechanism and Interventions*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Glasser, W. (1965) *Schools Without Failure*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gore, S., and Eckenrode, J. (1994). 'Context and process in research on risk and resilience' in R Haggerty et al (Eds) *Stress, Risk and Resilience in Children and Adolescents: Processes, Mechanism and Interventions*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, S Johnson, B., and Oswald, M. (1988) '*Tracking Childhood Resiliency*'. Paper given at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Adelaide, November 29th – December 3rd.
- Johnson, B., Howard, S., and Oswald, M. (1999). *Quantifying and Prioritising Resilience Promoting Factors: Teachers' Views*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education/New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Melbourne, 29th November-2nd December,
- Kohn, A. (1993). 'Choices for Children: Why and How to Let Children decide'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74 (1), 8-20.
- McCubbin, H. I., Thompson, A., Pirner, P., and McCubbin, M. A. (1988). *Family Types and Family strengths: A Life Cycle and Ecological Perspective*. (Minneapolis, Burgess).
- McCubbin, H. I., & McCubbin, M. A. (1988). 'Typologies of resilient families: emerging roles of social class and ethnicity', *Family Relations*, 37, pp. 247-254.
- Myrick, R. (1997). *Developmental Guidance and Counselling: a Practical Approach*. Minneapolis: Educational Media Corp.

Noddings, N. (1988) 'Schools face crisis', *Education Week*, December 7th.

Pence, A. R., (1998). (Ed). *Ecological Research with Children and Families: From Concepts to Methodology*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Rutter, M. (1987). 'Psychological resilience and protective mechanisms'. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57, 316-333

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimer, P., and Ousten, J. (1979). *Fifteen Thousand Hours. Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Wang, M. C., Hartel, G., and Walberg, H. J. (1993). 'Synthesis of research: What helps students learn?' *Educational Leadership*, 51, (4), 74-79.

Wang, M. C., Hartel, G., and Walberg, H. J. (1994). 'Educational resilience in inner cities' in M. C. Wang and E. W. Gordon (Eds) *Educational Resilience in Inner Cities: Challenges and Prospects*. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wang, M., (1997). 'Next steps in inner city education. Focussing on resilience development and learning success', *Education and Urban Society*, v 29, (3), 255-276.

Werner, E., and Smith, R. (1988). *Vulnerable but Invincible: A Longitudinal Study of Resilient Children and Youth*. New York, Adams, Bannister and Cox.

Woolfolk, A. E., (1993) *Educational Psychology*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon

Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., and Hoy, W. K. (1990) 'teachers' views of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6, 137-148.

Table 1: Teachers' responses to questionnaire on what makes for resiliency in children: mean scores.

1. Resilient students have *stable relationships with peers* because: Mean scores

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they consistently display friendliness 	3.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are encouraged and supported in forming social relationships at school 	3.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are trained by their parents to be friendly and sociable 	3.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they have opportunities to meet and form friendships in formal and informal settings (e.g. clubs, church) 	2.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their friends are accepting and sociable 	3.0

2. Resilient students have *well-developed problem-solving and thinking skills* because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they have meta-cognitive abilities (ie, they can think about their own thinking) 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school offers opportunities to develop and practice problem-solving and thinking skills 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the family encourages the use of problem-solving and thinking skills 	3.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community offers opportunities to develop and practice problem-solving and thinking skills 	2.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their peers use and value similar problem-solving and thinking skills 	3.2

3. Resilient students have realistic plans for the future because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they display optimism 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are encouraged to plan ahead in Life Skills and Career Education courses at school 	2.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are given practical support and access to family networks by their parents 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community provides opportunities for employment, further study and other goals for the future 	2.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their peers share similar aspirations and future ambitions 	3.3

4. Resilient students have a positive sense of efficacy (believe they can achieve deal effectively with tasks) because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they believe in themselves as competent individuals 	3.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school holds high expectations for all students and promotes success in key learning areas 	3.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the family encourages them to 'have a go' and try different things 	3.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community provides opportunities for them to try different things and recognises their achievements 	2.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their peers recognize and value their successes 	3.0

5. Resilient students experience success in at least one or two areas because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are motivated, they are prepared to take risks, and they have good basic skills and abilities 	3.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school offers opportunities for success in a wide range of academic and non-academic areas 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the family models and values achievement and personal accomplishments 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community provides opportunities for achievement and for the recognition of success in a wide range of fields 	2.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their peers share and value their own and others' successes 	3.0

6. Resilient students communicate effectively because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they willingly engage in discussions with others 	3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they are taught to express themselves and to be assertive in school 	3.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the family values and practices regular discussion and conversation 	3.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community provides opportunities for engagement in formal /informal communication (eg, church, clubs) 	2.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> their peers provide and enjoy opportunities for conversation 	3.1

7. Resilient students have a strong attachment to at least one adult because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they value and seek adult support 	3.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teachers are accessible and interested adults to whom students can turn for support 	3.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they have an accessible extended family which provides a suitable adult mentor 	3.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> local groups provide suitable adult mentors 	2.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> friends model (or provide advice about) turning to adult mentors for support 	2.9

8. Resilient students are able to accept responsibility for themselves and their behaviour because:

Influencing Factor	Rank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> they care about themselves and others 	3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school promotes students' responsibilities as well as their rights and stresses the consequences and outcomes of personal behaviour 	3.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the family promotes students' responsibilities as well as their rights and stresses the consequences and outcomes of personal behaviour 	3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community provides them with opportunities for service <i>and responsible</i> leadership 	2.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> peers demand personal accountability 	2.8

Table 2: Ranked means of forty items comprising questionnaire on teachers' views about about what develops resiliency

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean
Success/self	3.7400
Efficacy/self	3.7329
Communicate/self	3.5106
Responsible/self	3.5035
Responsible/family	3.4550
Attachment/family	3.4269
responsible/school	3.3783
attachment/self	3.3738
efficacy/family	3.3610
Communicate/family	3.3452
Attachment/school	3.3437
future/friends	3.2931
Future/self	3.2884
Thinking/school	3.2884
Success/family	3.2820
Thinking/self	3.2701
Future/family	3.2684
Success/school	3.2577
Peers/self	3.2383
Thinking/family	3.2156
Peers/family	3.1600
communicate/peers	3.1466
Efficacy/school	3.1422
Communicate/school	3.1206
Peers/friends	3.0678
Peers/School	3.0537
thinking/friends	3.0378
Efficacy/friends	3.0237
Success/friends	2.9740
Peers/community	2.9576
attachment/peers	2.9143
Future/school	2.8865
responsible/peers	2.7801
Future/community	2.6508
communicate/community	2.5806
responsible/community	2.5664
efficacy/community	2.5379
Attachment/community	2.5060
Thinking/community	2.4882
Success/community	2.4668

Table 3: Items identified as the most influential, when comparing the three school levels.

Type of Item	Number of items recorded		
	J Primary	Primary	Secondary
Self- related	5	5	6
School-related	4	1	1
Family-related	1	3	4

Table 4: Protective assets associated with ten items with highest ranked means: comparison of responses from teachers of three school levels.

Type of item	Number of items recorded		
	J. Primary	Primary	Secondary
Accept responsibility	3	3	3
Strong attachment	1	2	2
Sense of efficacy	1	2	2
Communicate well	1	1	0
Experience success	2	1	1
Belief in future	1	1	1
Problem solver	1	0	0

TABLE 5: WHAT YOU DO TO FOSTER RESILIENCE:

1. Never 2. Seldom. 3. Occasionally 4. Frequently. 5. At every Opportunity 6. Not relevant

(Mean scores)

1. <i>I offer opportunities, venues and support programs for students to share their problems and gain appropriate social support.</i>	3.8 m3.5 f3.9*
· <i>I assist students in developing problem-solving strategies.</i>	4.3 m4.1 f4.4*
· <i>I encourage my students to work hard and achieve.</i>	4.7 m4.7 f4.7
· <i>I discourage my students from worrying about the future by allaying some of their concerns. ##</i>	3.4 m3.3 f3.5*
· <i>I point out the value of having good, close friends.</i>	3.8 m3.6 f3.9*
· <i>I offer opportunities and guidance to my students about ways to cope with criticism by their peers.</i>	4.0 m3.7 f4.2*
· <i>I discourage my students from using wishful thinking that is unrealistic ##</i>	3.2 3m3.3 f3.2
· <i>I offer my students opportunities and strategies to be actively involved in social actions - writing to the editor and school and community projects.</i>	3.4 m3.1 f3.5
· <i>I offer opportunities and guidance to my students about ways to reduce stress and tension in their lives.</i>	3.4 m3.2 f3.5*
· <i>I offer my students guidance, information and practice in the use of different coping skills.</i>	3.6 m3.4 f3.8*

· I discourage my students from blocking out problems by ignoring them ##	3.7 m3.5 f3.8*
· I discourage my students from blaming themselves all the time when things go wrong ##	3.9 m3.7 f4.1*
· <i>I offer opportunities for students to discuss issues of concern and positively encourage those who tend to keep to themselves.</i>	4.0 m3.8 f4.1*
· I encourage my students to pray and seek spiritual guidance when things go wrong	2.0 m1.8 f2.1*
· I teach my students to look on the bright side of things and be positive and optimistic.	4.0 m3.8 f4.1*
· I actively encourage my students to investigate and use the various professional help organisations and personnel available to them.	3.5 m3.2 f3.7*
· I stress the importance of relaxing diversions like reading, listening to music and watching TV. ##	3.3 m3.1 f3.5*
· I emphasise the importance of playing sport and keeping fit	3.8 m3.9 f3.9

Comparison of means between males and female teachers using Anova, *=signif at $p \leq .05$.

Factor 1 shown in *Italics*, Factor 2 shown with '##'

Descriptive Statistics: Females

	Mean
opportunity to share	3.8975
assist in problem solving	4.4350
encourage work hard	4.7490
discourage worry	3.4899
value friendships	3.9028
accept guidance re criticism	4.1660
discourage wishful thinking	3.2398
involve in social action	3.5488
stress reduction	3.5142
practice in coping skills	3.7692
discourage ignoring problems	3.7592
discourage blaming selves	4.0607
discuss concerns	4.1102
encourage spiritual help	2.1341
encourage positive attitude	4.0813
encourage professional help	3.6640
emphasise relaxation	3.4696
encourage active sport	3.9224

Descriptive Statistics:Males

	Mean
opportunity to share	3.5000
assist in problem solving	4.1154
encourage work hard	4.6883
discourage worry	3.2500
value friendships	3.5897
accept guidance re criticism	3.7115
discourage wishful thinking	3.2564
involve in social action	3.1282
stress reduction	3.2372
practice in coping skills	3.3846
discourage ignoring problems	3.5192
discourage blaming selves	3.6516
discuss concerns	3.7821
encourage spiritual help	1.7692
encourage positive attitude	3.8462
encourage professional help	3.2308
emphasise relaxation	3.1154
encourage active sport	3.8590