

**TEACHER EXTRA WORK: A LOCAL PERSPECTIVE**

**GUY POMAHAC**

B.Ed., University of Lethbridge, 1981

A Project  
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
of the University of Lethbridge  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree

**MASTER OF EDUCATION**

**THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION**

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

March 2003

## Dedication

Without the tireless and total support of my wife, Kelli, this project may not have seen its completion. The editing, revising and infusion of her ideas, suggestions and critical challenges made this a finer piece of work. I am thankful she allowed me the time and space when I desperately needed it to meet deadlines or meetings or just to get away from its burden. It was a struggle and I am forever grateful that she was at my side to keep me focused. Thank you for your love and patience while accepting all the long nights. To my darling daughter Taylor who was born at the start of this journey, your smile and laugh made me realize the only important piece of work I could really ever hope to do, was to be the best father I could. Everything else pales in comparison. This project has provided an insight into my, and my colleagues life as educators. More significantly, however, it has impacted what being a teacher means to the *whole* family. To that end this project has been completed with the grandest “team kiss” in our family history, along with my eternal thanks.

## Abstract

In this study, 78% (305) teachers of the Alberta Teachers Association Local #41 and Lethbridge Public School District # 51, were asked to provide information concerning their present working conditions. In addition, 106 of those respondents took part in a week-long logbook providing more detailed data on the working life of teachers.

Three subsets of teachers (elementary school-junior high/middle school-high school) tabulated their *extra* time spent devoted to (1) *professional duties* and (2) *out of school commitment to instruction*. Respondents included: 153 elementary, 57 junior high/middle school and 95 high school teachers. Of the 106 (100%) responding to logbooks, 58 were elementary, 25 were junior high/middle and 23 were high school teachers. On average, teachers in the district as a whole devoted 162.4 hours yearly to professional activities over assigned contractual workload hours (elementary-178.4 hours, junior high/middle school-191.5 hours, high school-119.3 hours). Their extra out-of-school commitment to instruction provided an average of 209.2 hours yearly over assigned contractual workload hours (elementary-123.4 hours, junior high/middle school-243.2 hours, high school-327.0 hours). When total average hours of extra work of professional and school expected time were adjusted to account for preparation time, the figures were 323, 316, and 290 respectively for elementary, junior high, and high school. These data show that there is little discernable difference in the amount of extra work done.

Logbooks documented respondents averaging 9.25 hours engaged in school and professional activities during a typical work day. On the weekend respondents recorded an average 6.25 hours further devoted to school and professional related activities. Broken down by subset, school related/professional hours on the weekend included: elementary- 7.41/0.24, junior high/middle school-3.82/0.86, high school-4.0/2.3 respectively.

The study provided ATA Local #41 with important information that would expand the baseline data with regard to collective contract agreements and present working conditions. First, it gave future committee members and researchers a basis for comparison. Secondly, the study determined how much time teachers in the district spent on *specific* teaching and school related activities, and how this differed between elementary, junior/middle and high school levels. Thirdly, the study provided data for comparison in regard to provincial wide studies on teacher workload. Finally, the study provided the Local with data useful in informing the public and other education stakeholders about the nature of teacher workloads.

## Acknowledgements

This project could not have been completed without the generous amount of time energy and support given to me by numerous individuals.

Thank you to my supervisor Dr. Richard Butt, who took me from an “older experienced” student to an “older experienced and *refined*” student while nurturing my growth as a professional. Your expertise, patience, and willingness to commit *your* time to making this happen, are greatly appreciated.

Thank you to Dr. Rick Mrazek for your longevity of support through all the personal and professional experiences we have shared. Your guidance, patience and influence on me as a young student, to a university student, to a graduate student, to a colleague, as a mentor and friend, will always be remembered with fondness and held in high regard.

To my University of Lethbridge colleagues that assisted me by giving freely of their time, energy and critical support, I thank you for putting up with all my requests, discussions and venting displays. Specifically, Dr. Nola Aitken, Dr. Art Aitken, Dr. George Bedard, and Dr. Kris Magnusson, a heart filled thank you for your parts in making this project finer. To Scott Powell thanks for being the computer guru you are. Your assistance was truly valued.

To my former school colleagues that encouraged me and listened to my “drivel” about being a Master of Education student, a thank you for not letting me get “beyond” myself, and reminding me of the “real” world of teaching and what a teacher *is* and *does*.

To the teachers of the Local that took the time from their schedules to participate in my study. Your input was greatly appreciated. We *can* change our professional lives, *together*.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	iii
Abstract .....	iv
Acknowledgments .....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Tables List.....	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Research Questions .....	3
Delimitations, Limitations, and Biases.....	3
Significance of Research .....	5
Chapter Two: Literature Review .....	8
Teacher Stress and Burnout: Effects and Causality .....	9
Comparisons of Workload Studies.....	19
Teacher Workload: Truths and Perceptions.....	25
Chapter Three: Research Methodology and Design.....	32
Development of Research Instruments.....	33
Sample .....	35
Data Collection Device.....	36
Ethical Considerations.....	39
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Results .....	42
Subset Survey .....	42
Teacher Extra Work Profile .....	53
Teacher Logbook .....	56

Variations.....	58
Chapter Five: Conclusion and Recommendations.....	74
References.....	88
Appendices.....	99

## List of Tables

### Table

1. Subset Survey Results.....	43
2. Logbook Profile .....	44
3. High-Low Ranges: Elementary.....	54
4. High-Low Ranges: Junior High.....	55
5. High-Low Ranges: High School.....	56
6. Logbook Results .....	57
7. Comparison of Professional vs. Expected Time by Subset.....	63
8. Percentage of Total Hours of Professional vs. Expected Hours by Subset.....	64
9. Subset Average Hours in Professional and School Expected Time.....	65
10. Weekend Logbook Subset Results.....	69
11. Weekday Logbook Average.....	71



# Teacher's Extra Work: A Local Perspective

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

“Burnout” affects all professions but tends to be more pervasive in the human service occupations such as education. Symptoms include dissatisfaction, negativism, boredom, unpreparedness, testiness, frequent illness, forgetfulness, depression, and tiredness. It is a contention that the workload dynamics of individual teacher's timetable play a major role in the construction of these conditions. Further, this workload, in conjunction with a daily personal agenda being carried out, could adversely affect the teacher in the classroom. Are teachers under more demands to do more with less? Has the workload increased? Are teachers in fact still perceived as having a light workload? Is the time off from teaching still the biggest issue with the public? There are many unanswered questions and myths about teachers' work lives which can be answered by the gathering of specific data. Contractual workload time is clear, but the amount of extra work that teachers do which is both “expected” and voluntary is not. An investigation into factual components of the typical extra workload *expected* and *accomplished* by teachers is the first step in this process and will be the focus of this study.

To this end, teachers of the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) Local #41, and Lethbridge Public School District #51, were asked to provide information concerning their present working conditions. As well, the general perception held by teachers is that there is a significant difference within the three sublevels of schooling with regard to teacher workloads. In addition, teachers have been subjected to the additional emphasis

of *mandated* Teacher Professional Growth Plans. The outcome is a heightened awareness of serious issues concerning the impact those initiatives have had on their assigned workload. The acute attention paid the teaching profession in the absence of data, has fostered numerous misconceptions for educational stakeholders. Hence, clarification is necessary. This study was undertaken to provide the local association with vital information that could be used to describe and improve the working conditions of its members in measurable ways.

Four areas of emphasis were identified as the focus of this study. First, was the present Working Conditions Committee's (WCC) desire to leave historical documentation for the Local #41. This study would provide factual source of data with regard to "extra" work and working conditions and would assist future committee members and researchers by providing a basis for comparison. Secondly, to determine how much time teachers of the district spend on teaching and school related activities and how this differs between various subsets within the district. Thirdly, to provide accurate data for comparison in ongoing ATA province-wide research on teacher workload. Finally, to provide the Local with useful evidence for informing concerned education stakeholders about the substance and number of activities its teachers have provided to ensure quality education for its children.

The process involved a three-part survey of principals and teachers and a weekly logbook completed by teachers. Two workshops were implemented to assist school ATA representatives in the administering of the study. A follow up debriefing session with the representatives was also scheduled as a cumulating activity to help them understand the nature of the research project and its methodology to facilitate future replication of

research and data gathering activities. For the purposes of this study, *only* the teacher survey and teacher logbook will be examined in detail.

### Research Questions

The main question of this project was, “ How much extra time do teachers spend on teaching and school-related activities, and how does this time differ for various subsets of teachers?” Stemming from this was additional inquiry for answers to the following questions.

1. What is the nature of teacher’s extra workloads?
2. How can teacher’s extra workloads be best conceptualized, categorized, and portrayed?
3. How much extra do teachers work outside of working hours?
4. What tasks occupy teachers inside and outside school?
5. Are there variations in teacher’s extra workloads across contexts (type of school, roles, grade levels, teacher characteristics, gender, years of experience) both within the district and individual school?
6. How does the district compare to those districts that are similar in size, with similar number of teachers, and professional development opportunities?

### Delimitations, Limitations and Biases

There were five delimitations applied to this study:

- Only teachers of Public School District #51 and members of ATA Local 41 were surveyed.
- Teachers with less than a 0.5 FTE were eliminated from the sample population.

- Teachers had to be members of the Alberta Teachers' Association.
- The week chosen for the logbook was done on the basis that it was as “typical” as could be in terms of comparison to all three subsets. In other words, the week was chosen when there were no Parent-Teacher interviews, no whole school PD activities scheduled, no conventions, and no retreats.
- The Logbook was distributed on the following a basis:

Fewer than 20 FTE in school	2 teachers complete log
20.1-30.0 FTE in school	3 teachers complete log
30.1-40.0 FTE in school	4 teachers complete log
40.1-50.0 FTE in school	5 teachers complete log
50.1-60.0 FTE in school	6 teachers complete log
60.1 plus FTE in school	7 teachers complete log

In an attempt to ensure a sufficient and representative sample, an incentive was offered to those teachers who completed the logbook. Those teachers who recorded their workweek were given a gift certificate to a local bookstore as a way of expressing gratitude for their commitment to the survey. As in previous studies on teacher workloads, it was felt that those teachers greatly interested in teaching conditions and heavily involved in co-curricular and extra curricular activities, would be motivated to participate. Further, those teachers who felt that they devoted a great deal of time to their profession, were more likely to accurately complete the individual teacher survey and take on the responsibility of the logbook than those teachers not sharing the same sentiment.

Those teachers, who actively supported the Economic Policy Committee and specifically, the WCC and the Local ATA, were also thought to be more inclined to participate in a positive way. For those teachers who did not support the ATA and the Local, efforts were made in the workshops presented by the researcher to eliminate any pressure to participate. There were no formal requests made to teachers to undertake this study. There was an underlying hope that those offering information and data would be as accurate and honest as possible. Biases associated with the foregoing phenomena might be a source of error with the logbook study, but the survey to which 78% of the membership replied, would be less impacted, if at all.

#### Significance of The Research

To determine the actual time teachers spend in performing their job is one that is difficult to investigate and evaluate accurately. The major task of this study was to provide further analysis of working conditions that have made a glaring impact on teachers' lives both professionally and personally. Past research has dissected information and made substantial contributions to clarifying the perceptions and realities of teacher workloads. However, the implementation of the requirement to develop "Personal Growth Plans" by the Province of Alberta has added a new elements to teacher workloads. The expectation that teachers should develop Teacher Professional Growth Plans and gradually reach plan objectives, has placed teachers under extra scrutiny. In an effort to fulfil the obligation of the WCC and the Negotiation Sub-Committee (NCS) to its Local, a clear and concise investigation was needed with regard to teacher workload in the district. From the viewpoint of those entrusted to deliver the educational goals and objectives of the province and district, it was felt that an easily administered vehicle was

needed to portray an accurate picture. The committees, having already previously identified working conditions and concerns, were charged with providing information for its members that could be looked to as a standard description of teacher working conditions reality in comparison to their fellow colleagues.

There was a lack of empathy for teachers in contract negotiations and district wide educational directives. Teacher apathy was targeted as a concern that needed to be rectified. Part of that apathy had been identified as teachers were expected to do more with less. Increased levels of anxiety with teacher efforts to meet personal Teacher Professional Growth Plan goals occurred. This was attributed to the creation of these plans for the personal agenda for someone other than teachers themselves. Attention to concerns with regards to teaching workload issues has increased dramatically. A lack of accurate, substantiated, and communicated information on workload reality across the subsets fostered a perception of unfair workload expectations. Educational funding cutbacks and the additional emphasis on Personal Growth Plans have created a need for more communication between teachers. The *required* need to have continued and active participation in professional activities must be attainable through the provision of appropriate resources that are fairly distributed to all groups of teachers at all levels.

Lastly, the increased daily rigors of working in the classroom has resulted in an overwhelming concern with regard to the impact it has on the home life of teachers. After a number of years in the classroom, many teachers have become disillusioned with their occupation because the job of teaching has become less meaningful than it was once perceived to be. Consequently, this cannot be a symptom that can easily be reduced by simply addressing only school-based issues. To acquire a deeper understanding of teacher

concerns in the workplace, teachers' home lives need to be explored. It needs to be stated firmly that this is a profession that requires a huge amount of "home time" sacrificed in order to perform in the classroom. Contrary to other professions of similar educational training requirements (i.e. nursing, and social work) which require no work at home, there are no tangible concessions or rewards for "overtime." Often, it is the expectations placed upon the teacher by the school, the district or the teachers themselves, that lead to states of burnout, stress, and illness. This, in part, can be attributed to having teachers take their work home with them to be successful in the classroom. This may lead to erosion in quality of home life.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Literature Review

#### *Introduction*

In preparation for this project, review of relevant literature was conducted. The list of literature obtained included research on teacher workload, teacher burnout, teaching conditions, teacher morale, teacher persistence, teacher stress, teacher professional growth plans, teacher portfolios, emotional problems, teacher alienation, teacher attitudes, teacher work hours, instructional time, and non-instructional time requirements.

Many search engines and databases were perused. Specifically, the search engines utilized were Google, Dogpile, Alta Vista, Excite, HotBot, Meta-Crawler, Mamma, Ask Jeeves, Mega-Spider, Go.com, CNET Search.com., and Northern Light. A complete search of Journal Indexes included: CBCA Education, ProQuest Direct, Eureka and ERIC. Numerous studies from the Alberta Teachers' Association were investigated. Critiques of government publications locally, provincially, nationally, and internationally, were probed using the Canadian Research/Government Index. Additionally, various websites were investigated and are listed in the reference portion of this document. Finally, dissertation indexes were researched for previous studies concerning the above mentioned components of this particular study.

The focus of the literature review will provide background information that revolves around the following major areas identified in this workload study.

1. Teacher Stress and Burnout: Effects and Causality



2. Comparison Workload Studies
3. Teacher Workload: Truths and Perceptions

*Teacher Stress and Burnout: Effects and Causality*

A key aspect of the burnout syndrome, according to Maslach and Jackson's (1981) conceptualization of this phenomenon, is increased feelings of emotional exhaustion. Another aspect is the development of negative, cynical attitudes and feelings about one's students. A third aspect of the burnout syndrome is the tendency to evaluate oneself negatively, particularly with regard to one's work with students. Maslach and Jackson's conceptualization of burnout was operationalized to measure burnout by three scales: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Accomplishment. These three scales combined were termed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The MBI construct was validated in several studies by performing factor analyses on correlation matrices of questionnaire items (Byrne, 1991; Hipps, 1992).

In a study by Friedman (1993) on burnout in teachers, an examination of the unique content of the concept of teacher burnout was conducted. The major purpose of this study was to expose empirically the "core" of burnout in teachers, based on Maslach and Jackson's (1981) conceptualization of the phenomenon, and to assess the relative severity of its components. While most previous studies of this issue employed factor analysis, this study was different in its methodological approach, by using facet theory and analysis. The core of teacher burnout discerned in this study, based on Maslach and Jackson's conceptualization, was exhaustion, negative self-evaluation (non-accomplishment) and negative attitudes towards students. Based on Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler's (1986) work, such feelings culminate in strong negative feelings towards

teaching, such as discouragement and frustration, which may result in a desire to leave teaching.

In early studies of burnout in the teaching profession, burnout was perceived as a general concept which included almost any negative reaction of teachers to pressure related to their work such as becoming frustrated, mentally exhausted, excessively worried, feeling depressed and anxious, and acting defensively with others (Blase, 1992; Periman & Hartman, 1992). In later studies, the MBI was adapted for measuring burnout in teachers by researchers in the United States and in other countries (Farber, 1982; Friedman, 1991; Schwab, 1986).

Validation efforts by researchers of the burnout concept have led to the identification of the boundaries and content of this important concept. In that context, Shirom (1989) claimed that the major conclusion which may be drawn from past validation efforts is that the "unique content of burnout has to do with the depletion of an individual's energetic resources. Specifically, burnout refers to a combination of physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive weariness." This is the dimension of the burnout experience for which there is most support in the validation efforts (Shirom, 1989, p. 33). Shirom's contention regarding the core meaning of burnout was a logical deduction from an extensive review of the research literature, which dealt with the common features of the conceptualizations of burnout. However, no attempt was made by him or others to empirically test this narrowly defined concept of burnout.

As reported by Rathbone and Benedict (1980), the junior high school setting seems to be a particularly fertile ground for producing burnout among teachers because of developmental characteristics of the adolescent population. Studies by Gold (1985)

and Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) also revealed that junior high school teachers compared with elementary school teachers were more likely to report higher levels of stress and burnout.

The Holland et al. (1993), study was focused on a determination of an estimate of the concurrent validity of a preliminary 18-item form of a new screening inventory titled the Holland Burnout Assessment Survey (HBAS). This survey could be used to identify teachers at the middle/junior high school level who might be predisposed to burnout. This survey form was developed to measure four factors thought to be related to the probability of occurrence or lack of occurrence of burnout in middle school teachers namely, Positive Perception of Teaching, Support from Superiors, Knowledge of Burnout, and Commitment to Teaching. It should be noted that results of this survey showed little consistency between interrelationships of demographic variables and indicators of burnout.

Moore (2000) provided a study that integrates causal attribution research and the burnout and exhaustion literature to develop an attributional model of work exhaustion consequences. With this model, it is suggested that individuals experiencing work exhaustion will not exhibit all of the job attributes and behaviours found to correlate with exhaustion. Rather, individuals are likely to experience a subset of these, depending on their perceptions regarding the cause of exhaustion.

Coping with occupational stress among teachers is rapidly becoming a major issue in schools. Stress has been found to be costly to the individuals who experience it as well as to the schools in which they work (Cooper & Marshal, 1978). At the individual level, stress is made manifest in the feeling of fatigue, loss of sleep, and feeling of

burnout. In serious cases it is followed by symptoms such as hypertension, rashes, and ulcers (Kobasa, 1979). At the school level, the increase in stress is reflected in a growing annual average of days of teacher absences and a rise in the number of early retirements. These stress-related symptoms often lead students to question whether or not teachers are able to provide quality instruction or are merely going through the motions with minimal enthusiasm (Clark, 1985).

Due to societal and system changes, the pressures on teachers have intensified the work of teaching. According to Kuehn (1994) in his comparison with the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF) survey s of its members, the top causes of stress, as identified by teachers, have changed in recent years. In 1986, British Columbia teachers reported the following top 11 causes of stress: (1) attitude or actions of provincial government, (2) unmet needs of students, (3) decreasing real salary, (4) size of workload, (5) attitude of public, (6) size of class, (7) lack of preparation time, (8) the composition of class, (9) attitude or actions of school board, (10) mainstreaming of special needs students, and (11) lack of control of work environment.

Again in 1993, the BCTF teachers were surveyed and reported the following as their main causes of stress: (1) unmet needs of the students, (2) composition of class, (3) size of workload, (4) attitude or actions of provincial government, (5) inclusion of students with special needs, (6) media attacks on teachers and education, (7) attitudes and actions of school board, (8) size of class too large, (9) attitude of public, (10) rapid change in programs and curriculum, and (11) lack of control of work environment. In analysing these sources it can be said that bargaining success moved salary issues and lack of preparation time out of the top eleven. The top stressor is seeing the "unmet needs

of students.” This is a student-focused view. Close behind is the teacher-focused side of the same phenomenon, “size of workload.”

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) suggest an approach to defining coping patterns “in terms of the functions coping strategies serve, for example to avoid, to confront or analyse.” They indicate that this approach would enable examination of the problem-solving aspect of coping as well as its emotional-regulating function. They suggest a process of identifying coping patterns through the observations of multiple coping incidents across a variety of coping situations. Newton and Keenan (1985) describe five strategies in coping with work-related stress: (1) talking with others (superiors, colleagues); (2) direct action (a problem solving orientation); (3) preparatory actions (problem appraisal, getting information seeking a solution); (4) withdrawal and avoidance; and (5) expressing helplessness and resentment.

The negative impact of stress on the teacher involved, on the daily life of the school, and on the educational experience of students makes it imperative that effective responses to this problem be devised. However, to modify an individual’s propensity to use the coping strategies suggested by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) and describe by Latack (1986) and Moos and Billings (1982) yielded specific strategies in coping with occupational stress that include: (1) Active behavioural strategies (confronting or attempting to change the source of stress); (2) Active cognitive strategies (problem appraisal); (3) Inactive behavioural strategies (involving behaviours of escape and avoidance of the sources of stress); and (4) Inactive cognitive strategies (i.e., conforming with superior’s expectations perceiving helplessness and expressing resentment). However, these need a fuller understanding of the personal and environmental contexts in

which they occur. While studies conducted on this general issue are numerous (Kobasa, 1979; McCrae, 1984; Holahan & Moos, 1987), little is known about these particular coping strategies and their determinants among teachers (Milstein, 1983).

Numerous studies have reported high levels of stress and burnout in schoolteachers (Cox & Brockley, 1984; Cunningham, 1983; Farber, 1984a, 1984b; Tokar & Feitler, 1986). However, most studies have focused on urban schoolteachers; few have reported on stress and burnout in rural schoolteachers (Rottier, Kelly, & Tomhave, 1983). Stress can affect teachers' job satisfaction (Borg, Riding, & Falzon, 1991) and their effectiveness with pupils (Blase, 1986). Stress can also result in mental and physical illness and impair the working relationship between teachers and students as well as the overall quality of teaching (Kyriacou, 1987). Teachers often lower their level of time and energy in job involvement as a result of stress (Blase, 1982, 1986). Prolonged stress can result in burnout (Blase, 1986; Farber, 1984a, 1984b). Consequences of burnout include diminished job satisfaction, reduced teacher-pupil rapport and pupil motivation, and decreased teacher effectiveness in meeting educational goals (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b). Public school administrators need to focus on their teachers' level of stress and symptoms of burnout, which can be different in rural and urban school systems.

Several definitions of stress have been offered. A general definition characterizes stress, as a process in which environmental forces threaten an individual's well being. Teacher stress is specifically defined as conditions of negative effects, such as frustration and anxiety, that result from aspects of the job and that are perceived by teachers as a threat to their psychological or physical well-being (Kyriacou, 1987; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b). One model of teacher stress defines stress as a response syndrome

mediated by an appraisal of threat to the teacher's self-esteem or well-being (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978a). In that model, the appraisal of threat to well-being is the main mechanism for mediating the experience of stress. Coping mechanisms are subsequently activated to reduce the personal threat and mediate the stress-response syndrome (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978a). Therefore, the experience of stress results from the teachers' perceptions of demands, the inability or difficulty in meeting such demands stemming from a lack of effective coping resources, and the ultimate threat to the teachers' mental or physical well-being. That model is related to the transactional model of stress offered by Lazarus (1966) and Lazarus and Folkman (1984).

According to the transactional model, stress depends on an individual's cognitive appraisal of events and circumstances and on the ability to cope, the end result of a person's transaction with the environment. An individual's coping strategy is constantly changing to manage specific demands that are appraised as exceeding the person's resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As long as the individual's coping ability is not exceeded, no consequences of long-term stress need be experienced (Hiebert & Farber, 1984). However, coping with stress in the work environment can be less effective because many aspects of the work situation that are stressful tend to lie outside the individual's control (Kyriacou, 1981). The general level of alertness required by teachers in meeting potentially threatening and various demands may explain why the experience of stress is so prevalent (Kyriacou, 1987). Cox and Brockley (1984) concluded that "work appears as a major source of stress for working people, with teachers appearing to experience more stress through work than nonteachers."

The sources of teacher stress are multidimensional (Borg & Riding, 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzone, 1991; Boyle, Borg, Falzon, & Baglioni, 1995; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b). An early study by Coates and Thorsen (1976) found that commonly reported sources of teacher stress include time demands, clerical duties, difficulties with pupils, motivation and control of students, large classes, financial constraints, and lack of educational supplies. Later studies reported that the numerous sources of stress could be grouped into the four major categories of pupil misbehaviour (Borg & Riding 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon 1991; Boyle, Borg, Falzon, Baglioni 1995; Coldicott, 1985), poor working conditions (Borg & Riding 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon 1991; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b; Rowsey & Ley, 1986), time pressures (Borg & Riding 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon 1991; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b), and poor school ethos-staff relations (Borg & Riding 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon 1991; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b). Other studies cite students' poor attitudes (Kyriacou, 1987; Tokar & Feitler, 1986) and workload (Blase, 1986; Boyle, Borg, Falzon, Baglioni 1995.) as additional primary sources of teacher stress. Finally, teacher stress appears more prevalent in larger school systems than in smaller school systems (Green-Reese, Johnson, & Campbell, 1991; Reese & Johnson, 1988).

Relationships with pupils have been suggested as the most important source of stress for teachers (Tellenback, Brenner, & Lofgren, 1983). Several studies have indicated that disruptive pupil behaviour is consistently a predictor, if not the best predictor, of teacher stress (Borg & Riding, 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon, 1991; Boyle et al., 1995; Byrne, 1994; Coates & Thorsen, 1976; Coldicott, 1985; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b). However, other studies have suggested that stress from pupil



misbehaviour per se may be overrated when considering the impact of other sources of stress such as poor student attitudes, heavy workload, and time-resource difficulties (Feitler & Tokar, 1982; Hart, 1994; Hart, Wearing, & Conn, 1995; Kyriacou, 1987; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978b).

Feitler and Tokar (1982) reported that teachers ranked the consistent misbehaviour of individual students and not the overall quality of pupil behaviour, as highly stressful. Kyriacou (1987) suggested that continual stress from daily conflicts is probably more stressful than intermittent stressful encounters with a few problem students. Finally, Tokar and Feitler (1986) proposed that pupil misbehaviour might be stressful in relation to a poor school discipline policy. Most current studies do indicate that stress from pupil misbehaviour, workload, and time-resource allocation are the primary sources of teacher stress (Borg, Riding, & Falzon, 1991; Boyle et al., 1995).

Prolonged stress associated with the gradual erosion of important technical, psychological, and social resources can result in burnout (Blase, 1982, 1986; Farber, 1984b). Maslach and Jackson (1981) suggested that burnout among individuals who do "people work" could be characterized as multidimensional, that is, composed of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (see also Byrne, 1994). Emotional exhaustion includes increased feelings of depleted emotional resources and feelings of not being able to provide oneself to others at a psychological level. Depersonalization occurs when an individual develops negative attitudes toward students because of depleted emotional resources. Finally, burnout is associated with suppressed feelings of personal accomplishment and a negative evaluation of oneself (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, 1986). Research invariably identifies job-related stress as the

major factor in the etiology of the burnout syndrome (Blase, 1982, 1986); hence, the need for effective coping strategies targeting sources of stress becomes even more apparent (Bertoch Nielsen, Curley, & Borg, 1989; Dewe, 1986; Dunham, 1994; Jenkins & Calhoun, 1991).

Teacher burnout is a concern of many educators and is often caused by high levels of prolonged stress related to inordinate time demands, inadequate collegial relationships, large class size, lack of resources, isolation, fear of violence, role ambiguity, limited promotional opportunities, lack of support and involvement in decision making, and student behavioural problems (Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, & Bassler, 1988; Cunningham, 1983; Friedman, 1991, 1995). Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978b) found that difficult classes, behaviour problems, shortages of equipment, too much paper work, and demands on after-school time are major predictors of teacher burnout. Furthermore, overall classroom climate was found to be a major variable in the process of teacher burnout (Byrne, 1994). That finding suggests that, as the climate of the classroom deteriorates, teachers can become emotionally exhausted, develop negative attitudes toward their students and their job, and accomplish few educational goals for their students.

In summary, burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism occurring in the teaching profession. Research studies have cited the main causes of teacher burnout as (1) lack of administrative support, (2) lack of parental and community support, (3) workload, (4) low student motivation, and (5) discipline problems. While this study has identified previous findings in relation to burnout it will focus on one main source of the burnout phenomena: teacher workload.

### *Comparison Workload Studies*

How much time do schoolteachers devote to work? Although a variety of answers to this question exist, expectations are that teachers would experience time pressures that would lead to a spill over of schoolwork into family life. Drawing on aspects of numerous previous research studies, a local perspective of teacher workload was investigated. The basis of this current study was to compare perceived workload commitments and the impact it had on the daily lives of teachers in a school district's elementary, junior high, and high school setting. Research background provided here will build a foundation for comparison of global workload studies and provide insight into the current level of teacher *expected time* required to fulfil professional duties and time devoted to out of school instruction.

Motivated by an interest in time pressures and how workers deal with such pressures, Drago et al (1999) drew upon the "Time, Work and Family Project" (an American project format). Drago et al. decided to steer away from previous studies of working time for teachers using broad questions for inquiry. Using data collected using the "Time, Work and Family Project" their study investigated the amount of time that full-time, elementary school teachers devote to work. Six estimates of working time were compared using three levels of information from the district, school, and individual teacher/family. These included: (1) contractual working time, (2) standard time diary measure of working time, (3) face time (with staff, colleagues, students), or physical presence at work, (4) work invasiveness or the amount of time work invades an individual's time, (5) housework time, and (6) total hours of housework and teaching-

related activities. Further they examined the relationship between the measures of working time.

This project collected data using surveys, time diaries, and telephone interviews, which were administered by the Institute for Survey and Policy Research at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, during the 1997-98 school year. In the analysis presented, researchers used time diary data for a sample of full-time, elementary school teachers in four, urban, public school districts in the United States. Data from a time diary survey that they incorporated suggested that the average elementary school teacher works almost two hours more per day than the time required by contract. The findings, however, also showed that the choice of measurement substantially affects time estimates.

The first and most important task in determining time pressures placed on teachers is to generate an accurate estimate of how teachers spend their time. The accuracy of such estimates is critical to understanding how policies and practices both at work and at home function to alleviate or exacerbate such pressures. The study also explores the relationships between the measures of working time. For example, we find a systematic relationship between standard diary time and face time, such that as diary time increased, so does face time, but by a much smaller amount.

According to Drago's (1999) study, recent interest in working time stems from the assertion that, due to a variety of structural changes in the nature of employment and its relationship to the family, the North American workforce has become increasingly overworked. This argument has sparked intense debate. Two arguments are offered for why North American society is overworked and time pressured. First, the emphasis on attainment of a "better" quality of life has forced changes to the family financial

structure. Families are increasingly characterized by having dual earners--a phenomenon currently applying to 78 % of all married employees. Dual-earner families are largely the result of married women entering the workforce. For those women in particular, this shift has likely created pressures to manage work responsibilities as well as household tasks. Public elementary school teachers in urban schools fit this mold quite well. Eighty-seven percent of these teachers are women, 72 % are members of dual-earner couples, and 57 % are parents of dependent children.

A second argument explaining the overworked society is that time pressures result from attempts by industry to become more competitive in the global economy. In response to a variety of economic pressures, many firms have introduced high commitment work systems. High commitment work systems involve increased levels of teamwork, training, meetings, and involvement in the job and decisions around the job, all of which increases demands on employees. Similar initiatives and related demands on employees have been mirrored in teachers' jobs. For instance, poverty and accompanying decreases in tax bases in urban centres have motivated school administrators to introduce their own versions of high commitment work systems. There is some evidence that recent initiatives in the field of education, such as Accelerated Schooling and site-based management, which are intended to produce high commitment work systems in schools, may be adding to the demands already placed on teachers. Increasing levels of urban poverty also function as an additional source of workload and stress on teachers, carrying increased behavioural and performance problems among students. In the average school of Drago's (1999) sample population, 58.2 % of the children are from families who are financially near or below the poverty line. The higher the proportion of students in

poverty, the more the teacher is called upon to deal with difficult discipline problems and other conditions antithetical to a good learning environment. For all of these reasons, our expectations are that the Time, Work and Family sample has experienced substantial pressures on their time.

In their an effort to dissect the complexity of teachers' workload, C. Easthope, and G. Easthope, (2000) teachers in Tasmania, Australia, gave accounts of their experience of increased workload in the 10 years between 1984 and 1994. They reported working longer hours, teaching more students and having increased professional, pastoral and administrative duties. The reasons for this increased workload include: (1) less money being spent on education, (2) changes in student assessment from a norm basis to a criterion basis, (3) a change in the administrative structure within the state colleges in which most respondents teach and (4) a change in the student population. The result, they reported, was that their workload both increased and extended (intensified) leading to a much more complex workplace. Significantly, complexity was also produced by the attempt of teachers to maintain their professional commitment while adapting to the economic rationalist policies of administrators. However, loss of teachers through redundancy, stress, and a move to part-time work has meant that those teachers remaining have had to rationalise their work and reduce their professional commitment.

Campbell and Neill (1991) investigated the amount of time secondary school teachers spent working and the types of work activities they were engaged in. The weekly mean time spent on work was 54.4 hours. Teachers spent an average of 16.9 hours teaching and 12.9 hours in preparation, 18.1 hours in administration, 5.3 hours in in-

service training and 4.1 hours in other activities. Nearly 40% of the respondents felt that their academic background was not well matched to their current teaching assignment.

Livingstone (1994) studied the roles and workloads of primary school teachers. He looked at the changes in workload and how the resulting pressures affected teachers' professional work, students, and life outside school.

In addition to spending an average of 33 hours per week at school to conduct classes, prepare lessons, attend staff meetings, and fulfil a variety of school-related responsibilities, the average full-time public school teacher in the United States worked an average of 12 additional hours per week before and after school and on weekends during the 1993-1994 school year, according to statistics released by the U.S. National Center for Education Studies. Teachers spent 3 of these hours in activities involving students and 9 hours in other school-related work, such as marking and grading papers, preparing lessons, and meeting with parents.

Data published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development indicate that in 1992 the average amount of time per year public school teachers at the primary level spent teaching (excluding other school responsibilities) in 15 countries (mostly European) was 858 hours. The range ran from a low in Sweden of 624 hours to a high of 1,093 hours in the United States.

The British Columbia Teachers' Federation (2001) provided four reports about teacher workload and stress. In analysing the results of the English Teaching Workload Survey Questionnaire, Naylor and Malcomson (2001) recorded that secondary English teachers worked more than 53 hours a week while school classes were in session. On average, 19 hours per week were spent on preparation and marking. Further, they

reported that workload levels has increased in recent years and felt that the school organization played a major role in determining teacher perceptions of workload with semester-based schools showing the highest levels of dissatisfaction in areas of organization of preparation time. Many teachers reported having to adjust their teaching methods to cope with workload pressures. Such adjustments were driven by workload-coping requirements rather than pedagogical factors. Their survey also indicated widespread symptoms of stress and varying abilities to cope with stress by the respondents.

Qualitative data from the BCTF Worklife on Teachers Survey Series, 1: Workload and Stress indicate that B.C. teachers have a heavy workload and that many suffer from stress induced by a variety of causes, including: a large volume of work; a wide range of workload duties that have changed over time; changing class composition; seasonal pressures with intense periods of work in addition to regular loads; extensive curriculum changes, and finally, a wide range of expectations from government, employers, school administrators, and parents. Teachers identified four factors--time, resources, support and respect--as essential for a manageable workload, and felt these factors were lacking. The findings from this data (Naylor, 2001b; Schaefer, 2001a,b) closely matched the findings in the international literature on teacher workload and stress (Dinham & Scott, 2000; Drago et al. 1999; and Naylor, 2001a).

Schaefer's (2001b) study asked teachers to report the number of weeks of the nine-week summer vacation in 2000 that they had spent in each of the following activities: taking holidays; teaching summer school; working in employment other than



teaching summer school; taking education courses; volunteering; preparing for the upcoming school year; and engaging in other activities.

While teachers had technically had nine weeks of vacation during the summer of 2000, not all of this time was taken as traditional holidays. Survey results indicated that 25% of B.C. teachers took less than two weeks holidays. Approximately 33% took three weeks or less. On average 58% of the teachers used their summer vacation as holidays. Younger teachers took less time off than older teachers and teachers with fewer than 10 years of teaching experience took the shortest holidays.

About 7% of teachers spent part of the summer teaching summer school; 17% worked at a job other than teaching; 22% taught or did other paid work during part of the summer and about 2% held another job and taught summer school. Approximately 16% of the teachers spent part of their summer in the classroom, learning new pedagogy and content for the upcoming school year; 13% volunteered their services and 74% of the teachers responding spent one week of their summer vacation preparing for the upcoming school year.

#### *Teacher Workload: Truth and Perceptions*

To deliver high quality education, schools must attract, develop, and retain effective teachers. Working conditions play an important role in a school's ability to do so. Schools that are able to offer their teachers a safe, pleasant, and supportive working environment and adequate compensation are better able to attract and retain good teachers and motivate them to do their best. Teachers' working conditions are important to students as well as teachers because they affect how much individual attention teachers

can give to students. Large class sizes or disruptive students, for example, can make both teaching and learning difficult.

Some aspects of teachers' working conditions go along with the job regardless of where a teacher works. For example, teacher salaries tend to be low relative to those earned by similarly qualified individuals in other professions regardless of the type or location of the school. Other aspects of teachers' working conditions, such as school safety, vary widely from school to school. Thus, in addition to being concerned about teachers' working conditions in general, we need to pay attention to the types of schools that tend to have desirable or difficult working conditions and, for equity reasons, to the characteristics of the students who attend them.

Studies presented here describe a number of aspects of teachers' working conditions, including workload, compensation, school and district support for teachers' professional development, school decision making, school safety, student readiness to learn, and public respect for teachers.

There is extensive literature on teachers' work, including Apple (1986), Connell (1985), Durbridge (1991), Hargreaves (1990, 1992, 1994), Lee, Dedrick & Smith (1991), Lingard, Knight & Porter (1993), Ozga (1988), Seddon (1990, 1991), Thapan (1986) and Watkins (1993). All these writers point to the demands made upon teachers, with the more recent writings strongly suggesting these demands are increasing. Lieberman (1988) described the teaching situation as one requiring more work, more students and less time, and as being more instrumental, less expressive, less effective, less satisfying, and less professional than in the past.

For most of these writers, these changes are theorised using labour process theory, which sees the changes in education as part of a post Fordist shift in capitalism. A key implication of post Fordism for education is the attempt to relate education more closely to industry (Watkins, 1994). This has particular implications for the curriculum in that there is a move towards teaching competencies rather than providing general education (Soucek, 1994). For teachers, the moves to link education directly to corporate industrial goals has meant a massive shift in the nature of their work. This shift has been conceptualised as a process of intensification. This concept, originally posited by Larson (1980) is developed by Apple (1982) and Hargreaves (1994). Hargreaves (1994, p. 108) describes intensification of teachers' work as, the “bureaucratically driven escalation of pressures, expectations and controls concerning what teachers do and how much they should do within the teaching day.” The characteristic features of intensification (Hargreaves, 1994, pp. 118-120) are:

- (a) a lack of time, with no time for relaxation and no time to update skills;
- (b) the creation of chronic and persistent overload;
- (c) the replacement of time spent caring for students with time meeting administrative demands;
- (d) the enforced diversification of expertise;
- (e) the production of packaged curricula and packaged pedagogy.

Hargreaves (1994, p. 120) argues that many teachers “voluntarily consort with the imperatives of intensification,” seeing it as a move towards professionalisation.

Hargreaves then, through qualitative analysis of interviews with teachers in Toronto in 1987, explores the effects of intensification with particular reference to preparation time,

an issue over which teachers came out on strike. Hargreaves' work demonstrated quite clearly that intensification did affect teachers' perception of their work in Toronto in 1987. However, all the effects on teachers' work could not be explained by intensification. The increasing effort teachers put in was sometimes explained by their commitment to a professional ethos.

### *Summary*

The literature on workload reveals both the complexity of the concept and the varied ways used to measure it. Workload, in its narrowest definition--number of classes and number of students--is relatively simple to measure. The more expansive the definition poses vastly different measurement problems. With this in mind, the first research question--*What is the nature of teacher workload?*-- and the second--*How can teacher workloads be best conceptualized, categorized and portrayed?*--were answered by identifying the common themes and elements indicating workload concerns expressed by teachers in the literature reviewed. The focus of this study was then to apply those categories identified to a sample that was *not* random in its respondent selection, *also* to use a survey and a logbook component for gathering of data, and look at a *district-wide* response by teachers as a means of narrowing the degree of uncommon conditions eliminating those that were not applicable to the particular district status. These could be defined as: (1) student variables (for example demographics and socio-economic status, school variables such as teaching assignment, class size and composition), (2) teaching variables (such as experience and learning), (3) regulatory variables (such as school acts and school authority policies), and finally, (4) parental and societal variables (including

multiculturalism, inter-agency collaboration, parental support, community support, and provincial, national and global influences).

### *Themes*

Investigation into the support for concern regarding working conditions and teacher effectiveness produced several key themes:

- The Teachers and personal professional growth
- The Teachers and their workplace
- The Teachers and their working conditions
- The Teachers and their students
- The Teachers and their community

These themes permeate the vast research that defines the core of both teacher workload problems and teacher stress. Not surprisingly, an exploration of these themes suggests answers to many of the queries shareholders of education are faced with in addressing teacher dissatisfaction and demoralization today. Indicators identifying the quality of educational practices and teacher welfare initiatives that provide a healthy and safe teaching environment can emerge in either a positive or negative way. In other words, if one indicator is, or is not being met, results will have a significant effect on teacher well being. As well, that impact is conveyed to the classroom and students. Negative factors causes teacher stress to escalate accordingly. Chronic stress disposes more teachers to burnout. Overall however, the notion of workload remains as one of the top categories, in most studies, that teachers identified as instrumental in the burnout factor.

### *Common Elements for Investigation*

The nature of teachers' workload studies have also produced common elements that could be conceptualised and categorized. These could include the commitment of time devoted by teachers *inside* and *outside* the classroom to instruction, supervision, planning, professional growth initiatives, committee work, coaching, field trips, and community activities based on their school's involvement with business partnerships, parents, and other organizations of the educational nature.

### *Survey and Logbook*

For the purposes of this study, a blend of the survey and logbook methods employed by other researchers was formatted. Attention was given to the emphasis of the Mandated Professional Growth Plans implemented (Teacher Growth, Supervision and Evaluation Policy No. 631, Lethbridge School District No. 51, and Alberta Education Policy 2.1.5 1998) and how teachers would view their workload with these new procedures and regulations in mind.

Various studies have incorporated a variety of measuring devices for investigation into teacher workload. Drago et al. (1999) study, "The Time, Work and Family Project" utilized the idea of a time diary for teachers to overcome biases that they felt were an outcome of the survey method of gathering data. Most studies have been presented as the result of the survey method like Statistics Canada (Schembari, 1994) in the Labor Force Survey. This same concept has been used by the Alberta Teachers' Association Studies (ATA) which conducted workload studies in 1979, 1981, 1986, and 1990 (published 1991). The first three were one-page surveys, in which teachers were asked to list the

amount of assigned instructional time per week. The 1990 study asked teachers to record the actual instructional time spent on a specific day, namely October 24, 1990.

While these studies gave an accurate picture on the amount of time teachers spent on instruction, *none* asked teachers how much time was spent on teaching activities outside assigned instructional and preparation time. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF) initiated a comprehensive study in 1994 in which they also utilized the daily diary method. They completed a daily diary for two weeks, and the results, mostly anecdotal, were published in June, 1995. It was felt that a study of this magnitude and nature, involving active ATA members, would be useful in Alberta.

Clearly, it was ascertained that both the survey component and the diary concept would be essential to this particular study. Aspects of each were drawn from these main studies and blended to provide the unique design presented in this project that will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Research Methodology and Design

#### *Introduction*

What is the nature of teacher workload? There is a perception among some that teachers work five-hour days and enjoy three months of annual vacation. However, numerous activities and professional obligations require many hours beyond those readily apparent. Previous research has shown teacher's workload has increased and changed. As government funding for education declines, many school boards are reacting by increasing class sizes, reducing preparation time and increasing instructional time for teachers. This, together with increased professional development activities and growth plans, has required changes in both the workweek and the structure of teachers' work. At this point then we need to consider the evolving nature of teachers' workload, how it may be conceptualised, categorized, and measured in light of the research questions and goals of this study.

It is from these themes identified through previous researchers that this study drew its major focus. To accurately portray the working lives and workloads of the Local #41 members, specific research questions, data gathering devices, and methodology format were constructed. The emphasis on investigating *only* responses by teachers was critical in comparing that present state of working conditions to those documented in the province and globally prior to this study. Therefore, only the teacher survey and logbook responses will be examined in the remainder of this project.



### *Development of Research Instruments*

In order to answer this study's remaining research questions (*How much do teachers work outside of working hours? What tasks occupy teachers inside and outside of school? Are there variations in teacher workloads across contexts? How does this district compare to other districts similar in size in terms of workload?*) and connect the above themes to their relevance with workload in the Local, a blend of data collection devices and methods were constructed. Specifically, the following studies were used: "The Policy Analysis Unit of Warwick University " (Campbell & Neill, 1990) that initiated several studies on teacher time in England and Wales; "The Scottish Council for Research in Education" (Johnstone, 1993a) that investigated teacher workload as it affected stress, "The Wellington District Council in New Zealand" (Livingstone, 1994) which commissioned a study of teacher workload; "The Alberta Teacher's Workload Study" (1997) in which teachers used a logbook to record time spent on teaching activities both in and out of school, and "The Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation Study " (1995) that used the diary concept to identify time constraints placed on them by workload commitments, and finally, "The Time, Work, and Family Project" (Drago et al., 1999) that linked teachers' work to societal trends in which Drago provided evidence that the nature of work and society have changed, and that education has mirrored commercial demands to "do more with less," were used as templates for this study.

A survey and logbook were constructed, a specific timeline was followed, and a specific set of questions was developed to gather teacher responses to this study's main research questions: (1) What is the nature of your workload? (2) How can your workload

be conceptualised, categorized and portrayed? (3) How much time do you devote to school work outside of working hours? (4) What tasks occupy your time inside and outside school ?

Underlying these teacher-related inquiries, was the need to gather evidence for the understanding of variations in teacher workloads across different subsets (elementary, junior high, and high school) and how this particular local compared to other research results utilizing similar data collection devices. Unique to this study was the formation of a survey section titled, “Professional Activities,” which was broken down into categories that provided in-depth comparisons of common time commitments by teachers, regardless of subset to provincially mandated professional growth plans.

This project was intended to be quantitative. The use of the logbook was instrumental in gathering research data. The teacher surveys were developed to afford unique perspectives on common issues and concerns that had been previously identified to the Economic Policy Committee (EPC) and fell under the responsibility of the Working Conditions Committee (WCC) of Local #41. Rather than use a diary, like the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation (1995) study used, the logbook was deemed more applicable to the needs of the researcher. Specific data about actual teacher hours devoted to professional activities would allow comparisons to previous studies. Distinct insight into the time teachers were using in their pursuit of professional growth objectives was the focal point of the teacher logbook. In addition, a method of comparing the three subsets of teachers in the system was necessary. It was felt that the logbook would take less time to complete than a daily diary. Also, the survey could be completed during the same

time as the week-long requirement for those teachers undertaking the logbook component of the project.

The components of this project included the teacher survey (Appendix A), and the Logbook (Appendix B). Essential to the study, was the questionnaire at the end of the logbook (Appendix C) that asked teachers open-ended questions about the organization of their workload. The responses to these questions were to aid the Local in establishing a better understanding of teachers' views of workload upon completion of the logbook.

The teacher survey was divided into six major sections: (a) teaching assignment, (b) out of school commitment, (c) field trips, (d) supervision, (e) co-curricular involvement, and (f) professional activities. Teachers were asked to document time spent on each of the above categories of work.

The logbook was designed to be as easy as possible to complete. Each day was divided into ten-minute intervals. A list of activities was compiled from the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation (1995) study. Each activity was given an acronym, which was to be written beside the appropriate time slot (Appendix D). Teachers were asked to code each portion of their workday in order to document nature of work and gravity of time spent in that particular activity.

#### Sample

The project was completed with the support of the Local # 41 of the ATA and Lethbridge Public School District #51. All the four hundred fifty-four teachers in the district were requested to complete the teacher survey. Teachers, who volunteered to participate in the logbook component of the project, were given a gift certificate upon successful completion of the logbook. Numerous studies in the past (ATA Working

Conditions Survey 1979,1981, 1986, 1991) had randomly selected teachers from a database that was not specific to one jurisdiction. This project was implemented with the conditions placed on it by the WCC on behalf of the Local, and with the guidance of the NSC of the district and under the auspicious of the ATA.

Teachers were asked to complete the teacher survey identifying them as either working at an elementary, junior high or senior high school. Those teachers in schools that encompassed both elementary and junior high or junior high and senior high school, were asked to identify their majority of instructional time as the factor for determination of subset.

Classifying of the teachers created nine categories: (a) male elementary, (b) male junior high/middle, (c) male senior high, (d) female elementary, (f) female junior high/middle, (g) female senior high. Logbook teacher volunteers were classified in the same nine categories listed above as teachers.

There were eighteen schools involved in this project. They consisted of four high schools, three junior high/middle schools and twelve elementary schools. The desired number of teachers to be involved in the logbook component was set at fifty for an acceptable representation of population. An acceptable teacher response number to the survey was set at thirty percent of the total teacher population of the district.

#### Data Collection Device

The use of a survey consisting of three parts (teacher survey, principal survey, and teacher logbook) and had been recommended by the Working Conditions Committee (WCC) as a viable and expedient tool in the gathering of specific items of concern, however, the principal survey will *not* be used at this time and in this study. These items

had been identified by the WCC as a response to ATA provincial suggestions regarding solicitation of teacher's working conditions. Previous studies had been of a random provincial jurisdiction nature. Based on the fore mentioned criteria, the WCC thought that a district wide survey would best meet the needs on a local level. In addition, the applicability of the results in ongoing Provincial ATA studies would also be met.

To encourage a high return rate on a system wide survey, three workshops were conducted by the researcher. At these workshops emphasis was placed on the need for an accurate depiction of the working atmosphere of teacher. The need for establishing a solid foundation of real life teacher professional and personal commitments in terms of time were to be the backbone of negotiation strategies for the WCC as they prepared for emerging negotiations. Detailed instruction to the valid recording of time and activities was presented at the workshops to the individual school representatives. The survey was administered during a staff meeting as part of the scheduled ATA component. In order to assist teachers, a comprehensive list of descriptors (Appendix D) was provided to ensure accurate recording and to assist the in-servicing personnel with administering the survey and logbook.

#### *Part 1: Teacher Survey*

One ATA representative from each school was asked to administer a brief survey to all teachers on staff during a staff meeting and collecting them immediately upon completion.

#### *Part 2: Teacher Activity Log*

This is a booklet that was used to gather critical information for comparison in an ATA study on teacher workload. The booklet was to be given to 55 teachers in the Local.

Selection of those teachers was guided by a set of criteria established by WCC and an incentive of a \$25.00 gift certificate was agreed upon when completed.

In addition, the author provided two workshops prior to the implementation of the survey and logbook to assist representatives in the managing of this undertaking.

#### *Time Schedule*

- Selection of Logbook week of March 6-12, 2000
- Selection of Teacher Survey at the March 10, Staff Meeting
- Workshops for ATA Representatives March 2, and March 3, 2000
- Data Collection deadline March 15, 2000
- WCC information sharing session March 18, 2000

The study took place the week of March 6-12, 2000. Various reasons for this week to be chosen included: no teacher conventions, no semester breaks, no holidays, no parent-teacher interviews, no reports card due, and no major professional development activities scheduled. Hence, it was identified as a “typical” week across all three subsets. Initially, a two-day workshop had been administered to the ATA Representatives of each school. Teacher surveys were to be completed at scheduled staff meetings at the end of that week. Logbooks were distributed to any teacher who requested them after the initial meetings ATA Representatives had at their schools prior to the week selected for this study. All information and logbooks were to be returned to the ATA Local Office no later than Wednesday, March 15, 2000. Upon receiving the documents all identifying information was to be removed and strict confidentiality was to be adhered to by the researcher.

## Ethical Considerations

From the inception of this study, every effort was made to protect the confidentiality of the participants. Permission to proceed with this research was directed and obtained by the Local Executive, EPC and WCC chairs, and with unanimous approval of the various principals in the district. The survey contained a statement to the use of data collected (Appendix A) and a letter of intent and permission to administer the survey to its members (Appendix I) was obtained from the Local. Adherence to the Professional Code of Ethics, and the Freedom of Information Privacy Act (FOIP) requirements of participants was stressed. During the school ATA Representatives workshops, it was pointed out that this research was conducted by the researcher on behalf of the Economic Policy Committee and the Working Conditions Committees of the Local #41 of the ATA. Assurances were supplied that were to be reviewed at the school level by the ATA Representatives, that only the researcher and the ATA secretary would be viewing material collected. Both the survey and the logbook noted that the compiled data could be made available to other researchers with approval of the EPC.

It was expected that teachers (Appendix A) would fill out each survey component as honestly and accurately as possible. For those that were participating in the logbook activity (Appendix B), an assumption was made that they would make entries in the logbook regularly and honestly. Time allotment for activities was to be discretionary and truthful. Verification of survey completion was to be twofold. First, by the ATA Representatives in a coded system for teacher verification of criteria that had been pre-established to ensure validity and confidentiality. This included membership in the Local

ATA #41 and a full-time equivalent contract in the Lethbridge Public School District #51. Secondly, each survey was to be verified for any discrepancies that may have been forwarded to the author for clarification and rectified before final submission. Once the data had been tabulated, the original documents were sealed and placed in a secure area at the Local office.

Surveys and logbooks were returned by inter-school mail marked, “confidential” and the identifying marks were removed. An assistant opened and discarded envelopes, verified that the data was complete, checked off each participant’s name, tabulated the data in the spreadsheet for collection, and removed any names or schools from the surveys. Once all the data had been properly tabulated, any material concerning the participants’ involvement in this study was destroyed.

### *Summary*

Changes in workweek may indicate changes in the way we conceptualise and measure workload data with a certain school. As a response to requests by the Local, this study was directed to investigate inquiries to teacher workload for its WCC and EPC committees. For the purpose of this study, the following goals were to be referred to when measuring the Local’s teachers responses to their workload.

1. To establish a historical document for future reference as members of the local head into the new millennium.
2. To determine how much time teachers spend on teaching and school related activities and how these differ for various subsets of teachers.
3. To provide significant and accurate data for comparison in ongoing ATA research.

These results would assist provincial wide studies attempting to accurately find



factual information concerning the amount of time teachers spend doing professional duties.

4. To attempt to provide data useful to educate the public and education “shareholders” about the time and activities required, beyond actual instruction, teachers provide in the course of their working assignment.
5. To provide local Economic Working Conditions and Negotiation Committees of Local #41 with accurate and valid information about the present state of members working realities.

The blending of previous research instruments and formats enabled this study to accurately determine the nature of the workload of the teachers in the Local by using the survey and diary method. In the next chapter a closer look at the specific implications and results of this study will be presented.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Data Analysis and Results

#### *Introduction*

Following a discussion of survey and logbook return rates, this chapter will present data which will address the main research questions. Included will be an analysis of the nature of teacher workloads by: (1) how teachers extra work can be conceptualised and portrayed, (2) how teachers extra work varies across individuals and schools, (3) an examination of the differences between subsets, (4) comparisons to other districts and finally, (5) a summary of the findings.

#### *Survey Return Rates*

The study of teachers' workload in Local #41 was made possible by the substantial survey response from Lethbridge School District # 51 teachers from elementary, junior high, and high school levels (Table 1). It is important to draw attention to the level of response for two reasons: (1) the degree of interest shown by the respondents in learning more about their actual workload and, (2) to show that data gathered are almost evenly distributed between elementary teachers (grades 1-6) and secondary teachers (grades 7-12). This indicates a reliable sample and district-wide description of teachers' workloads. Furthermore, the return rate from individual schools that ranged from a low of 52% to 100% with a mean of 79.8% and 71.2% and 84.5% for high, junior high, and elementary school showed adequate return rates which represent each schools' nature, context, and culture.

Table 1

## Survey Subset Return Percent

School	# of Teachers	Surveys Returned	%
High School 1	56	51	91
High School 2	14	9	64
High School 3	13	12	92
High School 4	36	23	54
Total	119	95	79.8

  

School	# of Teachers	Surveys Returned	%
Jr. High 1	23	15	65
Jr. High 2	26	26	100
Jr. High 3	31	16	52
Total	80	57	71.2

  

School	# of Teachers	Surveys Returned	%
Elementary 1	22	22	100
Elementary 2	16	13	81
Elementary 3	18	13	72
Elementary 4	19	18	95
Elementary 5	9	7	78
Elementary 6	16	16	100
Elementary 7	21	17	74
Elementary 8	15	11	73
Elementary 9	14	9	64
Elementary 10	6	6	100
Elementary 11	13	12	92
Elementary 12	12	9	75
Total	181	153	84.5

The second component of the survey based on daily logbooks. The log was intended to capture an in-depth look at the life of a teacher-- recorded by examining a typical week of a teacher. They were asked to track: (1) teacher activities, (2) professional activities and (3) home activities. Using the typical week as the starting point, teachers tabulating the logbook were asked to complete their workweek and their weekend commitments on prescribed components. The main question explored was, "what does a teacher do during a typical week to fulfil their teaching mandate?"

A total of 106 logbooks were requested and 106 were returned successfully completed. Of the 106, 58 were elementary teachers, 23 were high school and 25 were from the junior high subset (Table 2).

In closer analysis of this component of the study, it was clear that most of the respondents were veteran teachers. Since the district has a considerable number of older teachers (both in age and experience) the data underscored a sense of what is it like to be a teacher at more mature stages of teachers' careers.

Table 2

Logbook Profile

Subset	# of Male	Avg. Age	Avg. Yrs Exp	# of Female	Avg. Age	Avg. Yrs Exp
Elementary	8	46.1	19.8	50	42.3	16.2
Junior/Middle	14	41.7	17.1	11	39.2	11.5
High	10	36.7	9.4	6	39.3	10.8
Totals	36	41.5	15.4	70	40.3	12.8

As intended, the survey could form an integral part of Local #41's EPC and WCC planning sessions in developing a sound basis for recommendations to the local board concerning the views of the district's teachers. With this in mind, efforts were made by the EPC and WCC to promote distinction between *what* the teachers perceived their workload and working conditions were and the reality of their professional obligations. The EPC and WCC committees were able to accurately place a finger on the pulse of teachers' working lives and commitments to the profession for the first time in the Local's history. Moreover, it provided a sound rationale for the Local's request to have an accurate document to track information for various education stakeholders concerned with the current state of teacher workload.

*What is the nature of teacher workloads?*

*How can teacher workload best be conceptualized, categorized, and portrayed?*

*What tasks occupy teachers inside and outside school?*

These research questions in relation to teachers' extra work can be addressed in two ways. Firstly, the derivation of research instruments and categories of "extra" work (activities over and above those considered contractual in nature) represent a conceptualisation of the nature of teachers' extra work. Secondly, from the data gathered through the survey and logbook, profiles of what the average teacher does in the way of extra work at each level are presented and discussed.

#### *Research Instruments*

The research instruments chosen for this study reflect the current nature of teachers' workload within the Alberta context. These instruments have provided significant guidance for workload studies during the past 10 years, in particular with regard to how workload can be categorized and measured effectively. What is problematic is how to describe teachers' workloads across jurisdictions and countries with differing conditions, contexts, and contractual circumstances, and which activities are measurable and which are not. Many differences exist that make cross jurisdiction comparisons difficult. This study offers the unique perspective of *one* district, with a *three-subset level* comparison that can easily be contrasted and compared with on-going provincial workload studies. Most importantly, this study provides teachers of the district means to compare themselves with: (1) their school colleagues, (2) other similar schools and teachers in same grade division or subset, (3) other subsets in the district, (4) the

province and other ATA studies in teacher workload and, (5) global teacher workload studies.

The second and third research questions are answered by the nature of the design of the survey and logbook, and the results therein.

The project survey was designed in a manner that allowed comparisons of categories previously established in teacher workload research. Broadly, the teacher survey addressed: (1) professional activities and, (2) school required time activities. Each of the subsets are displayed as a district-wide view (Appendix E) and, further defined as individual school based data in a particular subset (Appendix F and Appendix G) and, recorded according to established teacher survey descriptors explained in more detail in below.

The teacher activity logbook component was designed to allow respondents to record time spent in: (1) school activities, (2) professional activities and, (3) home activities and, (4) to complete a questionnaire regarding additional background information or a professional and personal nature.

#### *Professional Activities (Teacher Survey)*

Professional activities are defined as those activities that are considered to be part of the working life of a teacher. They are personal, obligatory, and/or can be volunteer in nature. The categories of professional activities that the Local's teachers were requested to document are defined as follows:

#### *Professional Growth Plan*

Each teacher who holds a probationary or continuing contract is required to develop and implement a growth plan annually. School boards may also require other

certificated or non-certificated staff to have a growth plan. A growth plan targets an area for professional growth each year. It may focus on an area a teacher would like to improve or it may build upon a strength a teacher possesses. The province requires that a teacher's professional growth plan (1) reflects goals and objectives based on assessment of the learning needs of the teacher, (2) shows a demonstrable relationship to the teaching quality standard and (3) takes into consideration the education plans of the school, the school authority and the government.

*District Level Committees and/or Meetings*

These would include such things as Policy, Working Conditions, Poverty, Mentorship, Leadership, Curriculum, Safe and Caring Schools, Public Education Works and any Ad Hoc committees.

*ATA Provincial, Local, Specialist Council Meetings*

These would include discipline specific related activities, namely the inclusion of Working Conditions, Economic Policy, Executive Council, Professional Development, Public Education Works, Social, ARA, Budget and other related committees.

*School Committees*

Included are committees pertaining to Timetable, Faculty Councils, Social, Technology, Curriculum, Provincial Achievement Tests (PAT's), Discipline, Gifted and Talented, Special Education, Policy, Mentorship, and so on.

*Workshops and Conferences*

These would include any professional conferences or workshops at the local, provincial, national or international level, in which the teacher made presentations or attended.

### *Other Professional Activities*

Included are participation in Master or Doctorate Degree Programs, Alberta Learning Test Writing or Test Evaluation work for Alberta Learning, for Alberta Education Commitments, Alberta Athletic Association commitments, National Coaching Certification Programs, and so on.

All these categories pertain to the *expected* participation by teachers within the Local #41 and are part of the policy and procedures of Lethbridge School District #51. While professional growth plans, school committees, and conferences are both a province and district mandate, therefore defined as *required* commitments, the other categories are considered voluntary in nature and left up to the individual teacher's discretion as to degree of participation.

### *School Required Time*

These categories are of two types. One is contractual, (i.e., as per collective bargaining agreements) while the second are volunteer in nature. A point of clarification is that these categories are *all expected* by the district if they are components of a particular discipline (i.e., band, drama, etc.) but not necessarily contractually agreed upon. A definition and description of these categories include:

#### *Out-of-School Commitment to Instruction*

Estimated minutes per week spent during lunch hours, evenings, etc., to do marking, preparation, providing extra help, parental contacts and so forth.

#### *Field Trips*

Estimated total time in a year spent in supervising field trips, excursions, school "fairs" and so forth, that occurs outside normal school hours.



### *Supervision*

Estimated total hours spent in providing general supervision for students-from 15 minutes before school begins to 15 minutes after school dismisses, including lunch, but *not including co-curricular* activities.

### *Co-curricular Involvement*

Estimated time spent in supervising student co-curricular activities outside the normal school day-include before and after school, lunch hour programs and weekend commitments.

Supervision commitments are dictated by district policies and procedures. The remaining three categories-- out-of-school commitment to instruction, field trips, and co-curricular involvement-- are left to individual teacher discretion in terms of degree of time committed engaging in these activities.

### *Teacher Activity Logbook*

The logbook consisted of three categories: school activities, professional activities, and home activities. Both the school and professional categories requested that teachers record their time spent engaging in activities that were considered part of school *contracted* time and personal time, out-of-school, needed to fulfil those activities *required* by the district or school. The following definitions and descriptions (codes for logbook follow each entry ) were used:

#### *School Activities*

These are part of the work life of every teacher, regardless of subset, and are considered to be integral in performing the role of a professional. The following is a list

of those activities commonly identified and researched with previous workload studies, that exist in this Local.

*Instruction*

Include teaching regularly assigned classes.

*Lesson Planning*

Include time spent in preparation, planning, constructing outlines, long and short term lesson plans, constructing tests and other diagnostic materials, reading and research for lessons and so on.

*Classroom and Materials*

Clean up, pets, plants, repair and maintaining of equipment; preparing materials for class, including photocopying, getting supplies ready, setting up for labs etc.

*Curricular Activities*

Activities after school and school-wide or multi-class activities during the day including such activities as science fair, guest speakers, assemblies, presentations, field trips, track meets, talking with students, counselling, meeting with parents, interviews, school council, maintaining student portfolios, *plus* record keeping relative to the above.

*Evaluation and Marking*

Evaluation and marking of assignments, tests, projects, etc.,( at home or at school); record keeping associated with the above.

*Report Cards*

Assembling marks and comments (including anecdotal reports), entering marks, preparing and/or distributing report cards.

### *Supervision*

Supervision of students, hallways, lunch, busses, playgrounds, etc., includes detention, internal “coverage” and homeroom/advisor.

### *Consultation with Teachers*

Meeting with other teachers, administrators or other members of school staff; includes staff meetings, school or district meetings, pod/team meetings, C-Teams (consultative with other professionals, parents and colleagues), and department meetings.

### *Consultation with Others*

Meetings with community members or outside agencies on matters relating to school programs or services (including extracurricular). These also include supervision of extracurricular and co-curricular activities; sports, fund raising, performances, school dances, *plus* administration and record keeping to above (uniforms, equipment, etc.).

### *Administrative Duties*

Those with an administrative designation record any and all duties related to administration.

### *Lunch Recess and Socializing*

Sitting in the staff room, socializing, eating, etc.

### *Driving*

Time spent as a driver or passenger on transportation *directly* related to school duties; this includes transportation to and from school related meetings, any transportation of students (except field trips).

### *Professional Activities*

These activities consist of out-of-school involvement in a variety of settings but are deemed to be of a professional nature. These definitions and descriptions included:

#### *Professional Development*

Classes and school related courses taken, in-service days, workshops, presenting PD activities, meetings with colleagues about teaching methods, reading of a professional nature, attendance at conferences and conventions.

#### *Professional Growth*

All activities associated with preparation and documentation of Teacher Professional Growth Plans.

#### *Professional ATA*

Local council meetings and committee meetings, specialist council meetings, representing the ATA at meetings or other agencies.

### *Home Activities*

This section of the logbook served two purposes: (1) gave the respondents the opportunity to record time spent in common activities with other professions and, (2) a critical look at an individual's personal habits that may also affect teacher workload, stress, and burnout. These definitions and descriptions included:

#### *Home Activities*

All activities related to your home life; include housework, meal preparation, cleaning, eating, personal and family care, shopping.

### *Volunteer and Service Activities*

Volunteer work of all types, caring for or assisting family or friends, community service, religious activities like church work or attending services.

### *Recreation and Relaxation*

Leisure activities, exercise, recreation, TV, hobbies and entertainment; include attendance at sporting and cultural events, *plus* any time during the school day that is solely self-directed and used for relaxation.

### *Sleep*

Besides actual sleep, this category includes watching TV or reading, while in bed.

### *Teacher Extra Work Profile*

Closer inspection of teachers in each subset reveals a typical profile that provides a description of common characteristics of teachers at each subset. First, with regard to their time allotted to Professional Activities (hours per year), the elementary teacher (Table 3) annually spends approximately: (1) 17 hours developing their Professional Growth Plans, (2) 8 hours involved in district committees and meetings, (3) 16 hours attending ATA, Provincial, and Specialist Councils, (4) 21 hours on school committees, (5) 31 hours at workshops or conferences and finally, (6) another 58 hours on other related professional activities. With regard to the time devoted to school teacher expected time, elementary teachers received approximately 96 minutes (minutes were used for the purpose of standardization as preparation time is allotted this way in the district) per week in preparation time, used 41 minutes per week for out-of-school commitment to

instruction, averaged 22 hours per year in field trips, 58 hours per year in supervision obligations, and a further 43 hours per year involved in co-curricular activities.

Table 3

High-Low Distribution for Elementary Schools Professional Activity and Expected Time

Professional Activity	High	Mean	Low
Professional Growth Plans (hr/yr)	133	16.67	0
District Level Committees/Meetings (hr/yr)	60	7.7	0
ATA Local/Provincial/Specialist Council (hr/yr)	624	15.78	0
School Committees (hr/yr)	120	20.64	0
Workshops/Conferences (hr/yr)	200	31.46	0
Other Professional Activities (hr/yr)	2800	57.71	0
Teacher Expected Time		Mean	
Prep Time (min/week)	240	96.37	0
Out of School Commitment to Instruction (min/week)	71	40.81	0
Field Trips (hr/yr)	600	22.24	0
Supervision (hr/yr)	250	58.35	0
Co-curricular (hr/yr)	1200	42.74	0

Secondly, the profile of a teacher from the junior high subset (Table 4) with regard to their time allotted to Professional Activities (on a yearly basis) displays approximately: (1) 7 hours developing Professional Growth Plans, (2) 8 hours at district committees and meetings, (3) almost 17 hours attending ATA, Provincial, or Specialist Council meetings or functions, (4) 16 hours on school committees, (5) 33 hours attending workshops and conferences, and finally, (6) 55 hours in other related professional activities. With regard to the time devoted to school expected teacher time they receive approximately 200 minutes per week in preparation time, use approximately 406 minutes (7 hours) per week in out-of-school commitment to instruction, provide an average of 32 hours per year for field trips, give 117 hours of supervision, and provide an average of 91 hours per year of co-curricular time.

Table 4

## High-Low Distribution for Junior High Professional Activity and Expected Time

Professional Activity	High	Mean	Low
Professional Growth Plans (hr/yr)	40	7.01	0
District Level Committees/Meetings (hr/yr)	50	8.37	0
ATA Local/Provincial/Specialist Council (hr/yr)	160	16.67	0
School Committees (hr/yr)	80	16.45	0
Workshops/Conferences (hr/yr)	446	32.8	0
Other Professional Activities (hr/yr)	2800	55.15	0

  

Teacher Expected Time	High	Mean	Low
Prep Time (min/week)	264	200.29	0
Out of School Commitment to Instruction (min/week)	2100	406.31	0
Field Trips (hr/yr)	216	31.85	0
Supervision (hr/yr)	550	117.15	0
Co-curricular (hr/yr)	550	91.21	0

Finally, the profile of a typical high school teacher (Table 5) provides the following information devoted to Professional Activities (on a yearly basis) approximately: (1) 16 hours toward-level committees or meetings, (3) 6 hours on ATA, Provincial or Specialist Council meetings or functions, (4) 17 hours on school committees, (5) 26 hours attending workshops or conferences, and (6) 27 hours further performing additional professional activities. With regard to their time devoted to school expected teacher time they receive approximately 280 minutes (5 hours) per week for preparation, use approximately 781 minutes (13 hours) a week in out-of-school instruction, provide approximately 47 hours per year for field trips, 104 hours per year supervising, and an additional 166 hours per year devoted to co-curricular activities.

Table 5

## High-Low Distribution for High School Professional Activity and Expected Time

Professional Activity	High	Mean	Low
Professional Growth Plans (hr/yr)	114	15.77	0
District Level Committees/Meetings(hr/yr)	40	4.89	0
ATA Local/Provincial/Specialist Council (hr/yr)	100	5.59	0
School Committees (hr/yr)	120	16.54	0
Workshops/Conferences (hr/yr)	128	25.75	0
Other Professional Activities (hr/yr)	300	26.66	0

  

Teacher Expected Time	High	Mean	Low
Prep Time (min/week)	1200	279.6	0
Out of School Commitment to Instruction (min/week)	1600	781.26	0
Field Trips (hr/yr)	400	46.85	0
Supervision (hr/yr)	500	103.53	0
Co-curricular (hr/yr)	1000	165.67	0

*Teacher Logbooks*

Responding logbook participants provided data (Table 6) for the average work day and an average weekend day. (see Appendix D: Logbook Descriptors). In order to provide a descriptive account of teachers' lives, both during the workweek and a typical weekend. This part of the study used the same variables identified in previous workload studies in an effort to draw valid comparisons of this districts' teachers with those in other districts using the same activity descriptions. For the purpose of this study, the weekend portion involved days which were predetermined to be typical in nature and, without any major conferences or workshops that teachers were required to attend.



Table 6

## Logbook Results

Teaching Activities Average Working Day			Teaching Activities Average Weekend Day		
Activity	Time min	%	Activity	Time min	%
Teaching Time	248	17.20	Teaching Time	0	0
Lesson Planning	51	3.51	Lesson Planning	37	2.60
Classroom and Materials	51	3.51	Classroom and Materials	11	0.80
Curricular Activities	25	1.70	Curricular Activities	5	0.40
Evaluation and Marking	53	3.70	Evaluation and Marking	42	3.00
Report Cards	31	2.20	Report Cards	61	4.25
Supervision	16	1.10	Supervision	0	0
Consultation with Teachers	43	3.00	Consultation with Teachers	1	0.10
Consultation with Others	3	0.20	Consultation with Others	1	0.10
Extracurricular/Co-curricular	17	1.20	Extracurricular/Co-curricular	8	0.60
Administrative Duties	4	0.30	Administrative Duties	0	0
Lunch, Recess, Socializing	25	1.70	Lunch, Recess, Socializing	1	0.10
Driving	26	1.80	Driving	8	0.60
Professional Development	10	0.70	Professional Development	4	0.30
Professional Growth	4	0.30	Professional Growth	8	0.60
Professional ATA	4	0.30	Professional ATA	4	0.30
Home Activities	220	15.30	Home Activities	341	23.15
Volunteer and Service	24	1.70	Volunteer and Service	54	3.65
Recreation and Relaxation	122	8.50	Recreation and Relaxation	301	21.00
Sleep	444	30.80	Sleep	531	37.00
Other	19	1.28	Other	22	1.60
Total	1440	100	Total	1440	100

In summary, teachers, *on average*, are engaged in school and professional activities for nine hours and twenty-five minutes a day (39%) during the workweek. In terms of the contractual time, a typical assigned instructional day consists of approximately 6 hours (25% of the entire day). This does not include the time spent driving to and from school or socializing at school during the lunch or other breaks during the day. Additionally, teachers, *on average*, engaged in six hours and two minutes of school related and professional activities during the weekend (25%).

A closer look at the weekend results (Table 10) provides an insight to the total number of hours respondents spent engaged in school and professional activities.

*Are there variations in extra workload among individuals and schools?*

#### *Individuals*

Each subset profile portrayed in Tables 3, 4, and 5, can be further analyzed to draw attention to variations in regard to extra work performed by *individual* respondents. In all three subsets, teachers recorded zero hours as the lowest amount of time devoted to each of every category of extra work, and very high maximums, indicating extreme variations for individuals in regard to extra work. The following discussion will provide insight to each subsets' highest individual teacher response in terms of commitment time to professional activity. Next, similar discussion regarding respondents time committed to *extra* expected school time will be presented.

Of note, this category contained a component of individual assigned preparation time (minutes per week) that *was not* of a standard format (established by the province and district) as required instructional time had been. In other words, depending on the specific teacher, their school timetable, and assigned workload, preparation time was a component that should be the least variant. However, next to assigned instructional time, preparation time highs and lows (for all three subsets) signalled a need of further clarification of *what* that time is, and *how* it is assigned for future valid comparisons of workloads that this study *did not* measure.

Individual subset teachers recorded various high number of hours devoted to the category of professional activity. One elementary teacher recorded the highest number of hours (133) devoted to professional growth plans for all three subsets. Another elementary teacher, recorded the highest number of ATA commitment hours (624), again

for all three subsets. School committees had one elementary and one junior high teacher record (120) hours devoted to that activity. The activities of workshops and conferences had a junior high teacher record 2-3 times more hours (446) than the highest teachers of the other two subsets. Finally, one teacher from the elementary and junior high recorded the same amount of hours (2800) devoted to other professional activities (i.e., involvement in a Master of Education program) far outreaching the highest high school recorded number of hours of 300.

In regard to the category of teacher expected time (i.e., extra work) an individual teacher in the high school subset received more preparation time *minutes* (1200) than both an elementary teacher (240) and junior high teacher (264). The category of out-of-school commitment to instruction (minutes per week), had an elementary teacher record 71, a junior high teacher 2100, and a high school teacher 1600. In regard to field trips, an elementary teacher recorded the highest amount of hours (600) to a junior high teacher (216) and high school teacher (400). In the supervision category, an elementary teacher recorded a high of 2500 hours, while a junior high teacher had 500 hours and high school teacher recorded 550 hours. The co-curricular category, had an elementary teacher record 1200 hours, junior high teacher 500 hours and, a high school teacher 1000 hours.

In many comments provided by respondents' regarding the study, the degree of commitment and willingness to engage in these activities from both the professional and personal nature, could be accountable for many of the variations in recorded time. Of these activities, *only* preparation time was assigned, the remainder are at the discretion of the individual teacher.

### *Schools*

With regard to the category of professional activities (Appendix E), in particular the high school subset, the largest staffed high school (high school #1), recorded the second lowest average number of hours (102.6) its teachers were engaged in professional activities. In sharp contrast, the smallest high school (high school #3), recorded the highest average number of hours (195.7) teachers engaged in professional activities. Investigating *individual* teacher responses (not included in this study), this particular high school recorded more teachers engaged in other professional activities such as Alberta Learning related work and, participation in a Master or Doctorate degree programs. Referring to the category of school expected time, again the smallest high school (high school #3) recorded the highest average hours (347.7) devoted by its teachers. A suitable answer for this is found in the structure of its delivery. This particular high school is an alternative high school program in nature. The framework consists of components that require increased teacher supervision (i.e., a work experience) outside the school involving both regular school hours, and outside normal working hours. Teachers are expected to be available for this and, to provide additional instruction when needed to their students.

The junior high subset also recorded variations for both categories. The highest number of average hours (291.3) of professional activities recorded by junior high teachers (junior high #3) can be attributed to three reasons. First, individual teacher responses to the survey recorded that this particular school had more teachers involved in the ATA and, Alberta Learning, and other Alberta Education commitments and, many

teachers involved in certification programs with regard to coaching requirements. Second, more teachers were involved in Master degree programs than other schools. Third, the school had many more teachers involved in district level committees (i.e., the mentorship program, Safe and Caring School committee). In sharp contrast to this involvement, the same junior high recorded the lowest average number of teacher hours (96.4) devoted to school expected time. Explanations for this included: (1) the school contained a “closed-campus” component that reduced teacher supervision, (2) lunch hour club programs were eliminated reducing supervision time and, co-curricular time, (3) a rotating lunch schedule that specifically due to the lack of sufficient time in its construction.

The elementary subset also recorded variations in both categories. The highest number of average hours (433.5) devoted to professional activities was recorded by the fourth smallest elementary school (elementary #13). Individual teacher responses saw more teachers from this school engaged in Master degree programs, district level committees and, the ATA both at the Local and provincial levels. In sharp contrast, the same elementary school (elementary #13) recorded the smallest number of average teachers hours (52.4) in the category of school expected time. This can be attributed to reported lower co-curricular activity at the school. Less activities requiring less teacher supervision, field trips, and the nature of parental assistance in the lunch program, reduced the amount of time expected by the school from its teachers.

In summary there is very wide variation for both individuals and schools in regard to all categories of extra work.

*Are there differences in extra workloads between subsets?*

Data revealed the numerous contextual, contractual, and jurisdictional conditions, determined by the district. Noticeable was the particular interpretation of workload (both professionally contracted and expected) at each subset despite common components of the districts' internal structural operation. For example, the school year was 200 days long, instructional days were determined to be 196 days with 4 days (including two teacher convention days) all equally required by the district. Within this structure, analysis of the data produced further insight to understanding the underlying perceptions and misperceptions of teacher workload. A key factor is the issue of how one arrives at a working definition of what is considered *contractual time*. For the district, and Local #41 teachers, a *yearly* ministerial block of *instructional* time was expected to be met. The three subsets *minimum* instructional time have been mandated at: (1) Kindergarten, 475 hours, (2) grade1-none, (3) grades 2-9, 950 hours and, (3) grades 10-12, 1000 hours.

In order to contrast and compare the subsets effectively, the minimum hours of instructional time and allotted preparation time should be considered. Assigned preparation times were set at the recorded averages: (1) elementary at 96 minutes, (2) junior high at 200 minutes and, (3) high school at 280 minutes, respectively.

It is evident that each subset has its own particular environmental characteristics. However, the data (Table 7) illustrate a comparison of the responding teacher's professional and personal yearly average hours as a member of a particular subset. Professional activities included: the formulation and implementation of *required growth plans*; required district level meetings or committees; Alberta Teachers' Association

(either local or provincial) commitments; any school committees (PD, discipline, curriculum, etc.); workshops or conferences; numerous other teacher commitments such as Summer School instruction, university classes, and exchange programs.

Table 7

## Comparison of Professional vs. Expected Teacher Time by Subset (hrs/yr)

Subset	# of Teachers	Professional Teacher Activities Total Hours	Professional Teacher Activities Average/Subset	School Expected Teacher Time Total Hours	School Expected Teacher Time Average/Subset
High School	95	11332	119.28	31061	326.95
Junior High	57	10917	191.52	13862	243.19
Elementary	153	27298	178.41	18873	123.35
Total	305	49547	162.4	63796	209.2

Certainly, an essential consideration of the study was how each subset viewed their workload and how that workload could be accurately defined. Comparisons of professional and expected time commitments by teachers at each subset (Table 8) were used as a means to determine a yearly percentage that can be easily understood by all.

In reference to the school expected teacher time, categories included out-of-school commitments to lesson planning and preparation; field trips; supervision (other than contractual in nature); and co-curricular (i.e., coaching, music festivals, etc.).

Comparing average yearly teacher time devoted to professional activities district-wide, the junior high subset recorded the highest at 191.52 hours. Elementary was next with 178.41 hours, and finally high school at 119.28 hours.

Comparing average yearly school expected teacher time district-wide, the high school led the way with 326.95 hours per teacher, while the junior high subset recorded 243.19 hours, and elementary subset at 123.35 hours.

Table 8

## Percentage of Total Hours of Professional vs. Expected Hours by Subset

Subset	Total Average Hours of Professional and Expected Time	Average Professional Times as a % of Total Hours	Average Expected Times as a % of Total Hours
High School	446.23	27	73
Junior High	434.71	44	56
Elementary	371.6	48	52

Simply stated, in general, teachers in the high school subset spends *less* time on their professional activities but *more* time on school expected time. Junior high also spends *less* time on their professional commitments than their school expected time. The elementary subset recorded *more* time spent on their professional commitments than their contribution to school expected time but these subset averages show the varying patterns in extra workload on both a school-by-school and individual teachers basis (see Appendix E).

As far as professional activities variations, junior high teachers spent less time on their professional growth plans than the elementary and high school subsets. High school teachers spent less time than elementary and junior high teachers on ATA commitments. Finally, high school teachers spent nearly half the amount of time pursuing other professional activities than the elementary and junior high teachers.

The following data (Table 9) compares and contrasts teachers' commitments to their professional obligations and the degree to which they engaged in activities considered to be components of their work lives. These are average yearly hours that respondents recorded as an individual, and as a member of a subset. At the core of these categories, is the distinction between the nature of what are those professional obligations



*expected* and those *required* by the school, district, and the province and the degree to which they are accounted for.

Table 9

## Subset Average Hours Engaged in Professional and School Expected Time

Professional Activities	High School Subset approx hrs/yr	Junior High Subset approx hrs/yr	Elementary Subset approx hrs/yr
Professional Growth Plan	16	7	17
District Level Committees	5	8	8
ATA (Local/Provincial)	6	17	16
School Committees	17	16	21
Workshops and Conferences	26	33	32
Other Professional Activities	27	55	58
Totals	97	136	152

  

School Expected Time	High School Subset hrs/yr	Junior High hrs/yr	Elementary Subset hrs/yr
Out-of-school commitment to instruction	10	12	21
Field Trips	37	23	19
Supervision	83	83	49
Co-curricular	132	65	36
Totals	262	183	125

Overall these averages indicated some differences and different patterns of work throughout the subsets. Of interest in the professional activities category is the lower approximate time junior high teachers are engaged in their professional growth plan development. Secondly, the approximate number of other professional activities hours of the high school subset was nearly half that recorded by the junior high and elementary subset. Major factors in this were the greater number of teachers in the junior high and elementary subsets engaged in post-graduate work, and also more teachers involved in Alberta Learning capacities.

The school expected time category revealed the greatest differences and variations in respondents time. Elementary teachers spent nearly double the amount of time on instructional activities (i.e., marking, parental contacts, preparation, etc.) than the junior high and high school subsets. A possible explanation could lie in the reality that teachers of this subset receive less weekly preparation time (as per contractual time) therefore needed to take their work home to meet obligations set by the schools and district administrations. Secondly, with regard to the supervision category, the elementary subset recorded engaging in approximately 30 hours *less* than the junior high and high school subsets. A possible explanation could be a misinterpretation of contractual supervision requirements and school specific supervision schedules (i.e., supervision teams versus individuals). Finally, the large difference in the amount of recorded time the high school subset engaged in co-curricular involvement was more than *double* the time recorded by the junior high subset, and nearly *triple* the time the elementary subset. This may be attributed to coaching time, band trips, cultural exchanges, and school club commitments that are more intense (requiring more teacher time spent) than either the elementary or junior high subsets.

One source of major variation of average time committed by teachers of the Local #41, exists in the category of teacher or school expected time. Elementary teachers recorded an average of 41 minutes a week in out-of-school commitment to instruction. By contrast, the amount of time junior high (406 minutes), and high school (781 minutes), teachers give in addition to their assigned instructional time. This raises numerous questions as to the nature of the out-of-school instruction provided by junior and high school teachers. For example, do teachers need more instructional time at this

level? What is the nature of timetabling measures that does not allow adequate classroom time for instruction? Are there adequate resources available, or are teachers forced to adapt to conditions (i.e., lack of textbooks) by giving up personal time to make up for unavailable resources, and materials just to do their assigned role? Junior high and high school teachers, especially those assigned to grade 9 and grade 12, recorded much more time devoted to this category as a result of Provincial Achievement Testing, and Diploma Examinations as a possible reason for the discrepancy. Teachers commented on the need to spend more time clarifying, and providing additional support to students outside of the classroom due to the emphasis placed on those examinations. However with a lack of adequate supplies, materials and resources to do so, forced teachers to adapt in the only way they seemed to have control over-- their personal time commitment. Many teachers recorded the needs of their students (i.e., entrance to universities, high school entrance requirements, etc.) outweighed their personal time as the reason this category was so unequally responded to by teachers of this subset.

Another contrast was noted in relation to field trips. The high school subset recorded the highest hours (47), followed by junior high (32) and elementary (22) hours respectively. Here again the high school teachers were expected to contribute more time in coaching, band, drama, and student-club related excursions that required time. They recorded 104 hours, however, junior high teachers recorded the highest average with 117 hours and elementary the lowest at 58 hours. While junior high contains many similar activities as high school, more teachers at this subset spent more time devoted to supervising dances, class field trips, and graduation or farewell type activities for their students.

Finally, as expected due to the context and nature of this subset, the high school subset recorded the greatest amount of teacher time devoted to co-curricular activities. Teachers spent an average of 168 hours supervising out of school time for coaching, directing, travelling to competitions, intramurals, art shows, performances of fine arts, and so on. This category needs to be investigated in greater detail in future studies of teachers' workloads due to the inequality across the three subsets. In many cases this additional time can directly be attributed to workload stress and burnout identified in previous literature. Many teachers commented on the simple need for giving an equitable reward back to them for taking so much time away from their personal lives. This raises questions in regard to the complex nature of teachers' workloads. In particular, what is the type and nature of stress and burnout related activities within the district? What are the means of eliminating those from teachers' lives? What forms of teacher assistance initiatives can be utilized in an effort to diminish situations that lead to stress and burnout? These need to be addressed in more detail in future studies on workload.

#### *Subset Logbooks*

The respondents that participated in the logbook activity provided additional data for subset comparisons. The number of respondents from each subset served as a cross section (see Table 2) of teachers at various career stages, years of experience, and willingness to engage in activities that are considered components of teaching (Appendix D). The respondents recorded both the time committed to engaging in activities on the weekend (Table 10) and during the work week (Table 11).

Table 10

## Weekend Logbook Subset Results (Total hours engaged)

School Activities Instructional	Elementary (n=58)	Junior High (n=25)	High School (n=23)
Instruction (SI)	1.5	0	1
Lesson Planning (SP)	72.5	21.5	19.5
Classroom and Materials (SM)	40	6.5	7.5
Curricular Activities (SC)	7	0	3
Evaluation and Marking (SE)	82	28	25.5
Report Cards (SR)	172	1	0
Supervision (SS)	0	0	0
Consultation with Teachers (ST)	5.5	1	2
Consultation with Others (SO)	1.5	0	2
Extra/Co-curricular (SX)	2	14	17
Administrative Duties (SA)	0	0	0
Lunch Recess and Socializing (SL)	0	1	2
Driving (SD)	46	22.5	13.5
Total	430	95.5	93
Average	7.41	3.82	4.04

Professional Activities	Elementary (n=58)	Junior High (n=25)	High School (n=23)
Professional Development (PD)	9	8	8
Professional Growth (PG)	2	3.5	2
Professional ATA (PA)	3	10	0
Total	14	21.5	10
Average	0.24	0.86	2.3

With regard to the data, elementary respondents doubled the number of the junior and high school subsets. What is significant in this data recorded in the category of report cards. Clarification must be made that this was considered a typical weekend void of any activities that were seasonal in nature (i.e., report card time). Some elementary respondents recorded this particular weekend as an opportunity to prepare for upcoming

report cards that were not to be administered at the same time as other elementary schools. Due to the high number of respondents in this subset (58) an average for teachers engaged in report card related work would be approximately 3 hours making it still higher than both the junior and high school subsets, but clearer in its interpretation as a comparative figure. If a valid comparison could be drawn with this category, both the junior and high school subsets would need to include teacher time devoted to report card obligations (i.e., time spent on computer grading programs such as Grade Book, or Grade Book Plus). The study *did not* make that distinction and did not require documentation for all respondents completing the survey. However, it *did* ask those teachers involved in the logbook component to do so both during the work week and the weekend (Table 6). During the logbook instruction workshop given by the researcher, this category was clarified by requiring respondents to include teacher time spent recording evaluations for report cards in either the written or computer format. A consideration for future workload studies would be to clarify the nature, and the amount of time spent inside and outside regular school hours that is not normally part of the teachers' every weekend time commitments.

Comparing the subsets teachers' commitments to both school and professional activities during the workweek (Table 11) was based on a random selection of two workdays that did not include a Monday (to avoid long weekends, PD days) or Fridays (to avoid staff meetings, PD days or school activities such as assemblies or early dismissal routines). The comparison *differs* than the weekend documentation as it records the time engaged in these activities in *average minutes*.

Table 11

## Weekday Average (Minutes)

School Activities	Elementary n=58	Junior High n=25	High School n=23
Instruction (SI)	300	300	270
Lesson Planning (SP)	20	30	60
Classroom and Materials (SM)	20	30	20
Curricular Activities (SC)	10	40	35
Evaluation and Marking (SE)	60	40	40
Report Cards (SR)	15	15	10
Supervision (SS)	15	30	10
Consultation with Teachers (ST)	10	15	15
Consultation with Others (SO)	20	30	5
Extra/C0-curricular (SX)	15	25	100
Administrative Duties (SA)	5	5	10
Lunch, Recess, and Socializing (SL)	30	25	15
Driving (SD)	15	15	20
Total Minutes	535	600	610
Hours	8.92	10	10.2
Average			

  

Professional Activities	Elementary n=58	Junior High n=25	High School n=23
Professional Development (PD)	0	2	3
Professional Growth (PG)	2	0	2
Professional ATA (PA)	0	3	3
Total Minutes	2	5	8
Hours	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average	0.034	0.2	0.34

*How does the district compare to other districts?*

One reason for conducting this study was to provide a basis for inter-district comparisons of teachers' workloads. In an effort to provide a means of comparing and contrasting the Locals' data to other studies, difficulty arose due to a lack of commonality of categories of work and definitions of professional activities. The format of this study has attempted to take into account changes in teachers' work lives and hopefully serve as

a template for future workload studies. It is intended that it will encourage and facilitate research, both for on-going Local #41 efforts, and provincial ATA studies.

World-wide research of teacher workload (Appendix H) has produced various perspectives on the validity of data gathering devices, offered many diverse interpretations and speculations as to the nature of teachers' work, and identified areas of attention that future researchers need to consider when constructing blueprints for investigation procedures. The superficial comparison with cited worldwide studies displays the need for clarification of: (1) the nature of weekend hours devoted to professional activities by teachers, and (2) the distinction of what are considered contractual hours and what are not, and (3) a continued and sequential return to each study to monitor teachers' changing work lives. Compared to the selected studies, the Locals' teachers' weekly workload was high, their hourly school day was average, and their time spent on work-related activities on the weekend was minimal (although data limitation of these studies made comparisons of this category difficult). The reliability and validity of this study's can be further enhanced when the investigation process used is duplicated in another jurisdiction with similar conditions to draw comparative, accurate, and substantive data. This will lead to greater discussion and analysis of the results of this study providing a clearer picture for the Local in regard to the nature of teacher workload, and how it *truly* impacts the lives of its teachers.

### *Summary*

The nature of this study revealed the overall complexity of determining teachers' workloads. Each particular subset had distinguishing components which attributed to the difficulty in developing a standard measure for teachers' working lives. These included:



(1) the uneven number of instructional hours assigned provincially, and implemented jurisdictionally, (2) assigned preparation time variances, (3) differences in school expected time deemed necessary over and above regular working hours based on specific program needs and student involvement, (4) the individual teacher's commitment to teaching, (5) distinction in regard to teachers' *career stages* in terms of length of service to the profession, years experience in teaching, and years teaching a particular discipline at a particular grade level. These components provided the study with various interpretations of the nature of teachers' workload that the study identified through subset comparisons of workloads and the respondents committed time to various aspects of their professional and personal lives.

The final analysis revealed each subset provided *more* time committed by teachers than assigned to fulfil their contractual obligations. Each subset also recorded *more* time devoted outside regular school time assisting students, interacting with parents and the community, and simply completing the work necessary to keep their classrooms in order.

Teachers of ATA Local #41 averaged an additional 2 hours and 40 minutes each day just to meet the demands, obligations, and requirements of their "working life." Perhaps the gathered data in this project may be used as a means of gaining a better understanding of the real conditions of teacher workloads and dispel many of the myths and wrong perceptions. With its impact a valid means of re-gaining back teacher dignity can be established, resulting in productive changes in the working lives of teachers. The data obtained in this project provided a clear insight to the nature of the Local's workload and the daily lives of teachers in and out of the classroom.

## Chapter Five

### Conclusion and Recommendations

#### *Introduction*

The final chapter will provide an overall summary of the findings of the study and their impact on the working lives of teachers of Local #41. Beginning with the purposes for the study, discussion will include the research questions that were developed in its formation, and offer accounts of the limitations experienced. Next, a brief look at the nature of teachers' workloads, the categories of investigation, and teacher profiles will be presented. Following that, variations that exist in individual teachers' workloads based on individual contexts, and school contexts, will be discussed. Next, the claim that teachers' workloads differ between elementary, junior high, and high school subsets will be examined. Finally, a reflection on the current state of affairs teachers face in education and the impact it has on their personal workloads.

#### *Purpose of Study*

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of teachers' workloads in the Local #41. It was to produce a "snap shot" look at the working lives of teachers that would provide the Local #41 Working Conditions and the Economic Policy Committees (WCC, EPC) with substantiated data for: (1) use in contract negotiations, (2) a starting point for workload historical documentation construction, (3) the acquisition of valid data for comparison with ongoing Alberta Teachers' Association workload studies, and (4) the documentation of pertinent data to provide the Local with current information for the purposes of providing accurate working realities to the numerous stakeholders of education. The study was initiated, and approved by the Locals' executive body as a

means of gathering pertinent data from its members in an effort to formulate substantiated actions plans for investigation of current working conditions of the Local.

The study focused on six specific research questions: (1) What is the nature of teacher workloads? (2) How can teacher workloads be best conceptualized, categorized, and portrayed? (3) How much do teachers work outside of working hours? (4) What tasks occupy teaches inside and outside school? (5) Are there variations in teacher workloads across contexts both within the district and individual school? (6) How does the district compare to other districts that are similar in size, with similar number of teaches, and professional opportunities?

From the research questions formulated, a literature review was undertaken which resulted in the identification of several themes regarding teacher working conditions and teacher effectiveness. These themes were focused on the teacher and: (1) their personal and professional growth, (2) their workplace, (3) their working conditions, (4) their students, and (5) their community. For the purpose of the study, focal points were determined to be the assessment of teachers personal and professional growths, the appraisal of workplaces, and the current state of working conditions in the Local. To this end, the research instrument developed included a teacher survey component, and a daily logbook component as a means of gathering data.

### *Limitations*

Certain limitations of the study need to be addressed to be able to draw more valid comparisons with this project and future teacher workload studies. Critical to establishing valid comparison variables is to clarify understanding in: (1) the nature of *what* exactly is considered contractual time, instructional time, preparation time and *how* each school

district or division allocates each with regard to legal agreements with their teachers; (2) the lengths of workweeks; (3) which activities are considered to be “extra” to the workday and which are contracted and thereby included; (4) the nature of geographic, economic, cultural, structural, and educational differences that could result in skewed results, making valid comparisons harder to achieve.

This study attempted to avoid those limitations by establishing a common base of understanding by the participants. First, was the establishing of a common description of what was instructional, preparation, co-curricular and extra-curricular time. Many studies differ in their description of what constitutes these and how all parties involved in engaging them as part of their workload, define them.

Secondly, the workweek was considered to be five days in length. A typical workday was (as per district policy) determined to be from fifteen minutes *before* the first class of the day to fifteen minutes *after* the last class of the day in each particular school in the district. While these minutes were supervisory in nature, it was a district-wide expectation, and was agreed to in the Local’s collective bargaining agreement. Again, studies indicated there was a wide range of what was considered a workweek. In fact, some reported a three-day workweek, others a five-day, and still others cited a six-day workweek. More importantly, however, was the absence of data regarding the length of a school year, and the number of “teaching/instructional” days/hours that were contained in that year.

Thirdly, this study presented specific descriptors of activities that were categorized from an educational perspective with the language and comprehension common to the district, school, and teachers involved. Numerous studies looked at

teacher workload but were based on nation-wide sampling where descriptors may not have been fully understood or possibly misinterpreted by the respondents.

Lastly, this study was *specific* to a group of teachers within a common district and aimed at establishing a comparison of *all* three distinct subsets of grade levels with each other and to their status in the district as a whole. Further, the inclusion of teacher time on the weekend needed to complete their assigned workload duties, was essential to produce valid data for ongoing ATA studies within the province. Many studies researched were nation-wide in nature, contained random sampling, or were based solely on a particular grade level or subset of teacher.

#### *The Nature of Teacher Extra Workloads*

##### *Subsets*

Arguably, teachers of each subset offered specific data which portrayed the peculiarities of the working environment they faced, in sharp contrast to the other teachers' subsets. However, it can certainly be stated that teachers of all the subsets have shared an increased workload, a reduction in available personal time, an increase of expectations by others (i.e., school, district, community, province) as a result of present working conditions. Moreover, the current political and educational climate suggests that teachers' workloads of the district will see further restructuring and modifications to reflect those initiatives undertaken by provincial and Local bargaining agents.

One of the most curious notions is that certain subsets of teachers do "more than" their colleagues in the other subsets. It is nearly impossible to definitely place a value on each subset's individual makeup and draw a correlation that accurately defines the subtle characteristics of each. However, in an effort to compare common variables required by

the district and province (i.e., instructional hours, preparation minutes per week, supervision requirements), the data collected provided unique insights to teacher involvement on a personal and professional level. The data also provided a means of describing teachers' work. There are certain expectations specific to each subset that previously have been inaccurately represented. For example, variation in assigned teachers' workloads and school or district-based expectations have *seemed* to underscore the profession's belief that one subset does more than the other in both a professional and personal level. Elementary teachers have often felt that they do much more class-time preparation and supervision of students than their high school counterparts. In response, high school teachers felt that they are more active in coaching and government diploma test preparation, making their time commitments exceed what is understood to be a "normal" workweek. (i.e., coaching on weekends out of town).

As a result, each subset displayed a give-and-take approach to teachers' commitment and willingness to engage in the various activities they had been asked to record. For example, some teachers offered the time committed to coaching, and supervision of teams (high school subset), as more demanding of their workload than that time spent marking student work (elementary subset). Such contentions underlined the difficulty of establishing the actual *worth* of teachers' commitments to their workload expectations. Each subset had a viable answer for the other when discussion led to what it was that each subset may do more of than the other, and which subset may have did less.

Of particular interest is the data on out-of school commitment to instruction. There is a high degree of variation in each subset which signals a need for closer inspection in future studies. Recorded ranges for the average hours of out-of-school

instruction per year by each subset included: (1) the high school from 8.9 hours to 15.3 hours, (2) the junior high from 8.9 to 26.0 and, (3) the elementary from 9.0 to 55.0. Clearly the elementary subset teachers recorded more time committed to marking, preparation, providing extras help, parental contacts and so forth, than the other two subsets. Further examination of these variations (see Table 4) amongst the subsets for all categories of Appendix E, provide additional information with regard to approximate hours teachers are engaged in activities common to all three subsets.

Most importantly, is the category of total average hours of professional and expected time comparison. Recall, preparation times are recorded in *minutes per week*. When the amount of preparation time is calculated on a yearly hourly basis, and *not included* in each subset totals, a more valid comparison of teacher time devoted to professional activities resulted. When subtracted from the combined total hours yearly of professional an school expected time (see Table 8), a smaller degree of difference is identified among the subsets. The new total hours for high school would be 290, junior high 316, and elementary 323. (If the high school figure could be adjusted for the anomalies preparation time for high school coaches and Fine Arts people, that figure would be higher.)

When further adjusted, the average yearly hours of *preparation time* for the subsets would be: (1) high school -156, (2) junior high-119, and (3) the elementary-49 respectively. This becomes even *more* significant when regarded in the standard distribution measurement (minutes per week) over the Local's five-day work week. Average *daily* preparation time for each subset becomes: (1) elementary-19 minutes, (2) junior high-40 minutes, and (3) high school-56 minutes.

Noteworthy, is the district expectation for preparation time that teachers are to utilize this time for classroom related duties (i.e., lesson planning, activity preparation). This time is *not* considered over and above the workday, but is considered to be included in the regular working hours assigned.

It is an essential to recognize that at each level of schooling, unique components of the teacher's working day are driven by the needs of their students. In general terms given the preceding discussion, there is little evidence that teachers in each subset work harder or less vigorously than the others. Arguably, the biggest source of variation is not subset specific, but could possibly be due to the number years of teaching in that particular context (this study did *not* directly require the survey respondents to record this variation), career stage or degree of commitment to teaching.

### *Schools*

As mentioned, previous workload studies have concluded that teacher burnout is significantly created by and ameliorated through factors which those in school organizations have some, or considerable, control. The study displayed many of the same conditions experienced by teachers in other workload studies and revealed common areas of considerations for future working conditions investigations in an effort to eliminate increasing workloads. Through individual teacher comments regarding particular circumstances of working conditions in their schools, valid data comparisons were achieved by the Locals' teachers and served as a link to other on-going workload studies in the province, and world-wide.

Both leadership and organizational factors have moderate to strong effects on teachers' context beliefs (i.e., the working atmosphere teachers find themselves in) and



personal goals. Organizational factors also have moderate effects on capacity beliefs (i.e., self-efficacy, self-confidence, academic self-concept, and self-esteem), and the largest total effects on burnout. Teachers' perceptions of an overall school culture and direction that is compatible with their personal goals in addition to their perceptions that working conditions will permit them to accomplish these goals, cannot be overlooked as a powerful implication on individual teacher's willingness to commit time, both personal and professional to their workday.

Leadership becomes a critical component for teachers willing to engage their personal and professional time in extra work, and commit to initiatives proposed by their leaders. Conditions inside and outside of school must take into account. From a leadership point of view, teacher development can be significantly enhanced through establishment of a shared school vision, common goals, organization of professional development opportunities, and positive working relationships within the community. There must be a meaningful mission statement and philosophy which provides teachers the opportunities to assess their own needs for growth and gain access to sources of assistance inside or outside of school. Fostering teacher leadership, providing individualized support, encouraging intellectual stimulation, establishing high performance expectations (i.e., common school goals pursued for the benefit of all), and contingent rewards which enhances commitment, effort and job satisfaction, are areas of working conditions that leaders must pay great attention to.

### *Individuals*

Of particular interest from analysis of the gathered information, and was reflected in teachers' responses to this study, was the discussion that revolved around three integral

factors of teachers' workloads which underscored previous workload studies. In a sense, these could be conceived as the heart of accurate comparisons in teachers' workloads and could serve to be the categorical foundations of future workload studies. These include: (1) *career* stage of teachers (i.e., years of experience, novice or master teacher), (2) years of experience at a particular level of instruction and, (3) teachers' degrees of commitments, and (4) the involvement in post-secondary education. Arguably, these components permeate the daily lives of teachers and determine the level of success in a balanced, manageable and productive career in teaching.

In fact, it could be stated that most teachers responding to the survey and participating in the logbook activity gained a greater insight and admiration for each other, regardless of where they taught. It was very evident that teachers were genuinely intrigued with each other's level of commitment and dedication to the profession *in* and *outside* contractual time. Further, given the status of education in the province and the reaction of society to teachers as a whole, this project provided much needed accurate information to address misconceptions about teachers and their job as an often discredited profession. In the past, teachers responded to negative remarks about the ease of their profession with insufficient concrete evidence to refute such claims. This is no longer the case in Local #41. In fact, evidence gathered clearly shows the sacrifices, degrees of commitment and obligations teachers *make* to provide the best possible learning environment for their students.

#### *District*

Data obtained in this survey indicated that numerous teachers in the district have too high a workload and that many are suffering from stress. Increased expectations

placed on them by administrations, students, parents and the community often conflicts with their personal lives. The simple argument for the need for teachers to live and work in a safe and caring environment extends to the need for making their daily rigors less time consuming and more productive. As can be seen, teachers care deeply about their students, their profession, and the role they play in making the education system a rewarding experience for its members. Many teachers are committed to making schools work for students but are becoming increasingly disillusioned with efforts to make their personal teaching commitment more effective.

The large amount of extra time devoted by teachers should signal the need for closer scrutiny as the *core* reason teachers are feeling overwhelmed, burnt out, disrespected, disillusioned, frustrated and angry.

#### *Recommendations for Future Studies of Teacher Workload*

Future studies of teachers' workloads on a district-to-district, and jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction level, must include clear definitions of what are the commonly understood definitions, and components of instructional time, preparation time, and contractual obligations, on a yearly, weekly, and daily basis. They must be revisited on a scheduled basis every 2-5 years to accurately gather current data in order to assist the Local and other education stakeholders (i.e., school boards, provincial organizations, parents and communities) in their deliberations in accurately assessing working conditions. They must contain a component of grouping teachers in the category of number of years experience. These categories should include identification of individual teacher's career stages, years of experience at a specific subset, grade level taught, and a means of recording teachers' willingness to be committed and engaged in these categories. They

must include a category that includes a gender-based component that reflects possible further limitations that are unique to a female and male teacher. Specific attention should be given to the concept of preparation time distribution and its affects on workload and job satisfaction. Finally, studies should investigate the impact of leadership (individual, administrative, district, provincial, and by community) on teachers' sense of willingness to devoted more time (personal and professional) to making their working lives better.

### *Summary*

What *is* the nature of teacher workloads? Teachers are responsible for wearing many different hats. Their roles have dramatically changed as has the nature of society requirements of them. The idea of solely teaching curricula content and preparing students for future academic rigors, has long been replaced by society's expectation that teachers *will* take on the roles of parents, care givers, cheer leaders, judges, mediators, mentors, coaches, referee, social workers, policemen, role models, counsellors, friends, administrators, performers, and teachers. What was once considered a regular classroom, in the traditional sense of educational delivery, has been circumvented with the focus on a differentiated classroom structure. With little adequate teacher training or proper classroom resources, teachers are forced to adapt to unrealistic expectations placed on them by society, governments, and various stakeholders of education. Teaching has become more stressful, less rewarding financially, demoralizing, disrespected, and uninviting to newer candidates for possible entrance into the profession.

Teachers see key areas as a source of stress in their profession. First, they perceive an increase in the complexity and difficulty of teaching and relating to students. The ever changing class composition, including the integration of special needs students

(coded), ESL, gifted, and behavioural problem students, has drastic consequences on teacher workload. These students all require special adaptations, approaches or modifications of materials. Often, the capacity to adapt and modify requires training, resources, and support mechanisms which are not always available. This further increases stress and pressure on the classroom teacher.

Secondly, teachers identified the volume of daily work during the work day and the increased expectation that teachers will address a wide range of task and issues. Many teachers work 50-60 hours a week in fulfilling their obligations. Many suffer from stress and burnout resulting in sacrificing their physical and mental health well-being for their job requirements. This creates an imbalance in their lives that causes them to be constantly juggling the needs of their students and their own needs. Most importantly, this addition of many non-teaching tasks could be considered the *core* of the problem of teacher workload. Teachers are asked to do much more than just teach. These additional expectations have teachers seeing their role as ever expanding, with much added but nothing taken away, resulting in an unacceptable high workload. There seems to be a sense of increased pressure at certain times of the year, usually around report card time. While there are many different expectations for this activity, the underlying premise is that it takes up a huge amount of time and is very stressful. Extra curricular activities (concerts, coaching, and field trips) also are felt as areas of increased teacher stress and time concern. Curriculum changes are another area causing workload pressure. Often expectations are thrust upon teachers from many diverse sources. What is lacking, however, is the necessary support, resources, and materials needed to implement and integrate the changes. This leads to teachers questioning the purpose, usefulness, and

expectations of such changes on themselves and their students. Again, this causes undue stress by committed teachers to meet those expectations despite limitations and further increases their workload and results in high ranges of stress-induced consequences.

Thirdly, teachers see insufficient time, inadequate resources, and limited support as the main causes of unrealistic workload conditions. Many non-instructional activities take away valuable contact time with students. It appears quite evident that the time teachers spend at school or at home is expanding and teachers are supplying that time while sacrificing their own health and family lives. Many teachers reported that inadequate basic resources such as textbooks were not available. Numerous teachers purchased their own materials and supplies in order to teach the required curriculum. Basic learning resources, lab equipment, classroom supplies were not provided or distributed in ways that met needs. Teachers' workload and stress increased as they desperately struggle to find used resources, supplies, and materials to implement curriculum expectations.

Finally, the perceived issue of limited or lack of respect experienced by teachers is paramount in the daily rigors of the teaching profession. There still exists a feeling that "teachers have it easy" in many communities. The apparent low and uncompetitive salary reflects a lack of respect for teachers. Stemming from this is the current question of how do we, as a profession, maintain and attract good teachers? Many workers and jobs require far less training, less responsibility, and have better pay than teachers. This seems to be a constant source of frustration and, in some cases, despair by respondents who felt they could not remain in the profession if present circumstances do not drastically improve. Significantly, there exists an ever present feeling expressed by

teachers concerning a lack of respect shown to them by some administrations, parents, students, and even colleagues that increases the pressures of their workload.

Why do teachers work as long and as intensely as they do? It appears from this survey that they do so ultimately to benefit their students. However, underscoring this is sense of a subtle pressure on teachers to add to their workload commitments, regardless of what their existing workload might be. This “pressure” comes from numerous sources including parents, students, employers, administrations, communities, governments, and colleagues. All “expect” something, but few consider the effect of cumulative expectations on teachers which inevitably leads to excessive workload and stress.

Previous studies have indicated recommendations for improving teacher workload conditions. Data from this study have supported what many researchers have identified as areas to be addressed, and agree with recommendations as vital to making productive changes in the work and professional lives of teachers. These include the increased provision of adequate funding at all levels by educational stakeholders for learning resources, adequate preparation time, and competitive professional salaries making for healthier schools and teachers. Paramount to implementing any initiatives for reorganizing teacher workloads is the continued need to promote an understanding of the nature of teachers’ workloads. This work needs to occur in the media and public policy so that teachers and their students are not subjected to negative images of teaching and education. Replacing teacher-bashing and negative comments about public schools by the media, public, and government with supportive, respectful environments allowing true education to occur, would go a long way to improving the work life of teachers and, consequently, the schools in which children learn.

## References

- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1979, June). *Working conditions survey*. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1981, June). *Second working conditions survey*. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1991a, April). *Third working conditions survey*. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1991b, April). *Working conditions of ATA Members, 1990*. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1996, September). A report card on education. [Special Issue]. *ATA News* 23.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. (1997). Teachers to be surveyed on hours worked. *ATA News*, 31(10).
- American Federation of Teachers. (1995). Principles for professional development: AFT's guidelines for creating professional development programs that make a difference. Washington, DC: Author.
- Apple, M. (1986). Are teachers losing control of their skills and the curriculum? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 18(2), 177-184.
- Bertoch, M. R., Nielsen, E. C., Curley, J. R., & Borg, W. R. (1989). Reducing teacher stress. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 57, 117-128.
- Blase, J. J. (1982). A social-psychological grounded theory of teacher stress and burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 93-113.



- Blase, J. J. (1986). A qualitative analysis of sources of teacher stress: Consequences for performance. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23(1), 13-40.
- Borg, M. G., & Riding, R. J. (1991). Towards a model for the determinants of occupational stress among schoolteachers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 6, 355-373.
- Borg, M. G., Riding, R. J., & Falzon, J. M. (1991). Stress in teaching: A study of occupational stress and its determinants, job satisfaction and career commitment among primary schoolteachers. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 11, 59-75.
- Borthwick, P., et al. (1982). *Teacher burnout: A study of professional and personal variables*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Houston, TX.
- Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M., & Baglioni, A. J., Jr. (1995). A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 49-67.
- Brissie, J. S., Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Bassler, O. C. (1988). Individual, situational contributors to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 106-112.
- Byrne, B. M. (1991). The Maslach Burnout Inventory: Validating factorial structure and invariance across intermediate, secondary and university educators. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(4), 583-605.

- Byrne, B. M. (1994). Burnout: Testing for the validity, replication, and invariance of causal structure across elementary, intermediate, and secondary teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 645-673.
- Clark, E. H. (1985). An analysis of occupational stress factors as perceived by public school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Auburn, TX.
- Coates, T. J., & Thorsen, C. E. (1976). Teacher anxiety: A review with recommendations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 159-184.
- Coldicott, P. J. (1985). Organizational causes of stress on the individual teacher. *Educational Management and Administration*, 13, 90-93.
- Connell, R. (1985). *Teachers' work*. Sydney NSW: George Allen & Unwin.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshal, J. (1978). Sources of managerial and white collar stress. In: C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), *Stress at work*. New York: Wiley.
- Cox, T., & Brockley, T. (1984). The experience and effects of stress in teachers. *British Educational Research Journal*, 10, 83-87.
- Cunningham, W. G. (1983). Teacher burnout--Solutions for the 1980s: A review of the literature. *The Urban Review*, 15, 37-51.
- Dewe, P. (1986). *Stress: Causes, consequences and coping strategies*. Wellington: New Zealand Education Institute.
- Drago, R., Caplan, R., Constanza, D., & Brubaker, T. (1999). New estimates of working time for elementary teachers. *Monthly Labor Review*. 122(4), 31-40.
- Dunham, J. (1994). A framework of teachers' coping strategies for a whole school stress management policy. *Educational Management and Administration*, 22, 168-174.

- Durbridge, E. R. (1991). Restructuring in the schools sector. *Unicorn*, 17(2), 85-90.
- Farber, B. A. (1982, April). *Stress and burnout: Implications for teacher motivation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Farber, B. A. (1984a). Stress and burnout in suburban teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 77(6), 325-331.
- Farber, B. A. (1984b). Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues. *Teachers College Record*, 86, 321-338.
- Feitler, F. C., & Tokar, E. (1982). Getting a handle on teacher stress: How bad is the problem? *Educational Leadership*, 39(6), 456-458.
- Friedman, I. (1991). High and low burnout schools: School culture aspects of teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 84(9), 325-333.
- Friedman, I. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 88, 281-289.
- Green-Reese, S., Johnson, D. J., & Campbell, W. A. (1991). Teacher job satisfaction and teacher job stress: School size, age and teaching experience. *Education*, 112(2), 247-252.
- Gold, Y. (1985). The relationship of six personal and life history variables to standing on three dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory in a sample of elementary and junior high school teachers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46, 77-387.

- Hargreaves, A. (1990). Teachers' work and the politics of time and space. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(4), 303-320.
- Hargreaves, A. (1992). Time and teachers' work: An analysis of the intensification thesis. *Teachers College Record*, 94(1), 87-108.
- Hargreaves, A. (1993). Individualism and individuality: Reinterpreting the teacher culture. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts* (pp. 319-354). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hart, P. M. (1994). Teacher quality of work life: Integrating work experiences, psychological distress, and morale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 109-132.
- Hart, P. M., Wearing, A. J., & Conn, M. (1995). Conventional wisdom is a poor predictor of the relationship between discipline policy, student misbehaviour and teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 27-48.
- Hiebert, B., & Farber, I. (1984). Teacher stress: A literature survey with a few surprises. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 9, 14-27.
- Hipps, E. S. (1992, April). *Development of the measure of educator stress*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Holahan, C., & Moos, R. H. (1987). Personal and contextual determinants of coping strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 946-955.

- Iwanicki, E. F., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross validation study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41*, 1167-1174.
- Jackson, S., Schwab, R. L., & Schuler, R. S. (1986). Toward an understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(4), 630-640.
- Jenkins, S., & Calhoun, J. F. (1991). Teacher stress: Issues and intervention. *Psychology in the Schools, 28*, 60-70.
- King, A. J. C., & Peart, M. J. (1992). *Teachers in Canada: Their work and quality of life*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Teachers' Federation.
- Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1-11.
- Kuehn, L. (1994). *Teaching in the '90's Report No.2: Changing Sources of Stress*. Retrieved from [www.bctf.ca/researchreports/93wlc06](http://www.bctf.ca/researchreports/93wlc06)
- Kyriacou, C. (1981). Social support and occupational stress among school teachers. *Educational Studies, 7*, 55-60.
- Kyriacou, C. (1987). Teacher stress and burnout: An international review. *Educational Research, 29*, 146-152.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1977). The prevalence of stress among teachers in medium-sized mixed comprehensive schools. *Research in Education, 18*, 75-79.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1978a) A model of teacher stress. *Educational Studies, 4*, 1-6.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1978b). Teacher stress: Prevalence, sources, and symptoms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 48*, 159-167.

- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1979a). Teacher stress and satisfaction. *Educational Research, 21*, 89-96.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1979b). A note on teacher stress and locus of control, *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 52*, 227-228.
- Latack, J. C. (1986). Coping with job stress: Measures and future directions for scale development., *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 377-385.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- LeBlanc, C. (1994). Teacher time: Education's critical resource. *Education Canada, 34*(2), 12-15.
- Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). The effect of the social organisation of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology of Education, 64*, 190-208.
- Lingard, B., Knight, J., & Porter, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Schooling reform in hard times*. London: Falmer Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). *Maslach Burnout Inventory: Manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 99-113.

- McRae, R. R. (1984). Situational determinants of coping responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 919-928.
- Milstein, M. (1983). *Stress management in schools: The organization is the problem and the solution*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Moore, J. E. (1998). An empirical test of the relationship of casual attributions to work exhaustion consequences. In M. A. Rahim, R. T. Golembiewski, & C. C. Lundberg (Eds.), *Current topics in management 3* (pp. 36-67). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Moore, J. E. (2000). One road to turnover: An examination of work exhaustion in technology professionals. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 141, 28.
- Moos, R. H., & Billings, A. G. (1982). Conceptualizing and measuring coping resources and processes. In C. Goldberg & S. Breznitz, (Eds.), *Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects* (pp. 212-230). New York: Free Press.
- Naylor, C. (2001a). *Teacher workload and stress: An international perspective on human costs and systematic failure*. (British Columbia Teacher's Federation Research Report). Retrieved from [www.bctf.ca/education/worklife](http://www.bctf.ca/education/worklife)
- Naylor, C. (2001b). *What do British Columbia's teachers consider to be the most significant aspects of workload and stress in their work? Analysis of qualitative data from the BCTF Worklife of Teachers Survey series, 1: Workload and stress*. (British Columbia Teacher's Federation Research Report). Retrieved from [www.bctf.ca/education/worklife](http://www.bctf.ca/education/worklife)

- Ozag, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Schoolwork. Approaches to the labour process of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University.
- Periman, B., & Hartman, E. A. (1982). Burnout: Summary and research. *Human Relations*, 35(4), 283-305.
- Rathbone, C., & Benedict, C. (1980). *A study of teacher burnout at the junior high school level*. Portsmouth, NH: New England Teacher Corps Network.
- Reese, S. A., & Johnson, D. J. (1988). School size and teacher job satisfaction of urban secondary school physical education teachers. *Education*, 108, 382-384.
- Rottier, J., Kelly, W., & Tomhave, W. K. (1983). Teacher burnout-small and rural school style. *Education*, 104(1), 72-79.
- Sargent, L. R. (1981). Resource teacher time utilization: An observation study. *Exceptional Children*, 47(6), 420-25.
- Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF). (1995, June). *The workload and worklife of Saskatchewan teachers-full time teachers, 1994-1995*. (Research Report No. 12). Saskatoon: Author.
- Schaefer, A. (2001a). *Demographic Overview: Teacher workload issues and stress survey*. (British Columbia Teacher's Federation Research Report). Retrieved from [www.bctf.ca/education/worklife](http://www.bctf.ca/education/worklife)
- Schaefer, A. (2001b). *How I spent my summer vacation: Time-use data from the Spring 2001 BCTF Worklife of Teachers Survey Series-Workload issues and stress*. (British Columbia Teacher's Federation Research Report). Retrieved from [www.bctf.ca/education/worklife](http://www.bctf.ca/education/worklife)



- Schaefer, A. (2001c). Teacher workload and stress: A British Columbia perspective. By: Naylor, C, *Education Quarterly Review*, 8(3) 33-36.
- Schembari, P. (1994). Teacher workload in elementary and secondary school. *Education Quarterly Review*, 1(3), 11-16.
- Schwab, R. L. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventory form*. New York: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Schwab, R. L., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982a). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(1), 6.
- Schwab, R. L., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982b). Who are our burned out teachers? *Educational Research Quarterly*, 7, 5-16.
- Seddon, T. (1990). Who says teachers don't work? *Education Links*, 38, 4-9.
- Seddon, T. (1991). Teachers' work: A perspective on schooling. In R. Maclean & P. McKenzie (Eds.), *Australian Teachers Careers*. Hawthorn: Australia Council for Educational Research.
- Maclean, R., & McKenzie, P. (Eds.). (1991). *Australian teachers' careers*. Hawthorn: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Tellenback, S., Brenner, S., & Lofgren, H. (1983). Teacher stress: Exploratory model building. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 19-33.
- Thapan, M. (1986). Forms of discourse: A typology of teachers and commitment. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 7(4), 415-431.
- Tokar, E., & Feitler, F. C. (1986). A comparative study of teacher stress in American and British middle schools. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 6(1), 77-82.
- Watkins, P. (1993). Work, skill and teachers. *Unicorn*, 19(3), 65-74.

Watkins, P. (1994). The Fordist/post-Fordist debate: The educationalist implications. In J. Kenway (Ed.), *Economising Education: The post-Fordist direction* (pp.65-86). Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Appendix A  
Lethbridge Public School Local No. 41  
Teacher Workload Survey 2000  
Individual Teacher Survey

**Note:** Teachers are asked to provide their name so staff reps can ensure that every teacher has had an opportunity to respond to the survey. All identification will be removed from surveys before data is processed. **Please note, however, that the Economic Policy Committee may make the compiled data available to outside researchers (eg. Masters students) for purposes approved by the EPC.**

<b>Teacher Name</b>		<b>School</b>	
<b>Teaching Assignment</b>	In the spaces below provide data for each class that you teach during a normal week (this semester or reporting period)		

<b>Class</b> (subject and grade level. Eg. Science 7a, Info Pro20, Social Studies 4/5)	<b>Description</b> (eg: single grade, multi age group, special education, CTS ) (single or multi module, etc)	<b>Enrolment</b> (number of students on the class register. For multimodule CTS course, do not count a student more than once)	<b>Minutes of instruction per week</b> (= minutes/ class* number of meetings)	<b>Students with IEP's</b> (total number, then broken down by type. Eg: 3 in total, 2 ESL, 1 G&T)	<b>Classroom Assistants</b> (number assigned to class and number of minutes per week each is present)	<b>Pull Outs</b> (please indicate whether any students are "pulled out" of the class to receive special programming – number & minutes/ week)

<b>Scheduled Prep time/week</b> (minute)	
<b>Out of School Commitment to Instruction</b> (estimated or average number of <b>minutes/week</b> you spend during lunch hours, evenings, weekends, etc., to do marking, preparation, providing extra help, parental contacts, etc.)	<b>Min/wk</b>
<b>Field Trips</b> (Please estimate the total time ( <b>hours/year</b> ) you will spend supervising field trips, excursions, school "fairs" and so on)	<b>Hr/yr</b>
<b>Supervision</b> (Please estimate the total time ( <b>hours/year</b> ) you spend in a year providing general supervision for students – from 15 minutes before school begins to 15 minutes after school dismisses, including lunch, but not including co-curricular activities)	<b>Hr/yr</b>
<b>Co-curricular involvement</b> (estimate the total time you spend ( <b>hours/year</b> ) in supervising student co-curricular activities outside the normal school day – include before and after school, lunch programs and weekend commitments)	<b>Hr/yr</b>
<b>Professional Activities</b> (Please estimate the total time you spend ( <b>hours/year</b> ) doing work on various committees/projects as categorized below)	

<b>Professional Growth Plan</b>	Hr/yr	<b>District level committees/ meetings</b>	Hr/yr	<b>ATA Local, Provincial, Specialist Council Meetings</b>	Hr/yr
<b>School Committees</b>	Hr/yr	<b>Workshops/ conferences</b>	Hr/yr	<b>Other Professional Activities</b> (please specify)	Hr/yr

## Appendix B

**Lethbridge Public School Local 41  
Teacher Survey 2000  
Teacher Activity Log**

Teachers are telling us that workloads are increasing. Your ATA Local is trying to get a clear picture of what teachers "do" in this the first year of the millennium. Detailed interviews about general school programs and expectations are being conducted with all principals in Lethbridge School District No. 51. All teachers in the local have also been asked to complete a brief survey about their specific teaching/working conditions and about their overall workload.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the third component of this important project by completing the Teacher Activity Log. The attached activity log has been modeled on one that was used in the Edmonton Public School Local during 1997 and is intended to require only about 10 minutes daily to complete. We asked that you keep the booklet with you and check off your activities several times during each day. It really should be quite simple.

The information you provide in your log will be kept confidential by the Economic Policy Committee. Data you provide will be reported *only* after it has been compiled. Anything that could be used to identify any individual will be removed prior to the data being reported. **Please note, however, that the Economic Policy Committee may make the compiled data available to outside researchers (e.g. Masters students) for purposes approved by the EPC.**

Instructions for the Daily Log

In each time slot, write a two-letter code for the activity that occupied that time period. If, for example, recess or lunch begins in the middle of a time slot, don't worry about being exact—merely indicate the length of the activity. (Suppose recess starts at 10:27 and runs until 10:39. report it in the 10:30-10:40 time slot. Or if a phone call to a parent lasts from 11:14-11:18, you can either enter it in the 10 minute period (see sample below) or not report it at all, then mentally add those minutes to the next phone call.) Please use your judgment, but report your activities as accurately as possible. If an activity takes fewer than three minutes (class change for example) please just ass it to the activity of the previous time period. If the activity runs through several time slots, please use arrows or ditto marks. A sample portion of the logbook is provided below **(Keep in mind this a 24 hour record)**:

Time	Activity	Time	Activity
Noon	00-10	6:00 PM	00-10
	10-20		10-20
	20-30		20-30
	30-40		30-40
	40-50		40-50
	50-00		50-00
1:00 PM	00-10	7:00 PM	00-10
	10-20		10-20
	20-30		20-30
	30-40		30-40
	40-50		40-50
	50-00		50-00
2:00 PM	00-10	8:00 PM	00-10
	10-20		10-20
	20-30		20-30
	30-40		30-40
	40-50		40-50
	50-00		50-00

Since Lethbridge Public School Local 41 is providing all teachers who complete the daily log a gift certificate in appreciation for their time and efforts. It is necessary that you complete the demographic information below (it will be removed before any data is processed).

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

### Logbook Participants Demographic Information

Having agreed to participate in the Economic Policy Survey of teacher workload study, it is necessary for you to complete the following questions. All information will be confidential to only the EPC and the researcher compiling the information you provide. This will assist the Local in establishing and assessing various aspects of teacher workloads for comparison to previous ATA studies. Please fill out the information as accurately as possible.

#### General Information

1. Was this a “typical” work week? \_\_\_\_\_ If no, please outline circumstances that made it atypical. Use the space below and continue on the back cover if necessary.
  
2. Are there any circumstances about your school timetable( for example a compressed work week, lunch hour classes, closed campus etc.) that may affect the information you have provided? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, please provide the details.
  
3. The following information is optional, but will assist the EPC in assessing the impact that various demographic factors may have on teacher’s workload.

Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Years of Teaching Experience \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Children    Living with you    Living Elsewhere

Age <5	_____	_____
Age 5-12	_____	_____
Age 12-17	_____	_____
Age 18+	_____	_____

Do you have a spouse living with you? \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, is your spouse (Check all that apply):

Employed part time (in or out of the home)	_____
Employed Full time (in or out of the home)	_____
A teacher	_____
Full time at home	_____

## Appendix D

### Descriptors for Research Project Teacher Workload Study

#### Professional Activities

□ Professional Growth Plan (A)

Each teacher who holds a probationary or continuing contract is required to develop and implement a growth plan annually. School boards may also require other certificated or non-certificated staff to have a growth plan. A growth plan targets an area for professional growth each year. It may focus on an area a teacher would like to improve or it may build upon a strength a teacher possesses. The province requires that a teacher's professional growth plan (1) reflects goals and objectives based on assessment of the learning needs of the teacher, (2) shows a demonstrable relationship to the teaching quality standard and (3) takes into consideration the education plans of the school, the school authority and the government.

District Level Committees and/or Meetings (B)

These would include such things as Policy, Working Conditions, Poverty, Mentorship, Leadership, curriculum, safe and Caring Schools, Public Education Works and any ad hoc committees.

□ ATA Provincial, Local, Specialist Council Meetings (C)

These would include discipline specific related activities. Further the inclusion of Working Conditions, Economic Policy, Executive Council, Professional Development, Public Education Works, Social, ARA, Budget and other related committees.

□ School Committees (D)

Include in this would be committees pertaining to Timetable, Faculty Councils, Social, Technology, Curriculum, PAT's, Discipline, Gifted and Talented, Special Education, Policy, Mentorship, and so on.

□ Workshops and Conferences (E)

These would include those activities covered by Professional Development funding or individual teacher supplemented. They could be at the local, provincial, nation or international level. These would be either in the teacher capacity of participating in them, or delivering them.

□ Other Professional Activities (F)

Included in this would be participating in Master or Doctorate Degree Programs, Alberta Learning in Test Writing or Test Evaluation work, Alberta Education Commitments, Alberta Athletic Association commitments, National Coaching Certification Programs and so on.

#### School Required Time

□ Out of School Commitment to Instruction (G)

Estimated minutes per week spent during lunch hours, evenings, etc., to do marking, preparation, providing extra help, parental contacts and so forth.

- Field Trips (H)  
Estimated total time in a year spent in supervising field trips, excursions, school “fairs” and so forth.
- Supervision (I)  
Estimated total hours spent in providing general supervision for students—from 15 minutes before school begins to 15 minutes after school dismisses, including lunch, but *not including co-curricular* activities.
- Co-curricular Involvement (J)  
Estimated time spent in supervising student co-curricular activities outside the normal school day—include before and after school, lunch hour programs and weekend commitments.

#### Teacher Activity Log

- School Activities ( Codes for logbook follow each entry )
  - *Instruction-* teaching regularly assigned classes (SI)
  - *Lesson Planning-* preparation, planning, outlines, long and short term lesson plans, constructing tests and other diagnostic materials, reading and research for lessons and so on (SP)
  - *Classroom and Materials-* Clean up, pets, plants, repair and maintaining of equipment; preparing materials for class, including photocopying, getting supplies ready, setting up for labs etc. (SM)
  - *Curricular Activities-* Activities after school and school-wide or multi-class activities during the day (Science Fair, guest speakers, assemblies, presentations, field trips, track meets, talking with students, counselling, meeting with parents, interviews, school council, maintaining student portfolios, *plus* record keeping relative to the above. (SC)
  - *Evaluation and Marking-* Evaluation and marking of assignments, tests, projects, etc.( at home or at school); record keeping associated with the above (SE)
  - *Report Cards-* Assembling marks and comments (including anecdotal reports), entering marks, preparing and/or distributing report cards (SR)
  - *Supervision-* Supervision of students, hallways, lunch, busses, playgrounds, etc., includes detention, internal “coverage” and homeroom/advisor (SS)
  - *Consultation with Teachers-* Meeting with other teachers, administrators or other members of school staff; includes staff meetings, school or district meetings, pod/team meetings, C-Teams, and department meetings (ST)
  - *Consultation with Others-* Meetings with community members or outside agencies on matters relating to school programs or services (including extracurricular) (SO)
  - *Extra Curricular and Co-Curricular-* Supervision of extracurricular and co-curricular activities; sports, fund raising, performances, school dances, *plus* administration and record keeping to above (uniforms, equipment, etc.) (SX)
  - *Administrative Duties-* (for those with an administrative designation only) record any and all duties related to designation (SA)
  - *Lunch Recess and Socializing-* Sitting in the staff room, socializing, eating, etc. Use this code for “free” time when you are not required or expected to be at school and you do not do any of the fore mentioned activities (SL)

- *Driving-* Time spent as a driver or passenger on transportation *directly* related to school duties; include transportation to and from school related meetings, any transportation of students (except field trips) (SD)

□ Professional Activities

- *Professional Development-* Classes and school related courses taken, in-service days, workshops, presenting PD activities, meetings with colleagues about teaching methods, reading of a professional nature, attendance at conferences and conventions (PD)
- *Professional Growth-* All activities associated with preparation and documentation of Teacher Professional Growth Plans (PG)
- *Professional ATA-* Local council meetings and committee meetings, specialist council meetings, representing the ATA at meetings or other agencies (PA)

□ Home Activities

- *Home Activities-* All activities related to your home life; include housework, meal preparation, cleaning, eating, personal and family care, shopping (HH)
- *Volunteer and Service Activities-* Volunteer work of all types, caring for or assisting family or friends, community service, religious activities like church work or attending services (HV)
- *Recreation and Relaxation-* Leisure activities, exercise, recreation, TV, hobbies and entertainment; include attendance at sporting and cultural events, *plus* any time during the school day that is solely self-directed and used for relaxation (HR)
- *Sleep-* Include all “pillow time” even if you are watching TV, reading, or engaging in other bedroom activities(HS)



Appendix E

All Subsets  
Summary  
(hrs/yr)

School	#of Teach	Surv Return	%	Professional Activities	Avg Teacher Professional Activities	Out of School Commitment to Instruct	Avg Teacher Hours Commitment to Instruct	Field Trips	Supervision	Co- Curr	School Expected Teacher Time	Avg Teacher Total
High School 1	56	51	91	5231	102.6	781	15.3	1694	5234	9022	16746.3	328.1
High School 2	14	9	64	748	83.1	96	10.7	410	984	1108	2502	178.7
High School 3	13	12	92	2348	195.7	106	8.8	871	1935	1714	4520	347.7
High School 4	36	23	64	3005	130.7	254	11.0	1476	1683	3895	7308	317.7
Jr. High 1	23	15	65	1755	117.0	169	11.3	645	2815	1581	5221.3	226.5
Jr. High 2	26	26	100	4501	173.1	675	26.0	830	2543	2290	5663	217.8
Jr. High 3	31	16	52	4661	291.3	142	8.9	341	1320	1328	2989	96.4
Elementary 1	22	22	100	4533	206.0	301	14.0	587	1223	1775	3585	162.9
Elementary 2	16	13	81	1374	105.7	718	55.0	225	538	345	1108	69.2
Elementary 3	18	13	72	1696	130.5	527	41.0	242	813	409	1464	81.3
Elementary 4	19	18	95	3827	212.6	922	51.0	1065	932	614	2611	130.5
Elementary 5	9	7	78	1016	145.1	84	12.0	61	813	121	995	110.6
Elementary 6	16	16	100	1932	120.8	353	22.1	245	672	1006	1923	120.1
Elementary 7	21	17	74	1621	95.4	207	12.2	341	1335	673	2349	111.9
Elementary 8	15	11	73	2918	265.3	127	12.0	132	488	690	1310	87.3
Elementary 9	14	9	64	1613	179.2	130	14.4	234	717	262	1213	86.6
Elementary 10	6	6	100	500	83.3	51	9.0	44	547	225	816	136.1
Elementary 11	13	12	92	5202	433.5	225	19.0	101	382	198	681	52.4
Elementary 12	12	9	75	1066	118.4	101	11.2	127	469	222	818	68.2
Totals	380	305	78.4	49547	162.4	5969	20.0	9671	25443	27478	63822.6	209.2

## Appendix F

Professinal Activities  
Subset Comparison Summary  
(hrs/yr)

School	# of Teachers	A	B	C	D	E	F	School Time
High School 1	56	922	241	280	740	1798	1250	5287
High School 2	36	654	184	331	685	531	620	3041
High School 3	13	222	105	7	337	449	1228	2361
High School 4	14	79	52	48	207	287	75	762
TOTALS	119	1877	582	666	1969	3065	3173	11451

School	# of Teachers	A	B	C	D	E	F	School Time
Jr, High 1	23	133	67	51	174	1123	207	1755
Jr, High 2	26	269	364	841	835	1063	1129	4501
Jr, High 3	31	159	239	442	307	438	3076	4661
TOTALS	80	561	670	1334	1316	2624	4412	10917

School	# of Teachers	A	B	C	D	E	F	School Time
Elementary 1	16	205	177	344	313	370	523	1932
Elementary 2	22	529	232	1060	606	1035	1071	4533
Elementary 3	16	325	128	105	348	337	131	1374
Elementary 4	18	279	75	112	155	383	692	1696
Elementary 5	20	214	142	814	628	952	1077	3827
Elementary 6	9	62	40	130	160	240	384	1016
Elementary 7	6	133	46	15	192	114	0	500
Elementary 8	21	295	205	86	285	514	236	1621
Elementary 9	15	170	82	19	298	218	2131	2918
Elementary 10	14	274	44	61	151	673	410	1613
Elementary 11	13	471	144	49	158	631	3749	5202
Elementary 12	12	77	87	78	463	260	101	1066
TOTALS	182	3034	1402	2873	3757	5727	10505	27298

- (A) Professional Growth Plan
- (B) Distrisric level Committees/meetings
- (C) ATA Local, Provincial, Specialist Councils
- (D) School Committees
- (E) Workshops/conferences
- (G) Other Professional Activities

Appendix G  
Expected Time  
Subset Comparison Summary  
(hrs/yr)

School	# of Teachers	G	H	I	J	Expected Time
High School 1	56	781	1694	5234	9022	16731
High School 2	36	96	410	984	1108	2598
High School 3	13	106	871	1935	1714	4626
High School 4	14	254	1476	1683	3895	7308
TOTALS	119	1237	4451	9836	15739	31263

School	# of Teachers	G	H	I	J	Expected Time
Jr. High 1	23	169	645	2815	1581	5210
Jr. High 2	26	675	830	2543	2290	6338
Jr. High 3	31	142	341	1320	1328	3131
TOTALS	80	986	1816	6678	5199	14679

School	# of Teachers	G	H	I	J	Expected Time
Elementary 1	16	301	587	1223	1775	3886
Elementary 2	22	718	225	538	345	1826
Elementary 3	16	527	242	813	409	1991
Elementary 4	18	922	1065	932	614	3533
Elementary 5	20	84	61	813	121	1079
Elementary 6	9	353	245	672	1006	2276
Elementary 7	6	207	341	1335	673	2556
Elementary 8	21	127	132	488	690	1437
Elementary 9	15	130	234	717	262	1343
Elementary 10	14	51	44	547	225	867
Elementary 11	13	225	101	382	198	906
Elementary 12	12	101	127	469	222	919
TOTALS	182	3746	3404	8929	6540	22619

(G) Out of School Commitment to Instruction

(H) Field Trips

(I) Supervision

(J) Co-curricular

Appendix H

Time Comparisons of Teacher Workload Hours

Comparison Study	Weekly Hrs.		In School		Out of School		Week end		Unique Conditions of Study
	Avg. Workload	Hrs.	Av. Hrs per day	Hrs per day	Avg. Hrs per day	Avg. Hrs	Avg. Hrs		
Stats Canada (1994)	39.4		7.9		N/A		N/A	Nation-wide sample	
Canadian Teachers Fed (1990-92)	28		5.6		3.8		N/A	No teaching workload presented	
Drago (1996)	48.5		9.7		N/A		N/A	4 Urban School Districts from 30 Nation wide cities	
Saskatchewan (1995)	47.2		9.4		N/A		N/A	Diary method, 25-30 min/day, anecdotal, exaggeration	
B.C.T.F. (2000)	58		11.6		N/A		N/A	Random province-wide sample	
Wellington (1994)	54.5		10.9		N/A		6	Smaller schools-more responsibility than larger ones	
Warwick (1990)	49.6		9.92		4.4		N/A	No noticeable workload differences with gender	
Scottish Council (1993)	42.5		7.89		N/A		3.1	Diary method, used Occupational Stress Indicator	
Alberta (1996)	52.9		10.6		N/A		N/A	Random province-wide sample	
LeBlanc's (1994)	55		11		N/A		N/A	Asked hrs/yr or hrs/week as better indicator	
McGhan (1995)	43.3		8.7		N/A		N/A	Classroom workload=lack of school reform ability	
Gades and Dillion (1982)	55		11		N/A		N/A	Looked at vocational teachers	
U.S. (1997)	33		6.6		2.4		N/A	U.S. National Center for Education Statistics	
Local #41 ATA	46.3		9.3		2.7		0.15	A specific district look at three subsets	

## Appendix I

P.O. Box 673  
Lethbridge Alberta  
T1J 3Z6



Phone: (403) 320-5531  
Hours: Monday through  
Thursday, afternoons only  
Fax: (403) 329-3522  
ataleth@telusplanet.net

2003 January 8

### Two Whom It May Concern

Lethbridge Public School Local 41 directed Mr Guy Pomahac to undertake the study of teacher workload within our local for the purposes of gathering data for negotiations and historical reference. It was our desire that survey results would accurately reflect working conditions within our school district and it should be known that ethical considerations were discussed and adhered to. All identification was removed from surveys before information was processed and teachers were advised that compiled data would be made available to outside researches (eg Masters students) for purposes approved by the Economic Policy Committee of Lethbridge Public School Local 41.

All information received during this data collection will be used professionally and will be not be used, or misused as propaganda.

Sincerely

Ms B Witzke, Chair  
Economic Policy Committee  
Lethbridge Public School Local 41

eif