

A STUDY OF THE WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS IN THE  
CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES**

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY  
MAY BE XEROXED**

**(Without Author's Permission)**

KLAUS MICHAEL LUEDICKE

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

373579







A STUDY OF THE WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS IN THE CENTRAL  
AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS OF NEWFOUNDLAND

---

A Thesis

Presented to

The Department of Educational Administration  
Memorial University of Newfoundland

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education

---

by

(C) Klaus Michael Luedicke

May 1974

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine: (a) the effect that a teacher's sex and marital status, years of teaching experience, years of training, subject field, size of school, and average daily number of student contacts have on the workload of Central and Regional High School teachers in Newfoundland; (b) the views that teachers hold toward their actual teacher workload; (c) the teachers' estimation of a desirable workload and the recommendations of teachers for implementing the desired workload. Three time intervals were used when calculating a teacher's workload: the five-day week, the two-day weekend, and the seven-day week.

Data for the study was obtained through a questionnaire prepared by the investigator. Of the three hundred questionnaires sent to teachers, a net usable return of 66.7 percent was received.

An analysis of the data revealed that a teacher's sex and marital status, subject field, and average daily student contact have an influence on a teacher's total workload, as well as on some components comprising a teacher's workload. On the other hand, a teacher's years of teaching experience, years of training, and size of school have little or no effect on a teacher's total workload, or on the various components comprising a teacher's workload.

Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed by teachers toward their actual workload. They sought time provision during the regular school day for preparation and marking, a reduced classroom instruction load, a decrease in the student-teacher ratio, a reasonable quantity

of different subjects/courses taught by a teacher and the virtual elimination of non-professional tasks.

The findings further indicated that teachers desired a total workload of 38.75 hours in a seven-day week, as compared to an actual seven-day week workload of 43.83 hours. To implement the desired workload, seventy-five recommendations directed primarily toward local school administration, school boards, and the Department of Education were given. Approximately one-half of the recommendations were within the control or influence of the local school to implement. A reduction in the student-teacher ratio and the employment of teacher aides were the most often cited recommendations for implementing the desired workload. It was apparent in the study that teachers seek to have their occupation "professionalized". In part, this means being relieved of mundane tasks so that more time can be devoted to planning and carrying out their work for students.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance given by numerous persons in the preparation of this thesis. Dr. Robert Fisher, in his capacity as supervisor of the thesis, offered many suggestions, and gave much appreciated guidance and constructive criticism. Mr. Joe Price gave the writer considerable help in the analysis of the statistical data. A thank you goes to all of the teachers who took their valuable time to provide the investigator with the teacher workload data.

A special thank you goes to the writer's wife, Marie, who had overwhelming patience and understanding, and who was a source of much inspiration and enthusiasm for the writer.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	1
Nature of the Problem . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Significance of the Study . . . . .	2
Definition of Terms Used . . . . .	4
Limitations of Study . . . . .	5
Overview of Thesis . . . . .	5
Basic Assumptions . . . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
The General Problem of Teacher Workload . . . . .	7
Measuring Teacher Workload . . . . .	16
Reducing Teacher Workload . . . . .	21
Review of Selected Studies . . . . .	23
III. PROCEDURE . . . . .	36
Data Collection . . . . .	36
Instrument . . . . .	36
Sample . . . . .	36
Data Analysis . . . . .	38

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	40
Summary . . . . .	58
V. THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	64
Summary . . . . .	82
VI. THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	86
Summary . . . . .	105
VII. THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	109
Summary . . . . .	131
VIII. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	135
Summary . . . . .	153
IX. THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAILY STUDENT CONTACTS OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	157
Summary . . . . .	176
X. TEACHER VIEWS TOWARD THE ACTUAL TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	181
Number of Hours for Preparation . . . . .	182
Amount of Assigned Classroom Instruction Time . . . . .	184
Number of Hours for Marking . . . . .	185
Student-Teacher Ratio . . . . .	187
Number of Subjects Taught . . . . .	188
Clerical Work . . . . .	189
Number of Hours for Supervision . . . . .	190
Mental Fatigue and Exhaustion Factors in Teaching . . . . .	191
Summary . . . . .	193

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. TEACHER VIEWS CONCERNING A DESIRED TEACHER WORKLOAD . . .	194
A Comparison of the Desired Teacher Workload and the Actual Teacher Workload . . . . .	194
Recommendations for Implementing the Desired Teacher Workload . . . . .	200
Responsibility Resting with the Local School . . . . .	201
The Local School and Its Potential for Control . . . . .	203
Responsibility Resting with the School Board . . . . .	204
Responsibility Resting with the Department of Education . . . . .	205
Responsibility Resting with Other Bodies . . . . .	207
Summary . . . . .	208
XII. A COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY TO THE RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	209
The Actual Teacher Workload . . . . .	209
The Desired Teacher Workload . . . . .	216
Summary . . . . .	222
XIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	223
The Problem . . . . .	223
Procedure . . . . .	225
Findings Regarding The Actual Teacher Workload . . . . .	225
Findings Regarding The Desired Teacher Workload . . . . .	227
Conclusions . . . . .	229
Recommendations . . . . .	230
Problems for Further Study . . . . .	232
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	234
APPENDIX . . . . .	238



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. COMPARISON OF INSTRUMENTS FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF TEACHER WORKLOAD . . . . .	18
II. TOTAL WORKLOAD IN HOURS FOR VARIOUS TIME INTERVALS . . . . .	25
III. A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER WORKLOAD OF VARIOUS STUDIES . . . . .	27
IV. EVALUATION OF TEACHING LOAD AS RELATED TO AVERAGE NUMBER OF PUPILS TAUGHT DAILY . . . . .	32
V. A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND DESIRED WORKLOAD AS RECOMMENDED BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS . . . . .	35
VI. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF A SAMPLE OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	41
VII. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	42
VIII. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	44
IX. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	46
X. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	48
XI. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	49
XII. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION . . . . .	52
XIII. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	53
XIV. THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	54

## TABLE

## PAGE

XV.	THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	56
XVI.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	61
XVII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	62
XVIII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	63
XIX.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF A SAMPLE OF 199 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	65
XX.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	66
XXI.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	68
XXII.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	70
XXIII.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	72
XXIV.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	73
XXV.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION . . . . .	75
XXIV.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	77

## TABLE

## PAGE

XXVII.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	79
XXVIII.	THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	81
XXIX.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	83
XXX.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	84
XXXI.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN- DAY WEEK . . . . .	85
XXXII.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF A SAMPLE OF 197 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	87
XXXIII.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	88
XXXIV.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	90
XXXV.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	92
XXXVI.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	95
XXXVII.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	96
XXXVIII.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION . . . . .	98

## TABLE

## PAGE

XXXIX.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	99
XL.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	101
XLI.	THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES.	103
XLII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	106
XLIII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	107
XLIV.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	108
XLV.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF A SAMPLE OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	111
XLVI.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	112
XLVII.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	114
XLVIII.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	116
XLIX.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	119
L.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	121
LI.	THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION . . . . .	123

TABLE	PAGE
LII. THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	125
LIII. THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	126
LIV. THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	128
LV. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SUBJECT FIELD AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	132
LVI. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SUBJECT FIELD AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	133
LVII. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SUBJECT FIELD AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	134
LVIII. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL OF A SAMPLE OF 195 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	136
LIX. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	137
LX. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	139
LXI. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	141
LXII. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	143
LXIII. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	144
LXIV. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION . . . . .	146

TABLE	PAGE
LXV. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	148
LXVI. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	149
LXVII. THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	151
LXVIII. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	154
LXIX. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	155
LXX. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	156
LXXI. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF A SAMPLE OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	158
LXXII. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION . . . . .	159
LXXIII. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE PRE- PARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS . . . . .	161
LXXIV. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING . . . . .	163
LXXV. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS . . . . .	165
LXXVI. THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA- CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES . . . . .	167

## TABLE

## PAGE

LXXVII.	THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION. . . . .	168
LXXVIII.	THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK . . . . .	170
LXXIX.	THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES . . . . .	172
LXXX.	THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	174
LXXXI.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	178
LXXXII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	179
LXXXIII.	SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	180
LXXXIV.	A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK . . . . .	195
LXXXV.	A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND . . . . .	196
LXXXVI.	A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK . . . . .	197
LXXXVII.	A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS OF FOUR STUDIES . . . . .	210



TABLE	PAGE
LXXXVIII. A COMPARISON OF THE DESIRED TOTAL WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS OF TWO STUDIES . . . . .	217
LXXXIX. THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD OF NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS OF A SAMPLE OF 200 TEACHERS . . . . .	225
LC. THE DESIRED WORKLOAD OF NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS OF A SAMPLE OF 200 TEACHERS . . . . .	228

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Teacher workload has been studied by educators for more than half a century. Severe shortages of teachers, booming enrollments, and increasing costs of education have served as prime stimulators for teacher workload studies. Numerous individuals have developed teaching load formulas in an effort to gauge precisely a teacher's workload.

In comparison to the United States, few teacher workload studies have been carried out in Canada. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association conducted a survey of teacher workload in 1961 as part of the Canadian Teachers' Federation national survey. However, due to a low percentage of return, the completed questionnaires were never separately tabulated for the province. No other teacher workload studies have been conducted in Newfoundland.

#### The Problem

Nature of the problem. The time a teacher spends in the classroom teaching is but one component comprising the actual time spent on duties for which the teacher is held responsible. Tasks related to instruction and tasks unrelated to instruction are not necessarily performed during the regular school day, but are nevertheless activities which comprise a teacher's total workload. It should be of interest to educators generally, and to administrators

in particular, to have knowledge of the workload of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher, so as to have an additional rationale from which to evolve teacher assignment policies.

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to analyze the workload of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher. More specifically, it was to examine:

1. The effect of the following selected factors upon the median hourly workload in a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week:
  - a) Sex and marital status.
  - b) Years of training.
  - c) Years of teaching experience.
  - d) Subject field.
  - e) Size of school.
  - f) Average daily number of student contacts.
2. The views that teachers hold toward their actual workload.
3. Teachers' estimation of a desirable workload.
4. Teachers' recommendations for implementing the desired teacher workload.

Significance of the study. A relationship between a teacher's morale and teaching efficiency exists. According to Friesen, "Good teachers are those who demonstrate a considerable degree of job-satisfaction."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John W. Friesen, "All Is Not Well In The Teaching Profession," The A.T.A. Magazine, 1 (March-April, 1970), 14.

Secondly, if the complex goals of modern education are to be met, it is imperative that the question of teacher workload be closely examined and be adjusted to reasonable expectations. A National Education Association Committee on Teacher Load concluded that:

There was an inescapable relationship between teacher load and the goals of modern education. As teacher load becomes heavier, the possibility of the goals being attained becomes less and less.<sup>2</sup>

McMurtry propounds that teacher workload will become one of the crucial issues in education in the 1970's.<sup>3</sup> Referring to a survey made of Toronto teachers dealing with staff-board relations and working conditions, he states:

Toronto teachers rate their board under 59% in both staff-board relations and working conditions . . . the lowest in the Board's history. There is little doubt that the next clash in public education will be over such issues. The major areas which will come under teacher fire will be:  
     teacher and non-teacher workload  
     pupil-teacher ratios  
     staff-administration relations.<sup>4</sup>

Davis argues that teacher workload studies serve as concrete evidence with which to gain public support for increased school staffs.<sup>5</sup> This undoubtedly has relevance for the Newfoundland setting. Evidence produced from workload studies in Newfoundland can be directed to the

---

<sup>2</sup>"N.E.A. and Teacher Welfare: Teacher Load," National Education Association Journal, XLV (February, 1956), 97.

<sup>3</sup>John McMurtry, "Three Main Areas for Complaint," Monday Morning, II (January, 1968), 32.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Hazel Davis, "What to do About Teaching Load?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (December, 1962), 156.

provincial decision-makers in education to support rational work assignments.

Little has been definitely known in Newfoundland about the workload of the Central and Regional High School teachers. Varying opinions have been expressed by teachers and administrators, and the public in general. However, no completed teacher workload studies have been found by the investigator. Therefore, considering the total situation, the need for this study was demonstrated.

#### Definitions of Terms Used

Central High School. A school that exclusively accommodates pupils in grades 7 to 11 inclusive, or grades 8 to 11 inclusive.

Regional High School. A school that exclusively accommodates pupils in grades 9 to 11, inclusive, or grades 10 to 11 inclusive.

Teachers. An individual holding a valid teaching certificate and who is employed to instruct students, but who is not designated as a principal or vice-principal.

Teacher workload. The total time required to perform the varied tasks for which a teacher is normally held responsible.

Five-Day Week. Monday through Friday inclusive.

Two-Day Weekend. Saturday and Sunday.

Seven-Day Week. Monday through Sunday inclusive.

### Limitations of the Study

This study has surveyed the workload of only Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers and the views held by this group. The conclusions and implications drawn from this research are consequently only applicable to this group of Newfoundland educators. Secondly, only six variables, of a large number of possible variables, have been used in an attempt to determine what has an effect on teacher workload.

### Overview of Thesis

Data for this study were obtained by means of a questionnaire sent to Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. Chapter I introduces the problem investigated. Chapter II reviews the related literature on teacher workload. Chapter III presents the procedure followed for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapters IV to IX examine the selected factors of sex and marital status, which includes members of religious orders, years of training, years of teaching experience, subject field, size of school, and average daily number of student contacts, to determine which have an effect on teacher workload. The views that teachers have regarding their actual workload is dealt with in Chapter X, while the workload that teachers perceive to be desirable and the recommendations that they have for implementing it is contained in Chapter XI. Chapter XII compares the findings of this study to the findings of related studies. A summary of this study as well as the conclusions of this study, together with recommendations and problems for further study are presented in Chapter XIII.

### Basic Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, it was assumed by the investigator that the data given by teachers regarding their actual teacher workload reflected the situation as it actually exists. It was also assumed that the selected factors of sex and marital status, years of training, years of teaching experience, subject field, size of school, and average daily number of student contacts are independent of each other in the effect that they might have on a teacher's workload.



## CHAPTER 11

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### The General Problem of Teacher Workload

To educate the whole child is the task of today's school. The physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of the child must be catered to, as well as the mental needs. Recognition, therefore, on the part of the teacher that each child is an individual is of prime importance. However, are teachers viewed as being individuals or are they all treated the same? Just as children have different interests, abilities, individual likes and dislikes, and different capacities, so do teachers. Do working conditions recognize the individual differences of teachers and do they permit teachers to meet their professional obligations adequately? One writer does not think so. He states:

Consider a teacher staggering under too many periods per week, too many students per class, too many books to mark, too many subjects to prepare, too much imposed in-service training to keep up with, too many meetings to attend, and all too often, too many recognized or unrecognized humiliations to be consistent with full self-respect. Consider the reaction of this teacher when he is told that he is oppressing students, stifling inquiry, and merely handing on stale packages of knowledge for students to regurgitate back to him.<sup>1</sup>

Administrators desire to have highly qualified teachers who conduct themselves in a professional manner. How professionally are

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Andree, "Large Classes and Effective Teaching", The Clearing House, XXXI/1 (February, 1959), 49.

teachers treated? Selden refers to the situation in Toledo schools where teachers are usually involved in a teaching rôle almost all of the time that school is in session. Unilaterally pre-established patterns of time result in the teacher being placed in a classroom that is normally isolated from other classrooms; teaching and planning alone; having few opportunities to engage in professional inter-classroom visitation with other teachers or discussion with other teachers to see what else is happening in the school or how other teachers are meeting their problems; or carrying out common planning with other teachers. Therefore, with almost all of the teacher's time accounted for, the range of freedom of how the teacher utilizes his time is severely limited. It is in this context that teachers are told by administrators to innovate, be imaginative, try out new ideas, and experiment with new materials.<sup>2</sup>

Timmermans maintains that teachers are required to devote too many hours on activities which prevent them from spending time on the activity for which they are trained and prize the most--teaching. Activities referred to are supervising in the halls, the cafeteria, the gym, as well as presiding over study halls and examinations.<sup>3</sup> Hunter refers to the uneconomical use of the teacher's time on activities such as supervision of halls, study supervision, supervision

---

<sup>2</sup>David Selden, Teacher Workload and Teacher Dropout, Quest Papers Series, No. 5 (Washington: American Federation of Teachers, 1969); 1.

<sup>3</sup>Brian D. A. Timmermans, "Teachers, Time and Teaching", Educational Courier, XLII (April, 1972), 5.

of students boarding and getting off busses, lunch hall supervision, and a whole array of extra-curricular tasks, repetitive paper work and record keeping as

the best example of practices that keep teachers in the background of new advances. It is ludicrous, uneconomical and degrading to a teacher when he is forced to spend a high proportion of his day in tasks that have nothing to do with teaching or are not remotely connected with imparting knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

In a Canadian Education Association panel discussion on teacher workload, a past president of the Canadian Teachers' Federation went so far as to suggest that when the number of hours in the day are insufficient for the number of activities to be carried out properly, teachers must say, "My job is classroom instruction. I will prepare my lessons and I will check the pupils' work and I will do the rest to the extent that I have time".<sup>5</sup>

Clement concludes that higher salaries are advocated for teachers, yet they spend a significant portion of their time doing tasks that should be performed by aides, assistants, or secretaries. "We seek to raise the professional status of teachers, yet keep them performing duties hardly professional in nature".<sup>6</sup>

Findings of studies give support to the view that too much

---

<sup>4</sup>David J. Hunter, "Working Conditions", The Bulletin, XLV (December, 1965), 517.

<sup>5</sup>Bruce Mickleburgh, "Keeping Posted", The Educational Courier, XXXVI (November-December, 1965), 36.

<sup>6</sup>Stanley Clement, "More Time for Teaching", The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (December, 1962), 54.

time is devoted to non-professional tasks by teachers. The British Columbia Teachers' Federation study revealed 19.8 percent.<sup>7</sup> The Canadian Teachers' Federation found 10.3 percent<sup>8</sup>, while the Alberta Teachers' Association study concluded 8.8 percent.<sup>9</sup>

The number of students that a teacher has to teach has a profound influence on the quality of teaching that is taking place when considering the goal of individualizing instruction. Obviously the more students a teacher has, the more time is required for preparation, marking, student and parent interviews, and clerical activities. The energy expended by the teacher is greater. Research, however, is inconclusive in supporting the foregoing statements. Nevertheless, it is Keliher's contention that for those who care about the child's personal, creative, and social development, there are studies that support the plea by teachers for a reasonable class size.<sup>10</sup> One writer argues that many people in and out of education are fruitlessly trying to define the exact pupil-teacher ratio for ultimate learning efficiency. Instead, he feels that it is more

---

<sup>7</sup>British Columbia Teachers' Federation, Teaching Assignments in Some British Columbia Secondary Schools and Their Workload Implications, 1967-68, Informational Report No. 5, (Victoria: British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1968), 12.

<sup>8</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, Teacher Workload: A Cross-Canada Survey of the Workload of Canadian Teachers, A Report Prepared by the Research Division (Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1962), 22.

<sup>9</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, The Professional Load of Alberta Teachers, A Report Prepared by the Professional Load Committee (Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association, 1963), 12.

<sup>10</sup>Alice V. Keliher, "Effective Learning and Teacher-Pupil Ratio", The Education Digest, XXXI (January, 1966), 20-21.

logical to support the experimentation that is taking place with different pupil-teacher ratios within the economic restrictions that dictate what the pupil-teacher ratio is. Through approaches such as teacher aides, para-professionals, team-teaching programs, individual student study centers, and modular scheduling, efforts are being made to make whatever pupil-teacher ratio is in effect more meaningful.<sup>11</sup>

In a review of the research on the effectiveness of class size on learning, Sitkei concluded that:

1. Although the research studies of class size are not conclusive, there are twice as many studies in favor of smaller classes over larger classes.
2. Smaller classes tend to have more variety in instructional methods used than do larger classes.
3. Desirable practices tend to be dropped when class size is increased; desirable practices are added when class size is decreased.
4. The strongest and best supported argument for small classes is that they are a guarantee against "educational accidents".
5. If the teacher is not informed of changes in class-size policy, the results are poorer than if he is aware of the situation.

---

<sup>11</sup>V. M. Short, "Let's Take the Mystique Out of Education," School Progress XXXIX (May, 1970), 52.

6. Depressions and other socio-economic forces result in decreasing class size, and economic prosperity in increasing class size; pressure to increase class size results in a rash of studies on the effects of varying class size,<sup>12</sup>

It is Weber's view that problems of teacher workload are:

1. Functions of the climate of the school.
2. Functions of the basic attitude of teachers.
3. Functions of the individual energy output of the teacher.
4. Functions of the amount of money available for school support.<sup>13</sup>

More specifically Weber concludes that where schools were autocratically operated by administrators, teacher workload was considered to be a major problem, whereas in schools where a philosophy was followed in which teachers participated meaningfully in the planning and decision-making process, and in which principals substituted leadership for authority, and where principals were the co-ordinators of teacher initiated ideas and procedures, teacher workload was not considered by teachers to be a major problem.<sup>14</sup> The irony of Weber's statement is that democratically operated schools often mean more work for teachers.

Is there a need to study teacher workload? According to some writers we have come to expect more of our teachers than they are

---

<sup>12</sup>George E. Sitkei, The Effects of Class Size: A Review of the Research, Research Study Series (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County of Superintendent of Schools, 1968), 10.

<sup>13</sup>Clarence A. Weber, Leadership in Personnel Management in Public Schools, (St. Louis: Warren H. Green, Inc., 1970), 68.

<sup>14</sup>Clarence A. Weber, Personnel Problems of School Administrators, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1954), 125-126.

able to handle. The essential ingredient of time has been neglected in the assignment of responsibilities to teachers. Hunter contends that working conditions prevent teachers from keeping pace with the rapid advances taking place in education. Teachers educated in the 1940's, 1950's, 1960's are expected to prepare students to live in the 1970's, 1980's and on into the twentieth century. These teachers, however, are not given the time to adequately prepare their work and keep up-to-date to meet the new ideas in their subject area.<sup>15</sup>

A teacher workload study, therefore, will ascertain whether indeed the best use is made of the time, energies and skills of teachers. Umstattd suggests that specific issues will emerge in a study of teacher workload by a school staff:

1. Are there kinds of staff we ought to have, but do not have at the present?
2. Can we relieve teachers of some non-teaching duties and if so, which ones?
3. Can teachers work together in certain combinations or teams to produce for pupils better opportunities for learning and do so with more efficiency?
4. Do we have sufficient teacher energy to revise and update the curriculum: if we don't, how can we with this end in view rearrange organization and responsibility in our

---

<sup>15</sup>Hunter, loc. cit.



School.<sup>16</sup>

Elsbree and Reutter suggest that teacher workload studies serve to make the establishment of a policy defining the minimum number of hours that teachers should devote to their teaching duties easier. It may result in job descriptions for teachers being developed. Frank assessments of the existing staff and equipment should follow as an outcome of a teacher workload study. If additional staff resources cannot be added when a severe overloading problem exists, the present curriculum program needs to be examined for possible pruning.<sup>17</sup>

The consequences of the present teaching load of many teachers are frustration and demoralization. Stinnett propounds that no factor has more to do with success or failure than teacher workload.<sup>18</sup>

McMurtry states that in various surveys conducted by Canada's provincial Departments of Education,

overwork, too-large classes, administrative interference, and general frustration are reasons given just as frequently as poor salary by men and women who have quit the profession.<sup>19</sup>

McMurtry continues by discussing a study made of teachers

---

<sup>16</sup>J. G. Umstattd, "How Can a School Get Started on a Staff Utilization Improvement Project?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIV, (April, 1960), 201.

<sup>17</sup>Willard Elsbree and Edmund Reutter, Staff Personnel in Public Schools, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), 98-101.

<sup>18</sup>T. M. Stinnett, Professional Problems of Teachers, (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1969), 226-227.

<sup>19</sup>John McMurtry, "Three Main Areas for Complaint," Monday Morning, 11 (January, 1968), 32.

under the Toronto Board of Education. The Toronto teachers gave their board a 59 percent rating in both staff-board relations and working conditions, which was a drop of 12.5 percent from the previous year. Teacher and non-teacher workload, pupil-teacher ratios, and staff-administration relations will be, in McMurtry's view, the major areas of clash in public education in the 1970's.<sup>20</sup>

The point is also made by McMurtry that between 11 and 20 percent of the total Canadian teaching body leaves the profession annually.<sup>21</sup> In an address to a local of the Alberta Teachers' Association, Friesen expounded that for every one hundred teachers who receive proper certification, only 12 to 15 percent actually remain in the teaching profession.<sup>22</sup> Staple indicates that in the 1969-70 school year, 22.4 percent of the Newfoundland teaching force from the previous school year left the profession. A considerable portion of this turnover was for up-grading reasons and housewives returning to the home for a period of time. The permanent teacher dropout from the profession in this time period, however, was 4.9 percent.<sup>23</sup> Working conditions and low morale are major factors contributing to teacher dropouts.

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>John W. Friesen, "All Is Not Well In The Teaching Profession", The A.T.A. Magazine, L. (March-April, 1970), 13.

<sup>23</sup>Mark Staple, An Investigation of the Supply-Demand Schedule for Teachers in the Province of Newfoundland with Projections to 1980-81. A Report Prepared by the Educational Planning Division, Department of Education (St. John's: Department of Education, 1971), 34-35.

### Measuring Teacher Workload

Being a teacher is not a standardized type of occupation. The workload that one teacher has is likely to be different from that of another teacher due to a host of factors. Meyers cited the most comprehensive list of factors, reviewed by the investigator, that contribute to a teacher's workload. The twenty-five factors were categorized under the three headings of Personnel, Curricular, and Personal Morale.<sup>24</sup>

#### Personnel

- Number of pupils taught per week
- Pupil clock hours

- Personal equation between teacher and pupil

- Personality of classes (general)

- Class size
- Classification
- Disciplinary standards
- Attitude toward work
- Age of pupils' maturity
- Morals--citizenship standards
- Mentality
- Attendance habits
- Home environment of pupils

#### Curricular

- Extra-curricular duties

- Variations in load because of subject matter

- Amount of preparation (pre-class)
- Amount of contingent work (post class)
- Number of different preparations
- Number of classes taught daily
- Amount of non-class clerical work, supervision, administration, etc.

---

<sup>24</sup>L. L. Meyers, "Needed: An Objective Method of Determining Teacher Load", The Nation's Schools, 111 (April, 1943), 30-31.

Physical environment  
 Length of school day  
 Relative subject weightings  
 Number of different fields in which the teacher works  
 Type of school organization  
 Length of period  
 Relative weight of teaching and laboratory  
 Size of school and its type  
 Utilization of physical aids, mode of presentation

#### Personal Morale

Relation between teaching load and teacher's capacity and proportional rewards  
 Emotional features of school conditions  
 Teacher's health  
 Teacher sex  
 Length of service and permanence  
 Professional growth  
 Community and non-school activities  
 Preparation for field of training

The teacher workload studies reviewed by the investigator took most of the factors from the Curricular grouping into account: amount of extra-curricular duties, preparation time, post class contingent work, amount of clerical work, supervision time, length of class period and school day. As one would anticipate, some of the non-statistical type Personal Morale factors are not usually found in studies because they are difficult to measure. The Canadian Teachers' Federation study cites sex, grade level, subject field, and experience of the teacher as among the most frequently employed variables in teacher workload studies.<sup>32</sup> In addition, the investigator found years of training, size of school, marital status to be used rather frequently.

Numerous formulas have been developed to measure teacher workload. Table 1 presents the workload factors that are taken into account

---

<sup>32</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit. 11.

TABLE 1  
COMPARISON OF INSTRUMENTS FOR THE MEASUREMENT  
OF TEACHER WORKLOAD\*

Elements of Workload	Originators					
	Douglass	Almack- Bursch	Brown- Fritzmeier	Sand	Frost	Petit
Class Periods	X	X	X	X	X	X
Duplicate Assignment	X			X		
Number of Preparations	X		X		X	X
Number of Pupils	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cooperation	X	X	X	X		X
Subject Weight	X	X	X			
Standard Teacher Load					X	
Length of Period	X		X		X	

\*Leonard Clark, "Teaching Load Formulas Compared", The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XL (September, 1956), 55-61.

in some of the better known formulas. The Almack and Bursch, Brown and Fritzmeier formulas derive a teaching load index. Both formulas, however, are somewhat difficult to understand. Sand discarded the single load index. Instead, his formula gives the relationship of the various factors to each other and to standards established by him. However, no total load measure is given. Frost's formula is based on clock hours. Inadequate rationale into some aspects of his formula result in the formula's short comings. Petit concentrated on a point system in his formula. His formula is fairly easy to understand and compute.<sup>33</sup>

Perhaps the best known and most frequently used formula is that derived by Harl Douglass. His formula was first derived in 1928. Four years later it was refined. In 1950 it was revised. The Douglass formula is based on units, each of which represent the teaching of one class of twenty pupils for one fifty minute period. The formula reads:<sup>34</sup>

$$TL = SGC \left[ CP - \frac{Dup}{10} + NP - \frac{25CP}{100} \right] \left[ \frac{PL + 50}{100} \right] + \left[ .6PC \right] \left[ \frac{PL + 50}{100} \right]$$

TL = units of teaching load per week  
SGC = subject coefficient used for giving relative weights to classes in different subject fields

---

<sup>33</sup>Leonard Clark, "Teaching Load Formulas Compared," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XL (October, 1956), 55-61.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid, 57.

- CP = class periods spent in classroom per week  
 DUP = number of class periods spent per week in classroom teaching classes for which the preparation is very similar to that for some other section, not including the original section  
 NP = number of pupils in classes per week  
 PC = number class periods spent per week in supervision of the study hall, student activities, teachers' meetings, committee work, assistance in administrative or supervisory work, and other cooperations  
 PL = gross length of class periods in minutes.

Numerous criticisms have been levelled against the use of the Douglass formula. It does not take into account all the factors of wear and strain on the teachers. It has been argued that the formula is difficult and time consuming to compute. Douglass refutes this latter criticism. According to him, it should only take about three minutes to compute once you are used to working with it. The subject coefficient set up to weight different subjects is protested by many teachers. Duplicate sections are also criticized. Some teachers claim that they do not really exist. Preparation time cannot be reduced if teachers are taking individual differences into account. The measurement of cooperations are criticized on the grounds that no single index can take into account the amount of time and energy needed for all the different cooperations. Despite all of the criticism, the Douglass formula is one of the most widely used and highly respected teacher workload formulas.<sup>35</sup>

Elsbree and Reutter suggest that the utilization of a formula makes the process of measuring teacher workload more objective.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Clark, op. cit., 55-57.

<sup>36</sup>Elsbree and Reutter, op. cit., 102.

Weber, on the other hand, propounds that if the principle is applied that "no product can be more accurate than its least accurate factor, no formula for measurement of teaching load could be more accurate than the basic assumptions regarding the nature of the teaching experience".<sup>37</sup>

For Weber, teaching is not a routine, burdensome type occupation. Rather it is an artistic experience. For those who hold the former view of teaching, formulas have an important function. Subscribers to the latter view could not, according to Weber, accept the application of formulas or equations to measure a teacher's workload.<sup>38</sup>

#### Reducing Teacher Workload

Beginning with the collective bargaining era of the 1960's, teachers are demanding agreements which contain limitations on the school day, school year, class size, extra-curricular assignments, and classes designed to aid teachers in maintaining discipline. All have an effect on teacher workload. The major obstacle to immediate improvement in many of these areas seems to be cost.<sup>39</sup> Selden computed that to implement a 4-period instruction day for the teacher and an absolute limit of 25 pupils in class size would require that the

---

<sup>37</sup>Clarence A. Weber, Leadership in Personnel Management in Public Schools (St. Louis: Warren H. Green, Inc., 1970), 64.

<sup>38</sup>Weber, Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>T.M. Stinnett, The Teacher Dropout (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970), 71.



teacher workforce in the United States would have to be doubled.<sup>40</sup>

Douglass offers twenty-four ways in which the workload of teachers can be reduced. Twelve of the suggestions do not cost any money. These are:

1. Avoiding long, tedious, uninteresting teachers' meetings at the close of a full day of regular work.
2. Preventing or reducing to a minimum the interferences with the usual routine of the daily schedule: that is, special assemblies, interruptions by visitors or by the central sound system, etc. .
3. Providing simplified forms for all regular school reports, notices, and other clerical routine.
4. Ensuring that new teachers obtain wholesome and pleasant places to room and board and assisting them to develop something like normal social life.
5. Securing instructional supplies in advance of the date of actual use.
6. Assisting teachers to "discover" and use methods involving less tension, such as the laboratory method and recitation method.
7. Helping teachers to discover time-saving methods for conducting written quizzes and for testing daily preparations.
8. Helping teachers to discover other ways of solving disciplinary problems than that of keeping students after school.
9. Reducing fear and insecurity; conducting supervision in such a way as to eliminate fear.
10. Keeping to an almost negligible minimum the time requirement of teachers in connection with drives, campaigns, and the like.
11. Developing a considerate and co-operative attitude in working with teachers; letting them have, individually and

---

<sup>40</sup>Selden, loc. cit.

collectively, a voice in matters concerning their work; giving them encouragement, inspiration, and constructive advice.

12. Developing throughout the school a friendly, cheerful atmosphere and cordial relations between students, teachers, and other personnel.<sup>41</sup>

Of the twelve remaining suggestions, some definitely require expenditures, while others would vary from school to school. Included are such ideas as providing substitute teachers promptly, providing mimeographing material, allowing teachers to use the school secretary for business correspondence, providing aides and assistants. Keeping class size to not more than 25 pupils, keeping the number of different subjects a teacher is teaching to a minimum, taking co-operative activities into account in a teacher's total workload, and providing teachers with office space contributes to reducing a teacher's workload.<sup>42</sup>

#### Review of Selected Studies

The National Education Association conducted the first national teacher workload study in the United States in 1939. It revealed that teachers spent a median of 30.8 periods weekly in classroom instruction. A median of 10.3 hours was spent in out-of-class activities, other than preparation and marking.<sup>43</sup> In response to the continued

---

<sup>41</sup>Harl R. Douglass, Modern Administration of Secondary Schools (2nd ed.), (New York: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1964), 88-89.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 89.

<sup>43</sup>"The Teacher Looks at Teacher Load", N.E.A. Research Bulletin, XVII (November, 1939), 231.

interest being expressed in teacher workload, the National Education Association conducted its second national study in 1950. It found that an average of twenty-five fifty-five minute periods was devoted to classroom instruction, or 23.1 hours. Out-of-class activities comprised 13.0 hours, while miscellaneous duties added up to 11.9 hours. In other words, the 1950 study revealed that teachers spent a mean weekly workload of 48.0 hours.<sup>44</sup>

Canada's first national teacher workload study was conducted in 1961 by the Canadian Teachers' Federation, in close co-operation with the provincial teachers' organizations. Six time intervals were used, ranging from the school day to the yearly total. Table 11 presents the total workload for the various time intervals.

---

<sup>44</sup>"Teaching Load in 1950", N.E.A. Research Bulletin, XXIX (February, 1951), 13.

TABLE 11

TOTAL WORKLOAD IN HOURS FOR VARIOUS  
TIME INTERVALS\*

Time Interval	Median	Mean
School day	9.1	9.2
Weekend	3.6	4.5
7-day school week	49.6	50.4
Easter and Christmas holidays	9.7	20.7
Summer holidays	37.5	95.5
Yearly Total	2,051.0	2,118.0

\*Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 21.

In a seven-day week, Canadian teachers spent a median of 49.6 hours on their teaching responsibilities.

Two more teacher workload studies were under way in Canada during the 1961-62 school year. The Alberta Teachers' Association conducted its study as a result of a directive given to the Executive Council in the Association's 1961 Annual General Meeting. A seven-day workload of 50.2 median hours was being devoted to teaching responsibilities by Alberta High School teachers.<sup>45</sup> Fenske's study dealt with the workload of two hundred and six Central Alberta high

<sup>45</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 12.

school teachers. Only ten or fewer teacher schools were included.

Fenske found that teachers in his sample spent a median of 43.27 hours on their duties.<sup>46</sup>

Table III presents a breakdown of the teacher workload components used in the Canadian Teachers' Federation, Alberta Teachers' Association, and Fenske studies, together with the time devoted by teachers to each component. The Canadian Teachers' Federation and Alberta Teachers' Association studies include professional activities which refer to time spent at seminars, institutes, conventions teacher organization activities, university courses, and professional reading. It is debatable whether some of the professional activities should be credited under teacher workload. Course work is one example. Including all professional activities naturally increases a teacher's workload. The time spent on classroom instruction by teachers in the three studies ranged from a high of 24.7 hours to a low of 21.63 hours. The heaviest preparation load was 10.8 hours by the teachers in the Alberta Teachers' Association study, and the lightest preparation load was 7.48 hours by teachers in Fenske's sample. Little difference in the time devoted to professional activities was reported. Fenske's study revealed the most time spent on testing, which included marking, with 5.48 hours. Relatively little time was spent on extra-curricular activities by any of the teacher groups in the three studies. Supervision time ranged from 2.9 hours to 2.4 hours. The Alberta Teachers' Association study found

---

<sup>46</sup>Milton Fenske, "An Analysis of the Work-Week of a Central Alberta High School Teacher" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961), iv.

TABLE 111

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER WORKLOAD  
OF VARIOUS STUDIES\*

Elements of Workload	Five-Day Week		Seven-Day Week	
	Studies			
	C.T.F.	Fenske	C.T.F.	A.T.A.
Instruction	24.5	21.63	24.7	24.7
Preparation	6.7	7.48	9.5	10.8
Professional	1.8	--	2.2	1.6
Testing (marking)	3.2	5.48	3.9	4.1
Extra-Curricular	0.0	1.00	.5	.4
Supervision	2.4	2.48	2.4	2.9
Admin.-Clerical	--	--	--	1.2
Admin.-Professional	--	--	--	1.6
Other	.6	--	1.0	--
Total	45.13	43.27	48.5	50.2

\*Canadian Teachers' Federation, op., cit., 28-30.

\*Fenske, op. cit., 26-38.

\*Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 12.

that teachers were spending 1.2 hours on Administrative-Clerical activities, and 1.6 hours on Administrative-professional activities. A total of 1.00 hours was spent by teachers in the Canadian Teachers' Federation study on other activities. The total median workload is affected by the teacher workload components included in the study. This is quite obvious when it is the teachers in the Alberta Teachers' Association study that had the highest workload of 50.2 hours, and the teachers in Fenske's study had the lowest workload of 43.27 hours.

The Canadian Teachers' Federation study also determined the workload of teachers in the two-day weekend. The median time spent on preparation of lessons and materials was 1.7 hours, .30 hours was devoted to professional activities, and .50 hours on testing. Teachers had a total median workload of 3.51 hours in the two-day weekend.<sup>47</sup>

The British Columbia Teachers' Federation study revealed that teachers had a mean work-week of 43 hours. Classroom teaching comprised 44.6 percent of the teachers' load, non-teaching made up 19.8 percent, and school related activities 35.6 percent. Teachers spent an average of 19.5 hours in the classroom with an average class size of 28, and an average daily pupil load of 112.<sup>48</sup>

Five of the seven studies reviewed had sex and/or marital status as one of the factors which may have an effect on teacher

---

<sup>47</sup>British Columbia Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 12-14.

<sup>48</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 12.

workload. The 1950 National Education Association study,<sup>49</sup> and the Canadian Teachers' Federation study<sup>50</sup> both found single and married males to have a heavier workload than their female counterparts. Members of religious orders reported the heaviest workload in the Canadian Teachers' Federation study. The Alberta Teachers' Association<sup>51</sup> and Fenske<sup>52</sup> studies concluded that sex has little effect on a teacher's total workload. It does, however, have some effect on workload components. Both studies reported that males spent significantly more time on extra-curricular activities, while the Alberta Teachers' Association study found females to be spending more time on supervision than males, and the Fenske study found females to be spending more time on marking. The Manitoba Teachers' Society found marital status to have an effect on teacher workload.<sup>53</sup> Single teachers reported having the highest workload. It can be concluded from these studies that sex and marital status appear to have some effect on the component comprising a teacher's workload. The effect that sex and marital status have on total workload seems to be inconclusive.

---

<sup>49</sup>"Teaching Load in 1950", op. cit., 13.

<sup>50</sup>"Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 30.

<sup>51</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 24.

<sup>52</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 76.

<sup>53</sup>Manitoba Teachers' Society, The Workload of Manitoba Teachers, 1965-66, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Teachers' Society, 1966), 45.



The Alberta Teacher's Association,<sup>54</sup> Canadian Teachers' Federation,<sup>55</sup> Manitoba Teachers' Society,<sup>56</sup> and Fenske<sup>57</sup> studies included years of teaching experience as one of the factors that may have an effect on teacher workload. Two of the studies concluded that teacher workload decreases as years of teaching experience increases. The Canadian Teachers' Federation study found that teachers with 0, 1 and 2 years of teaching experience tended to have the heaviest workload. The Alberta and Fenske studies found that beginning teachers spent the most time on preparation. Fenske also found that teachers with 21 or more years of teaching experience spent significantly less time on preparation of lessons and materials. Years of teaching experience seems to have some effect on teacher workload.

Years of training was a selected factor in the Alberta Teachers' Association study,<sup>58</sup> and Fenske<sup>59</sup> study. Both concluded that years of training was not an influencing factor on teacher workload.

Subject field was included in the 1950 National Education Association study,<sup>60</sup> The Canadian Teachers' Federation study,<sup>61</sup> the

---

<sup>54</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 39.

<sup>55</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 33.

<sup>56</sup>Manitoba Teachers' Society, op. cit., 60.

<sup>57</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 54.

<sup>58</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 32.

<sup>59</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 68.

<sup>60</sup>"Teaching Load in 1950", op. cit., 15.

<sup>61</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 40.

Alberta Teachers' Association study<sup>62</sup>, and Fenske study<sup>63</sup>. The 1950 National Education study found that English and Social Studies teachers have the heaviest workload, and Mathematics teachers the lightest workload. In the Canadian Teachers' Federation study, English teachers spent nearly two hours more per week marking than did other teachers. Social Studies teachers had the heaviest preparation load. Fenske found that Social Studies and English have the heaviest marking load. He also found that Home Economics and Industrial Arts teachers spent significantly less time on the various teaching activities in comparison to all other groups. The Alberta Teachers' Association study found the opposite of other studies. English/Social Studies teachers had the lightest workload. The subject that a teacher is teaching has an effect on his workload.

The size of school seems to have some effect on teacher workload according to the Canadian Teachers' Federation<sup>64</sup> and Manitoba Teachers' Society<sup>65</sup> studies. The Alberta Teachers' Association<sup>66</sup> and the Fenske<sup>67</sup> studies concluded that the size of school has little effect on teacher workload.

---

<sup>62</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 79.

<sup>63</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 39.

<sup>64</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 35.

<sup>65</sup>Manitoba Teachers' Society, op. cit., 36.

<sup>66</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 69.

<sup>67</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 87.

The National Education Association study, The American Public-School Teacher, found that as the daily student contact increased, there tended to be an increase in the percentage of teachers who viewed their load as being heavy and extremely heavy. Table IV presents the evaluation of teaching load in relation to the average number of pupils taught daily.

TABLE IV

EVALUATION OF TEACHING LOAD AS RELATED TO  
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PUPILS TAUGHT DAILY\*

Evaluation of Teaching Load	Average Number of Pupils Taught Daily			
	Fewer than 115	115-149	150-184	150 or more
Number reporting	365	341	266	410
Reasonable load	72.6%	65.1%	55.6%	50.2%
Heavy load	23.0%	29.3%	36.5%	39.8%
Extremely heavy load	4.4%	5.6%	7.9%	10.0%

\*National Education Association, The American Public-School Teacher, (Washington: National Education Association, 1967), 28.

Teachers on either end of the daily pupil contact continuum reported their loads as reasonable, heavy, or extremely heavy. Other factors affecting teacher workload must be involved.

Among the studies examined, the degree of teacher dissatis-

faction was considerable. The range was from 30.9 percent<sup>68</sup> to 44.0 percent<sup>69</sup>. Specific complaints by teachers in the Fenske study that contributed to dissatisfaction were:

1. Classes too large.
2. Too many extra-curricular activities.
3. Too wide a variety of subjects to prepare for.
4. Credit load too great.
5. Should not have to supervise periods.
6. Extra-curricular work not shared equally.
7. Too much time spent on meetings.
8. Too much clerical work.
9. Too much time required for lesson preparation.
10. Lack of duplication of subjects which would help reduce the load.<sup>70</sup>

As workload increased, Fenske found the general trend that teacher dissatisfaction also increased.

Among the important teaching conditions that have an effect on lightening teacher workload, as reported by high school teachers in the 1950 National Education Association study are:

1. Friendly, sympathetic principal.
2. Adequate textbooks and supplies.
3. Teacher is teaching preferred grade or subject.

---

<sup>68</sup>British Columbia Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 23.

<sup>69</sup>"The Teacher Looks at Teacher Load", op. cit.

<sup>70</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 102.

4. Principal with insight into classroom problems.
5. Appreciative, responsive pupils in majority.<sup>71</sup>

Teachers in the Alberta Teachers' Association study<sup>72</sup> sought a ten percent reduction in the time devoted to instruction and preparation, i.e. from 27.70 hours to 22.23 hours, and from 10.80 hours to 9.78 hours. In addition, they sought a decrease of forty percent in supervision time. An increase of eighteen percent was desired for professional activities.

Table V compares the actual workload of teachers with the desired workload for teachers as recommended by teachers and principals in the Fenske study. A significant decrease in classroom instruction, preparation, and total workload time was recommended by both teachers and principals. Principals also recommended a decrease in marking time. A significant increase in extra-curricular activities was recommended by both teachers and principals.

---

<sup>71</sup>"Teaching Load in 1950", op. cit., 26.

<sup>72</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 85.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND  
DESIRED WORKLOAD AS RECOMMENDED  
BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS\*

Teacher Workload Components	Actual Workload	Desired Workload Recommended by Teachers	Signi- ficance	Desired Workload Recommended by Principals	Significance
Classroom Instruction	21.63	20.25	.01	20.00	.05
Preparation	7.48	6.00	.05	5.50	.01
Marking	5.48	5.00	nil	4.00	.01
Extra-Curricular	1.00	1.75	.01	2.00	.05
Supervision	2.48	2.42	nil	2.75	nil
Total	43.27	40.00	.01	39.50	.01

\*Fenske, op. cit., 106-117.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Data Collection

Instrument. A questionnaire was developed by the investigator after a study of the related literature. The instrument is divided into three parts. Part I sought personal and professional data needed to divide the sample into the various categories for each selected factor. Part II gathered information as to what the actual workload of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher was in a five-day school week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week; and the views that teachers held toward their actual workload. Part III collected data on the workload that teachers considered to be desirable, and the recommendations that they had to implement the desired teacher workload.

To establish face validity of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted in one urban and in one rural junior high school. Eighteen out of thirty-five questionnaires were completed and returned. At the end of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to comment and offer suggestions for improving the construction and content of the questionnaire. Four changes were made in the questionnaire as a result of the pilot study. One new question was added, and three questions were re-worded to make them clearer.

Sample. In the 1970-71 school year, there were forty Regional

High Schools and one hundred and four Central High Schools in Newfoundland. The former had a teacher population of 630 or 36.7 percent of the high school population, and the latter had a teacher population of 1085 or 63.3 percent of the high school population. The completed usable returns are broken down into 86 or 43.0 percent from Regional High School teachers and 114 or 57.0 percent from Central High School teachers. The distribution of teachers in relation to type of school in this study is reasonably close to the provincial distribution. The teachers included in this study were chosen by means of a table of random numbers.

On April 20, 1971, an introductory letter was sent to district superintendents and teachers. A copy of the questionnaire was included with the letter to the district superintendents. Five days later, questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of three hundred Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. By the end of the first week in May, one hundred and six completed returns were received. On May 7, the first follow-up letter was sent to teachers. Forty-nine more returns were received by May 21. On this same date, the second follow-up letter was mailed. Twelve additional returns were received by the end of May. On June 1, the final follow-up letter was sent together with a second copy of the questionnaire in the event that some teachers might have misplaced or destroyed the first copy. By the end of June, forty-two more returns were received for a total of two hundred and nine or 69.7 percent. Two hundred of the two hundred and nine questionnaires were actually usable. Of the nine questionnaires that had to be



disregarded, five were improperly filled out, two were from guidance counsellors, one from a part-time teacher, and one from a teacher who taught at both the high school and elementary levels. Therefore, a usable return of 66.7 percent was obtained.

### Data Analysis

To determine whether a selected factor had a significant effect on teacher workload for a five-day school week, two-day week-end, and seven-day week, the median test was used.

The median test is a procedure for testing whether two independent groups differ in central tendencies. More precisely, the median test will give information as to whether it is likely that the two independent groups (not necessarily of the same size) have been drawn from populations with the same median. The null hypothesis is that the two groups are from populations with the same median; the alternative hypothesis may be that the median of one population is different from that of the other or that the median of one population is higher than the other.<sup>1</sup>

The combined median for all scores in both samples were found. Both sets of scores are dichotomized at the combined median and the data cast in a 2 X 2 table. Siegel states that when N is larger than 40, Chi Square is used; when N is between 20 and 40 and no cell has a frequency of less than 5, Chi Square is used; when N is less than 20, the Fisher test is used.<sup>2</sup> The .05 level of significance for the median test was used in this study.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), 111.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 112.

The views that teachers held concerning their actual workload were studied. Commonality was looked for. Appropriate headings were derived which categorized the responses to the question, "What are your views concerning this workload?"

The replies to the teachers' estimation of a desired workload were compared to the teachers' actual workload. To test the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between the actual and desired workload", the median test was applied. The .05 level of significance was used.

The replies to the teachers' recommendations for implementing the desired workload were tabulated. The final data appears in the form of a list of recommendations.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

Based on a review of the related literature, no conclusive statements can be made regarding the effect of the combined factors of sex and marital status on teacher workload. It is, therefore, the purpose of this chapter to determine what effect these combined factors have on the workload of a sample of 200 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers.

Table VI gives the groupings into which teachers were divided for the purpose of this study and the number of teachers in each group. The largest group is Married Male, 108, and the smallest is Married Female, 18. The other three groups approximate each other in terms of number fairly closely--Single Male, 28; Member of Religious Order, 26; and Single Female, 20.

All of the tables that follow Table VI in this chapter are based on the sex and marital status groupings and numbers as shown in Table VI. The times given in the tables are in hours and are for three time intervals: a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive). The median times were determined from the times as reported by teachers.

The time spent on classroom instruction by teachers in the various sex and marital status groups is presented in Table VII.

TABLE VI

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF A SAMPLE OF  
200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL  
HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Sex and Marital Status	Number
Single Female	20
Single Male	28
Married Female	18
Married Male	108
Member of Religious Order	26
Total	200

Since teachers reported no instruction time in the two-day weekend, the times for the five-day week and seven-day week are the same. A relatively small numerical difference exists in the time spent on classroom instruction between the various groups. Members of Religious Orders devoted the most time with 22.33 hours, while Single Females reported the least time with 19.33 hours. The total group median time of 20.42 hours was exceeded by two groups - Members of Religious Order and Single Male. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant differences, at the .05 level, between the various sex and marital status groups in the time devoted to classroom instruction.

Sex and marital status is not an influencing factor in the

TABLE VI1

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO  
CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	19.33	nil	0.00	nil	19.33	nil
Single Male	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
Married Female	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
Married Male	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
Member of Religious Order	22.33	nil	0.00	nil	22.33	nil
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

amount of time spent by teachers in classroom instruction.

The number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials by teachers according to sex and marital status is given in Table VIII. In the course of a five-day week, teachers in the Member of Religious Order group reported the heaviest preparation load with 9.00 hours. The Married Male group recorded the lightest load with 5.00 hours. For the remaining three groups, the loads ranged from 5.50 to 6.67 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time of 6.00 hours--Single Female and Member of Religious Order. The median test for two independent groups revealed that members of religious orders spent significantly more time on preparation when compared to the remaining groups. The application of the median test also indicated that married males spent significantly less time than other teachers on the preparation of lessons and materials.

In the two-day weekend, all but one group spent 2.00 hours on preparation. The Married Female group reported 1.75 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was 2.00 hours. No statistical relationship was found between the sex and marital status of a teacher, and the time devoted to preparation in a two-day weekend when the median test was applied.

A considerable numerical difference exists between the various sex and marital status groups and the number of hours given to preparation in a seven-day week. Members of religious orders devoted the highest time with 12.00 hours. They were followed closely by single females who reported 10.00 hours. The remaining groups in descending order are: Married Female, 8.00 hours; Single Male, 7.67 hours; and

TABLE V111

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER AND THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO PREPARATION OF  
LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	6.67	nil	2.00	nil	10.00	nil
Single Male	5.17	nil	2.00	nil	7.67	nil
Married Female	5.50	nil	1.75	nil	8.00	nil
Married Male	5.00	.05	2.00	nil	7.00	.05
Member of Religious Order	9.00	.05	2.00	nil	12.00	.05
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

Married Male, 7.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that members of religious orders spent significantly more time, at the .05 level, on preparation than any other sex and marital status group. Conversely, married males spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on preparation than any other sex and marital status group in a seven-day week.

The sex and marital status of the teacher appears to be an influencing factor in the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a five-day week and in a seven-day week.

Table 1X presents the time that teachers in the various sex and marital status groups devoted to marking. In the course of a five-day week, the range is from 4.50 hours by married males to 5.50 hours by single females. The median time for all teachers as one group was 5.00 hours. Only single females exceeded the total group median time. When the median test for two independent groups was applied, it was revealed that married males spent significantly less time on marking than any other sex and marital status group.

For the two-day weekend, all but one group spent 2.00 hours on marking. The Married Male group reported 1.00 hours. Single females spent significantly more time on marking in a two-day weekend than any other group according to the results of the application of the median test. Married males, conversely, spent significantly less time on marking than any other group.

In a seven-day week, single females reported the highest time with 9.00 hours, while married males reported the lowest time with 6.00 hours. The remaining groups spent from 6.75 to 7.00 hours



TABLE 1X

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO MARKING\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	5.50	nil	2.00	.05	9.00	nil
Single Male	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
Married Female	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.75	nil
Married Male	4.50	.05	1.00	.05	6.00	0.5
Member of Religious Order	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

on marking. Four of the five groups exceeded the total group time of 6.00 hours. It was revealed by the median test for two independent groups that married males spent significantly less time on marking than any other group in a seven-day week.

Sex and marital status appears to have some influence on the time devoted to marking by teachers.

The number of hours spent on staff and departmental meetings is given in Table X. It must be pointed out that it may have been difficult for some teachers to estimate on a weekly basis the time devoted to such meetings. It is recognized by the investigator that varying time intervals occur between staff and departmental meetings. No teacher reported spending time on meetings in a two-day weekend. Consequently, the times reported for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. All but one group spent 1.00 hours on staff and departmental meetings. The exception is the Member of Religious Order group which indicated .50 hours. The median amount of time devoted by all teachers as one group is 1.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that married males spent significantly more time on staff and departmental meetings than did teachers in any other group. Secondly, it revealed that members of religious orders spent significantly less time on these meetings than did teachers in any other group.

Sex and marital status appear to have some effect on the time devoted to staff and departmental meetings.

Table XI indicates the number of hours devoted to extra-curricular activities by teachers in the various sex and marital

TABLE X  
 THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
 AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO  
 STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
 (N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Single Male	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Male	1.00	.05	0.00	nil	1.00	.05
Member of Religious Order	.50	.05	0.00	nil	.50	.05
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE X1  
THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	0.00	.05	0.00	nil	.33	.05
Single Male	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	3.00	nil
Married Female	0.00	.05	0.00	nil	0.00	.05
Married Male	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.42	nil
Member of Religious Order	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	2.50	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

status groupings. In a five-day week, single males devoted the most time to this activity with 2.00 hours. The Single Female and Married Female groups reported spending no time on this activity. Two groups exceeded the total group median of 1.00 hours--Single Male and Member of Religious Order. The median test for two independent groups revealed that the Single Female and Married Female groups spent significantly less time on extra-curricular activities than any of the other remaining groups.

While some teachers in all sex and marital status groups spent time on extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend, each group recorded spending no time on this activity. No statistical relationship was found between the sex and marital status of a teacher and the number of hours devoted to extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend.

A numerical difference of 3.00 hours exists between the two extreme groups in the time devoted to extra-curricular activities in a seven-day week. Single males reported the highest time with 3.00 hours, who in turn were followed closely by members of religious orders with 2.50 hours. Married females reported spending no time on extra-curricular activities. Single females reported the second lowest time with .33 hours. The median for all teachers as one group was 1.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that the Married Female group spent significantly less time on extra-curricular activities than any other group. The median test also revealed that single females spent significantly less time on extra-curricular activities than all other groups with the exception of the

Married Female group.

The sex and marital status of a teacher has some influence on the amount of time devoted to extra-curricular activities.

The supervision load of teachers in the various sex and marital status groups is presented in Table X11. No teacher in any group reported spending time on supervision in the two-day weekend. Consequently, the times for the five-day week and seven-day week are the same. Members of religious orders had the heaviest supervision load with 1.63 hours. Single males reported 1.58 hours, while married males reported 1.50 hours. The remaining two groups each had a 1.00 hours supervision load. Only one group exceeded the total group median of 1.50 hours. No significant difference, at the .05 level, in the time devoted to supervision was revealed when each group was compared to the remaining groups.

No statistical relationship exists between the sex and marital status of a teacher, and the number of hours devoted to supervision.

Table X111 presents the time devoted to clerical work by teachers in the various sex and marital status groups. All groups devoted a median amount of 1.00 hours on clerical work in a five-day week. The median amount of time for all teachers as one group was 1.00 hours. No significant differences, at the .05 level, were revealed by the median test on the number of hours devoted to clerical work by teachers in the different groups.

While some teachers were performing clerical work in a two-day weekend, each group reported spending no time on clerical work

TABLE X11

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Single Male	1.58	nil	0.00	nil	1.58	nil
Married Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Male	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
Member of Religious Order	1.63	nil	0.00	nil	1.63	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE X1.11

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
Single Male	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Male	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Member of Religious Order	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.33	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups



in this time period. The median test revealed no significant differences at the .05 level of significance.

In a seven-day week, the Single Female group reported the heaviest clerical load with 2.00 hours. Three groups each recorded a clerical load of 1.00 hours. The Member of Religious Order group was the only group to exceed the total group median time of 1.00 hours with 1.33 hours. No statistical relationship was found to exist between the sex and marital status of a teacher and the number of hours devoted to clerical work.

The sex and marital status of a teacher has no effect on the amount of clerical work that the teacher performs.

The number of hours devoted to miscellaneous activities is given in Table XIV. The term "miscellaneous" refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven that have already been examined in this chapter. Student conferences, parent conferences, and P.T.A. meetings were given as examples of miscellaneous activities in the questionnaire. Only one group reported spending a different amount of time on miscellaneous activities in a seven-day week from a five-day week. This was the Married Male group which reported .92 hours in a five-day week and 1.00 hours in a seven-day week. The times for the remaining four groups ranged from .75 hours reported by single females, to 1.00 hours reported by single males, married females, and members of religious orders. The total median group time for both the five-day week and seven-day week was 1.00 hours. All groups reported spending no time on miscellaneous activities in a two-day weekend. The median test for two independent groups revealed that

TABLE XIV

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	.75	nil	0.00	nil	.75	nil
Single Male	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Female	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Married Male	.92	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Member of Religious Order	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

no significant difference, at the .05 level, existed between the various groups on the number of hours devoted to miscellaneous activities for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week.

Sex and marital status have no effect on the number of hours devoted by a teacher to miscellaneous activities.

Table XV presents the number of hours devoted to all the teaching activities which comprise a teacher's workload for each of the sex and marital status groups. In a five-day week, three groups exceeded the total median group time of 39.25 hours; Member of Religious Order, 42.33; Single Female, 41.17; and Single Male, 40.17. The Married Female group spent 38.13 hours, while the Married Male group recorded 37.42 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that the Member of Religious Order group spent significantly more time, at the .05 level, on teaching activities than any other group. It was also revealed that the Married Male group spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on teaching activities than any other group in a five-day week.

The Member of Religious Order group spent the most time on total teaching activities in a two-day weekend with 7.13 hours. The Married Male group spent the least time with 4.00 hours, followed closely by the Married Female group with 4.25 hours. The two single groups each reported 6.00 hours. The total median group time of 5.00 hours was exceeded by three groups. It was revealed by the median test that the Member of Religious Order group spent significantly more time, at the .05 level, on total teaching activities than any of the remaining groups. Secondly, it was revealed that the

TABLE XV

THE SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=200)

Sex and Marital Status	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
Single Female	41.17	nil	6.00	nil	47.50	nil
Single Male	40.17	nil	6.00	nil	46.42	nil
Married Female	38.13	nil	4.25	nil	41.63	nil
Married Male	37.42	.05	4.00	.05	41.75	.05
Member of Religious Order	42.33	.05	7.13	.05	51.17	.05
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

Married Male group spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on total teaching activities than any of the remaining groups.

The number of hours devoted to all teaching activities by the 200 teachers as one group in a seven-day week was 43.83 hours. A numerical difference of 9.54 hours exists between the two numerically extreme groups. The time devoted to all teaching activities by each of the sex and marital status groups in descending were: Member of Religious Order, 51.17 hours; Single Female, 47.50 hours; Single Male, 46.42 hours; Married Male, 41.75 hours; and Married Female, 41.63 hours. Three groups exceeded the total group median time. The median test for two independent groups revealed that the Member of Religious Order group spent significantly more time on total teaching activities than any other sex and marital status group. The Married Male group spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on total teaching activities than any other group in a seven-day week.

Sex and marital status appears to be an influencing factor in teacher workload.

### Summary

Tables XVI, XVII, and XVIII present a summary of significant differences between the number of hours devoted to the various teaching activities by teachers according to sex and marital status and all other teachers for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week. In the course of a five-day week, single females and married females spent significantly less time on extra-curricular activities when compared to the other groups. Married males devoted significantly less time to the preparation of lessons and materials, while members of a religious order reported spending significantly more time on this activity. Married males also reported spending significantly less time on marking than any other group of teachers, but did report significantly more time on staff and departmental meetings. Members of a religious order reported spending significantly less time on staff and departmental meetings. Finally, married males had a significantly lighter total workload, while members of a religious order the heaviest total workload.

For a two-day weekend, single females reported spending significantly more time on marking than any of the remaining groups, while married males reported spending significantly less time. As in the five-day week, married males spent significantly less time on total teaching activities and members of a religious order significantly more time.

In a seven-day week, single females had a significantly heavier marking load than any other group of teachers. Married males

had a significantly lighter preparation, marking and total teacher workload. Married males, however, devoted significantly more time to staff and departmental meetings. Members of a religious order reported having a significantly heavier preparation and total teacher workload than any of the remaining groups, but also reported having a significantly lighter staff and departmental meeting load.

The findings of this chapter suggest that sex and marital status do have an effect on certain teaching activities as well as on the total teacher workload.

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS  
ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL  
OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Sex and Marital Status	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activi- ties
	Classroom Instruc- tion	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cleri- cal Work	Miscel- laneous Activi- ties	
Single Female	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
Single Male	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Female	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Male	nil	.05	.05	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Member of Religious Order	nil	.05	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS  
ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL  
OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Sex and Marital Status	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruc- tion	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activities	
Single Female	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Single Male	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Female	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Male	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Member of Religious Order	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XV111

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS  
ACCORDING TO SEX AND MARITAL STATUS AND ALL  
OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK\*

Sex and Marital Status	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruc- tion	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Word	Miscel- laneous Activities	
Single Female	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
Single Male	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Female	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Married Male	nil	.05	.05	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Member of Religious Order	nil	.05	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

## CHAPTER V

### THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

The assumption considered in using the years of training as a factor in teacher workload is that as a teacher with increased training has a wider background and pool of information to draw on in his teaching activities, a reduction in the workload may result. This may be particularly true of the teacher's preparation load. This chapter will examine the validity of this assumption for a sample of 199 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers.

Table XIX presents the groupings used and the number of teachers in each years of training group. In ascending order of years of training, 34 teachers are in the 1 to 2.9 group, 31 in the 3 to 3.9 group, 55 in the 4 to 4.9 group, 41 in the 5 to 5.9 group, and 38 in the 6 or more group. Throughout this chapter, the groupings as outlined in Table XIX will be used. The times given are as reported by teachers and are in hours for a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive).

The number of hours devoted to classroom instruction by teachers in the various years of training groups is presented in Table XX. Since no teacher reported spending time on classroom instruction on the weekend, the median hours for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. The numerical range is small between the various years of training groups. Teachers in the 1 to

TABLE XIX

THE YEARS OF TRAINING FOR A SAMPLE  
OF 199 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND  
REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Years of Training	Number
1 to 2.9	34
3 to 3.9	31
4 to 4.9	55
5 to 5.9	41
6 or more	38
Total	199

2.9 group reported the highest time with 21.00 hours, while the 5 to 5.9 and 6 or more groups each reported the lowest time of 20.00 hours. It is frequently recommended in the teacher workload literature that beginning teachers be given the lightest classroom instruction load. However, for this sample of beginning Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers, the recommended practice was not followed. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant differences, at the .05 level, between the various years of training groups.

The number of years of training that a teacher has completed does not appear to influence the number of hours devoted by a teacher to classroom instruction.

TABLE XX

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	21.00	nil	0.00	nil	21.00	nil
3 to 3.9	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
4 to 4.9	20.58	nil	0.00	nil	20.58	nil
5 to 5.9	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
6 or more	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

Table XXI presents the time devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials by teachers in each of the years of training groups. The numerical difference between the highest and lowest number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a five-day week is 2.25 hours. Teachers in the 4 to 4.9 group reported the highest time with 7.25 hours, followed by teachers in the 1 to 2.9 group with 6.75 hours. The 3 to 3.9 group and 6 or more group each reported the lowest time of 5.00 hours. The 1 to 2.9 and 4 to 4.9 groups exceeded the total group median time of 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, between the various years of training groups in the time devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials.

In a two-day weekend, all groups reported 2.00 hours. The total group median time was also 2.00 hours. No significant differences were found between the various years of training groups and the number of hours devoted to preparation upon application of the median test.

The number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a seven-day week by teachers in each of the years of training groups ranged from 6.50 hours to 10.00 hours. The 4 to 4.9 group had the heaviest preparation load, followed by the 2 to 2.9 group with 9.00 hours. Teachers in the 3 to 3.9 group had the lightest preparation load. The 6 or more group recorded 7.25 hours, while the 5 to 5.9 group spent 8.00 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time of 8.00 hours. When the median test was

TABLE XXI

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N = 199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	6.75	nil	2.00	nil	9.00	nil
3 to 3.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.50	nil
4 to 4.9	7.25	nil	2.00	nil	10.00	nil
5 to 5.9	6.00	nil	2.00	nil	8.00	nil
6 or more	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.25	nil
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

applied, no significant differences, at the .05 level, were found between the various groups.

Based on the findings presented in Table XXI, it must be concluded that the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials is not influenced by the number of years of training that a teacher has.

The marking load of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers is given in Table XXII. Three groups - 1 to 2.9, 4 to 4.9 and 5 to 5.9 - each devoted 5.00 hours to marking. The 3 to 3.9 group spent 4.25 hours, and the 6 or more group reported 4.00 hours. No group exceeded the total group median time of 5.00 hours. The application of the median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, in the number of hours devoted to marking.

All but one years of training group spent 2.00 hours on marking in a two-day weekend. The 4 to 4.9 group reported 1.50 hours. The total group median time was 2.00 hours. No statistical relationship was found upon application of the median test between the years of training a teacher has, and the number of hours devoted to marking.

In the course of a seven-day week, three groups recorded 6.00 hours of marking - 3 to 3.9, 5 to 5.9, and 6 or more. The remaining groups each indicated 7.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, in the time devoted to marking by the various years of



TABLE XXII

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
3 to 3.9	4.25	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
4 to 4.9	5.00	nil	1.50	nil	7.00	nil
5 to 5.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
6 or more	4.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

training groups.

The number of years of training that a teacher has does not appear to have an effect on the marking load of a teacher.

Table XXIII presents the number of hours spent by teachers in staff and departmental meetings for each years of training group. No teacher reported devoting time to staff and departmental meetings on a weekend. Consequently, the times presented for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. All groups recorded 1.00 hours. The total group median time was also 1.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed no statistical relationship between the number of years of training that a teacher has and the number of hours devoted by a teacher to staff and departmental meetings.

The years of training that a teacher has completed has no influence on the time devoted by a teacher to staff and departmental meetings.

The extra-curricular activity load of teachers in each years of training group is presented in Table XXIV. The 5 to 5.0 group reported the heaviest load in a five-day week with 2.00 hours. The 1 to 2.9 and 4 to 4.9 groups each indicated spending no time on this activity, while the 3 to 3.9 and 6 or more groups were in between the extreme groups with 1.00 hours. Only one group exceeded the total group median time of 1.00 hours. It was revealed by the median test that teachers in the 5 to 5.9 group devoted significantly more time to extra-curricular activities than any of the other groups. It was also found by the median test that teachers in the 4 to 4.9 group

TABLE XXIII

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF  
AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
3 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4 to 4.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
5 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XXIV

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-  
CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES \*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	0.00	nil	0.00	nil	.25	nil
3 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
4 to 4.9	0.00	.05	0.00	nil	.50	.05
5 to 5.9	2.00	.05	0.00	nil	2.00	.05
6 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

spent significantly less time on this activity than any other group.

Over thirty percent of the 199 teachers indicated that they spent some time on extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend. However, the median recorded for each group indicated that no group spent time on this activity. No significant difference revealed itself between the various years of training groups.

In a seven-day week, the number of hours that teachers were engaged in extra-curricular activities ranged from .25 hours to 2.00 hours. The lightest extra-curricular load was reported by teachers in the 1 to 2.9 group with .25 hours, followed by the 4 to 4.9 group with .50 hours. The 3 to 3.9 and 6 or more groups each recorded 1.50 hours, while the 5 to 5.9 group spent 2.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that a statistical relationship exists between a teacher's years of training and a teacher's extra-curricular activity load. Teachers in the 5 to 5.9 group devoted significantly more time on this activity than any of the other years of training groups. The 4 to 4.9 group spent statistically significantly less time on extra-curricular activities than any of the other groups.

A teacher's number of years of training has some effect on a teacher's extra-curricular activity load. The data suggest, however, that this selected factor has only a slight over-all influence.

Table XXV presents the number of hours that teachers were involved in supervision duties. No teacher reported spending time

TABLE XXV

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	1.83	nil	0.00	nil	1.83	nil
3 to 3.9	1.42	nil	0.00	nil	1.42	nil
4 to 4.9	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
5 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6 or more	1.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.67	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	nil

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

on this activity in a two-day weekend. Therefore, the median times reported for both the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. Only a slight difference exists between the times reported by each of the years of training groups. With the exception of the 5 to 5.9 group, all groups spent between 1.42 and 1.83 hours on supervision. The 5 to 5.9 group recorded 1.00 hours. Beginning teachers were the only group to exceed the total group median time of 1.50 hours. No statistical relationship was revealed by the median test between a teacher's years of training and the time devoted to supervision duties.

A teacher's supervision load is not affected by a teacher's number of years of training.

The clerical load of teachers in the various years of training groups is reported in Table XXVI. Each of the years of training groups indicated spending 1.00 hours on this activity in a five-day week and no time on this activity in a two-day weekend. All but the 5 to 5.9 group reported 1.00 hours being devoted to clerical work in a seven-day week. The 5 to 5.9 group recorded 1.50 hours. The 5 to 5.9 group was also the only group to exceed the seven-day week total group median time of 1.00 hours. No statistical relationship was found between a teacher's years of training and time devoted to clerical work upon application of the median test in each of the three time intervals.

A teacher's number of years of training is not an influencing factor on a teacher's clerical load.

TABLE XXVI

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
3 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4 to 4.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
5 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
6 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



Table XXVII gives the median times spent on miscellaneous activities as reported by teachers in each of the years of training groups. The term "miscellaneous" refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven that have already been examined in this chapter. Student conferences, parent conferences, and P.T.A. meetings were given as examples of miscellaneous activities in the questionnaire. All but one group reported spending 1.00 hours on miscellaneous teaching activities in a five-day week and in a seven-day week. The 4 to 4.9 group recorded .50 hours in both a five-day week and seven-day week. Since few teachers were engaged in miscellaneous activities in a two-day weekend, all groups reported spending no time on this activity in a two-day weekend. The total group median time for the five-day week and seven-day week was 1.00 hours.

A comparison of each years of training group to the remaining groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, between a teacher's years of training and the time devoted to miscellaneous activities.

A teacher's miscellaneous activity load is not influenced by a teacher's number of years of training.

The number of hours devoted to all teaching activities by teachers in the various years of training groups is given in Table XXVIII. In the course of a five-day week, the times ranged from 37.67 hours by teachers in the 6 or more group, to 40.00 hours by teachers in the 5 to 5.9 group. The remaining groups reported

TABLE XXVII

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER:  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day week		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
3 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4 to 4.9	.50	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
5 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

from 38.92 hours to 39.42 hours. Three groups exceeded the total group median time of 39.25 hours. No statistical relationship was found between years of training and time devoted to all teaching activities for a five-day week.

The 1 to 2.9 and 4 to 4.9 groups recorded spending 4.00 hours on teaching activities in a two-day weekend. The 5 to 5.9 group had a workload of 6.00 hours, while the remaining two groups reported 5.00 hours. The total group median time for the 199 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers in this study was 5.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups indicated that a teacher's number of years of training have no influence on a teacher's total workload in a two-day weekend.

Teachers in the 5 to 5.9 group had the heaviest total teacher workload in a seven-day week with 46.92 hours. Beginning teachers had the second heaviest total teacher workload with 43.33 hours. The 4 to 4.9 group reported 43.25 hours; the 6 or more group, 42.83 hours; and the 3 to 3.9 group, 42.58 hours. The median test for two independent groups found no significant difference, at the .05 level, between the number of years of training that a teacher has completed and a teacher's total workload.

The findings of Table XXVIII lead the investigator to conclude that a Newfoundland Central or Regional High School teacher's total workload is not affected by the number of years of training completed.

TABLE XXVIII

THE YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE TEACHER AND  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL  
TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=199)

Years of Training	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 2.9	39.42	nil	4.00	nil	43.33	nil
3 to 3.9	39.33	nil	5.00	nil	42.58	nil
4 to 4.9	38.92	nil	4.00	nil	43.25	nil
5 to 5.9	40.08	nil	6.00	nil	46.92	nil
6 or more	37.67	nil	5.00	nil	42.83	nil
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

### Summary

A summary of significant differences in the number of hours devoted to each of the teaching activities comprising a teacher's workload for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week is presented in Tables XXIX, XXX and XXXI. It was revealed by the median test for two independent groups that teachers in the 4 to 4.9 group spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on extra-curricular activities than teachers in any of the other years of training groups. On the other hand, teachers in the 5 to 5.9 group spent significantly more time on this teaching activity.

No statistical relationship was revealed by the median test between a teacher's number of years of training and the various teacher workload components for a two-day weekend.

In the course of a seven-day week, only two significant differences were found by the median test. Teachers in the 4 to 4.9 years of training group had a statistically significant lighter extra-curricular activity load, while teachers in the 5 to 5.9 years of training group had a statistically significant heavier extra-curricular load when compared to all other groups.

The assumption examined in this chapter was that a teacher has a wider background and pool of information to draw on in his teaching activities as his years of training increase, which would result in a reduced teacher workload. The findings of this chapter do not uphold this assumption. Years of training have virtually no effect on a teacher's workload.

TABLE XXIX

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Years of Training	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	
1 to 2.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
3 to 3.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4 to 4.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
5 to 5.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
6 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XXX

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Years of Training	<u>Teaching Activity</u>								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	
1 to 2.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
3 to 3.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4 to 4.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
5 to 5.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
6 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XXXI

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF  
TRAINING AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS  
FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Years of Training	<u>Teaching Activity</u>								
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activities	Total Teaching Activities
1 to 2.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
3 to 3.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4 to 4.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
5 to 5.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil
6 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



## CHAPTER VI

### THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

The basic assumption to be examined in this chapter is that as a teacher's years of experience increases, a teacher's workload decreases. This is founded on the premise that with increased experience, a teacher has a greater reservoir of information to draw upon. It is also to be expected that the preparation load of beginning teachers is heavier than that of more experienced teachers since the latter group is more familiar with the range of learning materials for the courses. According to the literature, beginning teachers should be given a lighter classroom instruction load. With less time devoted to preparation by the more experienced teacher, more time may be devoted to other activities such as extra-curricular activities. Of the seven teaching load formulas examined in Chapter III, only Petit's formula takes a teacher's years of experience into account even though four of the studies reviewed in Chapter III mentioned this factor.

Table XXXII presents the six groups into which teachers were categorized for the purpose of this chapter, and the number of teachers in each group. The group with 4.0 to 5.9 years of experience is the largest with 44 teachers and the group with 20.0 or more years is the smallest with 18 teachers. The remaining four groups by years of experience, in ascending order are 1.0 to 1.9 with 25 teachers, 2.0

to 3.9 with 34 teachers, 10.0 to 19.9 with 35 teachers, and 6.0 to 9.9 with 41 teachers.

All of the tables that follow Table XXX11 in this chapter are based on the years of experience groupings and numbers as shown in Table XXX11. The times given in the Tables are in hours and are for three time periods: a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive). The median times were determined from the times as reported by teachers.

TABLE XXX11

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE FOR A SAMPLE  
OF 197 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND  
REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Years of Experience	Number
1.0 to 1.9	25
2.0 to 3.9	34
4.0 to 5.9	44
6.0 to 9.9	41
10.0 to 19.9	35
20.0 or more	18
Total	197

The number of hours devoted to classroom instruction by teachers according to years of experience is given in Table XXX111. Teachers in the group with 20.0 or more years of experience reported the highest

TABLE XXX111

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
2.0 to 3.9	20.50	nil	0.00	nil	20.50	nil
4.0 to 5.9	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
10.00 to 19.0	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
20.0 or more	21.33	nil	0.00	nil	21.33	nil
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

time with 21.33 hours, while three groups - 0.0 to 1.9, 4.0 to 5.9 and 6.0 to 9.9 - shared the lowest time with 20.00 hours. The 2.0 to 3.9 group was assigned 20.50 hours and the 10.0 to 19.0 received a 20.67 hours assignment. Three groups exceeded the total group median time of 20.42 hours. The application of the median test for two independent groups revealed no significant differences, at the .05 level, between a teacher's years of experience and a teacher's assigned classroom instruction time.

A teacher's classroom instruction load is not influenced by a teacher's years of experience. The advice of some writers that beginning teachers should be given a lighter classroom load than experienced teachers does not seem to be followed in Newfoundland Central and Regional High Schools.

The preparation load of teachers in each years of experience group is given in Table XXXIV. The heaviest load was reported by teachers in the 2.0 to 3.9 group with 7.50 hours, while the lightest load was indicated by the 4.0 to 5.9 group with 5.00 hours for a five-day week. Of the remaining groups, the 20.0 or more group had the second heaviest load with 6.75 hours followed by the 0.0 to 1.9 group with 6.00 hours, the 6.0 to 9.9 group with 5.75 hours, and the 10.0 to 19.9 group with 5.33 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that teachers in the 2.0 to 3.9 group spent significantly more time, at the .05 level, on the preparation of lessons and materials than did teachers in all of the remaining groups.

Four groups reported 2.00 hours being taken up in the

TABLE XXXIV

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N = 197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	6.00	nil	3.00	nil	7.50	nil
2.0 to 3.9	7.50	.05	2.00	nil	10.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	5.00	nil	1.67	nil	7.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	5.75	nil	2.00	nil	8.00	nil
10.0 to 19.0	5.33	nil	2.00	nil	8.13	nil
20.0 or more	6.75	nil	2.00	nil	9.96	nil
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

preparation of lessons and materials in a typical two-day weekend. The 0.0 to 1.9 group had the heaviest preparation load with 3.00 hours. The lightest load was experienced by teachers in the 4.0 to 5.9 group with 1.67 hours. Only one group exceeded the total group median time of 2.00 hours. No statistical relationship was found between a teacher's years of experience and preparation load by the median test.

A numerical difference of 3.00 hours exists between the various years of experience groups in a seven-day week. The highest time was reported by the 2.0 to 3.9 group with 10.00 hours. The lowest time given was 7.00 hours by the 4.0 to 5.9 group. The remaining groups in ascending order were 0.0 to 1.9 with 7.50 hours, 6.0 to 9.9 with 8.00 hours, 10.0 to 19.0 with 8.13 hours, and finally the 20.0 or more group with 9.96 hours. The median test found no significant differences between the various groups.

No general trend emerged between the number of hours that a teacher spent on the preparation of lessons and materials and the number of years of experience that a teacher has. Teachers with 2.0 to 3.9 years of experience did have a significantly heavier preparation load in a five-day week. A teacher's years of experience does have some influence on a teacher's preparation load, though this influence can only be considered to be slight.

Table XXXV gives the marking load of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers according to the number of years of teaching experience. In a five-day week, 5.00 hours is the number of hours devoted to the marking of tests and assignments by all but the

TABLE XXXV

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER AND  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.50	nil
2.0 to 3.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	4.00	nil	1.00	.05	5.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
10.0 to 19.0	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.42	nil
20.0 or more	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	9.00	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

4.0 to 5.9 group. This group spent 4.00 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was also 5.00 hours. The median test found no statistical relationship between years of experience and a teacher's marking load.

Only one group deviated from the total group median time of 2.00 hours in a two-day weekend. This was the 4.0 to 5.9 group which spent significantly less time, at the .05 level, on the marking of tests and assignments than all other remaining groups.

A range from 5.00 hours to 9.00 hours exists in the time given to marking in a typical seven-day week. Teachers in the 20.0 or more group had the heaviest marking load, while teachers comprising the 4.0 to 5.9 group had the lightest load. The 2.0 to 3.9 and 6.0 to 9.9 groups each spent 6.00 hours, followed by the 10.0 to 19.0 group with 6.42 hours. Beginning teachers had the second heaviest marking load with 7.50 hours. Three of the six years of experience groups exceeded the total group time of 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups, however, found no significant differences between the various years of experience groups.

The number of years of experience that a teacher has does statistically have some influence on a teacher's marking load as is evidenced in a five-day week. No pattern, however, has emerged. The teacher group with the most years of experience reported the heaviest marking load in a seven-day week, and the beginning teacher group reported the second heaviest marking load for the same time period.

The number of hours devoted to staff and departmental meetings by teachers in each of the years of experience groups is shown in



Table XXXVI. Since no teacher in any of the groups indicated that time was spent on these type of meetings in a two-day weekend on a regular basis, the times given for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. It is recognized by the investigator that it is difficult to state the number of hours devoted to staff and departmental meetings in terms of a weekly period since some schools have meetings only once or twice a month. However, taking this shortcoming into account, teachers in each group reported that they devoted an average of 1.00 hours to staff and departmental meetings weekly. The median time for all teachers as one group was also 1.00 hours. No significant differences were revealed by the median test.

Based on the findings of Table XXXVI, a teacher's years of experience has no effect on the number of hours that a teacher spends in staff and departmental meetings.

Table XXXVII presents the extra-curricular activity load of teachers. The range in a five-day week is from no time by the 20.0 or more group to 2.00 hours by the 4.0 to 5.9 group. All but one of the remaining groups reported 1.00 hours. The 0.0 to 1.9 group spent .50 hours. Only one group exceeded the total group median time of 1.50 hours.

Individual teachers in each years of experience group indicated that they were engaged in extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend. However, each years of experience group recorded spending no time on extra-curricular activities. Consequently, no statistical relationship between a teacher's extra-curricular activity load and number of years of teaching experience was revealed.

TABLE XXXVI

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO  
STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
(N = 197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.00 to 1.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
2.0 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
10.0 to 19.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
20.00 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XXXV11

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	.50	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
2.0 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
10.0 to 19.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
20.0 or more	0.00	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

The 4.0 to 5.9 and 6.0 to 9.9 groups devoted 2.00 hours to extra-curricular activities in a seven-day week, while the 2.0 to 3.9 and 10.0 to 19.0 groups indicated 1.00 hours. The two remaining groups - 0.0 to 1.9 and 20.0 or more - each spent .50 hours on extra-curricular activities. The total group median time of 1.50 hours was exceeded by two groups. No significant differences were determined by the median test for two independent groups.

Years of experience does not appear to have any effect on the number of hours devoted by a teacher to extra-curricular activities.

The supervisory load of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers according to years of experience is given in Table XXXVIII. No teacher reported spending time on this activity in a two-day weekend. Therefore, the times given for the five-day week and seven-day week are the same. The heaviest supervisory load was experienced by teachers in the 2.0 to 3.9 group with 2.00 hours. The lightest load was reported by the 20.0 or more group with 1.00 hours. The 4.0 to 5.9 group recorded 1.33 hours, followed by the 6.0 to 9.9 and 10.0 to 19.9 groups with 1.50 hours. The second heaviest load belonged to teachers in the 0.0 to 1.9 group with 1.58 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time of 1.50 hours. No statistical relationship between a teacher's years of experience and supervisory load was revealed by the median test.

A teacher's supervisory load is not influenced by a teacher's number of years of teaching experience.

The number of hours devoted by teachers in the various years of experience groups to clerical work is presented in Table XXXIX.

TABLE XXXV111

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	1.58	nil	0.00	nil	1.58	nil
2.0 to 3.9	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	1.33	nil	0.00	nil	1.33	nil
6.0 to 9.9	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
10.0 to 19.9	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
20 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XXXIX

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.75	nil
2.0 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
10.0 to 19.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
20.0 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

Some teachers did indicate that they were engaged in clerical work on the weekend. As a group, however, teachers devoted no time to clerical work in this time period. The times reported for the five-day week and the seven-day week are identical for all groups with the exception of the 0.0 to 1.9 group. This group reported 1.00 hours in a five-day week which is the same number of hours as given by all remaining groups, but in a seven-day week the 0.0 to 1.9 group devoted 1.75 hours to clerical work. The 0.0 to 1.9 group was also the only group to spend more than the total group median time of 1.00 hours on clerical work in a seven-day week. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant differences, at the .05 level, between the various groups.

A teacher's years of training does not appear to have an effect on the number of hours that a teacher devotes to clerical work.

Table XL indicates the amount of time that is given to miscellaneous activities in each of the three time periods. "Miscellaneous" refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven already examined in this chapter. Examples of miscellaneous activities given in the questionnaire were student conferences, parent conferences and P.T.A. meetings. Some teachers allocated time to miscellaneous teaching activities in a two-day weekend. However, all groups reported spending no time on this activity in a two-day weekend. The number of hours devoted to miscellaneous activities in a five-day week and in a seven-day week by four of the years of experience groups was 1.00 hours. The 0.0 to 1.9 group spent .25 hours in a five-day week and .33 hours in a seven-day week, while the 20.0 or

TABLE XL

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	.25	nil	0.0	nil	.33	nil
2.0 to 3.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
4.0 to 5.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
6.0 to 9.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
10.0 to 19.9	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
20.0 or more	0.00	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



more group indicated spending no time in a five-day week and .50 hours in a seven-day week. No years of experience group devoted more than the total group time of 1.00 hours to miscellaneous teaching activities in either the five-day week or the seven-day week. No statistical relationship between a teacher's miscellaneous activity load and a teacher's years of teaching experience was found by the median test.

Based on the findings of Table XL, it must be concluded that the number of hours devoted to miscellaneous activities is not affected by a teacher's number of years of teaching experience.

The total workload of 197 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers, categorized according to the number of years of teaching experience, is presented in Table XL1. Teachers in the 2.0 to 3.9 group had the heaviest workload in a five-day week with 40.83 hours, followed closely by the 0.0 to 1.9 group with 40.17 hours. The teachers comprising the 10.0 to 19.9 group recorded the lightest workload with 37.25 hours. The remaining three groups ranged from 38.37 hours to 39.50 hours. Three groups - 0.0 to 1.9, 2.0 to 3.9, and 20.0 or more - exceeded the total group median time of 39.25 hours. The median test determined no significant differences in the workload between the six years of experience groups.

The 0.0 to 1.9 group reported having the heaviest total teacher workload in a two-day weekend with 6.50 hours. Two groups - 2.0 to 3.9 and 6.0 - 9.9 - equalled the total group median time of 5.00 hours. The 10.0 to 19.9 and 20.0 or more groups recorded 4.00 hours. The lightest weekend workload belonged to teachers comprising the 4.0 to

TABLE XL1

THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=197)

Years of Experience	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
0.0 to 1.9	40.17	nil	6.50	.05	47.67	nil
2.0 to 3.9	40.83	nil	5.00	nil	46.92	nil
4.0 to 5.9	38.67	nil	3.50	nil	42.67	nil
6.0 to 9.9	38.37	nil	5.00	nil	41.83	nil
10.0 to 19.9	37.25	nil	4.00	nil	41.79	nil
20.0 or more	39.50	nil	4.00	nil	44.67	nil
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

5.9 group. Statistically, the 0.0 to 1.9 group had a significantly heavier two-day weekend workload, at the .05 level, than all remaining years of experience groups.

Up to the 19.9 years of experience group, the findings of Table XL1 show that as years of experience increase, a teacher's total workload decreases in a seven-day week. The heaviest load was 47.67 hours by the 0.0 to 1.9 group. In descending order the next four groups recorded median times as follows: 46.92 hours by the 2.0 to 3.9 group; 42.67 hours by the 4.0 to 5.9 group; 41.83 hours by the 6.0 to 9.9 group; and 41.79 hours by the 10.0 to 19.9 group. The 20.0 or more group had the third heaviest total teacher workload with 44.67 hours. Three groups exceeded the total group median time of 43.83 hours. Statistically no relationship between years of experience and workload was revealed by the median test.

A teacher's number of years of teaching experience has some effect on a teacher's total workload in a two-day weekend. Statistically, beginning teachers had the heaviest workload. No statistical effects of years of experience on workload emerged for a five-day week or a seven-day week.

### Summary

A summary of significant differences between the number of hours devoted to the various teaching activities by each of the years of experience groups for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week is presented in Tables XLII, XLIII, and XLIV. Teachers with 2.0 to 3.9 years of experience spent significantly more time on the preparation of lessons and materials in a five-day week. In a two-day weekend, teachers in the 0.0 to 1.9 group had a significantly heavier workload than all other groups. Teachers comprising the 4.0 to 5.9 group devoted significantly more time to the marking of tests and assignments than all remaining groups in a two-day weekend. No significant differences were revealed by the median test for two independent groups in a seven-day week.

The basic assumption that as a teacher's years of experience increases, the teacher's workload decreases has not been statistically validated by the findings of this chapter.

TABLE XL11

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF  
EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS  
FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Years of Training	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cleri- cal Work	Miscel- laneous Activities	
0.0 to 1.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
2.0 to 3.9	nil	.05*	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4.0 to 5.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
6.0 to 9.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
10.0 to 19.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
20.0 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XL111

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF  
EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS  
FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Years of Experience	<u>Teaching Activity</u>								Total Teach- ing Activi- ties
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activities	
0.0 to 1.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
2.0 to 3.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4.0 to 5.9	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
6.0 to 9.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
10.0 to 19.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
20.0 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE XLIV

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO YEARS OF  
EXPERIENCE AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS  
FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK\*

Years of Experience	<u>Teaching Activity</u>								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cleri- cal Work	Miscel- laneous Activi- ties	
0.0 to 1.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
2.0 to 3.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
4.0 to 5.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
6.0 to 9.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
10.0 to 19.9	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
20.0 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

The subject field in which a teacher is teaching is frequently thought of by writers as having a potential effect on teacher workload. For instance, Douglass devised subject coefficients to take into account the influencing factor that the subject field might have on a teacher's total workload.<sup>1</sup>

For the purpose of this chapter, teachers were divided into the following groups:

1. English
2. Social Studies
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. French
6. Off Pattern
7. No Concentration
8. Others

To be placed into groups one to five, the teacher had to spend 50 percent or more of his classroom instruction time in the one subject field which was also the teacher's major and/or minor field of training. Group six is for the teacher who spent 50 percent

---

<sup>1</sup>Harl R. Douglass, Modern Administration of Secondary Schools (2nd. ed.), (New York: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1964), p. 96.



or more of his classroom instruction time in one subject field which was outside of the teacher's major and/or minor field of training. Group seven refers to the teacher who reported having a major and/or minor field of training, but was spending less than 50 percent of his classroom instruction time in one subject field. Group eight is a miscellaneous category. The teacher who was placed into this grouping was either in the field of physical education, music, home economics, arts, or was a teacher who reported no major nor minor field of training.

Table XLV presents the number of Newfoundland Central and Regional High Schools teachers in each grouping. The groups in order or size are, English, 40; No Concentration, 29; Mathematics, 28; Off Pattern, 28; Social Studies, 25; Others, 25; Science, 14; and French, 11. The total number of teachers is 200.

All of the tables that follow Table XLV in this chapter are based on the subject groupings and numbers as shown in Table XLV. The times given in the tables are in hours and are for three time intervals; a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive). The times are those as reported by teachers.

TABLE XLV  
 THE SUBJECT FIELD FOR A SAMPLE  
 OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL  
 AND REGIONAL HIGH  
 SCHOOL TEACHERS

Subject Field	Number
English	40
Social Studies	25
Mathematics	28
Science	14
French	11
Off Pattern	28
No Concentration	29
Others	25
Total	200

The time spent on classroom instruction by teachers in the various subject fields is reported in Table XLVI. Since teachers did not devote any time to classroom instruction on the weekend, the times reported in a five-day week and seven-day week are the same. No large numerical differences exist in the time spent on classroom instruction. A high time of 20.54 hours was reported by Social Studies teachers and a low time of 19.50 hours was reported by French teachers. Only the English and Social Studies groups are above the total group median time of 20.42 hours. The median test

TABLE XLVI

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	20.46	nil	0.00	nil	20.46	nil
Social Studies	20.54	nil	0.00	nil	20.54	nil
Mathematics	20.33	nil	0.00	nil	20.33	nil
Science	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
French	19.50	nil	0.00	nil	19.50	nil
Off Pattern	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
No Concentration	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
Others	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

revealed that there was no significant difference, at the .05 level, between the time spent by the various subject groups in classroom instruction. No statistical relationship exists between the subject field in which a teacher is teaching and the number of hours devoted to classroom instruction.

Table XLVII presents the number of hours that teachers in each of the subject fields spent on the preparation of lessons and materials. There is a numerical difference of 2.50 hours between the various groups in a five-day week. The No Concentration group had the heaviest preparation load with 9.50 hours, followed by the English group with 7.50 hours. The Social Studies, Mathematics, French and the Others groups had the lightest preparation loads with 5.00 hours. The No Concentration and English groups were the only groups above the total group median of 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that teachers in the No Concentration group devoted significantly more time to preparation than did teachers in the remaining groups in a five-day week.

In a two-day weekend, English teachers devoted the most time to preparation with 2.17 hours. French teachers reported the least time with 1.67 hours. All but one of the remaining groups of teachers spent 2.00 hours. Only English teachers exceeded the total group median time of 2.00 hours. A significant difference, at the .05 level, was revealed when the English group was compared to the remaining groups. English teachers spent significantly more time on the preparation of lessons and materials in a two-day weekend than

TABLE XLVII.

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	7.50	nil	2.17	.05	10.50	nil
Social Studies	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.50	nil
Mathematics	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
Science	6.00	nil	2.00	nil	9.25	nil
French	5.00	nil	1.75	nil	7.50	nil
Off Pattern	6.00	nil	1.67	nil	8.13	nil
No Concentration	9.50	.05	2.00	nil	10.33	nil
Others	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.25	nil
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

did teachers in the other subject field groups. No other significant differences were found.

A considerable numerical variation between the subject field groups exists in the time devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a seven-day week. English teachers reported the heaviest load with 10.50 hours, while teachers in the Others group reported the lightest load with 6.25 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was 8.00 hours. Teachers in the No Concentration group spent 9.50 hours, followed by teachers in the Science group with 9.25 hours. The Off Pattern group devoted 8.13 hours, while the remaining groups spent from 7.00 hours to 7.50 hours on preparation. Three groups exceeded the total group median time - English, No Concentration, and Science. Even though a considerable variation exists in the number of hours devoted to preparation, the median test revealed that no significant difference, at the .05 level, exists between the various groups in the time devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a seven-day week.

A statistical relationship between the subject field in which a teacher is teaching and the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials was revealed by the median test. However, this relationship is slight.

The number of hours devoted to marking by teachers in the various subject fields is shown in Table XLVIII. In the course of a five-day week, English teachers reported spending the most time on marking with 6.00 hours. This may be the result of the many

TABLE XLVIII  
THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	6.00	.05	2.00	nil	8.25	nil
Social Studies	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
Mathematics	4.00	nil	1.00	nil	5.75	nil
Science	4.75	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
French	4.50	nil	2.00	nil	5.00	nil
Off Pattern	5.00	nil	1.50	nil	6.17	nil
No Concentration	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
Others	4.00	nil	1.00	nil	5.00	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

compositions and papers that English teachers frequently say they have to mark. Teachers in the Mathematics and Others groups reported spending the least time on marking with 4.00 hours. The remaining groups spent anywhere from 4.50 to 5.00 hours on marking. Only English teachers reported exceeding the total group median time of 5.00 hours on marking. The median test for two independent groups revealed that there was a significant difference, at the .05 level, in the time devoted to marking by English teachers in comparison to the remaining groups. English teachers spent significantly more time marking than did teachers in the other groups, in a five-day week.

In a two-day weekend, the median time spent by all teachers as one group on marking was 2.00 hours. Teachers in the various subject field groups do not deviate far from this time. The Mathematics and Others groups spent 1.00 hours, while the Off Pattern group devoted 1.50 hours. All other groups spent 2.00 hours on marking in a two-day weekend. No group exceeded the total group median time of 2.00 hours. The median test revealed that no significant difference at the .05 level, existed between the various groups in the time devoted to marking in a two-day weekend.

A range of 3.25 hours spent on marking by the various subject field groups exists for a seven-day week. English teachers have the heaviest marking load with 8.25 hours, followed by Social Studies teachers and teachers in the Others group with 7.00 hours. The remaining groups had a marking load ranging from 6.17 hours for



the Off Pattern group to 5.00 hours for the Mathematics and Others groups. Four groups--English, Social Studies, Off Pattern, and No Concentration--exceeded the total group median of 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that no significant difference, at the .05 level, existed between the various groups in the time devoted to marking in a seven-day week.

A statistical relationship between the subject field in which a teacher is teaching and the time devoted to marking exists for English teachers. This relationship, however, is evident only for the five-day week. Consequently, subject field cannot be considered to be a strongly influencing factor on the marking load that a teacher may have.

The time devoted to staff and departmental meetings is given in Table XLIX. It is recognized by the investigator that it is difficult to state accurately the time spent on these types of meetings in terms of a weekly period. In some schools such meetings are held monthly. In others they are held bi-monthly. However, taking these differences into account, the time devoted to staff and departmental meetings as reported by all groups of teachers averaged 1.00 hours in both a five-day and seven-day week. No teacher in any group reported devoting time to this activity in a two-day weekend. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, existing between the various subject field groups in the time devoted to staff and departmental meetings. No statistical relationship, therefore, exists

TABLE XLIX

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Social Studies	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Mathematics	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Science	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
French	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Off Pattern	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
No Concentration	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Others	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

between the subject field a teacher is teaching and the time spent on staff and departmental meetings.

Table L indicates the extra-curricular activity load of teachers in each of the subject field groups. A numerical difference of 2.25 hours exists between the various groups in the time spent on extra-curricular activities in a five-day week. The heaviest extra-curricular load was reported by French teachers with 2.25 hours. Teachers comprising the No Concentration group indicated that no time was devoted by them to extra-curricular activities. The remaining groups ranged from .75 hours to 2.00 hours. Four groups exceeded the total group median time of 1.00 hours--French, English, Off Pattern, and Social Studies. The median test for two independent groups revealed that no significant difference, at the .05 level, exists between the various groups in the time devoted to extra-curricular activities in a five-day week.

Little time was spent on the extra-curricular activities by most teachers in the various subject fields in a two-day weekend. Hence, all groups reported spending no time on this activity. No significant difference, at the .05 level, was determined between the various groups upon application of the median test.

In the seven-day week, the time spent on extra-curricular activities by teachers in the various groups ranged from no time spent to spending 2.00 hours. The English, Social Studies, and French groups reported 2.00 hours. The Mathematics group devoted 1.71 hours, while the Others groups indicated 1.50 hours. The remaining

TABLE

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
Social Studies	1.33	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
Mathematics	.75	nil	0.00	nil	.75	nil
Science	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
French	2.25	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
Off Pattern	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.71	nil
No Concentration	0.00	nil	0.00	nil	0.00	nil
Others	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

groups spent 1.00 hours or less. Five groups exceeded the total group median of 1.00 hours - English, Social Studies, French, Off Pattern, and Others. The median test for two independent groups revealed no statistical relationship between the subject field in which a teacher may be working and the time devoted to extra-curricular activities in a seven-day week.

The subject field, in which a teacher is working has no influencing effect on the time that the teacher devotes to extra-curricular activities.

The supervision load of teachers in each of the subject fields is shown in Table LI. Since no time was devoted to supervision in the two-day weekend, the time reported by a group is identical for both the five-day week and the seven-day week. Teachers in the No Concentration group reported the heaviest load with 2.00 hours. A partial explanation for this group spending the most time on supervision might be that they tend to be working in the smaller schools. The English and French groups reported the lowest time with 1.00 hours. The remaining subject field groups ranged from 1.83 hours to 1.25 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was 1.50 hours. No statistical relationship was revealed between the various subject field groups and the number of hours devoted to supervision.

The subject field in which a teacher is working has no effect on the time that the teacher devotes to supervision.

TABLE LI  
THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF  
HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Social Studies	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
Mathematics	1.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.67	nil
Science	1.25	nil	0.00	nil	1.25	nil
French	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Off Pattern	1.83	nil	0.00	nil	1.83	nil
No Concentration	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
Others	1.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.67	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

Table LII examines the number of hours devoted to clerical work by each of the subject field groups. Most teachers did not report performing clerical work in a two-day weekend. Consequently, all but one group reported spending the same time on clerical work in a five-day week as in a seven-day week. Only two groups deviated from the total group time of 1.00 hours. These were the Science group with 2.00 hours in a five-day week, and the French group with 1.25 hours in a five-day week and 1.75 hours in a seven-day week. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, in the time devoted to clerical work between the various subject field groups.

The amount of clerical work that a teacher does is not statistically affected by the subject field in which that teacher is working.

The time spent on miscellaneous activities by teachers in the various subject field groups is indicated in Table LIII. The term "miscellaneous" refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven that have already been examined in this chapter. Student conferences, parent conferences, and P.T.A. meetings were given as examples of miscellaneous activities in the questionnaire. Since few teachers were engaged in miscellaneous activities in a two-day weekend, almost all groups reported the same time for both the five-day week and the seven-day week. In a five-day week, all but two groups reported spending 1.00 hours. The two exceptions were the Mathematics group which reported .50 hours, and the Others group

TABLE LII

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF  
HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Social Studies	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Mathematics	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Science	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
French	1.25	nil	0.00	nil	1.75	nil
Off Pattern	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
No Concentration	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Others	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



TABLE LIII

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Social Studies	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Mathematics	.50	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
Science	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
French	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Off Pattern	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	.92	nil
No Concentration	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Others	0.00	nil	0.00	nil	0.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

which indicated devoting no time to miscellaneous activities. The only group which differed in the time devoted to miscellaneous activities in a five-day week and seven-day week was the Off Pattern Group. In a five-day week, 1.00 hours were devoted, while .92 hours were indicated for the latter time period. No group exceeded the total group time of 1.00 hours for the five-day week and seven-day week. The median test for two independent groups revealed that no significant differences at the .05 level, existed between the various groups on the time devoted to miscellaneous activities for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week.

No statistical relationship exists between the subject field in which a teacher is teaching and the time devoted to miscellaneous activities.

Table LIV gives the time spent by teachers in the different subject field groups to the total teaching activities comprising a teacher's workload. In a five-day week, the range is from 35.63 hours for Mathematics teachers, to 41.42 hours for English teachers. The second highest time was reported by teachers in the Off Pattern group with 40.67 hours; followed by the No Concentration group, 40.17 hours; Social Studies group, 39.50 hours; Science, 38.08 hours; the Others group, 37.67 hours; and the French group with 36.50 hours. The time devoted to all teaching activities for all teachers as one group was 39.25 hours. Four groups exceeded the total group time - English, Off Pattern, No Concentration, and Social Studies. The median test for two independent groups revealed that English teachers

TABLE LIV

THE SUBJECT FIELD OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 200)

Subject Field	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
English	41.42	.05	5.67	.05	46.83	.05
Social Studies	39.50	nil	5.50	nil	44.50	nil
Mathematics	35.63	nil	3.00	.05	37.42	nil
Science	38.08	nil	4.75	nil	45.67	nil
French	36.50	nil	4.50	nil	42.75	nil
Off Pattern	40.67	nil	3.50	nil	42.50	nil
No Concentration	40.17	nil	5.00	nil	46.00	nil
Others	37.67	nil	4.50	nil	40.33	nil
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

spent significantly more time on their total teaching activities when compared to the remaining groups.

In a two-day weekend, the English group spent the most time on teaching activities with 5.67 hours. The Mathematics group spent the least time with 3.00 hours. The total group median time was 5.00 hours. Five groups spent less than the total group time on total teaching activities. These were the Off Pattern group with 3.50 hours; the Others group, 4.50 hours; the French group, 4.50 hours; and the Science group, 4.75 hours. The No Concentration group reported 5.00 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time. The median test for two independent groups revealed that English teachers spent significantly more time, at the .05 level, on teaching duties in a two-day weekend when compared to the remaining groups. Secondly, it was also revealed by the median test that Mathematics teachers spent significantly less time, at the .05 level on teaching duties in this time period than teachers in the other subject field groups.

A considerable numerical difference of 9.41 hours exists in the time devoted to teaching duties by the various subject field groups in a seven-day week. English teachers reported the heaviest workload with 46.83 hours. Teachers in the No Concentration group reported the second heaviest workload with 46.00 hours. In descending order for the remaining subject field groups were Science, 45.67 hours; Social Studies, 44.50 hours; French; 42.75 hours; Off Pattern, 42.50 hours; Others, 40.33 hours; and Mathematics; 37.42 hours. Four groups exceeded the total group median time of 43.83 hours. The median test

for two independent groups revealed a significant difference, at the .05 level, in the time devoted to teaching activities by teachers in the English group. They spent significantly more time on their total teaching activities than did teachers in the other groups.

The subject field in which a teacher is working has some effect on the time devoted to teaching duties.

English teachers reported the heaviest workload in each of the three time intervals, while Mathematics teachers reported the lightest workload in a two-day weekend. The over-all influence of subject field on total teaching activities, however, does not appear to be considerable.

### Summary

A summary of significant differences in the number of hours devoted to the various activities by each subject field groups for the five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week is presented in Table LV, Table LVI, and Table LVII. In the course of a five-day week, teachers in the No Concentration group spent significantly more time on the preparation of lessons than did teachers in the remaining groups. English teachers had the heaviest marking load and the heaviest total teacher workload when compared to the other subject field groups.

In a two-day weekend English teachers spent the most time on the preparation of lessons and materials. The English group also recorded the heaviest total teacher workload, while the Mathematics group recorded the lightest total teacher workload.

The summary of significant differences for a seven-day week reveals that the English group spent the most time on total teaching activities.

Based on the findings of this chapter, it must be concluded that the subject field in which a teacher is teaching appears to have little overall effect on a teacher's workload. The English group is the single group which can claim any major workload difference when compared to the remaining subject field groups.

TABLE LV

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY  
TEACHERS OF CERTAIN SUBJECTS AND ALL  
OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Subject Field	<u>Teaching Activity</u>								
	Classroom Instruc- tion	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activi- ties	Total Teaching Activi- ties
English	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Social Studies	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Math- ematics	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Science	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
French	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Off Pattern	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
No Con- centra- tion	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Others	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LVI

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES  
BY TEACHERS OF CERTAIN SUBJECTS AND ALL  
OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Subject Field	Teaching Activity								Total Teach- ing Activi- ties
	Classroom Instruc- tion	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activi- ties	
English	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Social Studies	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Math- ematics	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Science	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
French	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Off Pattern	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
No Con- centra- tion	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Others	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



TABLE LVII

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS OF CERTAIN SUBJECTS AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK\*

Subject Field	Teaching Activity								
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	Total Teaching Activities
English	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
Social Studies	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Mathematics	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Science	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
French	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Off Pattern	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
No Concentration	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Others	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

It is the purpose of this chapter to report on the effect that the number of teachers in a school has on the workload of a Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher.

Teachers in smaller schools often have to teach several different subjects, some of which are out of the teachers' major and/or minor field of training. This may have the effect of increasing the preparation load of these teachers. On the other hand, teachers in larger schools usually teach in their major and/or minor field of training. The number of duplicate sections taught by these teachers is also likely to be greater. Both of these factors may serve to decrease the preparation load of teachers in larger schools. The number of hours devoted to supervision and extra-curricular activities may be significantly less per teacher in larger schools than in smaller schools since these tasks can be spread over a larger number of teachers. In this study the number of teachers in a school has been used as the yardstick for size of school since teachers in Newfoundland are allocated to schools based on the number of students.

For the purpose of this chapter, teachers have been categorized into one of five groups as given in Table LVIII. Twenty-four teachers are in the 1 to 8 group; 70 in the 9 to 13 group; 38 in the 14 to 17 group; 28 in the 18 to 24 group and 35 in the 25 or more group for a total of 195 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers.

Throughout this chapter the groupings as outlined in Table LVIII will be used. The times given are as reported by teachers and are in hours for a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive).

TABLE LVIII

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL FOR A SAMPLE OF 195  
NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL  
HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Number of Teachers in the School	Number
1 to 8	24
9 to 13	70
14 to 17	38
18 to 24	28
25 or more	35
Total	195

Table LIX presents the time spent by teachers in classroom instruction for the various size of school groups. No teacher reported spending time in the classroom on the weekend. Therefore, the number of hours reported for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. The range between the various groups is only slight with a high of 20.67 hours by the 14 to 17 and 25 or more groups, and a low of 20.00 hours by the remaining groups. Two groups exceeded the total

TABLE LIX

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
9 to 13	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
14 to 17	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
18 to 24	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
25 or more	20.67	nil	0.00	nil	20.67	nil
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

group median time of 20.42 hours. No statistical relationship was revealed between the size of school and the time devoted to classroom instruction by the median test for two independent groups.

The preparation load of teachers by size of school is given in Table LX. No large numerical differences exist in the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials between the various size of school groups for a five-day week. Teachers in the 1 to 8 group recorded the heaviest load with 6.83 hours, while the 18 to 24 group recorded the lightest with 5.00 hours. The 14 to 17 group spent 6.50 hours and the 9 to 13 and 25 or more groups devoted 6.00 hours. The total group time was 6.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant differences, at the .05 level, between the various size of school groups in the time devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials.

In the course of a two-day weekend, all groups reported spending 2.00 hours on the preparation of lessons and materials. The total group median time was also 2.00 hours. No statistical relationship was revealed by the median test for two independent groups between the size of school and the time devoted to preparation for this time period.

In a seven-day week, all but one group exceeded the total group median time of 8.00 hours. The 14 to 17 group reported 9.25 hours, followed by the 1 to 8 group with 8.50 hours, the 25 or more group with 8.25 hours, and the 9 to 13 group with 8.13 hours. The 18 to 24 group devoted the least time with 7.00 hours. The application of the median test revealed no statistical relationship between the size

TABLE LX

THE SIZE OF SCHOOLS AND NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO PREPARATION OF LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	6.83	nil	2.00	nil	8.50	nil
9 to 13	6.00	nil	2.00	nil	8.13	nil
14 to 17	6.50	nil	2.00	nil	9.25	nil
18 to 24	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
25 or more	6.00	nil	2.00	nil	8.25	nil
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

of school and the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials.

No distinctive trend was revealed by the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials by teachers in the various size of school groups. The findings of Table LX suggest, therefore, that size of school has little or no influence on a teacher's preparation load.

The number of hours devoted to marking by teachers according to size of school is presented in Table LXI. All but one size of school group spent 5.00 hours on this teaching activity in a five-day week. The 9 to 13 group was the exception with 4.50 hours. The total group median time was also 5.00 hours. No statistical relationship was found between the size of school and the time devoted to marking by the median test.

In the course of a two-day weekend, all groups reported spending 2.00 hours on marking which is also the median time for all teachers as one group. The median test found no significant differences between the size of school and the time devoted to marking by teachers in the various size of school groups.

Only a slight numerical difference exists between the various size of school groups in the number of hours spent on the marking of tests and assignments in a seven-day week. The heaviest load was reported by the 14 to 17 group with 7.00 hours, followed by the 25 or more group with 6.75 hours. The remaining groups all reported 6.00 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time of 6.00 hours. The application of the median test revealed no statistical relationship

TABLE LXI

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF  
HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
9 to 13	4.50	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
14 to 17	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
18 to 24	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
25 or more	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.75	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



between the size of school and the number of hours devoted to the marking of tests and assignments in the course of a seven-day week.

Based on the findings of Table LXI, it can be concluded that the number of hours that a teacher spends on marking is not influenced by the size of school in which the teacher is working.

Table LXII presents the number of hours that teachers in the various size of school groups devoted to staff and departmental meetings. Since no teacher reported spending time on this activity in a two-day weekend, the times given for the five-day week and the seven-day week are identical. It is recognized by the investigator that it is difficult to state accurately the time devoted to these types of meetings in terms of a weekly period. In some schools such meetings are held monthly. In others they are held bi-monthly. However, taking these differences into account, the time as reported by all groups was 1.00 hours. This also corresponds to the total group median time. The median test for two independent groups revealed no significant difference, at the .05 level, existed between the various size of school groups and the time devoted to staff and departmental meetings.

Size of school, therefore, is not an influencing factor in the time devoted to staff and departmental meetings.

The extra-curricular load of teachers based on size of school is given in Table LXIII. In a five-day week, all but one group indicated that 1.00 hours was spent on this teaching activity. The 1 to 8 group reported .33 hours. No group exceeded the total group time of 1.00 hours. The median test found no statistical relationship.

TABLE LXII

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO STAFF  
AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
9 to 13	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
14 to 17	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
18 to 24	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
25 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXIII

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-  
CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	0.33	nil	0.00	nil	0.67	nil
9 to 13	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.75	nil
14 to 17	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
18 to 24	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
25 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

between the size of school and a teacher's extra-curricular load.

Despite the fact that some teachers spent time on extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend, each size of school group reported spending no time on this activity. No significant differences were found by the median test.

A numerical difference of 1.08 hours exists between the 9 to 13 group, which recorded the heaviest extra-curricular load in a seven-day week, and the 1 to 8 group, which recorded the lightest extra-curricular load with .67 hours. The other groups all indicated 1.00 hours. The 9 to 13 group exceeded the total group median time of 1.00 hours. No statistical relationship, however, was found to exist between size of school and a teacher's extra-curricular load by the median test for two independent groups.

The size of school in which a teacher is working appears to have no effect on a teacher's extra-curricular load.

The number of hours spent by teachers in supervisory duties is presented in Table LXIV. Since no teacher reported spending time on this activity in a two-day weekend, the times presented for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. With the exception of one group, the general trend appears to be that as the size of school increases, the number of hours devoted to supervisory duties decreases. The 1 to 8 group recorded 2.50 hours, followed by the 9 to 13 group with 1.67 hours, 14 to 17 group with 1.50 hours, and the 25 or more group with .50 hours. Despite the appearance of this general trend, the median test for two independent groups revealed no statistical relationship, at the .05 level, between the size of school in which a

TABLE LXIV

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	2.50	nil	0.00	nil	2.50	nil
9 to 13	1.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.67	nil
14 to 17	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
18 to 24	1.58	nil	0.00	nil	1.58	nil
25 or more	0.50	nil	0.00	nil	0.50	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\* Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

teacher is working and a teacher's supervisory load.

Size of school has little or no influence on the number of hours that a teacher devotes to supervisory duties.

The clerical workload of teachers according to the size of the school in which they are working is given in Table LXV. All groups reported spending 1.00 hours on clerical work in a five-day week which corresponds to the total group median time. The median test found no significant differences to exist.

In the course of a two-day weekend, each group reported devoting no time to clerical work. No statistical relationship was found to exist between size of school and a teacher's clerical workload.

The numerical difference between the various size of school groups and the number of hours devoted to clerical work is very slight in a seven-day week. The highest time was reported by the 18 to 24 group with 1.50 hours. The lowest time of 1.00 hours was shared between the 9 to 13 and 14 to 17 groups. The remaining two sizes of school groups each recorded 1.25 hours. The median test revealed a significant difference, at the .05 level, when the 14 to 17 group was compared to all remaining groups. This group spent statistically significantly less time on clerical work than all other groups.

A statistical relationship was revealed by the median test between the size of school in which a teacher is working and a teacher's clerical workload. This relationship, however, was found for only one group and can therefore be considered to be only very slight, overall.

The number of hours for which teachers directed their energy to miscellaneous activities is presented in Table LXVI. The term

TABLE LXV  
THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N = 195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.25	nil
9 to 13	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
14 to 17	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	.05
18 to 24	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
25 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.25	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXVI

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS  
ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	0.50	nil	0.00	nil	0.50	nil
9 to 13	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
14 to 17	.50	nil	0.00	nil	0.50	nil
18 to 24	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
25 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



"miscellaneous" activities refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven that have already been examined in this chapter. Student conferences, parent conferences, and P.T.A. meetings were given as examples of miscellaneous activities in the questionnaire. While approximately 10 percent of all teachers spent some time on miscellaneous activities in a two-day weekend, each size of school group reported spending no time on this activity in this time period. The times given for the five-day week and the seven-day week in Table LXVI are identical. The 1 to 8 and 14 to 17 groups reported .50 hours; while the remaining groups reported 1.00 hours. The median time for all teachers as one group was 1.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed no statistical relationship between size of school and time devoted by a teacher to miscellaneous activities.

The size of school in which a teacher is teaching has no influence on the time that a teacher devotes to miscellaneous teaching activities.

The number of hours devoted by teachers in the various size of school categories to all teaching activities comprising a teacher's workload is presented in Table LXVII. In a typical five-day week, the range in the number of hours devoted to teaching duties was from 37.67 hours by the 9 to 13 group, to 40.00 hours by the 25 or more group. The 1 to 8 and 18 to 24 groups each recorded 39.50 hours, while the 14 to 17 group indicated 39.75 hours. Three groups exceeded the total group time of 39.25 hours. The application of the median test for two independent groups revealed no statistical relationship between the

TABLE LXV11

THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO TOTAL  
TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=195)

Number of Teachers	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
1 to 8	39.50	nil	4.00	nil	43.67	nil
9 to 13	37.67	nil	4.00	nil	42.33	nil
14 to 17	39.75	nil	6.00	nil	44.33	nil
18 to 24	39.50	nil	4.50	nil	44.00	nil
25 or more	40.00	nil	5.00	nil	45.92	nil
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

size of the school and the total teacher workload for a five-day week.

In the course of a two-day weekend, the 14 to 17 group had the heaviest total workload with 6.00 hours, while the 1 to 8 and 9 to 13 groups had the lightest workload with 4.00 hours. The 25 or more group had the second heaviest workload with 5.00 hours, followed by the 18 to 24 group with 4.50 hours. Only one group exceeded the total group time of 5.00 hours. No significant differences were found to exist by the median test.

The workload for the various size of school groups in a seven-day week ranged from 42.33 hours by the 9 to 13 group to 45.92 hours by the 25 or more group. Three groups exceeded the total group time of 43.83 hours - 18 to 24 with 44.00 hours; 14 to 17 with 44.33 hours; and 25 or more with 45.92 hours. No statistical relationship between the size of the school and the total teacher workload revealed itself upon application of the median test.

A teacher's total workload is not influenced by the size of school in which a teacher is working according to the findings of Table LXVII.

## Summary

Tables LXVIII, LXIX, LXX present a summary of significant differences between the number of hours devoted to the various teaching activities according to the size of the school in which a teacher is teaching and all other teachers for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week. In both a five-day week and a two-day weekend, no statistical relationship emerged upon application of the median test. The only significant difference found was in a seven-day week. Teachers in the 14 to 17 group spent significantly less time on clerical work than did all other teachers in the remaining groups.

The assumption that teachers in smaller schools have heavier preparation loads, or conversely that teachers in larger schools have lighter preparation loads, has not been validated by the findings in this chapter. Neither was the assumption that teachers in smaller schools have heavier extra-curricular and supervision loads been upheld.

The findings of this chapter are that the size of school in which a teacher is teaching has virtually no effect on the workload of a teacher.




TABLE LXVIII

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE  
SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS  
FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Number of Teachers	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- laneous Activities	
1 to 8	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
9 to 13	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
14 to 17	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
18 to 24	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
25 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXIX

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN  
THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS  
TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING  
TO THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER  
TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Number of Teachers	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Depart- mental Meetings	Extra- Curri- cular Activi- ties	Super- vision	Cler- ical Work	Miscel- aneous Activities	
1 to 8	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
9 to 13	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
14 to 17	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
18 to 24	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
25 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXX

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE SIZE OF SCHOOL AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK\*

Number of Teachers	Teaching Activity								
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	Total Teaching Activities
1 to 8	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
9 to 13	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
14 to 17	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil
18 to 24	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
25 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAILY STUDENT CONTACTS OF THE TEACHER AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER WORKLOAD

The advisability of a reduction in both the student-teacher ratio and the total number of students for which a teacher is responsible has received considerable discussion in recent years in Newfoundland. Inherent in the argument for reducing the number of students with which a teacher has contact, in that as the number of students decrease, the workload of the teacher decreases. It is the purpose of this chapter to determine whether this assumption has validity for Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers.

For the purpose of this chapter, teachers have been placed into one of five categories as shown in Table LXXI. Forty-one teachers have an average daily student contact of 150 or less; 40 have 151 to 175; 52 have 176 to 200; 45 have 201 to 225; and 22 have 226 or more. The groupings as outlined in Table LXXI will be used throughout this chapter. The times given are as reported by teachers and are in hours for a five-day week (Monday through Friday inclusive), a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), a seven-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive).

The assigned classroom instruction load of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers grouped according to a teacher's



TABLE LXXI

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT FOR A  
SAMPLE OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL  
AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Average Daily Student Contact	Number
150 or less	41
151 to 175	40
176 to 200	52
201 to 225	45
226 or more	22
Total	200

average daily student contact is presented in Table LXXII. Since no teacher reported being in the classroom in a two-day weekend, the times given for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. The pattern emerged that as average daily student contact increased, assigned classroom instruction time also increased. Three groups spent less than the total group time of 20.42 hours. These were the 150 or less group with 19.33 hours; the 151 to 175 group with 20.00 hours; and the 176 to 200 group with 20.33 hours. The 201 to 225 and 226 or more groups exceeded the total group time with the former reporting 20.58 hours and the latter 23.33 hours. It was revealed by the median test for two independent groups that teachers in the 226 or more groups were assigned significantly more classroom

TABLE XXII

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION\*  
(N = 200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	19.33	nil	0.00	nil	19.33	nil
151 to 175	20.00	nil	0.00	nil	20.00	nil
176 to 200	20.33	nil	0.00	nil	20.33	nil
201 to 225	20.58	nil	0.00	nil	20.58	nil
226 or more	23.33	.05	0.00	nil	23.33	.05
Total Group	20.42		0.00		20.42	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

instruction time, at the .05 level, than teachers in the other four groups.

The findings of Table LXXII suggest that as a teacher's average daily student contact increases, so does the classroom instruction load.

The number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials by teachers in each of the average daily pupil contact categories are shown in Table LXXIII. The groups which exceeded 175 pupils daily in a five-day week spent more than the total group time of 6.00 hours for the same time interval. The two groups averaging 175 pupils or less each reported 5.00 hours in a five-day week. The 176 to 200 and 226 or more groups shared the heaviest preparation load with 7.50 hours. Statistically, however, the median test for two independent groups revealed no relationship between a teacher's preparation load and a teacher's average daily student contact.

Teachers in all average daily student contact groups reported spending 2.00 hours on preparation in a two-day weekend. The total group median time was also 2.00 hours. No significant differences were revealed by the median test.

Corresponding to the five-day week, the teacher groups exceeding 175 pupils daily also exceeded the total group median time. The 150 or less and the 151 to 175 groups each devoted 7.00 hours to the preparation of lessons and materials in a seven-day week. The remaining three groups ranged from 9.50 hours by the 226 or more group to 10.00 hours by the 176 to 200 group. Statistically, however,

TABLE LXXIII

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE  
TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS  
DEVOTED TO THE PREPARATION OF  
LESSONS AND MATERIALS\*  
(N=200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
151 to 175	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
176 to 200	7.50	nil	2.00	nil	10.00	nil
201 to 225	6.50	nil	2.00	nil	9.88	nil
226 or more	7.50	nil	2.00	nil	9.50	nil
Total Group	6.00		2.00		8.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

no significant differences, at the .05 level, exist between the various groups and the time given to preparation.

The influence of a teacher's average daily student contact on a teacher's preparation load, according to the findings of Table LXXIII, is slight. Statistically, no relationship exists.

The marking load of teachers in the various groups is presented in Table LXXIV. Teachers dealing with 176 or more students daily spent 5.00 hours in a five-day week marking. The 150 or less group devoted 3.00 hours, while the 151 to 175 group had a marking load of 4.50 hours. No group exceeded the total group median time of 5.00 hours. The application of the median test for two independent groups determined that teachers having 150 or less students daily spent significantly less time on marking than did teachers in the remaining groups.

In the course of a two-day weekend, only one group of teachers deviated from spending 2.00 hours on marking. This was the 150 or less group with 1.00 hours. The median time for the 200 teachers was also 2.00 hours. No statistical relationship between a teacher's average daily student contact and the number of hours devoted to the marking of tests and assignments was found by the median test.

Three groups exceeded the seven-day total group median time of 6.00 hours. These were the 176 to 200 with 7.00 hours; the 201 to 225 with 7.17 hours; and the 226 or more with 6.50 hours. The 150 or less group reported 5.00 hours and the 151 to 175 group, 6.00 hours. According

TABLE LXXIV

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MARKING\*  
(N=200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	3.00	.05	1.00	nil	5.00	.05
151 to 175	4.50	nil	2.00	nil	6.00	nil
176 to 200	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.00	nil
201 to 225	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	7.17	nil
226 or more	5.00	nil	2.00	nil	6.50	nil
Total Group	5.00		2.00		6.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

to the median test, teachers having an average daily student contact of 150 or less spent significantly less time on marking than did teachers in the remaining groups.

A teacher's marking load is influenced by the number of students that the teacher is responsible for daily. The finding that the teacher who has 150 or less students daily has a lighter marking load than the teacher who has more students, lends some support to the view that workload increases as the daily student contact increases.

Table LXXV shows the amount of time spent by teachers in the various average daily pupil contact groups on staff and departmental meetings. No teacher reported spending time on this activity in a two-day weekend. Consequently, the times given for the five-day week and seven-day week are the same. All groups spent 1.00 hours on staff and departmental meetings. The median time for all teachers as one group was also 1.00 hours. The median test did not determine any significant differences between the various groups and the time devoted to such meetings.

The findings of Table LXXV indicate that a teacher's staff and departmental meeting load is not influenced by a teacher's average daily student contact load.

The extra-curricular activity load of teachers in the various average daily student contact groups is given in Table LXXVI. In a five-day week, all but the 176 to 200 group spent 1.00 hours on extra-curricular activities. This group devoted 2.00 hours. It was also

TABLE LXXV

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER  
AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO STAFF AND DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS\*  
(N=200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
151 to 175	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
176 to 200	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
201 to 225	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
226 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.



the only group to exceed the total group median time of 1.00 hours. Statistically, however, no relationship between a teacher's average daily student load and extra-curricular load was found by the median test.

Some teachers were engaged in extra-curricular activities in a two-day weekend. However, each group recorded spending no time on this activity. The median test found no significant differences.

The 176 to 200 group had the heaviest extra-curricular load of all groups in a seven-day week with 2.00 hours. Teachers in the 201 to 225 group had the lightest load with 1.00 hours. Four of the five groups exceeded the total group median time of 1.00 hours. These were in ascending order: 150 or less with 1.21 hours; 151 to 175 with 1.25 hours; 226 or more with 1.75 hours; and 176 to 200 with 2.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups found no significant differences between a teacher's average daily student contact and extra-curricular activity load.

No pattern revealed itself in Table LXXVI. A teacher's extra-curricular load does not appear to be influenced by the teacher's average daily student load. One would have expected that teachers with more students to handle in regular classroom instruction would have had a lighter extra-curricular activity load than those teachers with a smaller average daily pupil load.

The number of hours devoted to supervisory duties is presented in Table LXXVII. No teacher in any of the groups reported spending time on this activity in a two-day weekend. Therefore, the times

TABLE LXXVI

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF  
HOURS DEVOTED TO EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.21	nil
151 to 175	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.25	nil
176 to 200	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
201 to 225	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
226 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.75	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXXVII

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SUPERVISION\*  
(N = 200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	2.00	nil	0.00	nil	2.00	nil
151 to 175	1.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.67	nil
176 to 200	1.50	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
201 to 225	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
226 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.50		0.00		1.50	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

given for the five-day week and seven-day week are identical. The general pattern, numerically, is that as a teacher's daily student load increases, the supervisory load decreases. Teachers having 150 or less students daily had the heaviest load with 2.00 hours, while teachers having 201 or more students had the lightest load with 1.00 hours. The 151 to 175 had the second heaviest supervision load with 1.67 hours, followed by the 176 to 200 group with 1.50 hours. Two groups exceeded the total group median time of 1.50 hours. However, the median test for two independent groups found no relationship between a teacher's supervision load and average daily student contact.

Based on the findings of Table LXXVII, a teacher's supervision load is not influenced by the number of students for which a teacher is held responsible daily.

The clerical workload of teachers according to the average daily student contact is presented in Table LXXVIII. Some teachers had clerical work to do in a two-day weekend. However, each group reported spending no time on this activity in this time period. The times given by four of the five groups for a five-day week and a seven-day week was 1.00 hours. The 201 to 225 group reported a median time of 1.00 hours in a five-day week and 1.50 hours in a seven-day week. The total group median time for both the five-day week and seven-day week was also 1.00 hours. The median test for two independent groups revealed that teachers in the 150 or less group spent significantly less time performing clerical work in a seven-day week than all remaining groups.

TABLE LXXVIII

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE  
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO CLERICAL WORK\*  
(N = 200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	.05
151 to 175	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
176 to 200	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
201 to 225	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.50	nil
226 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

A teacher's average daily student contact has some effect on the amount of clerical work that needs to be performed. As one would expect, the teacher group having the lowest average daily student contact has statistically the lightest clerical workload.

Table LXXIX indicates the number of hours given to miscellaneous activities by teachers in the various groups. The term "miscellaneous" activities refers to any teaching activity not included in the previous seven that have already been examined in this chapter. Student and parent conferences, and P.T.A. meetings were given as examples of miscellaneous activities in the questionnaire. Three groups reported 1.00 hours for both the five-day week and the seven-day week. The 151 to 175 group recorded .50 hours for both of these time periods. The only change in miscellaneous activity load between the five-day week and the seven-day week was reported by the 151 to 175 students daily group. In the five-day week, this group reported .50 hours, while in the seven-day week, it had a median time of 1.00 hours. No group exceeded the total group median time of 1.00 hours. In the course of a two-day weekend, all groups indicated spending no time on miscellaneous activities despite the fact some individual teachers did devote time to these activities.

No statistical relationship between a teacher's average daily student contact and miscellaneous activities load revealed itself for any of the three time intervals upon application of the median test.

The number of students that a teacher has to deal with daily does not have an influence on the number of hours devoted by a teacher

TABLE LXXIX

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE TEACHER AND THE NUMBER  
OF HOURS DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES\*  
(N = 200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	.67	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
151 to 175	.50	nil	0.00	nil	.50	nil
176 to 200	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
201 to 225	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
226 or more	1.00	nil	0.00	nil	1.00	nil
Total Group	1.00		0.00		1.00	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

to miscellaneous activities.

The total workload of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers for each of the average daily student contact categories is given in Table LXXX. In a five-day week, the workload of teachers increases as the average daily student contact increases. Teachers in the 226 or more group had the heaviest workload with 40.50 hours, and teachers in the 150 or less group had the lightest workload with 36.17 hours. The remaining groups reported 39.00 hours by the 151 to 175 group to 40.25 hours by teachers comprising the 201 to 225 group. The three groups exceeding 175 students daily exceeded the total group median time of 39.25 hours. It was determined by the median test, at the .05 level, that teachers having 150 or less students daily had a significantly lighter workload in a five-day week in comparison to the remaining average daily student contact groups.

In a two-day weekend, the 150 or less and 151 to 175 groups had the lightest weekend workloads with 4.00 hours each. The 226 or more group had the heaviest workload with 6.00 hours. The remaining two groups each reported 5.00 hours. Only the 226 or more group exceeded the total group median time of 5.00 hours. No statistical relationship between a teacher's average daily student load and total teacher workload evidenced itself upon application of the median test for two independent groups.

With the exception of one group, the workload of teachers increased as the average daily student contact increased in a seven-



TABLE LXXX

THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT OF THE  
TEACHER AND THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED  
TO TOTAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES\*  
(N=200)

Number of Students	5-day week		2-day weekend		7-day week	
	Median	Significance	Median	Significance	Median	Significance
150 or less	36.17	.05	4.00	nil	41.33	.05
151 to 175	39.00	nil	4.00	nil	42.50	nil
176 to 200	40.00	nil	5.00	nil	46.00	nil
201 to 225	40.25	nil	5.00	nil	45.92	nil
226 or more	40.50	nil	6.00	nil	48.25	nil
Total Group	39.25		5.00		43.83	

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon  
a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

day week. A numerical difference of 6.92 hours existed between the two extreme groups. In ascending order the median times given were 41.33 hours by the 150 or less group, 42.50 hours by the 151 to 175 group, 42.50 hours by the 151 to 175 group, 45.92 hours by the 201 to 225 group, and 48.25 hours by the 226 or more group. Three of the five groups exceeded the total group median time of 43.83 hours.

Statistically, teachers comprising the 150 or less group had a significantly lighter workload than teachers in all other remaining groups.

The average daily pupil contact that a teacher has is an influencing factor on a teacher's total weekend..

## Summary

Tables LXXXI, LXXXII and LXXXIII present a summary of significant difference between the number of hours devoted to the various teaching activities by teachers according to the average daily student contact and all other teachers for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week. In the course of a five-day week, the teacher group with 226 or more students daily had a significantly heavier classroom instruction load, at the .05 level, than all remaining groups. Teachers having 150 or less students daily had a significantly lighter marking load and a significantly lighter total teacher workload than did teachers in the remaining four groups.

Statistically, no relationship was revealed between a teacher's workload and average daily student contact for a two-day weekend.

Four significant differences, at the .05 level, were found upon application of the median test for two independent groups in a seven-day week. Teachers in the 226 or more group recorded the heaviest classroom instruction load. Teachers having 150 or less students daily had the lightest marking load, clerical load, and total teacher workload.

For the classroom instruction and marking components of teacher workload, the general pattern emerged that as the average daily student contact increased, so did the workload of these two teacher workload components. A similar pattern revealed itself for the preparation load of teachers having up to 200 students daily.

Conversely, as the teacher's average daily student contact increased, the teacher's supervision load decreased. Based on the findings of this chapter, it can be concluded that the number of students for which a teacher has responsibility has an effect on a teacher's workload.

TABLE LXXXI

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK\*

Number of Students	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	
150 or less	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	.05
151 to 175	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
176 to 200	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
201 to 225	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
226 or more	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXXXII

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND\*

Number of Students	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff and Departmental Meetings	Extra-Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	
150 or less	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
151 to 175	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
176 to 200	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
201 to 225	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
226 or more	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

TABLE LXXXIII

SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO THE VARIOUS TEACHING ACTIVITIES BY TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THE AVERAGE DAILY STUDENT CONTACT AND ALL OTHER TEACHERS IN A SEVEN-DAY WEEK\*

Number of Students	Teaching Activity								Total Teaching Activities
	Classroom Instruction	Preparation of Lessons and Materials	Marking	Staff And Departmental Meetings	Extra Curricular Activities	Supervision	Clerical Work	Miscellaneous Activities	
150 or less	nil	nil	.05	nil	nil	nil	.05	nil	.05
151 to 175	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
176 to 200	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
201 to 225	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
226 or more	.05	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil

\*Note: The calculation of significant difference was based upon a comparison of each group to all remaining groups.

## CHAPTER X

### TEACHER VIEWS TOWARD THE ACTUAL TEACHER WORKLOAD

It is the purpose of this chapter to present the views that 194 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers expressed toward their actual workload. Item seventeen asked, "What are your views concerning the actual teacher workload that you have?" Since item seventeen was open-ended, a broad range of comments were received. Categorized, the most frequent comments received from teachers had to do with:

1. The total teacher workload.
2. Number of hours for preparation.
3. Amount of assigned classroom instruction time.
4. Number of hours for marking.
5. Student-teacher ratio.
6. Number of subjects taught.
7. Clerical work.
8. Number of hours for supervision.
9. Mental fatigue and exhaustion factors in teaching.

Fenske found in his study of the workload of 203 Central Alberta High School teachers that the ten major complaints teachers had were:

1. Classes too large.
2. Too many extra-curricular activities.
3. Too wide a variety of subjects to prepare for.
4. Credit load too great.



5. Should not have to supervise periods.
6. Extra-curricular work not shared equally.
7. Too much time spent on meetings.
8. Too much clerical work.
9. Too much time required for lesson preparation.
10. Lack of duplication of subjects which would help reduce the load.<sup>1</sup>

In the present study, of the 194 teachers who expressed views toward their actual workload, ninety or 46.4 percent commented on the over-all workload. Forty-two or 45.6 percent of the ninety teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the present workload. The remaining forty-nine or 54.4 percent of the ninety teachers considered their total workload to be reasonable. It is recognized by the investigator that the nine prime areas of comment contributed to the over-all view that teachers have toward their actual workload. Cognizance must also be taken of the inter-relation of the nine areas of comment. However, for the purposes of this chapter each item was examined separately. A consensus of the views expressed about each area of concern was derived together with representative comments presented by teachers, to give increased insight into the feelings of teachers.

#### Number of Hours For Preparation

To meet the diversified needs, abilities, and interests of

---

<sup>1</sup>Milton Fenske, "An Analysis of the Work-Week of a Central Alberta High School Teacher" (Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961), 102.

students, and to come prepared with stimulating lessons for students; it was the view of sixty-three or 88.7 percent of the seventy-one teachers who commented on preparation load that time for preparation needs to be allocated for teachers during the regular school day. By regular school day, it appears that teachers equated the number of hours that students spend in school, which normally ranges from five to five and one-half hours per day in Newfoundland. Of the remaining eight teachers who presented views on preparation time, seven were satisfied with their present arrangement due to either an adequate number of unassigned classroom periods, having taught the courses for several years and hence indicating little preparation time needed, or the nature of the subject itself required relatively little preparation time. One teacher felt that the availability of teacher manuals for each course of study would help to lighten the number of hours needed for the preparation of lessons and materials.

An English teacher in a 37-teacher high school felt that if teachers are to keep up in their discipline to make for well-informed, interesting, up-to-date classroom presentations, then preparation time must be allocated during the school day:

While on paper the workload does not appear, by labour standards, to be excessive one must bear in mind that a teacher should have time to keep abreast of new developments in his discipline as well as time to do readings outside the prescribed texts which he has to prepare for class presentation. It should also be borne in mind that with the introduction of so many new courses into the school curriculum, more preparation time is required on the teacher's part because of the newness of the material. Provide more free time in the schedule for preparation.

A physics teacher with a 48.0 hour seven-day week workload, of

which 11.0 hours was devoted to preparation, summed up the feelings of many of the teachers when he wrote:

More school time is required for preparation, i.e., film viewing, research, lesson planning, audio-visual and demonstration planning, laboratory preparation and other duties. If we are in many instances to compete with television, then give us time for preparation.

#### Amount Of Assigned Classroom Instruction Time

Inseparable from comments regarding preparation load, marking load, student load, clerical work, number of subjects taught, extra-curricular activities, supervisory duties, and the mental fatigue and exhaustion factor is the number of hours to which a teacher is assigned to classroom instruction: Fifty-one or 26.3 percent of the one hundred and ninety-four teachers commented on the classroom instruction load. Every teacher who expressed a view desired a reduction in the number of periods in which a teacher is in the classroom and a corresponding increase, therefore, in the number of unassigned periods. The benefits to be derived from a reduced classroom instruction load cited include:

1. Increased time for preparation.
2. Increased time for marking.
3. More competent, effective teaching.
4. Increased personal involvement with students through interviews and extra-curricular activities.
5. Increased time for planning innovative practices.
6. Increased time for professional reading.

Recommendations as to the desired classroom instruction time per week ranged from forty-three percent to seventy-five percent of a five-

hour student day. The median classroom instruction time for the two hundred teachers of this study was 81.7 percent of a five-hour student day.

A French teacher in a 23-teacher school explained that his 50.25 hour weekly workload prevented him from adequately meeting his personal and family considerations. The number of hours that he was required to spend in the classroom played a major part in this shortcoming.

I don't complain to anyone. Yet the rest of our staff have expressed in our staff meetings that our school is trying to offer a too diversified curriculum for the number of teachers it has to do a good and competent job. Everyone including myself feel that we need more periods free from actual classroom teaching so that much of the work involved in preparing lessons, marking exams, as well as preparing them could be done during school hours rather than at home. I entirely agree with a diversified curriculum providing we have the adequate resources and teacher personnel to carry out the program so that every teacher on the staff could be happy with his workload.

A mathematics teacher with a classroom instruction load of thirty-two periods out of a thirty-five period teaching week stated:

My chief complaint is in the area of classroom instruction. By the time the seventh period comes, there is no way I can do justice to either the pupils or the material after teaching the past six periods.

#### Number of Hours For Marking

Forty-nine teachers presented views regarding the amount of time required for marking. Of this number, forty-two or 85.7 percent expressed dissatisfaction with the present situation. It was felt by these teachers that the need existed to have teacher marking time allocated during the regular school day. By regular school day, it appears that teachers equated the school day with the number of hours

that students spend in school, which normally ranges from five to five and one-half hours in Newfoundland.

Factors which contributed to the marking load of a teacher as cited by the forty-two teachers were:

1. The number of students in the class.
2. The total number of pupils per teacher.
3. The amount of classroom instruction time.
4. The number of courses taught.
5. The multiplicity of programs within the same subject area at the same grade level.
6. The introduction of new courses.
7. The nature of the subject area itself.

To cope with the marking load, it was expressed by some teachers that less than the desired amount of homework and assignments were given. A heavy marking load prevented other teachers from taking part in extra-curricular activities or having personal contact with students to the extent that they felt was necessary.

Of the remaining seven teachers who presented views on marking, two felt that teachers should not be expected to devote very much time to marking, while a third felt that a considerable portion of the teacher's marking load should be delegated to a teacher aide. One teacher had eleven "free" periods from the classroom during the regular school day which assisted considerably in coping with the marking of student work.

Noticeable in many of the teacher comments was the view that the time after the regular school day should be at the disposal of the

teacher for personal use. A teacher responsible for mathematics and English with a marking load of 4.75 hours and a total workload of 32.83 hours in a seven-day week commented:

Considering the fact that I have but two subject areas to teach, I feel that the actual workload is not too heavy. However, I feel that teachers should have more free periods in which to prepare work and mark tests, assignments, etc. I feel that at least two teaching periods per day would be sufficient. Most of my preparation and marking has to be done during "after school hours" - time which I feel a teacher should have at his disposal to do work other than school activities.

A biology teacher with a marking load of 5.50 hours and a total workload of 38.20 hours in a seven-day week found that his situation prevented him from taking in student work as much as he felt he should due largely to the classroom instruction load.

Since I have five grade ten biology classes and two grade eleven classes ... I cannot give written questions to take in, if I want to live at all. Corrections take too much time, so kids suffer because they get away with being lazy. It's impossible to do one's best job, but I try!

#### Student-Teacher Ratio

It was the view of the thirty-five teachers who raised the issue of student-teacher ratio that the teacher allocation formula followed by the Newfoundland Department of Education needs to be revised so that a reduction in the student-teacher ratio comes about. The departmental formula allows one teacher for every thirty-five students or fraction thereof. For every three teachers allocated, the formula allows for the allocation of an additional teacher.

To give the personalized, individualized attention to students that is needed, it was recommended by teachers that the student-teacher

ratio range from a minimum of 18 to 1 to a maximum of 30 to 1. In addition, some concern was expressed regarding the size of the student contacts that a teacher has. It was generally recommended that one hundred and twenty-five students be the maximum for which a teacher has responsibility.

A social studies teacher with an average student-teacher ratio of 35 to 1, and a total teacher workload in a seven-day week of 55.5 hours stated:

The workload is too heavy. Too many kids, too many teaching periods, and too much correcting. I love teaching but I never find time to become a really adequate teacher. Facing six periods daily with thirty-five to forty kids each period is overwhelming ... If I didn't find kids such a pleasure to work with, I'd long since have thrown it all up.

A third year teacher in a fourteen-teacher school with a total workload of 52.25 hours and an average student-teacher ratio of 33 to 1 felt overworked. Part of this feeling stemmed from,

the fact that principals, vice-principals and specialist teachers are included in the quota of classroom teachers. Also, since the ratio of thirty-five to one is still the minimum of the Department of Education, it is impossible to think in terms of personalized instruction.

#### Number Of Subjects Taught

Twenty-four of the one hundred and ninety-four teachers who responded to item seventeen in the questionnaire remarked on the number of subjects that they had to teach and the effect that this had on their workload. A distinction is made between subjects and courses. A teacher may be teaching in one subject area but in four courses within the one subject area.

Of the twenty-four respondents, fourteen stated that a reduction

in the number of subjects taught would have a considerable effect on decreasing a teacher's workload. The range in the number of subjects taught by these teachers was from two to seven, with a mean of 4.5. Six of the twenty-four teachers were dissatisfied with the number of courses that they had to teach which ranged from four to eight. The remaining four teachers were satisfied with their workload largely because they had responsibility for only one or two subject areas.

A teacher completing his seventh year of experience, with a seven-day workload of 54.0 hours, cited two major complaints in his situation. One related to clerical, while the second related to the number of subjects that he had to teach:

I am teaching too many subjects. Five subjects at the high school level takes up considerable time. If I were teaching strictly history in one grade, it would be much better. In addition to history, I also teach science which I think shouldn't be. This is one big problem that teachers have to face in Newfoundland's schools - that they have to teach a variety of subjects.

A teacher in his second year of teaching, reflected on the effect that the number of courses a teacher has to teach has on teacher workload:

My workload is heavy not because of the number of periods taught, but because of the number of different courses taught (7). Last year in a large high school in Nova Scotia, I taught two subjects and had 14 out of 35 periods free. This gave me the time to prepare my lessons thoroughly; something I have not been able to do this year.

### Clerical Work

Twenty-one of the twenty-three teachers who gave views regarding the amount of clerical work that they performed expressed dissatisfaction with the situation as it existed. Some teachers felt that they



had too much clerical work to do, while others thought that a teacher should not be required to devote any time to clerical activities, but instead delegate this work to a clerical aid or to a school secretary. This would free the teacher to devote more time to tasks for which he has been trained. The two remaining teachers were satisfied with their situation because of secretarial assistance or an adequate number of unassigned periods in which to perform the clerical tasks.

An English teacher stationed in a 15-teacher school, with a clerical workload of 2.0 hours in a seven-day week felt that the time devoted to clerical work can be much better utilized toward other activities:

I feel that my present workload is too heavy. I feel this because two hours a week for clerical work is two hours which could be spent preparing lessons or improving the quality of my tests and exams. Actually, a larger clerical staff would produce greater teacher efficiency and lessen the workload in all areas from preparation to testing.

A social studies teacher in a 10-teacher school with a clerical workload of 4.0 hours in a seven-day week commented:

As a teacher I have to spend too much time typing up examinations and doing other clerical work. This could be remedied by having secretaries do this clerical work which now takes up so much of the teacher's time. Every large school should have a secretary.

#### Number Of Hours For Supervision

Have personnel other than the teacher conduct corridor, lunch and study period supervision to give the teacher increased time for professional activities was the theme of the comments made by the nineteen teachers who expressed views toward supervision by teachers.

It was the contention of an English teacher in a 10-teacher

school, with a supervisory load of 4.75 hours and a total workload of 54.75 hours that:

Classroom supervision and corridor duty could be done by students thus giving me an extra five hours per week for preparation of lessons. I find that with actual teaching plus lesson preparation and supervision, I have little time to do much reading. I have no objection to the amount of work I spend doing my job, but I feel that it could be better distributed.

A second English teacher, who was stationed in a 24-teacher school, with a clerical load of 2.0 hours, a supervision load of 2.58 hours, and a total workload of 49.92 hours in a seven-day week found herself bogged down with menial tasks that prevented her from carrying out all professional tasks:

If meaningless, unprofessional duties like making up registers, typing exams, corridor duty were eliminated through wise use of parent volunteers, teaching assistants, etc., then I would gladly include extra-curricular activities, parent and student conferences, etc.. The workload is not that heavy, but the tedious repetitious meaningless little duties take the joy out of teaching! Let teachers teach and clericals type and supervisors supervise!

#### Mental Fatigue And Exhaustion Factors In Teaching

Twelve or 6.2 percent of the one hundred and ninety-four teachers who responded to item seventeen in the questionnaire referred to the mental fatigue and exhaustion factors of teaching. It was maintained that working forty hours per week in teaching is far more demanding mentally than most occupations of equivalent salary. Responses varied from working late at night kept the teacher away from his family obligations, working long hours affected the teacher's health, to reduce or eliminate supervision duties at recess and at lunch time to give the teacher a much needed rest period.

A mathematics teacher with a five-day workload of 42.67 hours and a weekend workload of 9.0 hours stated:

In what other profession does a person spend from 3 to 5 hours each night preparing for the next day's classes. To do an efficient job, this amount of time is needed. And I might add practically all weekend. There is hardly any time to keep up with the professional world by extra reading of educational magazines or even to read a book just for the mere joy of reading... teaching is not a joy anymore because of the workload.

A first year teacher with a seven-day week workload of 48.25 hours wrote:

— I believe the teacher workload to be more strenuous than any other occupation with comparable wages. Contrary to public image, teachers work well beyond the stipulated five hours. I find that no night is really free. Even if preparation is waived for one evening the class day suffers. I usually try to plan a week's lesson. This takes up Sunday afternoon and Sunday night. Because of the subjects that I am teaching (literature, language, and history) I have a constant pile of papers, etc. to be corrected ... I think that the unrealistic view of the teacher as being a model, a paragon of virtue, an almost inhuman species has added to the teacher workload, at least emotionally.

### Summary

The views expressed by the 194 teachers toward their actual workload dealt primarily with the need to provide teachers with preparation and marking time during the regular school day; a decrease in the amount of assigned classroom instruction time; a decrease in the student-teacher ratio; being assigned a reasonable number of different subjects and/or courses; having to perform little or no clerical work; being assigned little or no supervisory duties; and the mental fatigue and exhaustion factors in teaching. What should be of some concern is the considerable dissatisfaction expressed by teachers toward each of the factors raised affecting teacher workload. Of the 90 teachers who commented on their total teacher workload, 42 or 45.6 percent of the teachers felt overloaded.

## CHAPTER XI

### TEACHER VIEWS CONCERNING A DESIRED TEACHER WORKLOAD

The purpose of this chapter is to first present the desired teacher workload as perceived by 200 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. This desired workload is compared to the actual teacher workload to determine whether there were any significant differences, at the .05 level, between the actual workload and the desired workload. Secondly, in the course of the study teachers presented recommendations as to how the desired workload could be implemented. These recommendations are presented and categorized under one of five different headings:

Responsibility Resting with the Local School

The Local School and Its Potential for Control

Responsibility Resting with the School Board

Responsibility Resting with the Department of Education

Responsibility Resting with Other Bodies

#### A Comparison of the Desired Teacher Workload and The Actual Teacher Workload

Tables LXXXIV, LXXXV, and LXXXVI present a comparison of the desired teacher workload and the actual teacher workload of two hundred Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. In the course of a five-day week, a decrease of 2.92 hours was sought in classroom instruction to 17.50 hours; a 1.00 hours decrease in supervision to .50 hours; a 1.00 hours decrease in clerical work to

TABLE LXXXIV

A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD  
OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A FIVE-DAY WEEK

Teaching Activity	Actual Workload	Desired Workload	Significance
Classroom Instruction	20.42	17.50	.05
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	6.00	7.00	nil
Marking	5.00	5.00	nil
Staff and Departmental Meetings	1.00	1.00	nil
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.00	1.50	.05
Supervision	1.50	.50	.05
Clerical Work	1.00	0.00	.05
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	1.00	nil
Total Teaching Activities	39.25	35.33	.05

TABLE LXXV

A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD  
OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A TWO-DAY WEEKEND

Teaching Activity	Actual Workload	Desired Workload	Significance
Classroom Instruction	0.00	0.00	nil
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	2.00	1.50	.05
Marking	2.00	1.00	.05
Staff and Departmental Meetings	0.00	0.00	nil
Extra-Curricular Activities	0.00	0.00	nil
Supervision	0.00	0.00	nil
Clerical Work	0.00	0.00	nil
Miscellaneous Activities	0.00	0.00	nil
Total Teaching Activities	5.00	3.00	.05

TABLE LXXXVI

A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND THE DESIRED WORKLOAD  
OF 200 NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL AND REGIONAL HIGH  
SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR A SEVEN-DAY WEEK

Teaching Activity	Actual Workload	Desired Workload	Significance
Classroom Instruction	20.42	17.50	.05
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	8.00	8.50	nil
Marking	6.00	5.00	nil
Staff and Departmental Meetings	1.00	1.00	nil
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.00	2.00	.05
Supervision	1.50	.50	.05
Clerical Work	1.00	0.00	.05
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	1.00	nil
Total Teaching Activities	43.83	38.75	.05



no clerical work; and a 2.92 hour decrease in total teaching activities to 35.33 hours. Teachers wanted to devote more time to the preparation of lessons and materials. The desired increase was from 6.00 hours to 7.00 hours. An additional .50 hours was sought for extra-curricular activities to 1.50 hours. Statistically, the median test for two independent groups revealed that teachers desired a significant decrease, at the .05 level, in the number of hours devoted to classroom instruction, supervision, and total teaching activities. A significant time increase was indicated for preparation of lessons and materials, as well as extra-curricular activities.

Three time decreases in a two-day weekend were recommended. These were a reduction in the preparation load from 2.00 hours to 1.50 hours; a reduction in the marking load from 2.00 hours to 1.00 hours, and a reduction in the total weekend workload from 5.00 hours to 3.00 hours. No time increases in any of the teacher workload components were requested. The application of the median test for two independent groups determined that the three time reductions sought were statistically significant at the .05 level.

The 200 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers indicated a desired load change in six of the nine components comprising a teacher's workload in a seven-day week. A reduction in the number of hours devoted to classroom instruction from 20.42 hours to 17.50 hours; supervision load from 1.50 hours to .50 hours; clerical work from 1.00 hours to no clerical work;

and total teaching activities from 43.83 hours to 38.75 hours were desired. Time increases in preparation and extra-curricular activities were requested. The former being from 8.00 hours to 8.50 hours, while the latter was from 1.00 hours to 2.00 hours. Table LXXXIV shows an over-all desired decrease of 5.08 hours in a teacher's total seven-day workload. It was revealed by the median test for two independent groups that with the exception of the desired increase in preparation time, the time changes indicated were statistically significantly different from the actual teacher workload.

Fenske determined that Central Alberta High School teachers desired significant decreases in classroom instruction to 20.25 hours; preparation time to 6.00 hours, and total teaching activities to 40.00 from 43.27 hours. A significant increase was desired for extra-curricular activities to 1.75 hours. Principals, in Fenske's study, perceived desirable decreases for teachers to be in the areas of classroom instruction to 20.00 hours; preparation to 5.50 hours; marking to 4.00 hours; and total teaching activities to 39.50 hours. A significant increase perceived as being desirable was in extra-curricular activities to 2.00 hours.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Milton Fenske, "An Analysis of the Work-Week of a Central Alberta High School Teacher" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961), 106-117.

### Recommendations for Implementing the Desired Teacher Workload

In response to item nineteen in the questionnaire, "What recommendations would you suggest to implement the desired teacher workload that you indicated in question 18?" seventy-five different recommendations were received from 192 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. The recommendations were categorized under one of five different headings:

Responsibility Resting with the Local School.

The Local School and Its Potential for Control.

Responsibility Resting with the School Board.

Responsibility Resting with the Department of Education.

Responsibility Resting with Other Bodies.

Twenty-nine or 38.7 percent of the recommendations fell directly within the jurisdiction of the school. Depending on the local situation of a school, up to eight additional or 10.7 percent of the recommendations were of such a nature that the school may have control or considerable influence in the implementation of the recommendations. Therefore, almost 50 percent of the recommendations were directed toward implementation by school personnel at the local school level. Seventeen or 22.7 percent of the recommendations were directed toward school boards; eighteen or 24.0 percent were directed toward the department of education; and three or 4.0 percent were directed for implementation to other bodies.

### Responsibility Resting With the Local School

Some of the twenty-nine recommendations suggested depend heavily upon the initiative of the school administrator such as recommendations 1 to 10 inclusive, while other recommendations such as 20 to 26 inclusive, fall primarily within the control of the classroom teacher. Recommendations 20, 21, 22, and 28 place increased responsibility on the student. Only recommendation 19 might involve any financial expenditure. Therefore, it appears that as a group the recommendations suggested by teachers are realistic and of a practical nature in helping to implement the desired teacher workload.

1. Require the principal and the vice-principal to reasonably share the teaching load with the staff members of the school.
2. Equalize the workload among the staff.
3. Base the number of classroom instruction periods to which a teacher is assigned on the number of subjects and the nature of the subjects taught.
4. When allocating unassigned periods, make allowance for the amount of marking that English teachers have to do.
5. Do combining of subjects such as English literature and language, geography and history in the assignment of teachers.
6. Give beginning teachers more preparation time than experienced teachers.
7. Keep staff meetings to a minimum. However, have each staff meeting well planned when one is held.
8. Distribute the supervisory duties among the entire staff.
9. Assign teachers to their area of training regardless of the length of time the teacher has been in the school.
10. Utilize fully the talents of the teachers in the school.

11. Have a good attitude of co-operation among staff members rather than petty rules for teachers and students which make a heavy workload unbearable.
12. Stream classes homogeneously.
13. Concentrate initially in establishing authority and discipline within the school which reduces the need for supervision.
14. Have more workshops for the sharing of ideas.
15. Make provision during the regular school day for extra-curricular activities.
16. Use varying lengths of class periods.
17. Have lesson plans prepared and submitted in advance for approval to the principal.
18. Combine small and large classes at times.
19. Make an effort to increase the use of audio-visual materials in schools.
20. Survey student needs and teacher resources to determine what can feasibly be offered.
21. Give students the opportunity to participate in classroom instruction.
22. Provide students with time to explore independently for themselves.
23. Guide students to accept more responsibility for their conduct, classwork, and assignments.
24. Do some of the marking in the presence of students.
25. Reduce the correcting load by giving more long term papers and less short term assignments.
26. Decrease time on monthly tests and increase emphasis on study periods.
27. Have periodic tests in the classroom instead of formal examinations.
28. Have students do a considerable amount of the supervision.

29. Give students more responsibility in the use of school facilities.
30. Extend the teaching day from five to six hours, but set one period aside for library activities or individual student interviews.

#### The Local School and Its Potential for Control

The local school situation will largely dictate the extent to which the administration has control over some of the recommendations under this category. Secondly, since some of the recommendations involve groups outside of the school, the final decision-making may be out of the direct control of the school. The number of teachers and the number of students in a school may make recommendations 31, 35, and 38 difficult to carry out. Recommendation 34 is possible if the right kind of atmosphere exists in the school which will allow students to be left on their own for independent activities.

31. Assign teachers to duplicate classes.
32. No teacher should be forced to attend P.T.A. meetings.
33. Increase parental involvement in the school by having them supervise lunch periods and work in the library.
34. Conduct staff meetings during the regular school day.
35. Schedule no more than three successive teaching periods to increase teacher effectiveness.
36. Introduce non-grading into the school.
37. Involve service clubs in volunteer work in the school.
38. Limit subject areas to be taught by a teacher to a maximum of two and to a maximum of two grades.

### Responsibility Resting With the School Board

Recommendations thirty-nine to fifty-four inclusive deal with school design and construction, equipping schools, hiring professional personnel, in-service education, and hiring non-professional school personnel. In Newfoundland these responsibilities fall primarily under the jurisdiction of school boards. The funds for education, however, come mainly from provincial government revenues. School boards do not have the power to levy taxes for educational purposes on a per capita basis at the local level. Therefore, recommendations 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 49 depend particularly on provincial monies being available. Other recommendations such as 45, 46, and 51 involve little or no financial expenditure.

39. Construct classrooms that are more functional in design.
40. Provide suitable workrooms for teacher preparations.
41. Have teacher lounges that are separate from teacher work rooms.
42. Provide teachers with access to an office for interviews and discussions.
43. Have a sufficient quantity of audio-visual equipment in schools.
44. Provide a sufficient quantity of teaching aides and basic equipment in schools.
45. Hire teachers based on the needs of the students and the school.
46. Do staffing wisely so that there is no need for a teacher to be spread over four or five different subject areas.
47. Hire a specialist to work with slower students part of the school day.
48. Hire a guidance counsellor to discuss problems with students.
49. Hire Memorial University education students for work as teacher aides as part of their teacher training.

50. Where feasible, have a further integration of small schools to make greater specialization possible.
51. Raise the qualifications and the competence of teachers through a well-planned in-service education program.
52. Provide special secretarial help for rush periods.
53. Have the custodian supervise the school building at all times.
54. Have students go home for lunch.

#### Responsibility Resting with the Department of Education

The provincial government, through the Department of Education, controls the financial expenditure on education in the Province. The recommendations that recurred most often from the 192 teachers who replied to item 19 in the questionnaire involved financial expenditure and fell under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education.

The most frequent recommendation presented by teachers related to the employment of para-professional workers in the school. Ninety-three or 48.4 percent of the teachers suggested the hiring of teacher aides for clerical, supervisory, and para-professional assistance. A reduction in the student-teacher ratio was the second most frequent recommendation given. Ninety-one or 47.4 percent of the teachers sought a reduction. Another twenty-one or 10.9 percent recommended that additional teachers be hired for schools by having separate salary units allocated for administrators, specialists, and department heads. The present formula of the Department of Education for allocating teachers allows one teacher for every thirty-five students or fraction thereof. For every three teachers allocated, the formula allows for the allocation



of an additional teacher.

Course of study, number of days for in-service activities and vocational education similarly fall within the control of the Department of Education and are dealt with in some of the recommendations.

55. Decrease the student-teacher ratio.
56. Provide separate salary units for administrators.
57. Provide separate salary units for department heads.
58. Provide separate salary units for specialists.
59. Provide personnel, other than teachers, for supervision.
60. Provide secretarial/clerical staff so that there is one for every seven teachers or fraction thereof.
61. Provide teacher aides.
62. Allocate salary units based on the number of grades in a school rather than only on enrolment.
63. Allocate salary units based on the program offered by the school.
64. Provide extra pay for extra work.
65. Introduce a regulation setting a maximum of twenty teaching periods per week.
66. Implement the forty-hour week with overtime pay.
67. Provide for an easier and faster access system to films, filmstrips, and tapes.
68. Have a less frequent change of textbooks which would help in reducing the preparation and testing loads.
69. Reduce the number of subjects taught in school.
70. Allow for more conferences and workshops to be held on school time.
71. Integrate the academic and vocational schools in the province.

72. Extend the school year to 200 days, but have only 190 days for students.

Responsibility Resting With Other Bodies

73. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association should try to improve teaching conditions rather than only concentrate on salary issues.
74. Course for administrators in scheduling should be made available by Memorial University.
75. A greater participation by the federal government, in the financing of education is needed to share the cost of education.

### Summary

Teachers sought decreases in the classroom instruction, supervision, and clerical loads for a five-day week and a seven-day week. A time increase was desired for extra-curricular activities for both of these time periods. In the course of a two-day weekend, teachers would like to have a decrease in the preparation load. A decrease in the number of hours devoted to total teaching activities was requested for the five-day week, two-day weekend, and the seven-day week. The desired times for each of these time periods was 35.33 hours, 3.00 hours, and 38.75 hours respectively.

Seventy-five recommendations for implementing the desired teacher workload were given by teachers. Approximately 50 percent of the recommendations were within the control or influence of the local school to implement. The remaining recommendations fell primarily within the jurisdiction of school boards or the provincial department of education. Lowering the student-teacher ratio and employing teacher aides in the school were the most frequently mentioned recommendations of the seventy-five presented.

## CHAPTER XII

### A COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY TO THE RELATED LITERATURE

To determine how the findings of this study compare with those of similar studies, the major findings of this study are reviewed in relation to the related literature. This chapter, therefore, compares the actual median teacher workload, the views of teachers toward their actual teacher workload and the views of teachers toward their desired teacher workload. No studies reviewed by the investigator sought recommendations from teachers for implementing the desired teacher workload.

#### The Actual Teacher Workload

Table LXXXVII compares the actual teacher workload of teachers participating in this study, which for convenience is referred to as the Newfoundland study, to the findings of the Canadian Teachers' Federation, Fenske, and Alberta Teachers' Association studies. These are the most recently dated studies surveyed by the investigator in which workload was calculated in median hours. Other teacher workload studies reviewed used mean hours or Douglass teaching load units.

In the five-day week, teachers in this study spent less time in classroom instruction, preparation, supervision, and total teaching activities than did teachers in the Canadian Teachers' Federation and Fenske studies. With the exception of classroom instruction and total teaching activities, the differences in time between each of the studies

TABLE LXXXV11

A COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS  
OF FOUR STUDIES

Teaching Activities	5-DAY WEEK			7-DAY WEEK		
	Nfld.	C.T.F.*	Fenske*	Nfld.	C.T.F.*	A.T.A.*
Classroom Instruction	20.42	24.50	21.63	20.42	24.50	21.63
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	6.00	6.70	7.48	8.00	9.50	10.80
Professional	-	1.80	-	-	2.20	1.60
Marking	5.00	3.20	5.48	6.00	3.90	4.10
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	.50	.40
Supervision	1.50	2.40	2.48	1.50	2.40	2.90
Administrative- Clerical	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	1.20

TABLE LXXXVII (CONTINUED)

Teaching Activities	5-DAY WEEK			7-DAY WEEK		
	Nfld.	C.T.F.*	Fenske*	Nfld.	C.T.F.*	A.T.A.*
Administrative- Professional	-	-	-	-	-	1.60
Staff Meetings	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	.60	-	1.00	-	-
Total Teaching Activities	39.25	45.13	43.27	43.83	48.50	50.20

\*Canadian Teachers' Federation, loc cit.

\*Fenske, loc cit.

\*Alberta Teachers' Association, loc cit.

for each of the teacher workload components is less than two hours. It is noticeable, however, that Newfoundland teachers devoted more than 50 percent less time to supervisory duties than did teachers in the other two studies. The definition of classroom instruction used in the Canadian Teachers' Federation study included extra help classes given before and after school hours. This might partially account for the heavier classroom instruction load of 24.50 hours in the nation-wide study. The numerical difference of 5.88 hours in the total teacher workload between this study and the Canadian Teachers' Federation study can partly be accounted for by the inclusion of the professional component in the Canadian Teachers' Federation study. Professional activities included in the definition were university courses, seminars, and professional reading.

Table LXXXVII also indicates that high school teachers in Newfoundland had a lighter classroom instruction, preparation, supervisory, clerical, and total teacher workload in a seven-day week than their counterparts in the Canadian Teachers' Federation and Alberta Teachers' Association studies. The broader definition of classroom instruction and the inclusion of professional activities in the latter two studies would tend to show a heavier total teacher workload. Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers devoted more hours, however, to marking and to extra-curricular activities.

The selected factors examined in this study as having a possible effect on teacher workload were sex and marital status, years of teaching experience, years of training, subject field, size of school, and average daily number of pupil contacts. The influence

that these variables had in six of the studies reviewed by the investigator are compared to the findings of this study.

The sex and marital status of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers was found to have an impact on some of the teacher workload components, as well as on the total teacher workload. The National Education Association<sup>2</sup>, Canadian Teachers' Federation<sup>3</sup>, and Manitoba Teachers' Society<sup>4</sup> studies found sex and marital status to have an effect primarily on a teacher's total teacher workload, while the Alberta Teachers' Association<sup>5</sup> and Fenske<sup>6</sup> studies concluded that sex and marital status have little effect on total teacher workload, but some effect on the components comprising a teacher's workload. While the Canadian Teachers' Federation and National Education Association studies found single and married males to have heavier workloads than single and married females, this study revealed married males to have the lightest teacher workload, and single males to have the second heaviest teacher workload. This study, however, concurred with the findings of the Canadian Teachers' Federation and Manitoba Teachers' Society studies that members of religious orders have the heaviest total teacher workload. The Alberta Teachers' Association

---

<sup>2</sup>National Education Association, "Teaching Load in 1950," Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, XXIX (February, 1951), 13.

<sup>3</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, *op. cit.*, 30.

<sup>4</sup>Manitoba Teachers' Society, The Workload of Manitoba Teachers, 1965-66, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Teachers' Society, 1966), 45.

<sup>5</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, *op. cit.*, 39.

<sup>6</sup>Fenske, *op. cit.*, 76.



and Fenske studies concluded that male teachers spend the most time on extra-curricular activities. This study found that female teachers spend significantly less time on extra-curricular activities in comparison to male teachers.

Statistically, the number of years of teaching that a teacher has received has little overall influence on a teacher's workload based on the findings of this study. Numerically, however, there were signs of a pattern that indicated a decrease in teacher workload as teaching experience increased. The Alberta Teachers' Association study found signs of the same pattern.<sup>7</sup> The Canadian Teachers' Federation study found a marked decrease in teacher workload with an increase in teaching experience.<sup>8</sup>

It was found by this study that a teacher's years of training has virtually no effect on the workload of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher. The Alberta Teachers' Association<sup>9</sup> and Fenske<sup>10</sup> studies reached a similar conclusion.

The major findings of this study with regard to subject field as a factor influencing teacher workload were that English teachers have the heaviest total teacher workload in a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week, as well as the heaviest marking load in a five-day

---

<sup>7</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 39.

<sup>8</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, 33.

<sup>9</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 32.

<sup>10</sup>Fenske, 68.

week, and the heaviest preparation load in a two-day weekend. The National Education Association study found English teachers to have the heaviest teacher workload and mathematics teachers to have the lightest teacher workload.<sup>11</sup> Numerically, mathematics in Newfoundland Central and Regional High Schools also had the lightest teacher workload. English teachers in the Canadian Teacher's Federation<sup>12</sup> and Fenske<sup>13</sup> studies had the heaviest marking loads. It was the finding of the Alberta Teachers' Association study, however, that English/Social Studies teachers have the lightest teacher workload.<sup>14</sup>

The size of school in which the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher is teaching has virtually no effect on teacher workload. This finding agrees with the findings of the Fenske<sup>15</sup> and Alberta Teachers' Association<sup>16</sup> studies. According to the Canadian Teachers' Federation study, however, a teacher's workload tends to decrease as the size of the school increases.<sup>17</sup> The Manitoba Teachers' Society study found that teachers in smaller schools spend smaller percentages of their time on instruction, professional, extra-curricular

---

<sup>11</sup>National Education Association, op. cit., 15.

<sup>12</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, op. cit., 40.

<sup>13</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 39.

<sup>14</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 40.

<sup>15</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 87.

<sup>16</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, 69.

<sup>17</sup>Canadian Teachers' Federation, 35.

and other activities, while teachers in larger schools spend larger percentages of their time on preparation, testing, and supervision.<sup>18</sup>

The investigator found in the Newfoundland situation that as the average daily student contact of a teacher increases, so does the workload of the teacher increase. It was also determined that as the average daily student contact increases, the supervision load decreases. The Alberta Teachers' Association study, however, found no significant differences in the weekly hour load of teachers meeting various numbers of pupils per week. Only a slight increase in time was given to extra-curricular activities by teachers having a higher average daily student contact.<sup>19</sup> The National Education Association's 1967 study found that as the average daily student contact of a teacher increases, the degree of dissatisfaction also increases.<sup>20</sup>

#### The Desired Teacher Workload

A comparison of the actual teacher workload and the desired teacher workload of Fenske's study to this study is presented in Table LXXXVIII. Teachers in each of the two studies sought a significant decrease in the classroom instruction load and the total teacher workload. Newfoundland teachers sought a classroom instruction load of 17.50 hours, while Alberta teachers were satisfied with 20.25 hours. Only a

---

<sup>18</sup>The Manitoba Teachers' Society, op. cit., 36.

<sup>19</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 56.

<sup>20</sup>National Education Association, The American Public School Teacher, (Washington: National Education Association, 1967), 28.

TABLE LXXXV111

A COMPARISON OF THE DESIRED TOTAL WORKLOAD  
OF TEACHERS OF TWO STUDIES

Teaching Activities	Newfoundland			Fenske*		
	Actual	Desired	Significance	Actual	Desired	Significance
Classroom Instruction	20.42	17.50	.05	21.63	20.25	.01
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	8.00	8.50	nil	7.48	6.00	.05
Marking	6.00	5.00	nil	5.48	5.00	nil
Staff and Departmental Meetings	1.00	1.00	nil	-	-	-
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.00	2.00	.05	1.00	1.75	.01
Supervision	1.50	.50	.05	2.48	2.42	nil
Clerical Work	1.00	1.00	nil	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	1.00	nil	-	-	-
Total Teaching Activities	43.83	38.75	.05	43.27	40.00	.01

\*Fenske, Ibid., 106-117.

small numerical difference separates the desired teacher workload of the two groups. Newfoundland teachers want a total teacher workload of 38.75 hours compared to the Alberta teachers' request for 40.00 hours. Teachers in each study sought a significant increase in the number of hours devoted to extra-curricular activities, with Newfoundland teachers desiring 2.00 hours and the Alberta teachers, 1.75 hours. Teachers in the Newfoundland Central and Regional High Schools would be happy with a preparation load of 8.50 hours compared to 6.00 hours for Alberta teachers. Each group of teachers desired a marking load of 5.00 hours. A considerable difference exists in the time teachers wanted to devote to supervision. Newfoundland teachers wanted a decrease to .50 hours, while Alberta teachers were satisfied to have a supervisory load of 2.42 hours.

The Alberta Teachers' Association study also determined the desired teacher workload of secondary school teachers. However, the findings were computed on a yearly basis rather than on a weekly basis. Nevertheless, decreases were desired in five areas. Four of the decrease requests correspond with the findings of this study: classroom instruction, supervision, clerical work, and total teacher workload. Alberta teachers also sought a reduction in the preparation load.<sup>22</sup>

The teachers who participated in this study and the teachers who participated in Fenske's study<sup>23</sup>, expressed similar views toward their actual teacher workload. Teachers in both studies expressed

---

<sup>22</sup>Alberta Teachers' Association, op. cit., 52.

<sup>23</sup>Fenske, op. cit., 102.

concern over the large number of students in some classes, the number of subjects that they have to teach, supervisory duties, the amount of clerical work, and the number of hours required for preparation.

The British Columbia Teachers' Federation study asked teachers what factors they believe played the most significant part in reducing the effectiveness of the learning situation. The fact that teachers had to contend with some large classes was the most frequently mentioned concern. Other major comments related to: teaching assignment not in specialty area, inadequate facilities and equipment, total number of students in a cycle, variety of subjects taught, and number of new courses.<sup>24</sup> Each of these concerns was also evident in Newfoundland Central and Regional High Schools.

The major recommendations of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation study are similar to the views of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers toward their workload. Some of the Ontario study recommendations were:

1. Maximum class size of 30 for academic subjects.
2. Maximum number of 30 occupied periods in a 5-day cycle.
3. Provide para-professional assistance.
4. Build flexible schools.
5. Provide teacher workrooms and offices for some teachers and all department heads.

---

<sup>24</sup>British Columbia Teachers' Federation, Teaching Assignments in Some British Columbia Secondary Schools and Their Workload Implications, 1967-68, Informational Report No. 5, (Victoria: British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1968). p. 24.

6. Provide adequate library facilities.
7. Provide preparation time for teachers.
8. Limit the number of courses to be taught by a teacher to four.
9. The school office handle routine marking and school attendance records.<sup>25</sup>

To improve the lot of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher, the most frequently given recommendations were to reduce the student-teacher ratio and provide para-professional assistance.

Newfoundland teachers were not specifically asked whether they considered their workload to be satisfactory or heavy. However, 21.6 percent of the Newfoundland teachers expressed that they were dissatisfied with their present workload, and 25.5 percent indicated that they found their workload to be reasonable. The National Education Association study found that 37.1 percent of the secondary teachers regarded their load as being heavy or extremely heavy.<sup>26</sup> The British Columbia Teachers' Federation study determined that 30.9 percent of the teachers felt that their teaching load was unmanageable to the point where it detracted from the effectiveness of the learning situation that they were able to create.<sup>27</sup> While only 21.6 percent of the Newfoundland teachers

---

<sup>25</sup>Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, Report of the Committee on Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching, (Toronto: Ontario Teachers' Federation, 1968), 21-22.

<sup>26</sup>National Education Association, loc. cit.

<sup>27</sup>British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 23.

expressed dissatisfaction, this cannot be taken as an indicator that Newfoundland teachers are relatively happier with their lot. The percentage expressing dissatisfaction would most likely have been higher had the questionnaire included a question similar to the one included in the previous studies which asked teachers whether they regarded their teacher workload as being reasonable or heavy.



### Summary

While some differences between the findings of this study to related studies have been noted, the researcher concludes that in many respects the findings of this study are similar to the previous research. Teachers have a total workload ranging from approximately 43.00 hours to 50.00 hours in a seven-day week. While few studies calculate separately the workload of a teacher in a two-day weekend, it is obvious, however, that some time is devoted to school work in this time period.

Sex and marital status, subject field, and average daily student contact appear to have some impact on teacher workload. The influence of a teacher's years of experience and the size of the school in which a teacher is working on teacher workload is inconclusive. While this study found these two factors to have little or no effect on teacher workload, some other studies found them to have an influence. A general finding found in studies is that the number of years of training that a teacher has completed has a minimal influence on teacher workload.

Teachers desire a reduction in load, particularly the number of hours devoted to assigned classroom instruction and to the total teacher workload. An overall total teacher workload of approximately 38.00 to 40.00 hours seemed to be acceptable to teachers. To assist in improving the working conditions of teachers, a reduction in the student-teacher ratio, the provision of functional and flexible school facilities, and changes in teacher assignment were sought.

## CHAPTER XIII

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### The Problem

Being a teacher involves more than being in the classroom five hours per day. With the rapid growth of knowledge and the new organizational developments taking place in education today, as well as changes in the academic disciplines offered in the schools, the demands placed on the high school teacher appear to be mushrooming. Attention needs to be focused, therefore, on the essential ingredient of having time for the teacher to properly cope with these increased demands. Teachers are expected to be innovative, imaginative, up-to-date in their thinking and approaches to teaching, yet the accompanying working conditions to fulfill these expectations are not always provided. The teacher who feels overburdened is less likely to produce the desired learning situations. As a result students suffer. A study of the workload of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers should, therefore, be of interest to educators generally, and to administrators in particular, so as to have additional information from which to evolve rational teacher work assignment policies.

Specifically, it was the purpose of this study to examine:

(a) the effect that the teacher's sex and marital status, years of teaching experience, years of training, subject field, size of school, and average daily number of pupil contacts have on teacher workload;

(b) the views that teachers hold toward their actual workload; (c) the teachers' estimation of a desirable workload and the teachers' recommendations for implementing the desired workload.

### Procedure

To obtain the data for this study, a questionnaire was developed by the investigator based on a review of the related literature. A pilot study was conducted to establish face validity of the instrument. The final copy of the questionnaire was then administered to a random sample of 300 Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers. Two hundred and nine questionnaires were returned. Of this number, two hundred were usable for a net return of 66.7 percent.

To determine whether a selected factor had an effect on teacher workload, the median test for two independent groups was utilized. The .05 level of significance was used. The median test was also applied to determine whether there were any significant differences between the actual teacher workload and the desired teacher workload.

### Findings Regarding The Actual Teacher Workload

Table LXXXIX presents the workload of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers for a five-day week, two-day weekend, and seven-day week. The classroom instruction time of 20.42 hours comprised only 46.6 percent of the total teacher workload of 43.83 hours in a seven-day week. The preparation load of 8.00 hours and the marking load of 6.00 hours accounted for 31.9 percent of the seven-

TABLE LXXXIX

THE ACTUAL WORKLOAD OF NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL  
AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS  
FOR A SAMPLE OF 200 TEACHERS

Teaching Activities	5-Day Week	2-Day Weekend	7-Day Week
Classroom Instruction	20.42	0.00	20.42
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	6.00	2.00	8.00
Marking	5.00	2.00	6.00
Staff and Departmental Meetings	1.00	0.00	1.00
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.00	0.00	1.00
Supervision	1.50	0.00	1.50
Clerical Work	1.00	0.00	1.00
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	0.00	1.00
Total Teaching Activities	39.25	5.00	43.83

day week workload. Staff and departmental meetings, extra-curricular activities, clerical work and miscellaneous activities each accounted for 1.00 hours, and supervision for 1.50 hours in a seven-day week for a total of 22.5 percent of the total teacher workload. The two-day weekend workload of 5.00 hours, or 11.5 percent of the seven-day week workload, was comprised primarily of lesson preparation and the marking of student work.

It was revealed, upon application of the median test, that sex and marital status, subject field, and average daily student contact have an influence on the total teacher workload, as well as on some components comprising a teacher's workload. To illustrate, married males tended to have the lightest total teacher workload, while members of religious orders had the heaviest total teacher workload. Single and married females devoted the least number of hours to extra-curricular activities. English teachers reported the heaviest total teacher workload, as well as the heaviest marking load in a five-day week and the heaviest preparation load in a two-day weekend. As the daily student contact increased, so did the total teacher workload. This trend was partially in evidence for the classroom instruction, preparation, and marking loads.

The application of the median test also revealed that the selected factors of teaching experience, years of training, and size of school have little or no effect on a teacher's total workload, or on the various components comprising a teacher's workload.

In expressing views toward their actual workload, the most often mentioned comments by teachers dealt with the need to: (1)

reduce the total teacher workload; (2) reduce the amount of assigned classroom instruction time and increase the time for lesson preparation and student corrections during the regular school day; (3) reduce the student-teacher ratio; (4) keep the variety of different subjects and courses taught by a teacher to a minimum; (5) keep clerical work and supervision to a minimum or better still, delegate these activities to teacher aides. Some concern was also expressed about the mental fatigue and exhaustion factors present in teaching.

#### Findings Regarding the Desired Teacher Workload

The desired workload of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers is presented in Table XC. In comparison to the actual teacher workload, significant load decreases were sought in classroom instruction, supervision, and clerical work in a five-day week and in a seven-day week. A reduction in the number of hours devoted to the preparation of lessons and materials in a two-day weekend was requested. A lighter total teacher workload was also indicated for each of the three time intervals. The change desired in the total teacher workload for a five-day week was from 39.25 hours to 35.33 hours, in a two-day weekend from 5.00 hours to 3.00 hours, and in a seven-day week from 43.83 hours to 38.75 hours.

Of the seventy-five recommendations given for implementing the desired teacher workload, approximately half were either within the jurisdiction of the school or within the scope of the school to exert some influence. The recommendations dealt primarily with the areas of teacher assignment, the organization of the school day, the organization

TABLE XC

THE DESIRED WORKLOAD OF NEWFOUNDLAND CENTRAL  
AND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS  
FOR A SAMPLE OF 200 TEACHERS

Teaching Activities	5-Day Week	2-Day Weekend	7-Day Week
Classroom Instruction	17.50	0.00	17.50
Preparation of Lessons and Materials	7.00	1.50	8.50
Marking	5.00	1.00	5.00
Staff and Departmental Meetings	1.00	0.00	1.00
Extra-Curricular Activities	1.50	0.00	2.00
Supervision	0.50	0.00	0.50
Clerical Work	0.00	0.00	0.00
Miscellaneous Activities	1.00	0.00	1.00
Total Teaching Activities	35.33	3.00	38.75

of students, and the employment of volunteer workers. Almost all of the recommendations involved no financial expenditure.

Sixteen of the seventy-five recommendations dealt with matters that were mainly within the jurisdiction of school boards. The design of school buildings, the provision of teaching aids, and staffing procedures were the subject of many of the recommendations.

Finances would play a more significant part in these recommendations.

The recommendations that recurred most often from the one hundred and ninety-two teachers involved financial expenditure dependent on the policies of the Department of Education. A reduction in the student-teacher ratio and the provision of separate salary units for teachers not working in the classroom were of greatest concern to teachers. Secondly, almost 50 percent of the teachers recommended that para-professional workers be hired for schools.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn by the investigator based on the responses from a sample of Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers.

1. The workload of the Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teacher exceeds what is considered to be the maximum normal work-week of 40 hours. For some organizations, the 35-hour work-week prevails. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers seek a work-week of 38.75 hours.
2. The factors of sex and marital status, subject field,



and average daily student contact have an effect on a teacher's workload. On the other hand, the factors of teaching experience, years of training, and size of school have little effect on teacher workload.

3. Newfoundland Central and Regional High School teachers seek to professionalize their occupation. They want to be relieved of the mundane and routine tasks that can be done more cheaply and more effectively by para-professional personnel. Instead, teachers desired to spend more time preparing for the classroom, correcting student work, reading professional literature, and researching innovative practices. In essence, they want time to think and plan for their work. Suitable offices and work areas need to be made available to teachers for these activities.
4. Teachers seek to give individualized attention to students. However, to accomplish this objective, a reasonable student-teacher ratio policy must first be implemented.
5. The school administrator has considerable control over improving the working conditions of teachers at little or no expense. No indication, however, was given by teachers that definite teacher workload policies are generally in effect in the Central and Regional High Schools of Newfoundland.

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings and

conclusions as previously stated in this chapter.

1. Considerable initiative can be taken at the school level to improve working conditions for teachers. A satisfied teacher is a more effective teacher. Therefore, it is recommended that a thorough study of teacher workload by the administrator and the school staff be made to evaluate the present situation and to further determine what can feasibly be done to realize the optimum working conditions. Such a study should result in specific teacher workload policies derived through consensus of all personnel involved.
2. Consideration by the Department of Education needs to be given to the varying of the type of personnel salary units allocated to a school. Specifically, regulations need to be implemented allowing for the funding of para-professional personnel.
3. A revision of the current method of allocating teacher salary units to schools needs to be carried out by the Department of Education with the view in mind of creating teaching conditions whereby the teacher has responsibility for a reasonable number of students, where the teacher teaches primarily in his area of specialty, where the maximum number of subjects taught by a teacher is two and where a teacher is relieved from assigned classroom instruction for a minimum of 25 percent of the student day.
4. Since it is the popular view of the general public that

teachers have a relatively short work-week, and since this is in fact not the case, it is recommended that teachers individually and collectively make the public aware of what the true workload situation is with the goal in mind of increasing public understanding of the work of the teacher. It is only through such increased public awareness and understanding that government will allocate the needed funds to provide for more teachers, para-professional personnel, improved educational facilities, and adequate supplies of teaching aids.

#### Problems For Further Study

Since teacher workload is a new area of research in Newfoundland, and since many aspects of teacher workload are yet to be studied, it is suggested that the following two problems relating to teacher workload be investigated as soon as possible.

1. Since provision for para-professional personnel was a major concern of teachers in this study, a comparative study needs to be made between schools having para-professional personnel and schools not having para-professional personnel. Such a study would ascertain the effect that para-professional personnel have on the organization and work activities of a teacher's typical work-week.
2. The findings of this study relate only to Central and Regional High School teachers. To widen the range of knowledge on the workload of Newfoundland teachers, a

study needs to be made into the workload of Newfoundland  
primary and elementary school teachers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

Clark, Charles E. Random Numbers in Uniform and Normal Distribution. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.

Douglass, Harl. Modern Administration of Secondary Schools. 2nd. ed. New York: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1964.

Elsbree, W.S. and Reutter, E. Staff Personnel in Public Schools. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Fawcett, Claude. School Personnel Administration. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964.

Siegal, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Stinnett, T.M. Professional Problems of Teachers. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Teacher Dropout. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publisher, Inc., 1970.

Weber, Clarence. Personnel Problems of School Administrators. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. Leadership in Personnel Management in Public Schools. St. Louis: Warren H. Green, Inc., 1970.

Vah Zwoil, James. School Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

2. Periodicals

Andree, Robert. "Large Classes and Effective Teaching", The Clearing House, XXXIII (February, 1959), 334-36.

Book, W.B., "Work Load and Quality Teaching," The Bulletin, XLV (March, 1965), 100-102.

Clark, Leonard. "Teaching Load Formulas Compared," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XL (October, 1956), 55-62.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Teaching: An Overworked Profession?" The Clearing House, XXX (September, 1955), 34-35.

Clement, Stanley. "More Time for Teaching," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (December, 1962), 54-59.

Davis, Hazel. "What To Do About Teaching Load?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXV (October, 1951), 148-156.

"Expecting the Impossible," B.C. Teacher, XLV (November, 1965), 53.

Friesen, John. "All is Not Well in the Teaching Profession," The A.T.A. Magazine, L (March-April, 1970), 12-14.

Gahan, Richard. "The Normal Working Day," The P.A.C.T. Magazine, V (December, 1966), 4.

Gallant, Thomas. and Zimmer, Larry. "Teaching in the Smaller Secondary School & Its Demands and Opportunities," The Bulletin of the N.A.S.S.P., L (February, 1966), 11-18.

Guggenheim, Fred. "Non-Teaching Activities of Teachers in a Staff Utilization Study," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (May, 1961), 325-331.

Hedges, William. "A Straightforward Plan to Reduce the Teacher's Load," The Clearing House, XLI (December, 1966), 210-213.

Hunter, David. "Working Conditions," The Bulletin, XLV (December, 1956), 517+.

Keliher, Alice. "Effective Learning and Teacher-Pupil Ratio," The Education Digest, XXXII (January, 1966), 20-22.

McKenna, Bernard. "What Research Says About Greater Learning in Smaller Classes," N.E.A. Journal, XLVI (May, 1965), 437-438.

McMurtry, John. "Three Main Areas for Complaint," Monday Morning, LI (January, 1968), 32-34.

Meyers, L.L. "Needed: An Objective Method of Determining Teacher Load," The Nation's Schools III (April, 1943), 30-31.

Mickleburgh, Bruce. "Keeping Posted," The Educational Courier, XXXVI (November-December, 1965), 29-37.

"N.E.A. and Teacher Welfare: Teacher Load," N.E.A. Journal, XLV (February, 1956), 96-97.

Pettit, Maurice "For Teaching Efficiency - Determining Teaching Load," American School Board Journal, CXXVIII (March, 1954), 34+.

Provus, Malcom. "Time to Teach," N.E.A. Journal, LIII (May, 1964), 17-18.

Redefer, Frederick. "Teacher Morale and Quality of Education", Nation's Schools, LIX (February, 1957), 53-55.

Short, V.M. "Let's Take the Number Mystique Out of Education", School Progress, XXXIX (May, 1970), 52-54.

"Time Devoted to School Duties," N.E.A. Research Bulletin, XL (October, 1962), 83-88.

Timmermans, Brian. "Teachers, Time and Teaching," Educational Courier, XLII (April, 1972), 4-6.

Walker, D.D. "Conditions for More Effective Work," The Bulletin, XLVI (December, 1966), 476-77.

### 3. Theses and Research Studies

The American Public-School Teacher. N.E.A. Research Division, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Fenske, Milton. "An Analysis of the Work Week of a Central Alberta High School Teacher". Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1961.

The Professional Load of Alberta Teachers. Research Monograph No. 4, The Professional Load Committee of the Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association, 1963.

Report of the Committee on Conditions of Work for Quality Teaching - Toronto: Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, 1968.

Seldon, David. Teacher Workload and Teacher Dropout. QuEST Papers Series, No. 5, Washington: American Federation of Teachers, 1969.

Sitkei, George. The Effects of Class Size: A Review of the Research. Research Study Series, Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Office of Superintendent of Schools, 1968.

Shellhammer, Thomas. "Work Week of Public Secondary School Teachers in California." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

Staple, Mark. An Investigation of the Supply-Demand Schedule for Teachers in the Province of Newfoundland With Projections to 1980-81. A Report Prepared by the Educational Planning Division, Department of Education, St. John's: Department of Education, 1971.

Teaching Assignments in Some British Columbia Schools and Their Workload Implication - 1967-68. Informational Report No. 5, Victoria: British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1968.

"The Teacher Looks at Teacher Load." N.E.A. Research Bulletin, XVII (November, 1939), 224-270.

"Teaching Load in 1950." N.E.A. Research Bulletin, XXIX (February, 1951), 4-51.

Teacher Workload: A Cross-Canada Survey of the Workload of Canadian Teachers. Research Study No. 6, Research Division, Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1962.

The Workload of Canadian Teachers. Supplement to Research Study No. 6, Research Division, Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1962.

The Workload of Manitoba Teachers, 1965-66. Winnipeg: The Manitoba Teachers' Society, 1966.



APPENDIX

Teacher Questionnaire

## Part I

## Personal and Professional Data

1. Please indicate your sex.

\_\_\_\_\_ male \_\_\_\_\_ female.

2. Please indicate your present marital status. (Check one blank only).

\_\_\_\_\_ single  
\_\_\_\_\_ married  
\_\_\_\_\_ member of religious order  
\_\_\_\_\_ widow or widower with no dependent children  
\_\_\_\_\_ widow or widower with one or more dependent children  
\_\_\_\_\_ divorced with no dependent children  
\_\_\_\_\_ divorced with one or more dependent children

3. What is your age?

\_\_\_\_\_ 30 or under  
\_\_\_\_\_ 31 to 40  
\_\_\_\_\_ 41 to 50  
\_\_\_\_\_ over 50

4. Please circle the grades taught in your school.

K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

5. How many full-time teachers are on the staff of your school?  
(Include yourself and the principal).

\_\_\_\_\_ number of teachers

6. How many years of university training do you have? Check one.

_____ less than one year	_____ 4 - 4.9 years
_____ 1 - 1.9 years	_____ 5 - 5.9 years
_____ 2 - 2.9 years	_____ 6 - 6.9 years
_____ 3 - 3.9 years	_____ 7 or more years

7. Counting the present school year, what is the total number of school years that you have been teaching? (Include fractions of a year).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ years.
8. Please indicate the teaching position that you hold.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ subject teacher  
 \_\_\_\_\_ department head  
 \_\_\_\_\_ specialist. (Please state area of specialization below).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ specialist.
9. Please indicate the subject(s), during your university training, that you  
 majored in \_\_\_\_\_  
 minored in \_\_\_\_\_  
 other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
10. How many class periods do you spend teaching per week?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ periods per week.
11. What is the length of a class period?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ minutes.
12. List the subjects that you are teaching in the present school year and the number of class periods per week that you spend teaching each subject.

<u>Subjects That You Teach</u>	<u>Number of Periods Per Week</u>
Example: a) <u>History</u>	a) <u>14</u> periods
b) <u>Mathematics</u>	b) <u>16</u> periods
1. _____	1. _____ periods
2. _____	2. _____ periods
3. _____	3. _____ periods
4. _____	4. _____ periods
5. _____	5. _____ periods
6. _____	6. _____ periods
7. _____	7. _____ periods

13. What is the smallest number of students in a class in which you teach? (Do not include classes that you only supervise. e.g. study period).

\_\_\_\_\_ number of students.

14. What is the largest number of students in a class in which you teach? (Do not include classes that you only supervise. e.g. study period).

\_\_\_\_\_ number of students.

15. What is the average number of students in your classes?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of students.

## Part II

### Your ACTUAL Teacher Workload

16. Directions: Estimate as accurately as possible the total time that you spend on the following activities in a typical 5-day school week (Monday through Friday inclusive), 2-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday), and 7-day week (Monday through Sunday inclusive).

	<u>Column 1</u> 5-day school week	<u>Column 2</u> 2-day weekend	<u>Column 3</u> TOTALS-Add Column 1 plus Column 2 for 7-day week workload
(i) Classroom instruction	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(ii) Preparation of lessons and materials	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(iii) Marking tests, homework, assignments, etc.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(iv) Staff meetings, depart- mental meetings	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(v) Extra-curricular activities carried on after regular class hours. (e.g. drama club, athletics)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(vi) Supervision (study periods, corridors, noon hours, etc.)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(vii) Clerical work (e.g. mimeo- graphing, registers, selling tickets)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(viii) Miscellaneous (e.g. P.T.A., parent conferences, student conferences, etc.)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
TOTALS	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.

17. What are your views concerning the actual teacher workload that you have? (Please be as specific as possible). {

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

### Part III

#### DESIRED Teacher Workload

18. Directions: Please indicate the teacher workload that you consider to be desirable by filling out the table below.

	<u>Column 1</u> 5-day school week	<u>Column 2</u> 2-day weekend	<u>Column 3</u> TOTALS-Add Column 1 plus Column 2 for 7-day week workload
(i) Classroom instruction	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(ii) Preparation of lessons and materials	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(iii) Marking tests, homework, assignments, etc.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(iv) Staff meetings, depart- mental meetings	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(v) Extra-curricular activities carried on after regular class hours. (e.g. drama club, athletics)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(vi) Supervision (study periods, corridors, noon hour, etc.)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(vii) Clerical work (e.g. mimeo- graphing, registers, selling tickets)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
(viii) Miscellaneous (e.g. P.T.A., parent conferences, student conferences, etc.)	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.	__ hours, __ minutes.
TOTALS	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.	__ HOURS, __ MINUTES.

19. What recommendations would you suggest to implement the desired teacher workload that you indicated in question 18? (Please be as specific as possible).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

20. Any additional comments regarding teacher workload that you may wish to make.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---









