

Sources and Level of Stress Coping Strategies of Faculty Members in the University of Eastern Philippines

Dr. Leah A. de Asis¹, Dr. Veronica A. Piczon²

¹Faculty Members of the College of Arts and Communication, University of Eastern Philippines

²Instruction Coordinator of the College of Education, University of Eastern Philippines

Abstract: *This study generally aimed at investigating the stressors that affect faculty members in the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP), and identify the coping strategies they use in response to these stressors. Specifically, it sought to find the profile of the respondents, the causes and levels of stress, and the coping strategies used by the respondents in managing stress. Mixed-method research design was used to attain its objectives. The population of the study was composed of UEP faculty members. Findings on the profile showed that majority of the faculty members were female and were 35 years old and above. Findings on the level of stress of the respondents revealed that more than 50 percent had "high" level of stress on work load and role overload. "Average Level" on relationship with students, relationship with colleagues, and control of work environment. In terms of sources of stress of the respondents, findings showed that they were "very much stressed" with lack of school facilities, lack of resources, completing forms, and paper works. And lack of well-defined goals and objective and common tasks, "much stressed" on lack of cooperation of other staff members, dealing with slow learners, poor lightning and ventilation, working with associates whom they felt incompetent, and meeting deadlines. The respondents were "averagely stressed" with unmotivated students, open area classroom, dealing with individual differences, with insufficient salary for work done, lack of opportunity for promotion, dealing with students with personal problems, and students absenteeism. As regards to stress coping mechanism of the respondents, finding show that majority of the respondents diverted their attention to other things of ignored the problems, "often" did symptom intervention such as concentrate efforts on doing something about it, do what has to be done, one step at a time, and take additional action to try to get rid of the problem. Likewise, they consult an expert to help them sort out their problem and sought emotional support. "sometimes" they indulge in productive activities, read the Bible, discuss feelings with friends, ask people who have similar experiences. On the test of relationship between profile and level of stress, results show that faculty members' stress can be attributed to the profile of the respondents in terms of age sex. Based on the findings, it is recommended that: The administration may prioritize school facilities and other school needs; Team building may be organized and conducted which may result to cooperation and coordination among the faculty; Additional Clerks may be hired to help faculty in their paperwork, such as encoding and production; Learning Assistance Program be strictly implemented to help slow learners; and Work load be reduced to two preparation with 15 units or one preparation with maximum of 18 units.*

Keywords: Stressor, Coping strategies, personality type

1. Introduction

This study generally aimed at investigating the stressors that affect faculty members in Teaching is a profession which develops the minds of people. It drives the growth of a country not only on the basis of economic consideration but also on the basis of improved and tolerant society, culture, and civilization. Just like other professions, however, teaching can be a source of stress which could lead to decline in teaching performance and the performance and the performance of the students. It is therefore important to deal with the stress issues in order to gain advantage and attain to peak in teacher job performance. However, it must also be kept in mind that stress cannot be eliminated fully from work place, rather, it can be reduced if administered properly with the right stress coping strategies.

Teacher stress is experienced by a teacher from unpleasant emotions, such as tension, frustrations, anger, and depression (Brown and Uehara, 2009). It is caused by environmental factors as well as individual characteristics. Major environmental factors include poor working conditions, scarcity of resources, heavy workloads, and students' behavior. Individual characteristics can include sex, age, personality, and the ability to cope (Guglielmi and Tatrow, 2008).

The mixed-method study explores possible strategies that faculty members can use to cope with stress that is directly related to their specific work environment. This will also contribute to the field of health education and promotion by providing faculty members with insight and information on how to effectively cope with the stress at work so that they can continuously meet educational goals. The administration will have a clear picture of the faculty members' condition and find solutions to improve causes of stress in the workplace.

2. Objectives

This research investigated the stressors that affect members and identified the coping strategies that faculty members use in response to these stressors. More specifically, it aimed to;

- 1) Determine the profile of the respondents, in terms of age and sex,
- 2) Identify the causes and the level of stress of the respondents; and
- 3) Find out the strategies used by the respondents to cope with their stressors.

3. Methodology

A mixed-method research design was used in this study. It determined the level of stress and coping strategies of faculty members using instruments and interview schedule. The research is quantitatively driven with a quantitative foundation, and a qualitative sequential element (Richards and Morse, 2002).

The quantitative aspect focused on understanding the sources and level of teacher stress through the perspectives of some faculty members guided by the instruments while the Qualitative element was done through informal interviews.

All regular faculty members of the UEP Main Campus were targeted as respondents. However, one hundred percent retrieved was not realized.

4. Results and Discussion

Profile of UEP Faculty

Table 1: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percentage
Above 50	26	18.84
45-50	48	34.75
34 to 44	39	28.26
34 and below	25	18.12
Total	138	100

The table shows the age distribution of respondents. The data revealed that faculty members whose age ranges from 45 to 50 had the highest number with 34.78% of the total. This was followed by those within the age range of 34 to 44 or 28.26%. Those with age ranges from 50 and above and 34 and below had the least number of 26 or 18.44% and 25 or 18.12%, respectively.

The presented data would mean that majority of the respondents are categorically matured and experienced. This may further mean that they were in the teaching profession for a quite number of years and had experienced different stressors.

Table 2: Sex Distribution of Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	42	30.43
Female	96	69.57
Total	138	100

Table 2 shows the sex distribution of respondents. The data revealed that of the 138 faculty members, 96 of 69.57% were female. It can be inferred that teaching profession is a female-oriented and dominated profession.

Table 3: Causes and Levels of Stress Respondents

Causes of Stress	Level of Stress	
Role Overload	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Completing forms, surveys, and paperwork	4.21	Very much Stressful
Helping students with personal problems	2.52	Low stressful
Dealing with individual differences	3.46	Much stressful
Providing help to colleagues	2.82	Averagely stressful
Lack of public appreciation for "I do" as a teacher	1.67	Not stressful
Managing extra-curricular activities	2.51	Low stressful
Sub mean	2.95	Averagely stressful
Relationship with colleagues		
Lack of cooperation of other staff members	3.47	Much stressful
Working with associates I feel are competent	3.51	Much stressful
Disagreeing on how a task is to be done	3	Averagely stressful
Lack of communication between the school and central office	2.26	Low stressful
Lack of participation in making decisions that may affect my work	2.83	Averagely stressful
Being accountable for the work of others	3.02	Averagely stressful
Lack of well-defined goals and objectives on common tasks	4.23	Very much stressful
Sub mean	3.18	Averagely stressful
Work load		
Lack of "breaks"	1.65	Not stressful
Lack of opportunity to interact with peers	2.09	Low stressful
Lack of school facilities	4.95	Very much stressful
Lack of resources	4.7	Very much stressful
Insufficient salary for work done	4.01	Much stressful
Lack of clerical help	3.12	Averagely stressful
Lack of opportunity for promotion	3.65	Much stressful
Sub mean	3.45	Much stressful

Relationship with students		
Dealing with slow learners	3.87	Much stressful
Disruptive students	3.57	Much stressful
Unmotivated students	3.73	Much stressful
Verbal abuse of students	1.65	Not stressful
Adjustment to students with different personality types	2.98	Average stressful
Lack of parental support of the students	2.1	Low stressful
Student absenteeism/tardiness	3.23	Average stressful
Student vandalism	2.11	Low stressful
Sub mean	3.32	Average stressful
Control of the Work Environment		
Open area classroom	4.73	Very much stressful
Poor lighting and ventilation	3.68	Much stressful
Home to school distance	2.31	Low stressful
Theft or damage to personal property	2.84	Average stressful
Sub mean	3.34	Average stressful
Grand mean	3.25	Average stressful

Table 3 shows the causes and the level of stress of respondents in terms of role overload, relationship with colleagues, work load, with students and control of the work environment.

As shown in the presentation, the respondents considered completing forms, surveys, and paperwork as the main source of stress under role overload. The mean of 4.21 is interpreted as “very much stressful”. Meeting deadlines with 3.50, and dealing with individual differences, 3.46, both interpreted as “much stressful”. On the other hand, providing help to colleagues has the mean of 2.82 interpreted as “average stressful”, while helping students with personal problems has 2.52 mean and managing extra-curricular activities with 2.51, both “low stressful”. The respondents perceived lack of public appreciation as teachers as “not stressful” with the mean of 1.67. The sub mean of 2.95 would mean overload of teachers was average stressful for them.

In the category “relationship with colleagues”, it was found out that lack of well-defined goals and objectives on common tasks ranked first with 4.23 mean, interpreted as “very much stressful”. On the other hand, working with associates the respondents feel incomplete had a mean of 3.51 and 3.47 for lack of cooperation of other staff members, are “much stressful”. Those with “average stressful” are being comfortable for the works of others, with 3.02 mean, disagreeing on how a task is to be done with 3.00 mean, and lack of participation in making decisions that affect work had a mean of 2.83. The respondents, however, considered lack of communication between the school and the central office to be “low stressful” with the mean of 2.26.

It could be noted that relationship with colleagues was rated by the respondents as “average stressful”.

The findings in general is contrary to claim of J. Blase (2006) which says that the most stressor is caused by organizational issues dealing with other teachers, though the respondents considered lack of well-defined goals as “very much stressful”

Under the category on work load, it was revealed that lack of school facilities is the number one stressor with 4.95 mean

and lack of resources, 4.70, both are interpreted as “very much stressful”. Lack of insufficient salary for work done, had a mean of 4.01, lack of opportunity for promotion, 3.65 mean, and lack of clerical help with the mean of 3.12. These are interpreted as “average stressful”. The respondents considered lack of opportunity to interact peers, with 2.09 mean as “low stressful” while lack of “breaks” with 1.65 mean as “not stressful”.

The findings revealed that work load with the sub mean of 3.45, interpreted as “much stressful” is the top stressor among faculty members in the University of Eastern Philippines.

The findings proved to claim of R. Hastings that the most stressor can be found in the work environment such as heavy workloads, organizational problems, lack of resources, lack of support and on autonomy, and decision making. J. Blaise also pointed out that low salary, stagnation, and boredom cause burnout.

Under relationship with students’ category, the sub mean is 3.32, which is “average stressful”. The results revealed that dealing with slow learners had a mean of 3.87, unmotivated students, 3.73, and disruptive students with the mean of 3.57. These are interpreted as “much stressful”. Those which were “average stressful” were students’ absenteeism and tardiness with the mean of 3.23, and adjustment to students with different personality types with 2.98 mean.

On the other hand, students vandalism with the mean of 2.11 and lack of parental support of the students, with the mean of 2.10 were “low stressful” while verbal abuse by the students had a mean of 1.65, “not stressful”.

The faculty members in the university are psychologically prepared in dealings with the students. Again, this is far from the statement of J. Griffith (1999) that the major sources of teachers’ stress can be directly attributed to the students, which was supported by R. Hasting and Bham in 2003 based on their survey and interview that the major stressors is on students discipline.

Under the category on the control of the work environment, the sub mean is 3.34, which is “averagely stressful”, poor lighting and ventilation with 3.68 mean, “much stressful” while theft or damage to personal property had a mean of 2.84 “averagely stressful” and home to school distance had

2.31 mean which is interpreted as “low stressful”. The Grand mean of 3.25 with the interpretation “averagely stressful” implies that the respondents can still manage the stressors without losing composure.

Table 4: Stress Coping Mechanism

Coping Mechanism	Levels of Stress	
	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Diverting Attention/ Ignoring		
I refuse to believe that problem has happened	4.15	Often
I diver myself by giving more attention to my duties and responsibilities	4.1	Often
I act as though there are no problems	4	Often
I try to help those who have the same problems as I have	3.55	Often
I tell myself that worrying will not solve a problematic situation	4.18	Often
I diver my attention from my problem by going out with friends	3.83	Often
I see other people who are in a worse situation than I am in	4.18	Often
I try to forget the event and tell myself that tomorrow is another day	4.16	Often
I convince myself that my happiness should not depend on other people	4.23	Often
I indulge in an exercise and other worthwhile activities to fill my time	3.61	often
Sub mean	3.99	often
Symptom intervention		
I take additional action to try to get rid of the problem	4.1	Often
I concentrate my efforts on doing something about it	4.17	Often
I do what has to be done, one step at a time	4.27	Sometimes
I indulge in productive activities or hobbies to improve my self	3.57	Often
I do something to improve myself physically and intellectually	3.61	Often
I try to involve my peers in the problem so we can solve it together	2.94	Sometimes
I send signals to my peers to let him/her know that something is wrong	2.73	Sometimes
I keep an open verbal communication with my clinical instructor so we can openly discuss the problem	2.69	Sometimes
I write notes to my Head Teacher/Principal her know how I feel	1.41	Never
Sub mean	3.27	Sometimes
Gaining/Sharing Information		
I ask people who has similar experience what they did	3.62	Often
I try to get advice from someone about the problem	4.2	Often
I talk to someone to find who could do something about the problem	4	Often
I talk to someone to find out more about the situation	3.9	Often
I read books to learn more about the problem	2.97	Often
I share experiences with someone similarly situated as I am so we can learn from each other	3.75	Sometimes
I consult an expert to help me sort out my problem	3.68	Often
I confident my problems with confess or and seek spiritual advice	3.57	Often
I read the Bible and other inspiration materials for guidance	3.76	Often
Sub mean	3.72	Often
Seeking Emotional Support		
I talk to someone about how I feel	3.58	Often
I try to get emotional support from friends or relatives	2.98	Sometimes
I discuss my feelings with someone	3.61	Often
I get sympathy and understanding from someone	2.79	Sometimes
I read the Bible for comfort and inspiration	3	Sometimes
I ask God in my prayer and meditation to give me solace	3.81	Often
I take comfort of the love of my siblings and friends	3.61	Often
I seek support from my friends and relatives	3.73	Often
I seek comfort by keeping a journal of my problem and feelings	3.67	Often
Sub mean	3.42	Sometimes
Grand mean	3.25	often

Table 4 shows the stress coping mechanism or strategies of the respondents in terms of diverting attention or ignoring, symptom intervention, gaining or sharing information and seeking emotional support.

The sub mean of 3.99 under diverting attention or ignoring had been interpreted as “often”.

This may seem that the respondents give more attention to other concerns rather than the problems which may hinder teaching-learning experiences.

Under symptom intervention, the sub mean is 3.27, interpreted as “sometimes”. Although there were items with means interpreted as “often”, such as taking additional action to get rid of the problem with 4.10 mean, concentrate efforts on doing something about it, 4.17 mean, doing what has to be done, one step at a time, 4.27 “always”, doing productive activities, with 3.57 “often”. Doing something to improve myself, 3.61 “often”, the results show that those were items that the respondents did sometimes only and one item, writing notes to the head with a mean of 1.41, interpreted as “never”. This implies that the symptom intervention is not prioritized by the respondents.

On gaining or sharing information, the sub mean is 3.27 interpreted as “often”. The highest mean under this strategy is 4.2 with the interpretation of “often”, was asking advice from someone about the problem. On the hand, the least is reading books to learn more about the problem with 2.97 mean, interpreted as “sometimes”. This would mean that the respondents consider practical solutions to problems rather than theories from books.

On items under seeking emotion support, the sub mean is 3.42 interpreted as “sometimes”. This would further mean that the faculty members in UEP are matured and emotionally capable individuals.

In general, the grand mean of 3.60 shows that the faculty members had utilized some strategies or mechanism in coping stress often along items on diverting attention or ignoring, gaining or sharing information and sometimes seeking emotional support and did symptom intervention.

5. Conclusions

The level of stress of faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines could be categorically considered “average”. Among the causes of stressors, only completing forms, surveys, and paperworks, lack of school facilities, lack of resources, and lack of well-defined goals and objectives and common tasks were “very much stressful”. These have nothing to do with relationships with students contrary to the claim of most theories that the major causes of stressors are students.

References

- [1] Blasé, J. A *Qualitative Analysis of Sources of Teachers Stress: Consequences for Performance*. American Education Research Journal, 2006
- [2] Griffith, J. *An Investigation of Coping Strategies Associated with Job Stress in Teachers*, *British Journal of Education Psychology*.
- [3] Hastings, R. *The Relationship between Student behavior Patterns and Teacher Burnout*. *School Psychology International*, 2006

Faculty member in UEP have high tolerance to stressors. They were stress practical in facing stress various and used various strategies in coping with it.

6. Recommendations

Based on items which were found very much stressful or much stressful, the hereunder recommendations are forwarded.

- 1) The administration may prioritize school facilities and other school needs.
- 2) Team building may be organized and conducted with may result to cooperation and coordination among the faculty.
- 3) Additional clerks may be hired to help faculty in their paperwork, such as encoding and production.
- 4) Learning assistance program be strictly implemented to help slow learners.
- 5) Work load be reduced to two preparations with 15 units or one preparation with a maximum of 18 units.

Implementing Agency: University Of Eastern Philippines

Budget: Php30,000.00

Total Amount of Expenditures: Php30,000.00

Duration of the Study: June 2015 – March 2015

Part II. Stress Assessment Scale

Instructions: Rate how often does each situation occur in your work as a teacher. Please ENCIRCLE the number that corresponds to your answer using the hereunder options.

- 5 very much stressful
- 4 much stressful
- 3 stressful
- 2 a little bit stressful
- 1 not stressful

Role Overload					
Completing forms, survey, and paperwork	5	4	3	2	1
Helping students with personal problems	5	4	3	2	1
Dealing with individual differences	5	4	3	2	1
Meeting deadlines	5	4	3	2	1
Providing help to colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of public appreciation for "I do" as a teacher	5	4	3	2	1
Managing extra-curricular activities	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship with Colleagues					
Lack of cooperation of other staff members	5	4	3	2	1
Working with associates I feel are competent	5	4	3	2	1
Disagreeing on how a task is to be done	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of communication between the school and central office	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of participation in making decisions that affect my work	5	4	3	2	1
Being accountable for the of others	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of well-defined goals and objectives on common task	5	4	3	2	1
Work lead					
Lack of "breaks"	5	4	3	2	1
lack of opportunity to interact with peers	5	4	3	2	1
lack of School facilities	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of resources	5	4	3	2	1
Insufficient salary for work done	5	4	3	2	1
Lack clerical help	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of opportunity for promotion	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship with Student					
Dealing with slow learners	5	4	3	2	1
Disruptive students	5	4	3	2	1
Unmotivated Student	5	4	3	2	1
verbal abuse by student	5	4	3	2	1
Adjustment to students with different personality types	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of parental support of the students	5	4	3	2	1
Student absenteeism/tardiness	5	4	3	2	1
Student vandalism	5	4	3	2	1
Control of the Work Environment					
Open area classroom	5	4	3	2	1
Poor lighting and ventilation	5	4	3	2	1
Home to school distance	5	4	3	2	1
Theft or damage to personal property	5	4	3	2	1

Part III. Stress Coping Mechanism

Instruction: The following items are designed to assess the different ways in which you respond to stress. Please ENCIRCLE the number that corresponds to your answer using the hereunder options.

- 5 always
- 4 often
- 3 sometimes
- 2 seldom
- 1 never

Diverting Attention/Ignoring					
I refuse to believe that problem has happened	5	4	3	2	1
I divert myself by giving more attention to my duties and responsibilities.	5	4	3	2	1
I act as though there are no problems	5	4	3	2	1
I try to help those who have the same problems as I have	5	4	3	2	1
I tell myself that worrying will not solve a problematic situation	5	4	3	2	1
I divert my attention from my problem by going out with friends	5	4	3	2	1
I see other people who are in a worse situation than I am in	5	4	3	2	1
I try to forget the event and tell myself that tomorrow is another day	5	4	3	2	1
I convince myself that my happiness should not depend on other people	5	4	3	2	1
I indulge in an exercise and other worthwhile activities to fill my time	5	4	3	2	1
Symptom Intervention					
I take additional action to try to get rid of the problem	5	4	3	2	1
I concentrate my efforts on doing something about it	5	4	3	2	1
I do what has to be done, one step at a time	5	4	3	2	1
I indulge in productive activities or hobbies	5	4	3	2	1
I do something to improve myself physically and intellectually	5	4	3	2	1
I try to involve my peers in the problem so we can solve it together	5	4	3	2	1
I send signals to my peers to let him/her know that something is wrong	5	4	3	2	1
I keep an open verbal communication with my clinical instructor so we can openly discuss the problem	5	4	3	2	1
I write my notes to my Head Teacher/Principal to let him/her know how I feel	5	4	3	2	1
Gaining/sharing Information					
I ask people who have similar experience what they did	5	4	3	2	1
I try to get advice from someone about the problem	5	4	3	2	1
I talk to someone who could do something about the problem	5	4	3	2	1
I talk to someone to find out more about the situation	5	4	3	2	1
I read books to learn more about the problem	5	4	3	2	1
I share experiences with someone similarly situated as I am so we can learn from each other	5	4	3	2	1
I consult an expert to help me sort out my problem	5	4	3	2	1
I confide my problems with a confessor or and seek spiritual advice	5	4	3	2	1
I read the bible and other inspiration materials for guidance	5	4	3	2	1
Seeking Emotional Support					
I talk someone about how I feel	5	4	3	2	1
I try to get emotional support from friends or relatives	5	4	3	2	1
I discuss my feelings with someone	5	4	3	2	1
I get sympathy and understanding from someone	5	4	3	2	1
I read the Bible for my comfort and inspiration	5	4	3	2	1
I ask my God in my prayer and meditation to give me solace	5	4	3	2	1
I take my comfort of the love of my siblings and friends	5	4	3	2	1
I seek support from my friends and relatives	5	4	3	2	1
I seek comfort by keeping a journal of my problem and feelings	5	4	3	2	1

Table 4b: Comparison of Pupils' Academic Performance in English, Science, and Mathematics in Central Schools

PUPILS' ACHIEVEMENT		BALICUATRO AREA				CENTRAL AREA				PACIFIC AREA				TOTAL	%	AVERAGE X	INTERPRETATION
		F	%	X	INTERPRETATION	F	%	X	INTERPRETATION	F	%	X	INTERPRETATION				
English	ABOVE AVERAGE	53	15.10	13.46	BELOW AVERAGE	118	37.77	13.09	BELOW AVERAGE	133	27.65	16.13	BELOW AVERAGE	304	18.00	14.46	BELOW AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	180	51.28			346	46.37			154	32.02			680	40.26		
	BELOW AVERAGE	118	33.62			393	45.86			154	40.33			705	41.74		
TOTALS		351	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	857	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	481	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	1,689	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE
Science	ABOVE AVERAGE	61	17.35	12.52	AVERAGE	128	14.94	11.08	AVERAGE	136	32.85	11.23	AVERAGE	349	20.66		AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	20	56.96			443	51.69			167	34.72			810	47.96		
	BELOW AVERAGE	88	25.07			286	33.37			156	32.43			530	31.38		
TOTALS		351	100.00		AVERAGE	857	100.00		AVERAGE		100.00		AVERAGE	1,689	100.00		AVERAGE
Math	ABOVE AVERAGE	31	9.40	8.73	AVERAGE	147	17.15		AVERAGE	110	22.87	10.11	AVERAGE	290	17.17	9.20	AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	244	69.52			418	48.77			277	57.09			939	55.59		
	BELOW AVERAGE	74	21.08			292	34.08			94	19.94			460	27.24		
TOTALS		TOTALS	331	100	AVERAGE	857			AVERAGE	481	100		AVERAGE	1,689	100		AVERAGE

Table 4c: Comparison of Pupils' Academic Performance in English, Science, and Mathematics in Barangay Schools

Table 1: Comparison of Pupils' Academic Performance in English, Science, and Mathematics in Barangay Bona																	
PUPILS' ACHIEVEMENT	BALICUATRO AREA				CENTRAL AREA				PACIFIC AREA				TOTAL	%	AVERAGE X	INTERPRETATION	
	F	%	X	INTERPRETATION	F	%	X	INTERPRETATION	F	%	X	INTERPRETATION					
E N G L I S H	ABOVE AVERAGE	7	4.29	10.58	BELOW AVERAGE	45	25.42	54.48	BELOW AVERAGE	6	6.34	14.83	BELOW AVERAGE	58	13.52	13.00	BELOW AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	55	53.75		53	29.94	59		66.29	167	38.93						
	BELOW AVERAGE	101	61.86		79	44.64	24		26.97	204	47.55						
TOTALS	163	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	177	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	89	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	429	100.00		BELOW AVERAGE	
S C I E N C E	ABOVE AVERAGE	18	9.82	10.32	AVERAGE	48	25.49	11.46	AVERAGE	11	12.36	11.71	AVERAGE	71	17.02	11.49	AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	93	57.02		49	27.68	58		65.17	200	46.92						
	BELOW AVERAGE	54	31.13		82	46.33	20		22.47	158	36.38						
TOTALS	163	100.00		AVERAGE	177	100.00		AVERAGE	89			AVERAGE	429	100.00		AVERAGE	
M A T H	ABOVE AVERAGE	11	6.75	8.13	AVERAGE	32	18.08	9.02	AVERAGE	11	12.36	8.89	AVERAGE	54	12.59	8.64	AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	87	53.37		33	29.94	64		71.91	204	47.55						
	BELOW AVERAGE	40	24.88		82	51.98	14		15.73	171	39.86						
TOTALS	163	100		AVERAGE	177			AVERAGE	89	100		AVERAGE	429	100		AVERAGE	