✦ ✦ ✦ ✦

THE PRESENT STATUS OF RESEARCH IN TEACHING LOADS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Oliver Hodge, *Norman, Oklahoma*

The teaching load in state and other universities lies very close to the center of all effective educational planning. This becomes evident when it is shown that four of the chief aspects of university administration are materially affected by considerations of the teaching load; namely, (1) cost, (2) personnel administration, (3) educational efficiency and (4) educational publicity.

There is a direct relationship between the size of the work load carried by individual instructors and the cost of instruction. The chief factors that influence instructional costs are: the schedule of teaching salaries, the size of the classes and the weekly teaching load of individual instructors. During the past decade the problem of cost has become rather acute with most institutions, and the usual solution has been to

load the instructor with a few more students and at the same time reduce his salary.

Personnel administrators are frequently confronted with the problem of what to do with individual teaching loads, whether to reduce or increase them. This situation is brought about mostly by the lack of knowledge or agreement as to the relation that should exist between other official university duties and the basic teaching load. The administrator has the problem of avoiding discrimination and being fair to all instructors. He cannot very well accomplish this without having scientific evidence of what weights should be assigned to the various phases of the instructors duties.

There is a distinct misconception and lack of appreciation on the part of the public as to the actual number of hours per week the average instructor devotes to his total official duties. It, therefore, seems administratively important and desirable, both in fairness to the instructor and for the best interests of institutional publicity, to ascertain the facts and acquaint patrons with the actual time-load involved in the normal teaching load attached to official membership in a university or college faculty.

In 1908 the Carnegie Foundation, in its *Third Annual Report,* devoted some space to this subject. This study contains much data but administrator of a college will derive little practical benefit from it. The institutions grouped in the several tables are not comparable in size or in aim. The tables, therefore, do not illuminate administrative problems.

In 1916 Dean Birge gathered some data and gave a report to the National Association of State Universities. His study was confined to three universities and hence was very limited in scope. He arrived at some rather general conclusions as follows: (1) The number of recitation hours to be assigned to a teacher differs with the aims and methods of the college concerned; (2) The matter can not be wisely discussed except after an investigation which shall fully report university practice and interpret it in the light of university aims and methods; (3) Any attempt to set up standards of practice at present would be a mistake, since (*a*) the practices of different institutions differ, and ought to differ, and (*b*) the practice now obtaining in many institutions will and ought to change as its aims and methods alter.

Leonard V. Koos carried on an investigation at the University of Washington in 1917. He secured his data by means of a questionnaire issued to the faculty. Each instructor was asked to report the time spent in his professional activities during one school week, May 14 to 19, inclusive. Out of this study Mr. Koos evolved some interesting and complicated tables and formulas, but nothing that revolutionized the time honored methods of adjudicating the work loads of faculty members.

In 1926 Dean F. J. Kelly, of the University of Minnesota, reported his "Cooperative Study of Relative Amounts of Time Required to Teach Different College Courses." Dean Kelly used a questionnaire to secure the pooled judgment of several deans of schools and colleges whose work was comparable. Each dean was to answer for his own school. Fifteen hours of elementary mathematics teaching per week was arbitrarily chosen as a common base, and the deans estimated the relative amounts of time required to teach the different courses in their departments. An evident weakness of this method is that it is doubtful if many of the deans had an accurate idea of the time required to teach 15 hours of elementary mathematics. Out of this study Dean Kelly developed two tables of indexes: the first gave the indexes of time required in preparation for teaching college courses; the second gave the equivalents of teaching

assignments in college departments. He then arbitrarily adopted the 45-hour week as the standard and developed the formula

$$H + \frac{I \times H}{5} = 45,$$

where H is hours of teaching per week.

I is the index of preparation found in the table of indexes, and the denominator 5 is determined by the fact that the index base is 10, and in order that $I \times H / X$ shall equal 45 - H, X must equal 5. For computing the number of two-hour laboratory periods which are equivalent to fifteen hours of elementary mathematics teaching, the formula used was:

$$2L + \frac{I \times L}{5} = 45,$$

where L is the number of two-hour periods, and

I is the index number found in the table.

In 1924 Lynn B. McMullen carried on a study of the service load in teacher training institutions of the United States. He defined *service load* as the work for which remuneration is received from the employing institution. The questionnaire and diary methods were used. Data were gathered from 69 teacher training institutions in 28 states, some 1,950 teachers having kept a diary of their time for one representative week. Some of Mr. McMullen's findings and conclusions are interesting and revealing. He found that there was a distinct variation in service load for different departments of instruction, and that there is no weekly service load that is "fairly well agreed upon."

In 1930 M. P. Cleghorn, of the Iowa State College engineering school, used the diary method for a representative week to determine the time spent on the various phases of the engineering instructor's weekly work load. He used the questionnaire to find the number of clock hours per week spent on: (1) student conferences, (2) official meetings, (3) executive and office, (4) research, (5) professional improvement, (6) teaching hours, and (7) total hours. He then developed the following formula to measure the load for any one course:

$$T = H + PC + GS,$$

where T is the total teaching load in clock hours per week in any course, H is the total classified clock hours per week in the course, C is the credit hours per week for one section of the course, P is the hours preparation per credit hour (one section), GS is the hours spent in grading divided by the number of students S in the course.

In 1934 L. O. Stewart, associate professor of civil engineering, Iowa State College, made a study somewhat similar to that reported by Mr. Cleghorn. It was concerned with engineering classes only and attempted to determine the time for each subject. A table for calculating teaching loads was developed. Data asked for in the questionnaire were: (1) time required in preparation, (2) time in classroom, (3) time for grading papers, and (4) time in conferences relating to the course. The following factors were used in calculations: (1) maximum size of section, (2) minimum size of section, (3) number of hours to be given per week by the average instructor to work relating to teaching will be taken as 36. This last includes (a) time in preparation, (b) time in classroom, (c) time

in grading papers, (d) time in conferences, (e) the total number of hours in the "Total work-week" of the average instructor will be taken as 44.

So meager are the research results on this general problem that one is reminded of the well-known remark in regard to the weather, "We are always talking about it but no one ever does anything about it."

✦ ✦ ✦ ✦