



Department
for Education

Teacher Workload Survey 2019

Technical report

October 2019

**Matt Walker, Jack Worth and Jens Van
den Brande: National Foundation for
Educational Research**



Contents

List of tables	3
1 Introduction	6
2 Sampling	7
3 Piloting and cognitive testing	10
4. Final questionnaire	16
5 Cooperation and response rates	41
6 Data processing and tabulation	43
7 Weighting	44
8 Data tables	49
9 Modelling the factors which impact on teachers' working hours	134
10 References	144

List of tables

Table 1: Changes made to the TWS 2019	12
Table 2: School cooperation rates	41
Table 3: Teacher response rates, within participating schools	42
Table 4: Weighting using entropy balancing to match sample to underlying population	46
Table 5: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by phase and school type	49
Table 6: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by Ofsted category	54
Table 7: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by full-time or part-time status	56
Table 8: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by role	58
Table 9: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by experience	60
Table 10a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by phase and school type (Support and management activities)	63
Table 10b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by phase and school type (Administrative activities)	66
Table 11a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by full-time or part-time status (Support and management activities)	68
Table 11b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by full-time or part-time status (Administrative activities)	69
Table 12a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by Ofsted category (Support and management activities)	70
Table 12b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by Ofsted category (Administrative activities)	72
Table 13a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by role (Support and management activities)	73
Table 13b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by role (Administrative activities)	74

Table 14a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by experience (Support and management activities)	75
Table 14b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by experience(Administrative activities)	77
Table 15: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by phase and school type	78
Table 16: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by school Ofsted category	82
Table 17: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by full-time or part-time status	84
Table 18: Strategies used by senior leaders to manage and plan professional time by phase and school type	86
Table 19: Strategies used by senior leaders to manage and plan professional time by school Ofsted category	88
Table 20: Proportion of all teachers viewing workload as a problem by teacher and school level variables	89
Table 21: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by phase and school type	91
Table 22: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by school Ofsted category	93
Table 23: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by role	94
Table 24: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by experience	95
Table 25: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on their school's working environment by phase and school type	96
Table 26: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on their school's working environment by school Ofsted category	98
Table 27: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by school type	99
Table 28: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by school Ofsted category	103

Table 29: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by role	105
Table 30: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by school type	107
Table 31: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by school Ofsted category	110
Table 32: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by role	112
Table 33: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by full-time and part-time status	114
Table 34: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by experience	116
Table 35: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by school type	118
Table 36: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by school Ofsted category	121
Table 37: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by role	123
Table 38: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by experience	125
Table 39: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by school type	127
Table 40: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by school Ofsted category	130
Table 41: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by full-time and part-time status	132
Table 42a: Final model of classroom teachers / middle leaders' total working hours (Teacher-level variables)	138
Table 42b: Final model of classroom teachers / middle leaders' total working hours (School-level variables)	140
Table 43: Final model of senior leaders' total working hours	141

1 Introduction

This technical report describes the methodology and analysis undertaken as part of the administration of the Teacher Workload Survey (TWS) 2019. The findings are presented in a separate report. The TWS is a large-scale nationally representative survey of teachers, middle leaders and senior leaders¹ first conducted in 2016. The 2019 survey is based closely on the TWS 2016, and was conducted between 11-29 March 2019. The survey helps act as a national ‘barometer’ for teachers’, middle leaders’ and senior leaders’ working conditions and forms a key part of the Department for Education’s (DfE) commitment to improving the evidence base on what drives unnecessary teacher workload and what works to reduce it. The survey was conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). A DfE Steering Group and an Advisory Group of practitioners and teaching unions advised the research team.

¹ Teachers refers to ‘Classroom Teachers’, Middle leaders include ‘Heads of Department/Subject’, ‘Heads of Year/Phase’, and ‘Other’ (middle leader) roles. Senior leaders include ‘Deputy/Assistant Headteachers’, ‘Headteachers/Heads of School/Acting Headteachers’ and ‘Executive Headteachers/Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) CEOs’.

2 Sampling

This section describes the process of selecting the sample of schools that were invited to take part in the TWS 2019.

Design considerations

The key sampling design consideration was to use the same sampling approach as the TWS 2016 (Higton *et al.*, 2017), which was Probability Proportional to Size (PPS). The two stages of PPS are traditionally:

1. Stratify the primary sampling unit (PSU) by some measure of size, then by other strata of interest. In the case of the TWS, the PSU was the school and the measure of size was the headcount of teachers.
2. Randomly select the same number of participants within each selected school to take part in the study. This stage of the survey was removed from the TWS 2016 for several reasons:
 - Requiring schools to draw a sub-sample of teachers on a random basis within their school would add a significant amount of workload for the school and hence would likely decrease the cooperation rate and eventual number of survey responses achieved.
 - Response rates per school would differ meaning non-response weighting would be required. In the TALIS survey, thresholds were set stipulating minimum response rates and significant resource was in place to ensure these thresholds were met. The budget required for this level of support would have been disproportionate for the TWS.
 - The variation in the size of the schools (in terms of the number of teachers) varies markedly by school. The only way to achieve an equal selection weight by teachers would be to set a very small target per school and sample far more schools. Given the time constraints and value for money, this was unrealistic.
 - Disproportionate sampling by phase was an important element of the sampling process. Without this, far more primary schools would have been selected than secondary. As a result, most of the secondary teacher responses would have come from a small number of schools, which may have introduced significant bias.

Thus, rather than sample teachers in a second stage of PPS, a census was taken within the randomly selected schools instead.

In order to remain consistent with the TWS 2016, the same overall sampling approach using the one-stage PPS method was taken in this survey. Schools were selected with a probability proportionate to the number of teaching staff listed in the 2017 School Workforce Census (SWC), which was the most recent available dataset at the time of

sampling. Secondary schools are larger cluster units than primary, so the design ensured a large enough number of secondary clusters were present. Without oversampling, there was a significant chance of bias at the secondary school level, because too few PSUs would have been selected. The oversampling was corrected through weighting. This overall approach had both the advantage of remaining comparable with the previous workload survey, as well as ensuring there was a sufficient number of secondary schools and secondary teachers in the achieved sample of schools.

Teachers' responses within these randomly selected schools were self-selecting and the sampling method does not correct for the unequal selection probabilities that result from selecting schools by the size of the teaching body. As noted above, this design is a deviation from the ideal two-stage approach and leads to unequal selection probabilities for teachers which were subsequently corrected through weighting. This is justified by a larger achieved sample size and a much simpler process of administration for schools, resulting in improvements in response rates.

The practicalities of research in schools

Some support and guidance activity with schools was undertaken in the current research to maximise response rates. This included engaging with schools during the recruitment phase and providing a large amount of explanatory materials to gain support and buy-in prior to the fieldwork going live. During survey administration, chasing activity via email and phone to schools was undertaken and reminder emails drafted for school coordinators to send to their teaching staff.

For each phase, a set of main samples (682 primaries, 481 secondaries and 40 special) and reserve samples (170 primaries, 120 secondaries and 10 special) were drawn. These sample sizes ensured that, based on conservative assumptions of response rates, the analysis was highly likely to be robust. In the end, the achieved sample exceeded these conservative estimates of response rates by a significant margin, hence guaranteeing the robustness of the analysis. All of the schools in the main and reserve samples were invited to take part.

Sampling

The sampling procedure originated from a complete list of all schools in England obtained from Get Information About Schools. From this, any non-relevant school types were removed, leaving the following school types:

- Academy Converter
- Academy Special Converter
- Academy Special Sponsor Led

- Academy Sponsor Led
- Community School
- Community Special School
- Foundation School
- Foundation Special School
- Free Schools
- Free Schools Special
- Studio Schools
- Voluntary Aided School
- Voluntary Controlled School.

Any schools marked as “closed” or “proposed to open” were removed, followed by any schools specified only as “16 plus” or “Nursery” in the Phase field.

Separately, the SWC 2017 was used to aggregate the number of teachers currently at every school. The Unique Reference Number (URN) for every school served as a unique identifier to merge this information in with the master dataset.

At this point, any school with no information on the number of teachers in the school was given a value of the median number of teachers within that school’s phase. The median number of teachers was used, instead of the average number of teachers, to avoid outliers upwardly or downwardly biasing the number of teachers within each phase. This was 13 teachers for primary schools, 18 teachers for special schools and 64 teachers for secondary schools. This imputation was made for 73 primary schools, 8 special schools and 31 secondary schools.

Data were then split into Primary, Secondary and Special phases and each dataset was sorted by the stratifiers - school type (academy and Local Authority (LA) maintained schools), geographical region (Government Office Regions code), the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals (split into five quintiles from lowest to highest), and the number of teachers in the school. First, a randomly-selected starting school was drawn. Second, every Nth school was selected into the sample, where N is proportionate to the probability of selection.

3 Piloting and cognitive testing

This section describes the process of piloting and cognitively testing the TWS and supporting materials.

Selection of schools and teachers

The schools approach letter, information sheet and privacy notice were piloted with a senior school leader in a primary school, secondary school and special school in December 2018.

The survey has separate routing for teachers/middle leaders and senior leaders. To test whether the questions for these two groups were performing as expected, the instrument was cognitively tested with a senior leader and a classroom teacher or middle leader in each of three different schools (a primary school, a secondary school and a special school) between January and February 2019. All pilot participants were recruited via NFER's School Leader Panel.

Testing process

The purpose of piloting was to ensure that the schools approach letter was sufficiently clear and persuasive, and that the information sheet and privacy notice were giving school leaders all the information they needed to decide whether or not their schools should take part in the survey. The documents were emailed to participating headteachers and responses were collected via a short one page question and answer sheet.

The purpose of cognitively testing the survey instrument was to check that respondents interpreted the survey questions and instructions correctly. The process involved a researcher visiting each of the three schools, and sitting with the senior leader and classroom teacher or middle leader as they completed an online version of the questionnaire. Participants were tested separately, and asked to sound out their thoughts as they read through and answered each question in turn. Supplementary questions were asked about the clarity of the questionnaire at the end of this process.

Feedback from testing

Pilot participants reported that the schools approach letter, information sheet and privacy notice were all easy to understand and contained all the information senior leaders wanted to see. One participant suggested that the reference in the approach letter to the different 'waves' of the survey, might be more easily understood if it referred to 'rounds' instead. This change was subsequently made to the letter.

A number of comments were made in relation to cognitively testing the survey instrument. As a result, a number of amendments were made to the survey, as summarised in the section below.

Changes made as part of the questionnaire development phase

Following cognitive testing, a number of changes were made to the questionnaire, as can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Changes made to the TWS 2019

Question	Revisions for 2019 (compared to 2016)	Reasons for changes
1. In order to provide some context for the survey, can you say which of the following best describes your main role at [INSERT SCHOOL FROM SAMPLE]?	Three categories were expanded: 'Head of Department/Subject', 'Head of Year/Phase', and 'Headteacher/ Head of School or Acting Head'. A new category was added, 'Executive Leader/ Headteacher or MAT CEO'.	Additional response options have been added to make it easier for participants to identify a role that is relevant to them.
2. In your most recent full working week, approximately how many hours did you spend in total on teaching, planning lessons, marking, covering for absence, interacting with other teachers, participating in staff meetings, pastoral care and other activities related to your job at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	Additional guidance added: 'Please do not include time spent travelling to work.'	Cognitive piloting revealed some teachers were unclear as to whether this estimate should include time spent travelling to work. As a result, this clarification was added.
3. Of this total, approximately how many hours did you spend on teaching in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	For consistency, and where not already present, the word 'approximately' was added to all questions that asked for a time estimate. The additional phrasing was designed to emphasise to teachers that

Question	Revisions for 2019 (compared to 2016)	Reasons for changes
		'estimates' were required, as cognitive piloting revealed that some teachers were spending a lot of time trying to calculate the correct number of hours, which was adding to the survey completion time.
4. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following activities other than teaching in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	See question 3 above.
6. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following specific support and management activities in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	See question 3 above.
7. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following specific administrative activities in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	See question 3 above.
10. In your most recent full working week, approximately how many hours did you spend in total on school management, staff supervision,	Additional guidance added: 'Please do not include time spent travelling to work.'	Cognitive piloting revealed some senior leaders were unclear as to whether this estimate should include time spent

Question	Revisions for 2019 (compared to 2016)	Reasons for changes
interacting with other teachers, teaching and on other tasks related to your job at [INSERT SCHOOL]?		travelling to work. As a result, this clarification was added.
11. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following activities in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	See question 3 above.
14. In the last two years, have any of the following school policies or approaches been revised in your school as part of a specific attempt to reduce workload?	New question.	
16. You said earlier that you worked [INSERT RESPONSE FROM Q2 OR Q10] hours in your last working week. Approximately how many of those hours were spent working during weekends, evenings or other out-of-school hours?	The word 'approximately' has been added.	See question 3 above.
19. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the way you are managed? Where reference is given to a 'manager' in the options below, we mean the person you report to.	Clarification added regarding what we mean by 'manager'. Response option removed: 'I am satisfied with the number of hours I usually work'. Response options added: 'My manager supports my well-being'; 'The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school'; 'The	Cognitive piloting revealed some teachers were unclear about what was meant by the term 'manager'. As a result, this clarification was added. New items about well-being were also added. Response option was removed to minimise burden on

Question	Revisions for 2019 (compared to 2016)	Reasons for changes
	governing body/board support staff well-being across the school'; 'My governing body/board support my well-being'.	teachers due to the addition of new options, and to avoid duplication.
28. Which of the following subjects do you teach on a regular basis?	Added response option: 'I don't teach a subject'.	Some secondary senior leaders do not actually teach a subject. As a result, this response option was added.
29. Are you any of the following?	Question changed from 'Are you a...?' Response options added: 'A trainee teacher'; 'A recently qualified teacher (RQT)'.	This question was reconfigured to help capture the views of teacher trainees and RQTs.
30. How many years have you been working in...?	Expanded third response option to make clear role being referred to was the one given in Q1: '...your current role as a [INSERT RESPONSE TO Q1]'.	Cognitive piloting revealed that some teachers were unclear which role this question was referring to. As a result, this response option was changed to link back to respondents' answers to Q1.

4 Final questionnaire

INTRODUCTION – Show to all

Teacher Workload Survey



Thank you for agreeing to complete this short survey, which should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete. The 'Teacher Workload Survey' forms a key part of the Department for Education's (DfE's) commitment to improving the evidence base on what drives excessive teacher workload and what works to reduce it. The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) is delivering the 2019 Teacher Workload Survey on behalf of the DfE and we are very grateful for your support in completing it.

If you have any queries about the completion of this survey, please contact NFER at TWS2019@nfer.ac.uk

You can find more details about the research and how we will use the data you provide on the project information site: <https://www.nfer.ac.uk/for-schools/participate-in-research/teacher-workload-survey-2019/>

Please use the buttons at the bottom of the page to move through the survey, please do not use your browser's forward and back buttons.

Please note that if the survey is left inactive for over 20 minutes you will be timed out. If you exit the survey before the end, any answers that you have given may still be analysed.

Once submitted you will not be able to go back and change any of your answers.

Q1 – Single response, Ask all, Force²

1. In order to provide some context for the survey, can you say which of the following best describes your main role at [INSERT SCHOOL FROM SAMPLE]?	Please select one	1.1	Classroom Teacher
		1.2	Head of Department/Subject
		1.3	Head of Year/Phase
		1.4	Deputy or Assistant Head
		1.5	Headteacher/Head of School or Acting Head
		1.6	Executive Leader/Headteacher or MAT CEO
		1.7	Other (Please specify)

² 'Force' refers to the question being configured so that respondents have to give an answer.

Working hours questions– TEACHER route

Introduction for Teachers

Working hours

The first questions cover the activities that are most common for classroom teachers and middle leaders (for example, heads of department/year or phase leaders).

Some questions will ask for an estimate of time spent in **hours** in your most recent full working week. “Full working week” means your last working week covering Monday to Sunday that was not shortened by illness, religious breaks or public holidays.

Q2 – Open Response, Ask all, Prompt³

2. In your most recent full working week, approximately how many hours did you spend in total on teaching, planning lessons, marking, covering for absence, interacting with other teachers, participating in staff meetings, pastoral care and other activities related to your job at [INSERT SCHOOL]?

Please include tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other out-of-school hours. Please do not include time spent travelling to work.

Round to the nearest half hour. As an example, three and a half hours would be recorded as 3.5 below.

(numeric response)

Q3 – Open Response, Ask all, Prompt

3. Of this total, approximately how many hours did you spend on teaching in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?

Please only count actual teaching time.

Time spent on preparation, marking, etc. will be recorded later in the survey.

Round to the nearest half hour. As an example, three and a half hours would be recorded as 3.5 below. Please record a 0 (zero) if you spent no time on teaching in your most recent full working week.

(numeric response)

³ ‘Prompt’ refers to the question being configured so that respondents are given a reminder to complete the question if it is left blank or partially complete.

Q4 – Multiple response, Ask all, Randomise order (4.11 remains fixed), prompt all except 4.11**4. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following activities other than teaching in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?**

Include activities that took place during weekends, evenings or other off classroom hours.

Please exclude all time spent teaching.

Again, round to the nearest half hour. Please record a 0 (zero) if you spent no time on a listed activity.

4.1	Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school	(Numeric response)	
4.2	Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	(Numeric response)	
4.3	Marking/correcting of pupils' work	(Numeric response)	
4.4	Pupil counselling (including career guidance and virtual counselling)	(Numeric response)	
4.5	Pupil supervision and tuition (including lunch supervision)	(Numeric response)	
4.6	Pupil discipline including detentions	(Numeric response)	
4.7	Participation in school management	(Numeric response)	
4.8	General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, work emails and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)	(Numeric response)	
4.9	Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	(Numeric response)	
4.10	Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports and cultural activities after school)	(Numeric response)	
4.11	Other activities	(Numeric response)	

Q5 – Grid single response per row, Ask all, prompt all except 5.11

Q5 – Grid single response per row, Ask all, prompt all except 5.11							
5.	<u>Across the whole school year</u>, is the amount of time you spend on the activities outlined in the last question too little, too much or about right?						
	Statements	Far too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Far too much	Not applicable
5.1	Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school						
5.2	Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school						
5.3	Marking/correcting pupils' work						
5.4	Pupil counselling (including career guidance and virtual counselling)						
5.5	Pupil supervision and tuition (including lunch supervision)						
5.6	Pupil discipline including detentions						
5.7	Participation in school management						
5.8	General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, work emails and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)						
5.9	Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians						
5.10	Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports and cultural activities after school)						
5.11	Other activities						

Information for all

The next two questions ask about more detailed activities relating to support, management and administration. When answering, it does not matter if you included any of the following in earlier responses you made.

Q6 – Multiple response, Ask all, Ask 6.5 to Secondary Only, Randomise order, prompt all

6. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following specific support and management activities in your most recent full working week at **[INSERT SCHOOL]?**

Round to the nearest half hour. Please record a 0 (zero) if you spent no time on a listed activity.

6.1	Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	(numeric response)	
6.2	Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	(numeric response)	
6.3	Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	(numeric response)	
6.4	Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	(numeric response)	
6.5	Timetabled tutor time	(numeric response)	
6.6	Staff meetings	(numeric response)	

Q7 – Multiple response, Randomise order, ask all, prompt all

7. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following specific administrative activities in your most recent full working week at **[INSERT SCHOOL]?**

Round to the nearest half hour. Please record a 0 (zero) if you spent no time on a listed activity.

7.1	School policy development and financial planning	(numeric response)	
7.2	Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	(numeric response)	
7.3	Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessments	(numeric response)	

Q8– Grid single response per row, ask all, ask 8.5 to Secondary Only, prompt all

8.	Across the whole school year, is the amount of time you spend on the support and management activities outlined in the last questions too little, too much or about right?						
	Statements	Far too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Far too much	Not applicable
8.1	Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day						
8.2	Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff						
8.3	Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents						
8.4	Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms						
8.5	Timetabled tutor time						
8.6	Staff meetings						

Q9– Grid single response per row, ask all, prompt all

9.	<u>Across the whole school year</u>, is the amount of time you spend on the administrative activities outlined in the last questions too little, too much or about right?						
	Statements	Far too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Far too much	Not applicable
9.1	School policy development and financial planning						
9.2	Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes						
9.3	Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessments						

Working hours questions – HEADTEACHER route

Introduction for Headteachers

Working hours

The first questions cover the activities that are most common for school leaders. If you are leading more than one school, please answer the questions in relation to the school we contacted you at.

Some questions will ask for an estimate of time spent in **hours** in your most recent full working week.

“Full working week” means your last working week covering Monday to Sunday that was not shortened by illness, religious breaks or public holidays.

Q10 – Open Response, Ask all, prompt

10. In your most recent full working week, approximately how many hours did you spend in total on school management, staff supervision, interacting with other teachers, teaching and on other tasks related to your job at [INSERT SCHOOL]?

Please include tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other out-of-school hours. Please do not include time spent travelling to work.

Round to the nearest half hour. As an example, three and a half hours would be recorded as 3.5 below.

(numeric response)

Q11 – Multiple response, Ask all, Do Not Randomise, prompt all

11. Approximately how many hours did you spend on the following activities in your most recent full working week at [INSERT SCHOOL]?

Please include tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other out-of-school hours. Again, round to the nearest half hour.

Please record a 0 (zero) if you spent no time on a listed activity.

11.1	Leadership and management within the school <i>Including strategic planning, preparing for and participating in governing board meetings, staff meetings and other school-centred management activities, such as those associated with the management of federated schools.</i>	(numeric response)	
11.2	Administration within the school <i>Including applying regulations to the school, reporting, school budget, preparing timetables and class composition.</i>	(numeric response)	
11.3	Administrative and management with external bodies <i>Including responding to requests from local, regional, or national education officials</i>	(numeric response)	
11.4	Performance management of staff <i>Including human resource/personnel issues, classroom observations, mentoring, initial teacher training and continuing professional development</i>	(numeric response)	
11.5	Teaching and related tasks <i>Including covering for teacher absences, lesson planning, assessing and marking pupils' work and student assessment</i>	(numeric response)	
11.6	Curriculum planning <i>Including developing curriculum and student evaluation</i>	(numeric response)	
11.7	Data analysis <i>Including analysis performance data at the level of the teacher and the school and record keeping for external bodies / regulatory purposes</i>	(numeric response)	
11.8	Student interactions <i>Including counselling and conversations outside structured learning activities, discipline</i>	(numeric response)	
11.9	Parent or guardian interactions <i>Including formal and informal interactions</i>	(numeric response)	
11.10	Recruitment <i>For teaching and support staff</i>	(numeric response)	
11.11	Other activities	(numeric response)	

Q12 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, prompt all

12.	<u>Across the whole school year</u>, is the amount of time you spend on the activities outlined in the last question too little, too much or about right?						
	Statements	Far too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Far too much	Not applicable
12.1	Leadership and management within the school						
12.2	Administration within the school						
12.3	Administrative and management with external bodies						
12.4	Performance management of staff						
12.5	Teaching and related tasks						
12.6	Data analysis						
12.7	Curriculum planning						
12.8	Student interactions						
12.9	Parent or guardian interactions						
12.10	Recruitment						

Q13 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, Randomise Order (13.6 remains fixed), prompt all except 13.6

13.	Does [INSERT SCHOOL] have any of the following strategies in place for managing and planning professional time?			
	Strategy	Yes	No	Not sure
13.1	Protected blocks of non-teaching time to plan lessons and/or mark work (PPA)			
13.2	Working collaboratively with other staff to plan schemes of work and/or share resources			
13.3	Existing schemes of work and associated lesson plans that can be adapted by teaching staff			
13.4	Computer software that effectively helps with administrative tasks			
13.5	A committee in place that monitors teachers' workload			
13.6	Other time management strategies (please specify)			

New Question 14 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, Randomise Order, except 14.8,						
In the last two years, have any of the following school policies or approaches been revised in your school as part of a specific attempt to reduce workload?						
		Yes, but it has <u>added</u> to my workload	Yes, and it has <u>reduced</u> my workload	Yes, and it has made <u>no</u> <u>difference</u> to my workload	No revisions made	Not sure if revisions have been made
14.1	Marking and feedback policy					
14.2	Approach to lesson planning					
14.3	School behaviour policy					
14.4	Teacher appraisal policy					
14.5	Communications protocols (internal and/or external)					
14.6	Data tracking/monitoring of students' progress					
14.7	Policies to support flexible working practices, such as special leave/absence policies					
14.8	Other (please specify, or if not applicable, leave blank)					

Heading: Perceptions and drivers of workload

Q15 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, Randomise Order, prompt all						
15.	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your working hours?					
Q15	Statements	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
15.1	I can complete my assigned workload during my contracted working hours					
15.2	I have an acceptable workload					
15.3	Overall, I achieve a good balance between my work life and my private life					

Q16 –	
Open Response, Ask all, Insert response from Q2 or Q10 into this question, prompt	
16.	<p>You said earlier that you worked [INSERT RESPONSE FROM Q2 OR Q10] hours in your last working week. Approximately How many of those hours were spent working during weekends, evenings or other out-of-school hours?</p> <p>Round to the nearest half hour. As an example, three and a half hours would be recorded as 3.5 below.</p>
	(numeric response)

Q17 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, Randomise Order, prompt all

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the working environment within [INSERT SCHOOL]?						
	Statements	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
17.1	Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems					
17.2	Lesson observations carried out in [INSERT SCHOOL] are an effective part of professional development activity					
17.3	Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at [INSERT SCHOOL]					
17.4	Teaching staff collaborate effectively on teaching and learning					

Q18 – Grid single response per row, Ask All, Randomise Order, prompt all

18.	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional development and support?					
	Statements	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
18.1	I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance and rules affecting professional practice					
18.2	I have the necessary Information and Communication Technology (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks					
18.3	[INSERT SCHOOL] supports continuing professional development for teachers					
18.4	I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities					
18.5	The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality					

Q19 – Grid single response per row, VERSION FOR TEACHERS, Randomise 19.1 to 19.4, prompt all

19.	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the way you are managed? Where reference is given to a 'manager' in the options below, we mean the person you report to.					
	Statements	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
19.1	My manager is considerate of my life outside work					
19.2	My manager supports my well-being					
19.3	The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school					
19.4	My manager recognises when I have done my job well					
19.5	I think that my performance is evaluated fairly					
19.6	I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decisions that affect my work at [INSERT SCHOOL]					

Q19 – Grid single response per row, VERSION FOR HEADTEACHERS, Randomise 19.1 to 19.6, prompt all							
19.	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the way you are managed? By 'manager', we mean the person you report to.						
	Statements	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
19.1	My manager is considerate of my life outside work						
19.2	My manager supports my well-being						
19.3	The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school						
19.4	The governing body/board support staff well-being across the school						
19.5	My governing body/board support my well-being						
19.6	My manager recognises when I have done my job well						
19.7	I think that my performance is evaluated fairly						

Q20 – Single response, reverse 20.1 to 20.4, Ask all, prompt				
20.	To what extent, if at all, do you consider teacher workload to be a serious problem in your school?	Please select one	20.1	Workload is not a serious problem at all
			20.2	Workload is not a very serious problem
			20.3	Workload is a fairly serious problem
			20.4	Workload is a very serious problem
			20.5	Don't know

Introduction for all

Linking to the School Workforce Census

The following two questions ask whether you would be happy to provide some personal details so that we can link your answers to information stored in the School Workforce Census (SWC) database. This means that you wouldn't need to answer another set of questions that ask about details already contained in the SWC database.

It also means we can explore how teacher workload affects issues such as teacher retention further down the line, which will in turn help DfE to develop policies based on robust evidence. DfE would keep this data until 31st August 2022.

Please be assured that your responses will only be used for the purposes of this research and for no other purpose. Only aggregated statistics will be produced with this information. No individual or school will be identified in any analysis or report that results from the use of this data.

Further information on how your data will be used, and your privacy protected, is available in the privacy notice https://www.nfer.ac.uk/media/3207/dfws_privacy_notice.pdf.

Q21 – Single response, Ask all , Force

21.	Do you give permission for NFER to match your survey answers to information in the School Workforce Census, for the purpose of analysis?	Please select one	21.1	Yes [-> Go to Q22]
			21.2	No [-> Go to Q24]

Q22 – Single response, show Q22 for those who said yes at Q21, Force				
22.	Do you give permission for NFER to provide your survey responses and personal details to the DfE to enable analysis of how teacher workload affects teacher retention?	Please select one	22.1	Yes [-> Go to Q23]
			22.2	No[-> Go to Q23]

Q23 – Multiple Response, Ask if yes for Q21, prompt 23.1, 23.2 and 24.4		
23.	In order for us to link to the School Workforce Census, can you please provide the following details:	
	Information required	Response – Allow or Refuse Details
23.1	First name	[open response]
23.2	Last name	[open response]
23.3	Maiden name/former last name (leave blank if not applicable)	[open response]
23.4	Date of birth (dd/mm/yyyy)	[date field]
23.5	Seven digit Teacher Reference Number (If known, otherwise please leave blank) This is your 7 digit number. Please ignore any initial letters such as RP. For example, If your number is “68/12345” just enter “6812345	[open response]

Q24– Single response, Ask if no for Q21 or did not provide 23.1, 23.2 and 23.4 for matching, prompt

24.	Into which of the following age bands do you fall?	Please select one	24.1	Under 25
			24.2	25 to 29
			24.3	30 to 34
			24.4	35 to 39
			24.5	40 to 44
			24.6	45 to 49
			24.7	50 to 54
			24.8	55 to 59
			24.9	60 or older
			24.10	Prefer not to say

Q25 – Single response, Ask if no for Q21 or did not provide 23.1, 23.2 and 23.4 for matching, prompt

25.	What is your gender?	Please select one	25.1	Female
			25.2	Male
			25.3	Prefer not to say

Q26 –

Ask if no for Q21 or did not provide 23.1, 23.2 and 23.4 for matching, prompt

26.	Please provide the number of hours per week for which you are contracted to work at [INSERT SCHOOL]? If your contract is variable and/or term-time only, please write in the typical hours you work per school week.		
	(numeric response)		

Q27 – Single response, Ask if no for Q21 or did not provide 23.1, 23.2 and 23.4 for matching, prompt

27.	Which of the following best describes your employment contract at [INSERT SCHOOL]?	Please select one	27.1	Permanent employment (an on-going contract with no fixed end-point before the age of retirement)
			27.2	Fixed-term contract for a period of more than 1 school year
			27.3	Fixed-term contract for a period of 1 school year or less
			27.4	Don't know

Q28 – Multiple response, Alphabetical order, Drop down menu, Ask all Secondary, prompt				
28.	Which of the following subjects do you teach on a regular basis?	Please select all that apply	28.1	I don't teach a subject
			28.2	Applied Business Studies
			28.3	Art and Design / Art
			28.4	Biology / Botany / Zoology / Ecology
			28.5	Chemistry
			28.6	Commercial and Business Studies/Education/Management
			28.7	Design and Technology
			28.8	Design and Technology - Food Technology
			28.9	Design and Technology - Resistant Materials
			28.10	Drama
			28.11	English
			28.12	French
			28.13	Geography
			28.14	German
			28.15	Health and Social Care
			28.16	History
			28.17	Humanities
			28.18	Information and Communication Technology/Computer Science
			28.19	Mathematics / Mathematical Development (Early Years)
			28.20	Media Studies
			28.21	Music
			28.22	Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE)
			28.23	Physical Education / Sports
			28.24	Physics
			28.25	Primary Curriculum
			28.26	Psychology
			28.27	Religious Education
			28.28	Science
			28.29	Sociology
			28.30	Spanish
			28.31	Other (Please specify)
			28.32	Prefer not to say

Q29 – Grid single response per row, Ask TEACHERS All, Ask HEADTEACHERS 29.4 only, prompt

29. Are you any of the following?			
	Role	Yes	No
29.1	A trainee teacher (i.e. you are training to be a teacher but have not yet gained Qualified Teacher Status)		
29.2	A newly qualified teacher (NQT) (i.e. you have gained Qualified Teacher Status, and begun but not completed your statutory induction (or NQT) period)		
29.3	A recently qualified teacher (RQT) (i.e. you have gained Qualified Teacher Status and are in your second or third year of teaching)		
29.4	An SEN Coordinator		

Q30 – Multiple response, Ask All 30.1, 30.3 and 30.4. ONLY ASK HEADTEACHERS 30.2, prompt all

31. How many years have you been working in...?

Please record the time in years to the nearest half year.

30.1	...the teaching profession	(numeric response)	
30.2	...a role that places you in the Leadership Group Pay Range	(numeric response)	
30.3	...your current school	(numeric response)	
30.4	...your current role as a [INSERT RESPONSE TO Q1]	(numeric response)	

Introduction, show text to all

Permission to Contact You for Further Research

The DfE may wish to contact you again in the next 18 months to ask you to take part in other research studies about teaching and workload issues. (Please note that, if contacted, you will be under no obligation to take part). Further information on how your privacy will be protected is available here:

https://www.nfer.ac.uk/media/3207/dfws_privacy_notice.pdf

The DfE may contact you directly or appoint an approved contractor. Your details would not be shared with any other third parties.

Q31 – Single response, Ask all - Mandatory

31.	Do you provide permission for NFER to pass on a copy of your survey responses plus your personal details to the DfE for this purpose?	Please select one	31.1	Yes, the DfE, or an approved contractor, may contact me to learn more about my survey responses and/or to invite me to take part in further research on this issue
			31.2	No

Q32 – Multiple Response, ask if yes at Q21 and yes at Q31, all prompt

32.	Could you please provide details of how we can contact you for further research on teachers' workload? Note your contact details will not be used for any other purpose.	
	Information required	Response – Allow or Refuse Details
32.1	Telephone Number	[telephone number]
32.2	Work email address	[email field]
32.3	Personal email address	[email field]

Q33– Multiple Response, ask if no at Q21 and yes at Q31, all prompt

33.	Please provide some contact details so we can contact you for further research on teachers' workload. Note your contact details will not be used for any other purpose.	
	Information required	Response – Allow or Refuse Details
33.1	Full Name	[open response]
33.2	Date of birth	[date field]
33.3	Telephone number	[telephone number]
33.4	Work email address	[email field]
33.5	Personal email address	[email field]

CLOSING STATEMENT – Show to all

Teacher Workload Survey Complete

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The next steps are for the collected data to be analysed and written into a comprehensive, published report from the DfE about teachers' workload. This would not be possible without you kindly taking the time to provide your details and opinions.

5 Cooperation and response rates

This section summarises the rate of school cooperation after being invited to participate in the TWS 2019, and the response rates among teachers in those schools.

School cooperation rate

Based on prior experience and conservative assumptions about potential co-operation and response rates, it was estimated that a minimum sample of 1,500 schools including both main and reserve samples (850 primary schools, 600 secondary schools and 50 special schools) would be required. The timeframe of the study meant that there would be little time to draw a reserve sample once the cooperation rate was known. As a result, the reserve sample was drawn at the same time as the main sample. The main sample of 1,200 schools was invited to participate. After reviewing the interim cooperation rate, a further 300 reserve sample schools were also invited to take part in the research.

In total, 449 schools (251 primary, 181 secondary and 17 special schools) agreed to take part in the study while 32 schools (2 per cent) refused to take part in the study. At least one survey response was received from 405 schools. Of the 1,500 schools invited, Table 2 shows the cooperation rates by school in total and between phases. The cooperation rate achieved for the full sample was 27 per cent; the cooperation rate for the sample excluding refusals was 28 per cent. The total cooperation rate in the 2016 wave of the TWS was 24 per cent; the cooperation rate for the sample excluding refusals in TWS 2016 was 28 per cent.

Table 2: School cooperation rates

	Primary		Secondary		Special		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total sampled schools	850	100	600	100	50	100	1,500	100
Refused	18	2	14	2	0	0	32	2
“Sample excluding refused”	832	98	586	98	50	100	1,468	98
Agreed to participate	251	30	181	30	17	34	449	30
Schools with participating teachers	220	26	168	28	17	34	405	27
Full sample co-operation rate		26		28		34		27
“Sample excluding refusals” co-operation rate		26		29		34		28

Teachers' response rate

As shown in Table 2, at least one survey response was received from 405 schools. The teacher response rate was calculated by dividing the number of responses received (in total and by school phase) by the total number of teachers present in these schools (based on figures in the SWC 2017).

The response rate in each school ranged from 1 per cent to 100 per cent. Of the 405 participating schools, just 12 schools had a response rate of less than 10 per cent. Table 3 shows that the overall teacher-level response rate within participating schools was 40 per cent. The teacher-level response rate was 45 per cent in primary schools, 38 per cent in secondary schools and 35 per cent in special schools.

Table 3: Teacher response rates, within participating schools

	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total
Teachers present in participating schools (n)	4,461	13,551	401	18,413
Responding teachers (n)	2,060	5,291	149	7,500
Estimated response rate (%)	45	38	35	40

6 Data processing and tabulation

Cleaning

Data were kept as similar as possible to the TWS 2016 for consistency and clarity of comparison. Data cleaning was performed for question 1 (role): a small number of respondents gave different job titles to the responses specified, which were re-classified into classroom teacher, middle leader or senior leader.

Additional data cleaning was performed where respondents had misinterpreted the question, such as Q26 (number of contracted hours per week). Here, where people had given responses less than one (such as 0.6) it was reasonable to assume they had given their hours proportional to full-time hours (FTE equivalent). These were cleaned by multiplying their response by 32.5. This was done in order to derive a consistent figure in hours for as many respondents as possible.

Data matching

Additional publicly-available existing data was matched for all schools where available, such as Ofsted rating and region classification, from Get Information About Schools⁴.

Teacher-level data from the SWC was also included where the teacher gave consent in Q21. Consenting teachers were matched by DfE to their SWC 2018 records using their name, date of birth, school ID and (where collected) TRN. There was a small group of teachers who could not be matched to the SWC and hence were without characteristics for analysis (740 out of the 4,949 who consented to be matched).

Processing and tabulating

The resulting cleaned data file had the weighting variable matched into it (see Annex 7: Weighting). Cross-tabulations of the data were run in SPSS. Tabulations were run both unweighted and weighted and then quality assured and validated for accuracy. This double-check ensured full confidence in data analysis.

⁴ <https://get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/>

7 Weighting

Weighting was necessary to account for the unequal selection probabilities resulting from the sampling process (see chapter 2) and hence to ensure that the achieved sample was representative of the teacher population in England. Entropy balancing, a statistical technique that adjusts the mean and variance of multiple characteristic variables simultaneously to match the sample of responses to a target population, was undertaken on the achieved sample⁵. The balancing procedure included the following variables:

1. **Phase of School.** This made the largest contribution to the weights. The design of the study ensured enough secondary schools were present and, as a result, there were a disproportionately large number of secondary teachers in the sample compared to primary.
2. **Size of school.** The second variable that made a large contribution to the weighting was the size of the school. The PPS sampling design led to an over-representation of teachers from larger schools compared to the total population of all teachers. The size of school variable (small/medium/large) was defined by creating three equally sized groups (tertiles) in terms of teachers' headcount from the SWC 2018 for primary and secondary schools separately, then using the minimum and maximum number of teachers for each of the six groups to classify the sample into these groups.
3. **Role.** A binary classification of teachers and middle leaders (classroom teachers, heads of department, heads of year) versus senior leaders (assistant headteacher upwards).
4. **Gender.** Responses by gender were broadly representative of the teacher population.
5. **Age.** Age bands were included in the balancing: under 25, 25 to 29, 30 to 34, 35 to 39, 40 to 44, 45 to 49, 50 to 54, 55 to 59 and 60 or older. Responses by age were broadly representative of the teacher population.
6. **Contract.** A binary classification between those on permanent contracts (an on-going contract with no fixed end-point before the age of retirement) and a fixed-term contract (either for a period of 1 school year or less or for a period of more than 1 school year). This was broadly representative of the population.
7. **Working arrangements.** Responses by full-time and part-time contracted staff were broadly representative of the population. Part-time was defined from the questionnaire as respondents reportedly working less than 28 hours or through the SWC 2018 (a pre-specified variable). Values of contracts greater than 40 hours per week were excluded from the analysis to remain consistent with TWS 2016. There were no cases where the two definitions disagreed, as information came either from the survey or from the SWC.
8. **Urban/rural denomination.** Responses by urban and rural schools were broadly representative of the population. Urban schools were classified as: urban city and

⁵ Hainmueller, J. (2012)

town, urban city and town in a sparse setting, urban major conurbation or urban minor conurbation. Rural schools were classified as: rural hamlet and isolated dwellings, rural hamlet and isolated dwellings in a sparse setting, rural town and fringe, rural town and fringe in a sparse setting, rural village, or rural village in a sparse setting.

9. **Ofsted rating.** Split by 'outstanding', 'good', 'requires improvement'/ 'inadequate' (these categories were combined due to small sample sizes) and 'not inspected yet'. 'Outstanding' schools were slightly over-represented compared to the population.
10. **Government Office Region code (GOR).** GOR was classified as: London, East Midlands, West Midlands, North East, North West, South East, South West, Yorkshire and the Humber and the East of England. Responses by region were broadly representative of the population.
11. **School type.** Another binary classification between academies and local authority maintained schools. Academy schools were disproportionately represented in the achieved sample, although this is likely to reflect the phase difference highlighted above as secondary schools are more likely to be academies and were over-sampled.
12. **Free school meal eligibility in the last 6 years (FSMever) quintiles.** The percentage of children in a school with FSMever was split into five equal groups (quintiles). The two lowest quintiles were slightly over-represented in the achieved sample.
13. **English as an additional language (EAL).** The percentage of children in a school with EAL was broadly representative of the population.

Whilst data for all respondents existed for all the school-level weighting variables (as this was information about their school which formed part of the sample), not all 7,287 respondents gave a response, or could be matched to SWC, to acquire all the teacher characteristic variables. Values were imputed for the following variables: age, gender, working arrangements and contract. The required values were imputed randomly using proportions from the underlying distribution of the population. For example, 28 per cent of all teaching staff in the population were male according to SWC 2018. If an individual's gender was missing due to non-response in the survey or it was not possible to match the individual to the SWC; then for the purpose of weighting they were randomly assigned a gender with probability of 28 per cent of being male and 72 per cent of being female. Once values were imputed for all the required teacher characteristics, weights were then applied to all respondents so that the sample matched the underlying population on all of the above variables. This was a statistically valid procedure because the school-level characteristics formed the most significant part of the resulting weights, as shown in Table 4. In other words, it made little difference to the resulting weights whether an individual with missing gender was randomly assigned to be male or female, as the weights were largely determined by school-level characteristics, for which there was no missing data.

Table 4: Weighting using entropy balancing to match sample to underlying population

Variables	Categories	Pre-weighting raw averages with imputations (%)	Post-weighting averages with imputations (%)	SWC averages (%)
Age	Under 25	3	3	3
	25-29	17	16	16
	30-34	18	18	18
	35-39	16	16	16
	40-44	14	14	14
	45-49	14	13	13
	50-54	10	10	10
	55-59	6	7	7
	60 or older	2	3	3
Gender	Male	28	24	24
	Female	72	76	76
Contract	Permanent	94	90	90
	Fixed-term/ temporary	6	10	10
Role	Teacher/ middle leader	90	86	86
	Senior leader	10	14	14
Working arrangements	Full-time	79	77	77
	Part-time	21	23	23
School size	Small	5	17	17
	Medium	28	34	34
	Large	67	49	49
Phase	Primary	27	51	51
	Secondary	73	49	49
Rural denomination	Urban	89	86	86
	Rural	11	14	14

Variables	Categories	Pre-weighting raw averages with imputations (%)	Post-weighting averages with imputations (%)	SWC averages (%)
Ofsted-category	Outstanding	23	18	18
	Good	53	57	57
	Requires Improvement/ Inadequate	10	12	12
	Not yet inspected by Ofsted	14	13	13
Geographical region	London	16	16	16
	North East	2	5	5
	East Midlands	9	8	8
	East of England	14	11	11
	North West	14	14	14
	South East	18	16	16
	South West	7	9	9
	West Midlands	9	11	11
	Yorkshire and the Humber	11	10	10
School type	LA maintained	40	50	50
	Academy	60	50	50
Percentage of pupils with English as an additional language		19	19	19
Free school meal eligibility quintiles	Highest	29	22	22
	2nd highest	25	21	21
	Middle	20	19	19
	2nd lowest	13	20	20
	Lowest	13	18	18

There were also six individuals that had duplicate SWC records (and had therefore submitted more than one survey response). Their weight was divided by two to account for this, ensuring that both sets of responses were taken into account (as they may not have been identical) but that these responses were treated as pertaining to one respondent.

8 Data tables

This section presents the data from the subgroup analyses in chapters 4 and 5 of the main report.

Chapter 4

Differences in perceptions on the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by teacher and school characteristics

Table 5: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by phase and school type

	School type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out-of-school	Primary Academies	0	3	38	37	22	523	2
	Primary LA maintained	1	4	40	35	20	1,149	15
	Secondary Academies	3	17	43	23	14	3,464	11
	Secondary LA maintained	3	15	40	27	14	1,395	4
Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	Primary Academies	1	14	73	10	1	524	1
	Primary LA maintained	2	16	70	9	2	1,161	3

	School type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Secondary Academies	5	30	56	8	2	3,465	10
	Secondary LA maintained	4	29	58	7	2	1,397	2
Marking/correcting of pupils' work	Primary Academies	0	1	50	29	19	508	17
	Primary LA maintained	0	1	43	36	19	1,127	37
	Secondary Academies	1	6	31	32	30	3,446	29
	Secondary LA maintained	1	7	32	31	28	1,381	18
Pupil counselling	Primary Academies	2	15	77	5	1	356	169
	Primary LA maintained	2	15	71	10	3	781	383
	Secondary Academies	3	23	63	10	2	2,868	607
	Secondary LA maintained	3	25	61	9	2	1,173	226

	School type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Pupil supervision and tuition	Primary Academies	0	2	84	11	3	441	84
	Primary LA maintained	0	2	81	15	2	931	233
	Secondary Academies	0	3	71	21	5	3,255	220
	Secondary LA maintained	1	3	71	21	4	1,323	76
Pupil discipline including detentions	Primary Academies	0	2	85	11	2	387	138
	Primary LA maintained	1	2	77	17	3	862	302
	Secondary Academies	0	3	61	25	10	3,310	165
	Secondary LA maintained	1	5	65	20	9	1,323	76
Participation in school management	Primary Academies	0	10	79	9	1	374	151
	Primary LA maintained	2	10	76	11	2	796	368

	School type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Secondary Academies	2	13	71	11	3	2,441	1,034
	Secondary LA maintained	2	14	70	12	3	993	406
General administrative work	Primary Academies	0	1	33	40	25	524	1
	Primary LA maintained	0	1	34	41	23	1,159	5
	Secondary Academies	0	2	20	40	38	3,461	314
	Secondary LA maintained	1	2	21	42	34	1,392	7
Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	Primary Academies	0	3	77	16	4	519	6
	Primary LA maintained	0	6	79	12	3	1,147	17
	Secondary Academies	1	11	63	20	5	3,397	78
	Secondary LA maintained	1	13	63	18	5	1,375	24

	School type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Engaging in extracurricular activities	Primary Academies	1	8	80	9	1	423	102
	Primary LA maintained	1	13	77	8	2	897	267
	Secondary Academies	8	21	61	8	3	2,909	566
	Secondary LA maintained	7	22	63	6	2	1,184	215

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 6: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by Ofsted category

	Ofsted category	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ Not applicable (n)
Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out-of-school	Outstanding	2	13	41	29	16	1,528	163
	Good	1	10	43	29	17	3,454	410
	RI*/Inadequate	3	10	33	33	21	615	82
Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	Outstanding	4	23	63	8	2	1,530	161
	Good	3	22	65	9	1	3,467	397
	RI*/Inadequate	4	26	56	10	4	615	82
Marking/ correcting of pupils' work	Outstanding	1	6	35	34	24	1,507	184
	Good	0	4	40	33	23	3,423	441
	RI*/Inadequate	1	4	30	31	33	610	87
Pupil counselling	Outstanding	2	21	65	10	2	1,228	463
	Good	2	20	68	8	2	2,708	1,156
	RI*/Inadequate	3	21	62	11	3	505	192
Pupil supervision and tuition	Outstanding	0	2	75	18	4	1,405	286
	Good	0	2	77	18	3	3,105	759

	Ofsted category	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ Not applicable (n)
	RI*/Inadequate	0	2	70	21	7	581	116
Pupil discipline including detentions	Outstanding	0	3	73	19	5	1,400	291
	Good	1	3	69	21	7	3,072	792
	RI*/Inadequate	0	4	62	23	10	580	117
Participation in school management	Outstanding	1	9	77	10	3	1,080	611
	Good	2	12	73	11	2	2,417	1,445
	RI*/Inadequate	2	14	66	12	5	443	254
General administrative work	Outstanding	0	2	24	42	32	1,526	165
	Good	0	1	28	41	29	3,460	404
	RI*/Inadequate	0	1	20	44	36	618	79
Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	Outstanding	1	7	71	17	4	1,495	196
	Good	1	9	72	15	4	3,413	451
	RI*/Inadequate	1	10	63	20	6	610	87
Engaging in extracurricular activities	Outstanding	6	18	66	8	2	1,296	395
	Good	3	16	71	8	2	2,821	1,043
	RI*/Inadequate	8	22	60	6	4	518	179

*Requires Improvement

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 7: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by full-time or part-time status

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out-of-school	Full-time	2	11	41	29	17	4,564	623
	Part-time	1	7	42	33	18	1,307	53
Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	Full-time	3	22	64	9	2	4,573	614
	Part-time	4	22	65	8	1	1,307	53
Marking/correcting of pupils' work	Full-time	1	4	36	33	26	4,526	661
	Part-time	0	2	42	35	21	1,281	79
Pupil counselling	Full-time	2	19	67	9	2	3,654	1,533
	Part-time	2	20	66	9	2	970	390
Pupil supervision and tuition	Full-time	0	2	75	18	4	4,207	980
	Part-time	0	2	78	17	2	1,126	234
Pupil discipline including detentions	Full-time	1	3	68	21	7	4,180	1,007
	Part-time	0	3	72	20	6	1,104	256
	Full-time	2	12	73	11	3	3,306	1,881

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Participation in school management	Part-time	2	9	78	10	2	815	545
General administrative work	Full-time	0	2	26	40	31	4,567	620
	Part-time	0	1	25	42	31	1,303	57
Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	Full-time	1	8	70	17	4	4,512	675
	Part-time	0	9	72	14	5	1,269	91
Engaging in extracurricular activities	Full-time	5	17	68	8	2	3,879	1,308
	Part-time	4	14	72	8	2	978	382

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 8: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by role

	Role	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out-of-school	Classroom teacher	1	7	40	33	19	4,312	17
	Middle leader	2	17	44	23	13	2,221	15
Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	Classroom teacher	3	22	66	8	2	4,318	11
	Middle leader	4	26	58	9	2	2,231	5
Marking/ correcting of pupils' work	Classroom teacher	1	3	38	34	25	4,262	67
	Middle leader	1	7	39	29	24	2,202	34
Pupil counselling	Classroom teacher	2	19	68	9	2	3,284	1,045
	Middle leader	3	21	64	10	2	1,896	340
Pupil supervision and tuition	Classroom teacher	0	2	78	16	3	3,826	503
	Middle leader	0	2	71	21	5	2,117	119
Pupil discipline including detentions	Classroom teacher	1	3	71	20	6	3,780	549
	Middle leader	0	3	66	22	8	2,104	132

	Role	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Participation in school management	Classroom teacher	2	11	77	8	2	2,551	1,778
	Middle leader	1	12	69	15	3	2,054	182
General administrative work	Classroom teacher	0	1	29	42	27	4,310	19
	Middle leader	0	2	19	39	40	2,228	8
Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	Classroom teacher	1	8	73	16	4	4,238	91
	Middle leader	1	10	65	18	6	2,202	34
Engaging in extracurricular activities	Classroom teacher	4	15	72	8	2	3,484	845
	Middle leader	6	21	61	8	3	1,931	305

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 9: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on non-teaching tasks by experience

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out-of-school	Less than six years	1	7	39	33	20	1,841	18
	Six to ten years	3	12	40	29	16	1,552	76
	Eleven years or more	2	11	43	28	16	3,139	660
Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school	Less than six years	2	18	69	9	1	1,847	12
	Six to ten years	4	23	62	9	3	1,554	74
	Eleven years or more	4	25	61	8	2	3,147	652
Marking/correcting of pupils' work	Less than six years	1	3	36	34	27	1,826	33
	Six to ten years	1	4	38	32	25	1,546	82
	Eleven years or more	1	4	39	33	23	3,091	708
Pupil counselling	Less than six years	2	23	66	8	1	1,396	463
	Six to ten years	3	20	63	10	3	1,250	378

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Eleven years or more	2	18	69	9	2	2,533	1,266
Pupil supervision and tuition	Less than six years	0	2	80	15	3	1,684	175
	Six to ten years	0	2	74	19	5	1,425	203
	Eleven years or more	0	2	75	19	3	2,833	966
Pupil discipline including detentions	Less than six years	1	4	69	19	7	1,653	206
	Six to ten years	0	2	67	23	8	1,411	217
	Eleven years or more	0	3	70	20	7	2,819	986
Participation in school management	Less than six years	2	13	75	9	2	1,106	753
	Six to ten years	2	11	74	10	3	1,151	477
	Eleven years or more	2	11	73	12	2	2,347	1,452
General administrative work	Less than six years	0	1	34	38	26	1,839	20
	Six to ten years	0	2	23	40	35	1,552	76

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Eleven years or more	0	2	24	43	32	3,146	653
Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians	Less than six years	1	9	72	15	3	1,806	53
	Six to ten years	1	8	68	17	6	1,538	90
	Eleven years or more	0	8	71	16	4	3,095	704
Engaging in extracurricular activities	Less than six years	5	17	71	6	1	1,526	333
	Six to ten years	5	16	68	10	2	1,315	313
	Eleven years or more	4	17	69	8	2	2,573	1,226

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in perceptions on the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by teacher and school characteristics

Table 10a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by phase and school type (Support and management activities)

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	Primary Academies	1	3	44	39	14	519	104
	Primary LA maintained	1	5	43	38	14	1,153	222
	Secondary Academies	2	9	48	31	9	3,395	364
	Secondary LA maintained	2	9	46	33	9	1,368	159
Staff meetings	Primary Academies	0	1	67	24	8	517	106
	Primary LA maintained	0	2	64	25	8	1,146	229
	Secondary Academies	0	4	55	30	10	3,454	305
	Secondary LA maintained	0	5	52	32	11	1,386	141

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	Primary Academies	2	0	84	11	3	273	350
	Primary LA maintained	2	1	80	14	3	608	767
	Secondary Academies	0	1	63	24	11	3,003	756
	Secondary LA maintained	1	2	68	21	7	1,213	314
Timetabled tutor time	Primary Academies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Primary LA maintained	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Secondary Academies	1	4	74	17	5	3,071	688
	Secondary LA maintained	1	5	79	14	3	1,242	285
Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	Primary Academies	2	12	76	9	1	391	232
	Primary LA maintained	2	13	75	8	1	855	520

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Secondary Academies	3	17	67	11	2	2,838	921
	Secondary LA maintained	3	19	65	11	2	1,180	347
Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	Primary Academies	1	9	77	12	2	459	164
	Primary LA maintained	1	8	80	9	1	995	380
	Secondary Academies	3	16	73	8	1	2,846	913
	Secondary LA maintained	3	15	72	9	1	1,175	352

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 10b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by phase and school type (Administrative activities)

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	Primary Academies	0	2	48	35	15	511	112
	Primary LA maintained	1	3	41	41	14	1,140	235
	Secondary Academies	1	4	32	41	22	3,430	329
	Secondary LA maintained	0	4	37	38	22	1,381	146
Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessment	Primary Academies	0	2	48	36	13	517	106
	Primary LA maintained	1	2	43	41	13	1,141	234
	Secondary Academies	1	3	33	43	20	3,427	332
	Secondary LA maintained	0	4	38	39	19	1,381	146
School policy development and financial planning	Primary Academies	1	11	79	9	1	326	297

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Primary LA maintained	1	7	80	11	1	734	641
	Secondary Academies	3	15	70	10	2	2,032	1,727
	Secondary LA maintained	2	15	71	11	2	855	672

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 11a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by full-time or part-time status (Support and management activities)

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	Full-time	1	7	46	34	12	4,505	682
	Part-time	1	5	45	37	12	1,285	75
Staff meetings	Full-time	0	3	58	29	10	4,559	628
	Part-time	0	4	61	27	9	1,281	79
Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	Full-time	1	1	68	21	9	3,591	1,596
	Part-time	0	1	76	17	5	976	384
Timetabled tutor time	Full-time	1	4	75	16	4	3,071	2,116
	Part-time	0	5	76	15	5	787	573
Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	Full-time	3	16	69	10	2	3,739	1,448
	Part-time	2	12	76	9	1	1,007	353
Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	Full-time	2	12	76	10	1	3,870	1,317
	Part-time	3	12	75	9	1	1,054	306

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 11b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by full-time or part-time status (Administrative activities)

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	Full-time	0	3	38	40	18	4,518	669
	Part-time	1	2	38	43	17	1,295	65
Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessment	Full-time	1	3	40	40	17	4,524	663
	Part-time	1	1	38	43	17	1,292	68
School policy development and financial planning	Full-time	2	13	73	11	1	2,811	2,376
	Part-time	1	9	80	9	2	734	626

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 12a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by Ofsted category (Support and management activities)

	Ofsted category	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	Outstanding	1	10	46	32	11	1,511	180
	Good	1	6	47	35	11	3,403	461
	RI*/Inadequate	2	7	38	38	14	607	90
Staff meetings	Outstanding	1	3	58	30	8	1,521	170
	Good	0	3	60	27	9	3,440	424
	RI*/Inadequate	0	4	54	29	14	616	81
Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	Outstanding	1	1	72	19	6	1,276	415
	Good	1	1	69	20	8	2,590	1,274
	RI*/Inadequate	1	1	68	20	10	508	189
Timetabled tutor time	Outstanding	0	4	78	14	3	1,140	551
	Good	0	4	76	16	4	2,104	1,760
	RI*/Inadequate	1	5	69	17	8	485	212
Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	Outstanding	2	17	68	10	3	1,280	411
	Good	3	15	72	9	1	2,740	1,124
	RI*/Inadequate	2	17	67	10	3	492	205
	Outstanding	2	13	73	11	1	1,288	403

	Ofsted category	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	Good	2	12	76	8	1	2,877	987
	RI*/Inadequate	2	12	76	9	1	509	188

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 12b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by Ofsted category (Administrative activities)

	Ofsted category	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	Outstanding	1	3	37	41	19	1,521	170
	Good	0	3	41	39	17	3,416	448
	RI*/Inadequate	1	5	24	45	26	609	88
Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessment	Outstanding	1	3	35	43	18	1,516	175
	Good	1	2	43	39	15	3,415	449
	RI*/Inadequate	1	3	27	46	24	611	86
School policy development and financial planning	Outstanding	2	10	74	12	2	935	756
	Good	2	11	77	10	1	2,062	1,802
	RI*/Inadequate	2	16	67	12	3	371	326

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 13a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by role (Support and management activities)

	Role	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	Classroom teacher	1	5	45	37	12	4,237	92
	Middle leader	1	9	49	31	10	2,113	123
Staff meetings	Classroom teacher	0	3	61	27	9	4,274	55
	Middle leader	0	4	56	30	10	2,231	5
Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	Classroom teacher	1	1	73	18	7	3,156	1,173
	Middle leader	0	1	66	23	10	1,942	294
Timetabled tutor time	Classroom teacher	1	4	75	16	4	2,750	1,579
	Middle leader	0	4	76	15	5	1,563	673
Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	Classroom teacher	2	13	75	8	1	3,106	1,223
	Middle leader	3	20	62	12	3	2,160	76
Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	Classroom teacher	2	11	78	8	1	3,364	965
	Middle leader	2	14	71	11	2	2,113	123

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

**Table 13b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by role
(Administrative activities)**

	Role	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	Classroom teacher	1	3	39	40	17	4,240	89
	Middle leader	1	3	36	39	20	2,224	12
Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessment	Classroom teacher	0	2	40	41	16	4,247	82
	Middle leader	1	3	38	40	18	2,221	15
School policy development and financial planning	Classroom teacher	2	10	78	9	1	2,142	2,187
	Middle leader	2	15	70	12	2	1,805	431

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

**Table 14a: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by experience
(Support and management activities)**

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Organising resources and premises, setting up displays, setting up/tidying classrooms	Less than six years	1	6	46	35	13	1,811	48
	Six to ten years	2	7	44	36	12	1,532	96
	Eleven years or more	1	7	47	35	10	3,093	706
Staff meetings	Less than six years	0	3	62	26	8	1,836	23
	Six to ten years	1	3	57	26	13	1,548	80
	Eleven years or more	0	3	59	29	9	3,120	679
Non-regular teaching cover for absent colleagues within school's timetabled day	Less than six years	2	2	73	17	7	1,324	535
	Six to ten years	1	0	67	22	10	1,237	391
	Eleven years or more	1	1	71	19	8	2,536	1,263
Timetabled tutor time	Less than six years	1	5	74	15	5	1,195	664
	Six to ten years	1	4	72	19	5	955	673
	Eleven years or more	0	4	77	14	4	2,162	1,637
Appraising, monitoring, coaching, mentoring and training other teaching staff	Less than six years	3	12	75	8	2	1,248	611
	Six to ten years	3	18	67	10	2	1,313	315
	Eleven years or more	2	15	70	11	2	2,704	1,095
	Less than six years	2	12	78	7	0	1,391	468

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Contact with people or organisations outside of school other than parents	Six to ten years	3	13	73	11	1	1,354	274
	Eleven years or more	2	11	76	9	1	2,731	1,068

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 14b: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on support and management, and administrative activities by experience(Administrative activities)

	Years of professional experience	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes	Less than six years	0	3	42	38	16	1,802	57
	Six to ten years	1	3	37	40	18	1,545	83
	Eleven years or more	1	3	37	40	19	3,116	683
Planning, administering and reporting on pupil assessment	Less than six years	0	3	44	37	16	1,803	56
	Six to ten years	1	3	36	43	17	1,545	83
	Eleven years or more	1	2	39	42	17	3,119	680
School policy development and financial planning	Less than six years	2	11	77	9	1	881	978
	Six to ten years	2	14	74	8	1	978	650
	Eleven years or more	1	11	74	12	2	2,087	1,712

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 15: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by phase and school type

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Leadership and management within the school	Primary Academies	3	17	77	3	0	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	4	31	58	5	1	210	0
	Secondary Academies	1	25	62	8	4	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	2	29	56	13	2	128	0
Administration within the school	Primary Academies	2	1	56	34	7	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	1	10	47	38	5	208	3
	Secondary Academies	0	1	44	42	13	283	1
	Secondary LA maintained	0	5	56	30	10	127	1
Administration and management with external bodies	Primary Academies	2	6	61	26	5	96	2
	Primary LA maintained	0	9	62	23	6	192	19

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Secondary Academies	0	2	64	30	4	274	10
	Secondary LA maintained	0	6	59	32	3	127	1
Performance management of staff	Primary Academies	4	9	75	11	1	96	2
	Primary LA maintained	1	23	68	8	1	210	1
	Secondary Academies	0	16	69	13	3	280	4
	Secondary LA maintained	2	14	76	8	0	127	1
Teaching and related tasks	Primary Academies	4	14	54	15	13	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	1	22	49	18	11	210	1
	Secondary Academies	1	13	61	20	5	283	1
	Secondary LA maintained	2	16	59	20	3	126	2

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Data analysis	Primary Academies	2	15	56	19	8	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	0	9	56	28	6	209	2
	Secondary Academies	0	15	63	18	4	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	2	16	58	20	5	128	0
Curriculum planning	Primary Academies	2	34	53	6	5	96	2
	Primary LA maintained	0	33	55	11	1	210	1
	Secondary Academies	2	33	57	7	1	280	4
	Secondary LA maintained	2	40	52	6	0	126	2
Student interactions	Primary Academies	4	23	64	8	1	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	7	33	53	4	2	211	0
	Secondary Academies	3	27	51	14	4	284	0

	School Type	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
	Secondary LA maintained	0	38	48	13	2	128	0
Parent or guardian interactions	Primary Academies	2	9	71	15	3	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	1	11	70	13	5	211	0
	Secondary Academies	1	19	61	15	4	283	1
	Secondary LA maintained	0	10	78	11	2	128	0
Recruitment	Primary Academies	2	11	79	3	5	84	12
	Primary LA maintained	0	10	73	10	6	175	36
	Secondary Academies	1	8	71	14	7	248	36
	Secondary LA maintained	0	7	67	22	3	118	10

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 11: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted rating	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Leadership and management within the school	Outstanding	2	23	63	9	3	159	0
	Good	4	28	60	6	1	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	1	28	67	3	1	78	0
Administration within the school	Outstanding	0	4	54	34	7	157	2
	Good	1	6	47	39	8	387	2
	RI*/Inadequate	1	9	42	42	5	77	1
Administration and management with external bodies	Outstanding	0	5	64	27	3	150	9
	Good	1	7	60	28	4	375	14
	RI*/Inadequate	0	4	67	22	8	72	6
Performance management of staff	Outstanding	2	20	70	7	1	156	3
	Good	1	20	66	11	1	385	4
	RI*/Inadequate	0	14	77	9	0	78	0
Teaching and related tasks	Outstanding	0	18	63	13	6	158	1
	Good	2	18	56	17	7	386	3
	RI*/Inadequate	0	15	52	22	11	78	0
Data analysis	Outstanding	0	15	62	19	4	158	1
	Good	1	13	60	22	4	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	0	8	44	34	14	78	0

	Ofsted rating	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Curriculum planning	Outstanding	2	39	54	3	2	158	1
	Good	1	38	53	7	1	386	3
	RI*/Inadequate	0	21	58	20	1	76	2
Student interactions	Outstanding	6	33	46	11	3	159	0
	Good	4	36	51	6	2	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	7	10	72	7	3	78	0
Parent or guardian interactions	Outstanding	1	12	64	16	6	159	0
	Good	1	11	69	15	4	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	0	17	72	9	1	78	0
Recruitment	Outstanding	1	9	72	12	6	143	16
	Good	1	9	73	11	6	338	1
	RI*/Inadequate	1	8	72	14	5	62	16

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 12: Perceptions of the amount of time spent on leadership tasks by full-time or part-time status

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Leadership and management within the school	Full-time	3	29	60	6	2	607	0
	Part-time	4	15	75	4	2	44	1
Administration within the school	Full-time	0	5	49	38	8	603	4
	Part-time	4	2	58	35	2	44	1
Administration and management with external bodies	Full-time	0	7	62	25	6	583	24
	Part-time	4	6	58	30	2	41	4
Performance management of staff	Full-time	1	18	70	10	2	600	7
	Part-time	6	9	80	4	2	44	1
Teaching and related tasks	Full-time	1	17	53	19	9	603	4
	Part-time	6	4	62	25	4	45	0
Data analysis	Full-time	0	13	57	24	6	605	2
	Part-time	4	11	61	17	7	45	0
Curriculum planning	Full-time	1	36	53	8	2	599	8
	Part-time	4	15	77	4	0	44	1
Student interactions	Full-time	5	32	53	9	2	607	0
	Part-time	4	26	67	4	0	45	0

	Status	Far too little (%)	Too little (%)	About right (%)	Too much (%)	Far too much (%)	Base (n)	Missing/ not applicable (n)
Parent or guardian interactions	Full-time	1	13	69	14	4	606	1
	Part-time	4	15	67	13	2	45	0
Recruitment	Full-time	0	9	75	11	5	528	79
	Part-time	4	21	65	4	6	38	7

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in the strategies used by senior leaders to manage and plan professional time by senior leader and school characteristics

Table 18: Strategies used by senior leaders to manage and plan professional time by phase and school type

	School Type	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not sure (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Protected blocks of non-teaching time to plan lessons and/or mark work (PPA)	Primary Academies	99	1	0	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	98	2	0	210	1
	Secondary Academies	90	9	1	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	97	3	0	128	0
Working collaboratively with other staff to plan schemes of work and/or share resources	Primary Academies	90	10	0	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	84	15	1	210	1
	Secondary Academies	88	11	2	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	90	10	0	128	0
Existing schemes of work and associated lesson plans that can be adapted by teaching staff	Primary Academies	77	20	2	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	87	12	0	210	1

	School Type	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not sure (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary Academies	91	7	1	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	87	13	0	128	0
Computer software that effectively helps with administrative tasks	Primary Academies	78	19	3	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	81	12	7	210	1
	Secondary Academies	77	18	6	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	87	8	5	128	0
A committee in place that monitors teachers' workload	Primary Academies	22	75	4	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	20	76	4	210	1
	Secondary Academies	28	68	4	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	23	70	6	128	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 19: Strategies used by senior leaders to manage and plan professional time by school Ofsted category

		Yes (%)	No (%)	Not sure (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Protected blocks of non-teaching time to plan lessons and/or mark work (PPA)	Outstanding	98	2	0	159	0
	Good	96	4	0	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	95	5	0	78	0
Working collaboratively with other staff to plan schemes of work and/or share resources	Outstanding	91	8	1	159	0
	Good	87	13	1	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	84	15	1	78	0
Existing schemes of work and associated lesson plans that can be adapted by teaching staff	Outstanding	91	8	1	159	0
	Good	88	11	1	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	82	17	1	78	0
Computer software that effectively helps with administrative tasks	Outstanding	81	11	8	159	0
	Good	82	14	5	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	71	18	10	78	0
A committee in place that monitors teachers' workload	Outstanding	23	67	9	159	0
	Good	24	72	4	388	1
	RI*/Inadequate	20	77	3	78	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Chapter 5

Differences in teachers' perceptions of workload by teacher and school characteristics

Table 20: Proportion of all teachers viewing workload as a problem by teacher and school level variables

		A very serious problem (%)	A fairly serious problem (%)	Not a very serious problem (%)	Not a serious problem at all (%)	Don't know (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
School type	Primary Academies	3	18	53	22	4	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	18	52	22	6	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	1	8	50	37	4	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	1	10	49	35	4	1,527	0
Ofsted category	Outstanding	29	52	13	2	4	1,691	0
	Good	27	51	15	2	5	3,864	0
	RI*/Inadequate	40	47	7	2	5	697	0
Role	Classroom teachers	29	50	13	2	6	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	34	52	10	2	3	2,236	0

		A very serious problem (%)	A fairly serious problem (%)	Not a very serious problem (%)	Not a serious problem at all (%)	Don't know (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Senior leaders	20	54	21	4	1	722	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

*Requires Improvement

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by teacher and school characteristics

Table 13: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by phase and school type

	School type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I can complete my assigned workload during my contracted hours	Primary Academies	72	19	2	6	0	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	69	22	3	4	1	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	77	17	3	3	1	3,757	2
	Secondary LA maintained	73	21	2	3	1	1,527	0
I have an acceptable workload	Primary Academies	31	39	11	16	2	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	28	40	14	16	2	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	40	39	10	9	1	3,759	0

	School type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary LA maintained	39	38	11	10	2	1,527	0
Overall, I achieve a good balance between my work life and my private life	Primary Academies	31	36	10	21	2	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	29	35	12	21	3	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	39	37	10	13	1	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	37	34	10	18	2	1,527	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 22: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I can complete my assigned workload during my contracted hours	Outstanding	72	20	3	3	1	1,691	0
	Good	72	21	3	4	0	3,861	3
	RI*/Inadequate	78	16	3	2	0	697	0
I have an acceptable workload	Outstanding	37	37	11	12	2	1,691	0
	Good	32	39	13	15	2	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	41	43	9	7	1	697	0
Overall, I achieve a good balance between my work life and my private life	Outstanding	36	36	9	16	3	1,691	0
	Good	32	35	11	19	2	3,864	0
	RI*/Inadequate	41	36	10	12	1	697	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 23: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by role

	Role	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I can complete my assigned workload during my contracted hours	Classroom teachers	73	20	2	4	1	4,328	1
	Middle leaders	78	16	2	3	0	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	63	25	6	5	1	720	2
I have an acceptable workload	Classroom teachers	34	39	12	13	1	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	40	39	10	9	1	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	27	38	15	18	3	721	1
Overall, I achieve a good balance between my work life and my private life	Classroom teachers	34	36	10	18	2	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	38	36	10	15	1	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	27	37	12	20	4	722	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 24: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' levels of agreement on statements about working hours by experience

	Years of professional experience	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I can complete my assigned workload during my contracted hours	Less than six years	75	19	2	4	1	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	76	18	2	4	0	1,627	1
	Eleven years or more	71	21	3	4	1	3,797	2
I have an acceptable workload	Less than six years	35	40	12	13	1	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	35	40	11	12	1	1,628	0
	Eleven years or more	34	38	12	13	2	3,798	1
Overall, I achieve a good balance between my work life and my private life	Less than six years	33	38	9	17	2	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	35	34	11	18	2	1,628	0
	Eleven years or more	34	35	11	17	2	3,799	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on their school's working environment by teacher and school characteristics

Table 25: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on their school's working environment by phase and school type

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Teaching staff collaborate effectively on teaching and learning	Primary Academies	2	8	8	50	32	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	1	9	10	52	27	1,374	1
	Secondary Academies	4	18	18	49	12	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	5	19	17	47	13	1,527	0
Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems	Primary Academies	2	8	14	50	26	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	11	16	48	22	1,374	1
	Secondary Academies	12	26	16	37	9	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	11	25	17	37	9	1,526	1

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Lesson observations carried out in the school are an effective part of professional development activity	Primary Academies	4	11	19	46	21	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	13	18	46	20	1,374	1
	Secondary Academies	9	20	21	40	10	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	8	19	22	40	10	1,527	0
Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at the school	Primary Academies	5	12	11	49	23	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	4	15	12	45	23	1,374	1
	Secondary Academies	11	25	26	32	6	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	10	22	24	34	9	1,527	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 14: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on their school's working environment by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Teaching staff collaborate effectively on teaching and learning	Outstanding	3	14	12	50	21	1,691	0
	Good	3	13	13	50	22	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	3	20	16	48	13	696	1
Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems	Outstanding	6	17	15	45	17	1,691	0
	Good	7	18	16	43	17	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	11	26	18	35	10	697	0
Lesson observations carried out in the school are an effective part of professional development activity	Outstanding	6	16	18	42	18	1,691	0
	Good	6	15	21	43	16	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	8	19	23	41	9	697	0
Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at the school	Outstanding	8	19	18	39	16	1,691	0
	Good	7	19	18	40	17	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	9	24	23	37	8	697	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

*Requires Improvement Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in teachers', middle and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches

Table 27: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by school type

	School Type	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Marking and feedback policy	Primary Academies	12	44	26	9	9	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	10	38	29	13	10	1,372	3
	Secondary Academies	25	25	26	12	13	3,744	15
	Secondary LA maintained	24	18	25	18	15	1,524	3
Data tracking/ monitoring of students' progress	Primary Academies	27	26	21	13	12	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	28	19	24	15	15	1,372	3
	Secondary Academies	34	14	19	16	16	3,751	8

	School Type	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary LA maintained	37	16	20	14	13	1,523	4
Approach to lesson planning	Primary Academies	18	33	19	19	11	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	17	23	21	24	14	1,373	2
	Secondary Academies	12	13	17	38	21	3,743	16
	Secondary LA maintained	14	13	20	35	18	1,525	2
School behaviour policy	Primary Academies	15	10	38	21	16	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	14	6	32	31	17	1,373	2
	Secondary Academies	34	10	26	16	14	3,747	12
	Secondary LA maintained	31	9	27	18	15	1,523	4

	School Type	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Teacher appraisal policy	Primary Academies	15	13	23	25	24	622	1
	Primary LA maintained	14	8	21	27	30	1,370	5
	Secondary Academies	21	11	26	18	24	3,749	10
	Secondary LA maintained	25	8	22	23	24	1,521	6
Communications protocols	Primary Academies	11	12	21	27	29	621	2
	Primary LA maintained	12	8	18	29	33	1,371	4
	Secondary Academies	18	6	21	27	29	3,750	9
	Secondary LA maintained	17	6	19	29	29	1,521	6
	Primary Academies	2	6	14	37	41	623	0

	School Type	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Policies to support flexible working practices	Primary LA maintained	3	6	11	37	44	1,373	2
	Secondary Academies	5	5	13	34	44	3,754	5
	Secondary LA maintained	5	5	14	35	40	1,523	4

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 28: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Marking and feedback policy	Outstanding	16	36	24	14	11	1,685	6
	Good	16	30	28	14	12	3,854	10
	RI*/Inadequate	27	24	34	6	10	695	2
Data tracking/ monitoring of students' progress	Outstanding	32	20	19	16	13	1,685	6
	Good	30	18	22	16	15	3,855	9
	RI*/Inadequate	39	14	23	9	14	697	0
Approach to lesson planning	Outstanding	12	19	18	34	17	1,687	4
	Good	14	21	19	30	16	3,853	11
	RI*/Inadequate	24	13	23	23	17	696	1
School behaviour policy	Outstanding	19	10	25	28	17	1,685	6
	Good	23	8	31	23	15	3,856	8
	RI*/Inadequate	31	9	31	15	15	695	2
Teacher appraisal policy	Outstanding	18	10	21	24	27	1,684	7
	Good	17	9	22	25	26	3,852	12
	RI*/Inadequate	25	10	29	14	23	696	1

	Ofsted Rating	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Communications protocols	Outstanding	14	7	15	33	31	1,688	3
	Good	14	7	20	28	31	3,847	17
	RI*/Inadequate	18	7	23	23	30	696	1
Policies to support flexible working practices	Outstanding	4	6	13	35	42	1,688	3
	Good	4	5	12	36	42	3,856	8
	RI*/Inadequate	4	3	11	35	47	697	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 29: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on the effects of revisions to schools' policies and approaches by role

	Role	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
Marking and feedback policy	Classroom teachers	18	28	26	12	16	4,314	15
	Middle leaders	22	29	28	15	6	2,230	6
	Senior leaders	7	51	28	12	1	722	0
Data tracking/ monitoring of students' progress	Classroom teachers	32	14	20	15	20	4,318	11
	Middle leaders	37	15	23	17	8	2,231	5
	Senior leaders	23	41	24	11	1	722	0
Approach to lesson planning	Classroom teachers	16	17	17	27	22	4,319	10
	Middle leaders	14	17	21	36	11	2,229	7
	Senior leaders	11	33	25	29	2	718	4
School behaviour policy	Classroom teachers	22	6	29	22	21	4,316	13
	Middle leaders	30	9	30	23	9	2,231	5

	Role	Yes, but it has added to my workload (%)	Yes, and it has reduced my workload (%)	Yes, and it has made no difference to my workload (%)	No revisions made (%)	Not sure if revisions have been made (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Senior leaders	19	18	37	24	2	721	1
Teacher appraisal policy	Classroom teachers	17	7	20	20	35	4,317	12
	Middle leaders	24	11	27	24	14	2,228	8
	Senior leaders	14	21	29	33	3	720	2
Communications protocols	Classroom teachers	13	5	17	24	40	4,315	14
	Middle leaders	18	7	24	31	20	2,230	6
	Senior leaders	13	20	21	39	7	721	1
Policies to support flexible working practices	Classroom teachers	3	5	10	30	52	4,322	7
	Middle leaders	4	5	15	39	37	2,233	3
	Senior leaders	7	9	19	52	13	721	1

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in views on professional development by teacher and school characteristics

Table 30: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by school type

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The school supports continuing professional development for teachers	Primary Academies	3	7	10	44	36	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	2	8	15	47	28	1,374	1
	Secondary Academies	4	12	17	46	21	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	5	14	17	45	19	1,526	1
I have the necessary Information and Communication (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks	Primary Academies	2	6	13	54	26	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	2	8	11	55	25	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	3	13	12	49	22	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	4	12	12	49	23	1,526	1

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities	Primary Academies	6	22	16	38	18	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	7	22	17	40	13	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	18	32	15	28	7	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	18	30	14	31	7	1,527	0
I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance and rules affecting professional practice	Primary Academies	7	27	27	34	5	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	8	32	27	29	5	1,375	0
	Secondary Academies	15	42	23	17	3	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	15	41	24	16	3	1,526	1
The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality	Primary Academies	5	13	24	44	14	623	0
	Primary LA maintained	5	18	23	42	11	1,375	0

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary Academies	7	19	26	39	9	3,759	0
	Secondary LA maintained	8	22	26	36	9	1,527	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages
Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 31: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The school supports continuing professional development for teachers	Outstanding	2	9	14	44	30	1,691	0
	Good	3	10	15	46	25	3,862	2
	RI*/Inadequate	4	12	16	49	19	697	0
I have the necessary Information and Communication (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks	Outstanding	3	11	10	51	25	1,691	0
	Good	2	9	11	53	24	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	4	11	14	49	21	697	0
I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities	Outstanding	14	27	13	34	12	1,691	0
	Good	12	27	17	34	11	3,864	0
	RI*/Inadequate	15	27	15	35	7	697	0
I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance	Outstanding	12	36	23	24	5	1,691	0
	Good	11	36	25	24	4	3,863	1
	RI*/Inadequate	15	40	26	19	1	697	0

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
and rules affecting professional practice								
The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality	Outstanding	5	16	22	45	13	1,691	0
	Good	6	18	25	41	11	3,864	0
	RI*/Inadequate	10	25	28	32	5	697	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 32: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by role

	Role	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The school supports continuing professional development for teachers	Classroom teachers	3	12	18	47	20	4,328	1
	Middle leaders	4	11	15	47	23	2,235	1
	Senior leaders	2	2	3	41	52	722	0
I have the necessary Information and Communication (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks	Classroom teachers	3	11	13	54	19	4,328	1
	Middle leaders	3	11	11	49	26	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	2	5	8	47	38	722	0
I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities	Classroom teachers	13	29	18	32	8	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	15	29	14	33	9	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	4	13	11	47	25	722	0
I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance and	Classroom teachers	11	34	28	24	3	4,328	1
	Middle leaders	14	40	22	20	4	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	6	35	18	31	9	722	0

	Role	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
rules affecting professional practice								
The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality	Classroom teachers	8	20	25	39	9	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	6	19	27	40	9	2,236	0
	Senior leaders	1	10	18	49	22	722	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 15: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by full-time and part-time status

	Status	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The school supports continuing professional development for teachers	Full-time	3	10	14	46	28	5,186	1
	Part-time	4	13	19	47	17	1,359	1
I have the necessary Information and Communication (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks	Full-time	2	9	11	51	26	5,187	0
	Part-time	3	13	14	54	16	1,359	1
I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities	Full-time	11	25	16	36	12	5,187	0
	Part-time	14	32	19	30	6	1,360	0
I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance and rules affecting professional practice	Full-time	11	36	25	24	5	5,187	0
	Part-time	11	39	26	22	2	1,359	1

	Status	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality	Full-time	6	18	23	42	11	5,187	0
	Part-time	7	20	27	39	8	1,360	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 34: Differences in teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' views on professional development by experience

	Years of professional experience	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The school supports continuing professional development for teachers	Less than six years	4	10	14	47	25	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	3	9	16	48	23	1,627	1
	Eleven years or more	3	11	15	45	26	3,798	1
I have the necessary Information and Communication (ICT) skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks	Less than six years	2	9	12	52	25	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	3	9	9	52	26	1,628	0
	Eleven years or more	3	11	13	52	22	3,798	1
I have time during my contracted working hours to take part in professional development activities	Less than six years	12	28	17	33	10	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	14	27	16	33	10	1,628	0
	Eleven years or more	12	26	16	36	11	3,799	0
I have enough time to keep informed on changes to guidance and	Less than six years	11	30	29	26	4	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	13	33	26	23	4	1,628	0

	Years of professional experience	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
rules affecting professional practice	Eleven years or more	11	39	23	23	3	3,798	1
The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality	Less than six years	8	19	22	41	10	1,859	0
	Six to ten years	6	19	22	42	11	1,628	0
	Eleven years or more	6	17	26	40	10	3,799	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Differences in views on line management by teacher and school characteristics

Findings for teachers and middle leaders

Table 35: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by school type

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
My manager supports my well-being	Primary Academies	2	7	23	38	30	525	0
	Primary LA maintained	5	9	18	40	27	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	5	11	18	42	24	3,474	1
	Secondary LA maintained	4	15	17	39	25	1,398	1
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Primary Academies	2	10	17	43	29	525	0
	Primary LA maintained	5	11	17	42	24	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	5	12	16	42	25	3,475	0

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary LA maintained	6	11	17	42	25	1,399	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Primary Academies	3	9	21	40	27	525	0
	Primary LA maintained	5	8	18	41	27	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	5	11	19	42	24	3,475	0
	Secondary LA maintained	5	11	23	38	23	1,399	0
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Primary Academies	2	4	18	48	28	525	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	7	17	51	23	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	4	11	19	49	17	3,475	0
	Secondary LA maintained	5	10	20	50	15	1,399	0
	Primary Academies	4	10	21	41	24	524	1

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Primary LA maintained	6	15	20	40	19	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	11	24	25	31	9	3,475	0
	Secondary LA maintained	12	24	22	33	10	1,398	1
I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decisions that affect my work at the school	Primary Academies	5	15	24	40	17	525	0
	Primary LA maintained	6	15	27	37	14	1,164	0
	Secondary Academies	11	28	29	25	7	3,475	0
	Secondary LA maintained	13	26	27	26	8	1,399	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 16: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
My manager supports my well-being	Outstanding	5	11	16	40	27	1,531	1
	Good	4	10	18	40	27	3,474	1
	RI*/Inadequate	6	12	22	43	18	619	0
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Outstanding	5	11	17	39	28	1,532	0
	Good	5	11	16	43	25	3,475	0
	RI*/Inadequate	5	13	20	44	18	619	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Outstanding	5	12	19	38	25	1,532	0
	Good	4	9	19	41	26	3,475	0
	RI*/Inadequate	5	11	21	44	19	619	0
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Outstanding	3	10	16	49	22	1,532	0
	Good	3	8	18	50	20	3,475	0
	RI*/Inadequate	6	12	21	47	14	619	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Outstanding	8	22	20	35	15	1,532	0
	Good	8	17	22	37	16	3,474	1
	RI*/Inadequate	14	25	23	32	7	619	0
I am satisfied with my level of involvement in	Outstanding	9	24	26	31	10	1,532	0
	Good	8	20	28	33	12	3,475	0

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
decisions that affect my work at the school	RI*/Inadequate	12	25	30	25	8	619	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 37: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by role

	Role	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
My manager supports my well-being	Classroom teachers	5	10	18	40	27	4,327	2
	Middle leaders	4	13	19	41	23	2,236	0
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Classroom teachers	5	11	16	43	25	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	5	11	16	42	26	2,236	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Classroom teachers	5	9	19	41	27	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	4	12	21	41	22	2,236	0
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Classroom teachers	4	8	19	49	20	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	3	11	16	50	20	2,236	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Classroom teachers	8	18	22	36	15	4,328	1
	Middle leaders	8	23	22	34	13	2,235	1
I am satisfied with my level of involvement in	Classroom teachers	9	21	29	31	10	4,329	0
	Middle leaders	9	23	24	33	12	2,236	0

	Role	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
decisions that affect my work at the school								

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 38: Differences in teachers' and middle leaders' views on line management by experience

	Years of professional experience	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
My manager supports my well-being	Less than six years	4	10	17	39	30	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	6	10	19	38	28	1,556	0
	Eleven years or more	4	11	19	42	23	3,156	2
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Less than six years	5	13	18	40	25	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	6	9	15	42	28	1,556	0
	Eleven years or more	5	11	16	44	24	3,158	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Less than six years	4	9	19	39	29	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	5	9	17	41	27	1,556	0
	Eleven years or more	4	11	21	42	22	3,158	0
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Less than six years	3	8	19	48	22	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	4	8	16	49	23	1,556	0

	Years of professional experience	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Eleven years or more	3	10	18	51	18	3,158	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Less than six years	7	20	23	34	16	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	9	19	22	35	15	1,555	1
	Eleven years or more	9	19	22	37	13	3,157	1
I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decisions that affect my work at the school	Less than six years	9	19	30	31	11	1,850	0
	Six to ten years	9	21	26	32	12	1,556	0
	Eleven years or more	9	23	26	32	10	3,158	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Findings for senior leaders

Table 39: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by school type

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Primary Academies	1	4	4	42	49	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	2	2	7	49	39	211	0
	Secondary Academies	1	3	13	42	41	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	0	3	6	45	45	128	0
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Primary Academies	2	2	9	40	47	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	1	4	14	42	39	211	0
	Secondary Academies	2	5	8	47	38	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	5	5	8	42	40	128	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Primary Academies	2	1	5	54	37	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	2	2	10	45	42	211	0

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary Academies	1	4	12	51	33	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	0	3	5	53	39	128	0
My manager supports my well-being	Primary Academies	1	2	14	44	38	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	2	6	18	37	37	211	0
	Secondary Academies	2	7	16	39	36	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	6	3	16	34	41	128	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Primary Academies	1	5	13	44	36	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	4	21	38	34	211	0
	Secondary Academies	2	4	17	37	39	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	6	3	8	41	41	128	0
The governing body/board support staff well-being across the school	Primary Academies	1	12	17	60	11	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	3	11	25	39	23	211	0

	School Type	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
	Secondary Academies	4	9	33	40	14	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	2	14	20	31	33	128	0
My governing body/board support my well-being	Primary Academies	1	15	22	49	13	98	0
	Primary LA maintained	4	14	19	41	21	211	0
	Secondary Academies	4	14	35	33	14	284	0
	Secondary LA maintained	3	14	22	38	23	128	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 40: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by school Ofsted category

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Outstanding	2	4	6	45	42	159	0
	Good	2	2	9	43	44	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	0	3	7	57	33	78	0
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Outstanding	6	5	8	39	42	159	0
	Good	1	4	13	41	41	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	1	0	14	52	33	78	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Outstanding	1	1	11	42	45	159	0
	Good	2	2	8	44	44	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	0	5	6	69	21	78	0
My manager supports my well-being	Outstanding	6	4	12	37	40	159	0
	Good	2	4	19	36	40	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	0	13	20	35	33	78	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Outstanding	6	6	13	32	43	159	0
	Good	2	4	19	37	38	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	0	6	17	48	29	78	0
The governing body/board support staff	Outstanding	3	9	26	33	30	159	0
	Good	3	10	23	44	20	389	0

	Ofsted Rating	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
well-being across the school	RI*/Inadequate	2	14	33	38	13	78	0
My governing body/board support my well-being	Outstanding	3	7	28	37	26	159	0
	Good	3	13	22	43	19	389	0
	RI*/Inadequate	3	23	27	30	17	78	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

*Requires Improvement

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Table 41: Differences in senior leaders' views on line management by full-time and part-time status

	Status	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
I think that my performance is evaluated fairly	Full-time	2	3	8	45	42	607	0
	Part-time	2	0	6	56	37	45	0
My manager recognises when I have done my job well	Full-time	2	4	13	42	39	607	0
	Part-time	4	0	7	56	33	45	0
The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school	Full-time	1	2	9	48	40	607	0
	Part-time	2	2	13	51	32	45	0
My manager supports my well-being	Full-time	2	6	17	39	36	607	0
	Part-time	2	2	15	41	41	45	0
My manager is considerate of my life outside work	Full-time	3	5	19	39	35	607	0
	Part-time	0	2	11	43	43	45	0
The governing body/board support staff well-being across the school	Full-time	3	10	24	43	20	607	0
	Part-time	0	13	26	43	19	45	0
	Full-time	3	14	23	41	19	607	0

	Status	Strongly disagree (%)	Tend to disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Tend to agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	Base (n)	Missing (n)
My governing body/board support my well-being	Part-time	0	11	26	47	15	45	0

Missing responses are excluded from the calculation of percentages

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

9 Modelling the factors which impact on teachers' working hours

Introduction to modelling

In Chapter 3 of the main report, relationships between a range of variables and teachers working hours were examined. Many of these school and demographic characteristics associated with workload are themselves interrelated. Furthermore, any apparent association between a variable and working hours may occur because both are related to a third variable, which has not been taken into account in a simple two-way tabulation.

In the following analysis, the association between teachers' self-reported working hours and a range of explanatory variables were examined simultaneously. This process minimised the possibility of being misled by spurious, inverse or absent associations, which can occur when only one explanatory variable is considered in isolation.

Procedure used for multilevel modelling

More specifically, two multilevel models (MLM) were constructed to complement the descriptive analysis: one for classroom teachers and middle leaders and one for senior leaders. Multilevel modelling is an extension of regression modelling that accounts for the fact that teachers are clustered within schools, and therefore will tend to be more similar to other teachers in the same school than they are to the wider sample. Specifically, the MLM used were mixed effects linear regression models where the overall error distribution was assumed to be Gaussian. The extent to which responses are similar within schools, which is estimated using MLM, is informative for understanding the extent to which workload and teacher attitudes differ depending on schools' policies and cultures. As well as providing estimates of between school variation, the MLM analysis also allows estimations of variance within schools, which can shed light on the differences in workload among teaching staff in the same school. All these differences to be drawn out in reported working hours between teachers with particular characteristics are over and above the effects of other teacher and school characteristics.

The candidate variables considered for inclusion in the model were those that are highlighted in Chapter 6 of the main report. These were variables that had known associations with working hours and/or were of a policy or theoretical interest. The process for constructing the final MLMs was an iterative procedure whereby variables that were not statistically significant were removed, and the models re-run, until all the teacher and school variables were adding explanatory power to the models. The analysis was re-run using different reference categories to check that no results were concealed by the particular choice of reference category. Where several variables were theoretically highly correlated, such as age and teaching experience, the one with the strongest

association with working hours was chosen. The teacher-level explanatory variables considered as candidates for the teacher model were:

- Gender
- Years in the teaching profession (NQT, 1/2/3/4 years, 5-year bands thereafter). Splitting this variable more finely than the three categories presented in the other sections of this report gave greater insight into the differences within the first five years of teaching.
- Contracted working arrangement (full-time/ part-time)
- Subject taught (only for secondary teachers. English was used as the reference category for comparing against all other subjects)
- Role (classroom teacher/middle leader)
- Teachers' average response to the following six questions about the way they were managed (derived from factor analysis - a statistical technique for identifying patterns in responses, which reduces the number of variables required to explain the data. The technique used was a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation on all variables, however as only one factor was extracted for this management variable, there were no rotations involved. Questions were used in the management variable if the Cronbach's alpha was higher with the question included in the factor and if the combination of the questions 'loaded' well together):
 - My manager is considerate of my life outside work
 - My manager supports my well-being
 - The senior leadership team support staff well-being across the school
 - My manager recognises when I have done my job well
 - I think that my performance is evaluated fairly
 - I am satisfied with my level of involvement in decisions that affect my work at the school

The interpretation of the management variable coefficient in the final model is slightly more difficult than for other variables as the size of the coefficient (-1.4) does not relate directly to a difference of 1.4 hours between 'happy' and 'unhappy' teachers but rather that, teachers who are happier with their 'management' tend to work fewer hours.

- School environment and support variables [reduced from a 5 point scale to a 3 point scale of disagreement/agreement]:
 - Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems
 - Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at [name of school]

- Teaching staff collaborate effectively on teaching and learning
- I have the necessary ICT skills to perform data recording and analysis tasks
- [Name of school] supports CPD for teachers
- The resources available at my school to help plan teaching and learning are high quality

These variables were implemented into the model separately as they were not highly correlated with one another, hence factor analysis was not necessary in this case.

The school-level explanatory variables considered as candidates for the teacher and middle leader model were:

- School phase (primary/secondary - special schools were included in secondary)
- School type (academy/LA maintained)
- Ofsted rating (Outstanding/Good/Requires Improvement and Inadequate/Not inspected yet. Good was used as the reference category for comparing against all other Ofsted category groups)
- Region (GOR vs London – reference category)
- Percentage of pupils with English as an additional language (EAL)
- Percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals in the last 6 years (FSMever)
- School size (small/medium/large defined separately for primary and secondary based on teacher headcount. Medium used as reference category for comparing against other school sizes)
- Senior leaders' responses to whether they had the following strategies in place in their school, averaged at school-level:
 - Protected blocks of non-teaching time to plan lessons and/or mark work (PPA)
 - Working collaboratively with other staff to plan schemes of work and/or share resources
 - Existing schemes of work and associated lesson plans that can be adapted by teaching staff
 - Computer software that effectively helps with administrative tasks
 - A committee in place that monitors teachers' workload

These variables were implemented into the model separately as they were not highly correlated with one another, hence factor analysis was not necessary in this case.

The approach for the senior leader MLM model was broadly the same except the following variables were omitted or amended, as they were not (as) relevant for senior leaders:

- Years of experience in teaching (replaced with an age variable: under 40 years/40 years and older)
- Subject taught (only for secondary teachers. English was used as the reference category for comparing against all other subjects)
- Senior leaders' average response to the five strategy questions above
- Role re-specified as: Deputy/assistant headteacher and headteacher/executive headteacher/MAT CEO
- School environment and support variables, except for teachers' average response from the six questions relating to the way they were managed derived from factor analysis in the teacher model

The final set of school- and teacher-level variables used in the teacher and middle leader model and the regression results are shown in Table 42 below:

**Table 42a: Final model of classroom teachers / middle leaders' total working hours
(Teacher-level variables)**

Category	Reference group	Average difference in working hours: category vs reference group	Statistically significant difference?
Male	Female	+1.1	Yes
NQT year	5 to 9.9 years of teaching experience	+0.8	No
1 year		+1.7	No
2 years		+1.8	Yes
3 years		+1.3	No
4 years		+0.8	No
10 to 14.9 years		-1.7	Yes
15 to 29.9 years		-1.1	No
20 to 24.9 years		-0.8	No
25 to 29.9 years		-0.9	No
30+ years		-1.6	No
Part-time	Full-time	-11.9	Yes
Maths	English	-0.1	No
Science		-0.2	No
Humanities		+1.7	Yes
Modern Foreign Languages		+0.6	No
Design and Technology and Computing		-1.0	No
Arts		+0.1	No
Primary curriculum		-0.5	No
No subject (response option in the teacher survey)		-4.9	Yes
Other		-1.1	Yes
Middle leader	Classroom teacher	+2.4	Yes
Strongly disagree/disagree with "Teaching staff collaborate	Neutral response to this statement	+1.2	Yes

Category	Reference group	Average difference in working hours: category vs reference group	Statistically significant difference?
effectively to address disciplinary problems”			
Strongly agree/agree with “Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems”		+1.3	Yes
Strongly disagree/disagree with “Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at [school]”	Neutral response to this statement	+1.0	Yes
Strongly agree/agree with “Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at [school]”		+0.3	No
Management variable (derived from factor analysis)		-1.4	Yes

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

**Table 42b: Final model of classroom teachers / middle leaders' total working hours
(School-level variables)**

Category	Reference group	Average difference in working hours: category vs reference group	Statistically significant difference?
Primary	Secondary	+2.6	Yes
Academies	LA maintained	+1.3	Yes
"Outstanding" Ofsted category	"Good" Ofsted category	+1.1	No
"Requires Improvement/ Inadequate" Ofsted category		+1.4	Yes
Not inspected yet		-0.2	No
East Midlands	London	+1.2	No
East of England		-0.2	No
North East		-0.2	No
North West		+1.0	No
South East		+1.9	Yes
South West		+1.1	No
West Midlands		+0.6	No
Yorkshire and the Humber		+0.7	No

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

The final set of school- and teacher-level variables used in the senior leader model were role (assistant or deputy headteacher/ headteacher, executive headteacher or MAT CEO) and working arrangements (full-time/ part-time), as can be seen in Table 43:

Table 43: Final model of senior leaders' total working hours

Category	Reference group	Average difference in working hours: category vs reference group	Statistically significant difference?
Headteacher/Executive Headteacher/MAT CEO	Deputy/Assistant Headteacher	+3.6 hours	Yes
Part-time	Full-time	-7.2 hours	Yes

Source: Teacher Workload Survey, 2019

Both the models were estimated with the weights calculated from entropy balancing applied to ensure that the results were representative of the teacher population and policy-relevant implications could be drawn from the MLM analysis.

Variables with a large number of levels were grouped into a smaller number of ordered-levels. This allowed convenient tabulations as well as direct estimates of their association with working hours by comparisons between the different levels. To allow straightforward comparisons, categorical explanatory variables had their reference levels set to a convenient group for comparisons among levels (in general, the group with the largest number of observations). The grouped numerical variables were treated in the same fashion, e.g. all groups for years in the teaching profession were compared to 5-9.9 years of teaching experience. However, other comparisons are also possible by first calculating the fitted values for two groups of teachers (explained below in the section entitled 'Contributions of the Explanatory Variables to Fitted Scores') and then subtracting one from the other to provide the estimated difference in working hours for the two groups being compared.

Between and within school variance components

Alongside the associations derived with specific variables, the models drew out the between-school and within-school variation that is unexplained by the characteristics (known as the residual). More technically this is known as an intra-cluster correlation (ICC) between teachers' self-reported workload in schools. The residual variance can be split into a between-cluster component, corresponding to school-level residual variation,

and a within-cluster component, corresponding to individual teacher-level residual variation. The ICC corresponds to the between-cluster component expressed as a percentage of the total residual variance (i.e. the between-school variation divided by total variation, then multiplied by 100).

For classroom teachers the school-level variance component is 6 per cent and for senior leaders it is 28 per cent. The values reported here suggest a relatively homogeneous school population in relation to teachers' working hours, with the majority of the difference being between teachers within the same school. The similar (although not identical) regression model in the 2016 wave of TWS found that 4 per cent of the variation in teachers' working hours and 15 per cent for senior leaders was attributed to factors differing across schools. This could be due to differences in the exact model used in TWS 2016 and TWS 2019, or indicate that the amount of residual variation in working hours driven by school-level factors has increased since 2016. Without further analysis to establish a like-for-like comparison between TWS 2016 and TWS 2019, it is not possible to determine which of these factors explains the change in the relative size of the school-level variance component.

Contributions of the explanatory variables to fitted scores

All the explanatory variables fitted with the present models consist of a small number of groups, either from splitting continuous variables (e.g. years of teaching experience into experience bands) or inherently categorical ones, such as gender. Each parameter estimate consists of a mixture of given levels and a reference category chosen to facilitate interpretation. Due to the choice of reference category for each variable, the intercept for the classroom teacher and middle leader model denotes the mean working hours for a teacher with the following characteristics:

- Female
- 5 to 9.9 years in teaching
- Full-time employment status
- Teaches English
- Classroom teacher
- Gave neutral response to the statement "*Teaching staff collaborate effectively to address disciplinary problems*"
- Gave neutral response to the statement "*Teaching assistants are effectively deployed at [school]*"
- School phase: secondary
- LA maintained school

- Ofsted-category Good
- In London

This 'reference' mean working hours has a fitted value of 52.7 hours. The fitted values for other types of classroom teacher/middle leader are obtained by simply adding the parameters estimates for the variables on which they differ to the intercept. For example, a classroom teacher who was part-time in a primary school would have a fitted value of $52.7 - 11.9 + 1.3 = 42.1$ hours, where -11.9 is the part-time coefficient (relative to full-time, the reference category) and +1.3 is the primary school coefficient (relative to a secondary school) in the teacher/middle leader model (use Table 41 as reference).

Other combinations can be worked out similarly, but the tables can also be interpreted directly to consider the estimated effect of a change in the level of a variable compared to the reference category. For example, all other things being equal, the estimate for being in a school with an Ofsted rating of 'Outstanding' has a fitted working hour that is 1.1 hours more than the reference category, a school rated 'Good'. This is after the effects of all the other variables is taken into account by the statistical model.

In the case of the final model for senior leaders, the variables present and the chosen reference category result in the parameter estimate for intercept corresponding to the self-reported total working hours of a senior leader who is:

- Assistant or deputy headteacher
- Full-time employment status

This 'reference' mean working hours has a fitted value of 55.2 hours. The same calculations can be applied, as explained above for the teacher and middle leader model.

10 References

Higton, J., Leonardi, S., Richards, N., Choudhoury, A., Sofroniou, N., and Owen, D. (2017). *Teacher Workload Survey 2016: Final Report* [online]. Available: [Report to Teacher Workload Survey 2016: Final report](#) [23 October, 2019].

Hainmueller, J. (2012). *Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies*. *Political Analysis* (2012) 20: 25-46. Available at SSRN: [Report to Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies. Political Analysis \(2012\)](#) [23 October, 2019].



Department
for Education

© Department for Education 2019

Reference: DFE RR951a

ISBN: 978-1-83870-062-1

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at: Jobshare.Mackenzie-Peachey@education.gov.uk, Workload.Solutions@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications