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ABSTRACT

This study sought to describe the workplace of the year-round school using the structure of Johnson's workplace theory. The rationale for conducting the study was based on the assumption that the nature of the workplace affects the teaching/learning act. Teachers' perceptions of the workplace ultimately influence their attitudes, efforts, and commitment toward the act of teaching. The year-round school schedule was found to influence teachers' perceptions of their workplace.

The frequent breaks of the year-round schedule were perceived as beneficial for both students and teachers by providing alternate vacation opportunities, time for inexperienced teachers to evaluate and plan instructional strategies, and an overall perception of greater energy expended upon the teaching/learning act.

However, the track assignment teachers were placed on influenced the perception of the benefits breaks provided. Some tracks were perceived by teachers as providing better opportunities for rejuvenation than others. In the case of teachers working extended contracts, who did not have track breaks, the perception of the workplace benefits were limited to financial incentives.

Teachers' perceived the breaks influenced attendance patterns and professional growth. Many of the teachers believed that the school district's lack of 12-month schools in the junior high and high schools negatively impacted upon student attendance during the summer months of the year-round school's operation. The constant influx of
staff affected teacher interaction and staff development. Teachers reported that the lack of a long summer break inhibited their ability to attend universities to attain advanced degrees and complete course requirements for teacher certification renewal.

Despite these difficulties, with a few exceptions, teachers expressed a desire to continue working on the year-round school schedule. The frequent breaks they enjoyed appeared to be the dominating factor in their decision to work in a year-round school. Extended contract teachers reported the need for extra money was a key factor for their decision. All teachers' responses were similar to the responses of teachers interviewed in Johnson's (1990) study in six of the seven workplace features. Teachers' views concerning the political aspect of the workplace differed from the description put forth in Johnson's (1990) study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Public school education in the United States at the end of the 20th century had been receiving great scrutiny for its failure to deliver better-quality education. Increasing expenditures per pupil for education had failed to improve pupil achievement while comparisons of academic achievement among youth in other countries seemed to indicate an educational decline in the United States. Many solutions to the problem were proposed ranging from early childhood intervention programs to state testing for teacher competence. Among the many attempts to improve academic achievement, and at the same time contain costs, was the idea of year-round school calendars. Additionally, new knowledge exhibiting the promise of and the possibility for shedding light on how achievement could be improved was a unique conceptualization of the workplace of the school. Recent studies on the school's workplace or work environment revealed that teachers were affected by the physical and nonphysical aspects of their workplace (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). These studies suggested that school improvement efforts had failed in the past and would continue to fail in the future unless workplace features which enhanced teacher task performance were identified and supported within the educational organization as a whole.
Johnson (1990) revealed that workplace features strongly influenced teachers' perceptions of the job they performed because these features were the conditions under which the job was accomplished. Teaching and learning did not take place in a vacuum. The educational environment had an all pervasive dominion over the teacher and ultimately, the learner. (Epstein, 1986; Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989; Schneider, 1985). The workplace was conceptualized as having physical, organizational, psychological, cultural, economic, political, and sociological features (Johnson, 1990). Each feature had its own identifiable characteristics which impacted teachers' perceptions of the workplace and the tasks they performed. Johnson concluded that the workplace features interacted within the school setting. Teachers' interaction with the features of the workplace determined their perceptions and influenced the responses of teachers toward students, the task of teaching, the manner of communication used with parents, and in some cases the method and sequencing of the instruction itself. The workplace of the school was found to be part of a complex social organization. This workplace, as viewed by Johnson (1990), had seven interactive features. The physical feature of the workplace addressed issues concerning safety, comfort, space and resources teachers had available to do their job. The features of the organizational structure of the workplace included teachers' perceptions of the authority distribution, workload, degree of specialization, teacher autonomy, supervision practices, and the interdependence and interaction of teachers among colleagues and staff members. The cultural features centered on the amount of support the
teacher perceived from colleagues, the clarity of set goals which work toward a common purpose, normative behaviors, and clear communication within the organization. The psychological feature encompassed the meaning placed on the work teachers did, the opportunities for learning and growth, personally and professionally, and the amount of stress teachers experienced within the workplace. Economic features of the school's workplace focused on pay and benefits received, incentives and rewards acquired, and job security. The political features of the workplace related to perceptions of equity within the school building and voice in governance. The final feature of the workplace, the sociological features, encompassed teachers' perceptions of their role within the organization, and characteristics of the students, parents, and peers, along with their perceptions of status. Teachers' contributions of commitment, involvement, and effort were related to identified workplace features which either facilitated or inhibited the act of teaching. Epstein (1986) and Schneider (1985) charged that academically successful schools, enhanced by positive workplace features, were able to secure greater parental support for, and assistance in, their children's learning than unsuccessful schools. The foundation of a school's academic success rested upon its ability to inspire teachers to make meaningful contributions. Workplace conditions affected the levels of commitment, involvement, and effort teachers experienced at work.

The absence of workplace conditions that provide opportunities for professional fulfillment has profound and negative consequences for work commitment. People recognize the constraints on their performance, and they have a clear sense of their low
Reform efforts directed toward the improvement of the educational system, which ignored the impact of teachers' perceptions of the workplace had very little chance for success. The teachers' perception of the ultimate consequences created by the implementation of any proposed change determined the involvement, effort, and commitment the teacher extended toward the success of that change. Thus, educational reform efforts hinged on the teachers' perception of the reform which ultimately determined how the implementation of the reform was carried out, thereby affecting the success of the reform itself.

The impetus for changes in the workplace occurred in some school systems through the implementation of a year-round calendar schedule used to increase building capacity as a means to alleviate overcrowding (see Chapter 2 for various descriptions of year-round plans and history of year-round education). The term "year-round school" in this study referred to schools operating on a 60-15 plan with five tracks rotating throughout the school year, which allowed the students to complete 180 days of instruction in one year. This plan increased the building capacity 25 percent (Glines, 1990; Helton, 1975). The workplace of the year-round school operationalized through the perceptions of the teachers working within the phenomenon was the focus of this study.

An investigation into the workplace conditions of year-round schools was considered useful and worthwhile to building administrators interested in improving teachers' task performance within the school.
Descriptive research on the workplace of the year-round schools was unavailable in the literature. In order to implement meaningful changes in the year-round schools' workplace for the purpose of enhancing the quality of education, research was needed to describe the essential workplace features of a year-round school.

Statement of the Problem
The purpose of the study was to examine the totality of the workplace of a selected year-round school as conceptualized by Johnson (1990). The major question was: What were the teachers' perceptions of the year-round school's workplace? Subordinate to the main question were the following:

1. What were the teachers' perceptions of the physical feature of the year-round school workplace?
2. What were the teachers' perceptions of the organizational feature of the year-round school workplace?
3. What were the teachers' perceptions of the cultural feature of the year-round school workplace?
4. What were the teachers' perceptions of the psychological feature of the year-round school workplace?
5. What were the teachers' perceptions of the sociological feature of the year-round school workplace?
6. What were the teachers' perceptions of the economic feature of the year-round school workplace?
7. What were the teachers' perceptions of the political feature of the year-round school workplace?
Significance of the Study

In the Sun Belt of the United States of America school enrollment increased due to population migration into the area. This factor in addition to increasing demands on public dollars (Bayles, 1979) and a federal policy of reaffirming that education is a state and local responsibility (Shanker, 1986) resulted in an increasing interest in year-round schools. Both educators and the general public began turning to year-round schools as an alternative to new and dollar-consuming school construction (Gottschalk, 1986).

However, in the face of this growing tendency to select the year-round school schedule as a means for accommodating growing numbers of students, the need for examining the consequences of this alternative became evident. Research concerning academic achievement levels of students, financial savings, implementation procedures, and historical studies had been done. These studies determined that year-round schools offered no significant advantages in the area of student achievement. Financial savings were not achieved. Building costs were reduced; however, the operation of year-round schools was found to cost more than nine-month schools. Thus, the original motivation of realizing cost savings through the year-round school calendar implementation was not achieved. However, White (1990) argued that year-round schools schedules saved more than new building constructions cost. He lamented that Jefferson County, Colorado had not realized the 87.7 million dollars of bonded indebtedness and 20 million dollars in capital reserve savings the year-round schedule had provided before termination of its multi-track
year-round school program. White (1990) referred to these cost savings as unreported or hidden cost savings.

Johnson (1990) and others proclaimed the importance of the work environment or workplace as a hidden key to successful schools. Yet no study to date had focused on the year-round schools' workplace. The workplace in which the teaching-learning act took place impacted on the commitment and effort teachers were willing to contribute toward student learning. Perceptions teachers had toward each of the workplace features influenced student achievement, parental support for the school, and efforts towards changing curriculum, as well as an accommodation to a year-round calendar. Thus, change in calendar from nine months to twelve months required a study of teachers' perceptions of the year-round school's workplace. Further, literature revealed that the workplace of the year-round school was distinctly different from that of the nine-month school.

The most apparent difference between nine-month and year-round school was the scheduling of student attendance. Year-round schools operated on a rotating schedule which did not allow for the entire student body or staff members working at the school site to meet at any one given time (Goldman, 1990; Moortgat, 1976). This contrasted with the nine-month calendar school year in which students and staff shared the same breaks and work schedules throughout the year. Gilbert Stevenson, a principal at Willow Canyon Elementary School in Sandy, Utah, and Ruben Carriedo, an administrator in the San Diego Unified School District, found that everything they did for students and teachers had to be done multiple
times due to one group always being out on break (Haney, 1990). Communication, isolation, and long-range planning of educational goals, due to the constant rotation of the multiple tracks were identified as workplace constraints for year-round schools (Goodman, 1990; Haney, 1990).

A second area of difference was the allocation of space. Year-round schools, unlike traditional schools, shared rooms, usually on a rotating schedule, with the teacher and students coming in from a 15-day break taking the classroom of the teacher and students going on the 15-day break. In this manner, teachers and students changed rooms three or more times in one year (Goldman, 1990; Stiff, 1986; Merino, 1983).

Educators are not used to packing and unpacking every eight to ten weeks. Teachers' classrooms have always been theirs for at least the year, and in many cases, years. Historically teachers feel an ownership of a particular classroom. One never dreamed the day would come that sharing rooms would be required. Year-round schools require many things - the greatest of which is sharing (Stiff, 1986, p. 14).

The traditional calendar teacher remained in the same classroom from the beginning of the year through to the end of the year and might even have had the same classroom in the same building year after year. The allocation of space and space utilization within the school differed from that of the nine-month school calendar.

Goodman (1990) argued that year-round schedules adversely affected principals' ability to provide leadership and direction for the school, which caused principals to experience increased levels of stress and dissatisfaction in the workplace. "It definitely takes its toll on you, ...."
You never have time like other principals to sit down without interruption to do planning and organization" (Goldman, 1990, p. 25). Sherman Sheffield, executive director of the Utah Association of Elementary School Principals, stated that several Utah principals accepted the state's offer of early retirement incentives during a recent window period due to the desire to escape the stress of conducting another year-round school calendar (Goldman, 1990).

The tradition of the long summer break for teachers, students, and administrators inherited from an agrarian society was another difference between nine-month and year-round schools. There were arguments for both views concerning this issue. Some felt that both teachers and children needed a break from the rigors of education. Others felt that the shorter vacation period provided opportunities for self-renewal with the added benefit of cutting down on the time spent on reviewing caused by the long summer break (Ballinger, 1988; Moortgat, 1976). Summer vacations were not only rest periods to rejuvenate; many educators utilized this time to pursue other important personal and professional activities. Teachers stated that the loss of the summer vacation time reduced professional growth opportunities (Webb, 1973). Stiff (1986) found that teachers new to the year-round school calendar were excited at the prospect of vacation periods throughout the year. However, as time passed the excitement waned and the added stress brought on by planning constraints, room changes, and other expectations involved in the year-round school had adverse effects on staff morale, productivity, and the overall learning climate of the school.
Traditionally, major maintenance of a school occurred during summer vacation and winter or spring breaks. It was during these times that projects such as stripping floors, painting, and carpet shampooing had taken place. In the year-round school schedule these maintenance tasks were more difficult to schedule and as a result, the physical plant suffered. The maintenance of the overall physical plant of the year-round school and that of the nine-month school differed (Stiff, 1986; Moortgat, 1976).

Other areas of concern were the lack of summer school opportunities for students needing assistance in critical subjects such as math, reading, and English. In the traditional nine-month school, students enrolled in summer programs offered by the schools as well as by other community agencies. Students attending year-round schools often were left out of remedial educational opportunities and parental options for single parents or working parents in regard to supervision of students on break during rotation periods were limited especially for older children (Stiff, 1986; Moortgat, 1976; Helton, 1975).

Year-round schooling's effect on teacher's attitudes toward the entire teaching-learning act could not be underestimated. Hunt (1974) surveyed 117 school districts that had completed feasibility studies for the implementation of year-round school schedules. The most important predictor of whether or not a district followed through and implemented the year-round schedule was the attitude of teachers and parents. Johnson's (1990) and Rosenholtz's (1989) studies found that teachers' attitudes concerning the work they do were affected by working conditions found in the workplace. Teachers' attitudes concerning the work they do were
shaped by the way the work was organized, the support they received in carrying out the task, and the acknowledgement or rewards attained when the task was completed. It followed that the workplace conditions created by the year-round school schedule had an affect on the attitudes of its teachers.

This study investigated the multifaceted workplace conditions of a year-round school. A study in this area was useful for several reasons. First, the study identified factors in the workplace which teachers perceived as inhibitors and enhancers to teachers' task performance. Second, possible differences in year-round schools and nine-month schools were suggested. Next, the investigation provided a foundation for further research regarding year-round schools. Also, the study provided building administrators with a foundation for implementing changes which would improve the workplace of the year-round schools, which in turn, would enhance teachers' task performance within. Finally, information collected in this study could be used by teacher training institutions to provide training for and understanding of the importance of the workplace in education.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made in the design of this study:

1. Teachers' views of the workplace influenced job satisfaction and performance.
2. Teachers' perceptions impacted upon student achievement by influencing the ways in which teachers interacted with students, parents, and the community.
Delimitations of the Study
The following delimitations were made in the design of this study:
1. Year-round schools in the Clark County School District were limited to the elementary school level.
2. Only teachers who had experienced both traditional nine-month scheduled schools and year-round schools were included in the data which compared nine-month and year-round schedules.
3. No direct observations of classroom instruction were allowed by the Clark County School District as a condition in obtaining permission to conduct the study.

Limitations of the Study
The following limitations were made in the design of this study.
1. This study was limited to one selected elementary school in the Clark County School District.
2. Conclusions were limited to the school involved in the case study.

Theoretical Base of the Study
The theoretical base of this study was the conceptualization of the workplace elucidated by Johnson (1990). The school work environment has been the subject of many recent studies (Conley et al., 1988; Goodman, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989), wherein characteristics of the workplace were found to inhibit or enhance teachers' task performance.
" A workplace is more than a physical setting; it is also the context that defines how work is divided and done, how it is scheduled,
supervised, compensated, and regarded by others." (Johnson, 1990). The comprehensiveness of the workplace as envisioned by Johnson enabled further examination of a complex phenomenon by identifying specific features within. She developed a framework which defined various features of the workplace of schools.

Schools staffed by teachers who are less than satisfied are likely to be schools perceived by teachers, parents, and students as having a greater array of serious problems. Conversely, schools in which teachers are more satisfied with their careers and teaching circumstances are relatively unlikely to be perceived by teachers, parents and students as having serious problems. Happily, these are likely also to be the schools most frequently perceived by students as giving them a good education (Goodlad, 1983, p.178).

Thus, the teachers' perception of the quality of the workplace impacted on the way parents and students viewed the services which the school had provided.

Many studies in recent years confirmed that the work environment or workplace had impacted the content of what teachers teach, how they went about teaching, and how teachers viewed themselves and their job (Johnson, 1990; Conley, Bacharach, & Bauer, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989).

The most powerful influence on the quality of teaching is the environment in which teachers emerge and maintain themselves as professional educators. Although they are the key to establishing quality learning settings, teachers are influenced by the physical and psychological surrounding in which they teach. Further their professional growth within this context must be viewed as developmental and in need of renewal (Andrews, 1983, p.33).
The workplace features of a school modified the ability of the teacher to perform the task of teaching. "If teachers are to succeed in meeting the many social and academic needs of their students, they must work in schools that make good teaching not just possible, but likely" (Johnson, 1990, p. 28). Federal and state mandates, administrators, school district regulation, community special interest groups, teachers, and students all interacted within the context of a school. The sum of these interactions and the physical setting in which the work occurred created the workplace in which the educational process unfolded.

Gecas and Schwable (1983), Hackman and Oldham (1980), and Kanter (1977) concluded that work motivation and commitment had less to do with personal qualities teachers brought to the workplace than with the design and management of the task within it. Workplace conditions not only affected the way teachers perceived themselves and their job, it also determined the actual act of teaching by controlling what materials were used to teach, the amount of time spent, and dictated specific subject goals and objectives (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). The design and management method used to orchestrate workplace features into a workplace had a profound affect on the perceptions of the teachers working within the conditions it created.

Even more to the point, the conditions under which teachers work are increasingly intolerable to people who qualify for jobs in the upper tiers of the American work force, the people who must now be attracted to teaching. Those people tend to think of themselves as professionals. Professional work is characterized by the assumption that the job of a professional is to bring special expertise and judgement to bear on the work at hand. Because their expertise and judgement is
respected and they alone are presumed to have it, professionals enjoy a high degree of autonomy in carrying out their work (Carnegie, 1986, p.36).

Lortie (1975) warned of the lack of professional treatment of teachers in the school’s workplace and its consequences. If schools recruited creative, talented people but failed to provide a workplace in which their creativity and talent were expressed and valued, dissatisfaction, frustration, and burnout occurred (Dworkin, 1987). Johnson (1990), Levine (1985), Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984), Lortie (1975), and Miskel (1972) concurred that the greatest source of teacher satisfaction was derived from the knowledge of individual student success. When workplace features inhibited that success by limiting the teachers’ control over the teaching process, teachers were more likely to attribute student success or failure to extraneous sources. As a result, teachers experienced fewer intrinsic rewards from the act of teaching which in turn, lowered teachers’ levels of commitment and effort expended toward the job.

Dworkin (1987) held that teacher burnout, quitting behavior, and entrapment were caused by teachers’ perception of poor task performance. He testified that teacher burnout was significantly and operationally related to plans to quit. Yet, Dworkin lamented, many who were planning to quit teaching apparently did not. He stipulated that these burned-out individuals were economically forced to stay in teaching, entrapped, burned-out, and no longer effective teachers. Such entrapped teachers, he proclaimed, posed a much greater problem for public education than those who left.

Teachers’ commitment was viewed by Rosenholtz (1989) as teachers’ desire to remain in the teaching profession, attendance patterns,
work investment, and job satisfaction experienced by teachers in the workplace. Solorzano (1983) concurred with Vance and Schlechty (1982) that many effective teachers left the profession physically and/or psychologically. For teachers who remained as well as for those who quit, negative effects were noted: low morale, lack of self-respect, decreased professional confidence, and a general sense of impotency, all of which decreased teacher effectiveness. Poor performance perception caused internally motivated people to search for ways to avoid such feelings in the future and to regain those pleasurable feelings that accompanied good performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). However, when people experienced low internal motivation, they felt dissatisfied and alienated, and subsequently they engaged in a variety of work behaviors that only reinforced their task failure, which included absenteeism from work, low effort expenditure and outright defection. Lyson and Falk (1984), Mark and Anderson (1985), along with Schlechty and Vance (1983) attested that defectors from the teaching profession were the most academically talented individuals. These individuals, at least as revealed by tests of verbal ability, were the very teachers most likely to help students learn (Ekstrom, 1975; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Levin, 1970).

Rosenholtz (1989) confessed that the performance and school commitment of most teachers after the first few years of teaching suffered considerably thereafter. A Metropolitan Life Survey (1986) of former teachers in America disclosed that the most frequently cited reason for teacher attrition was workplace dissatisfaction. Teachers from 78 elementary schools responded to a study done by Rosenholtz (1989), in
which workplace dissatisfaction and burnout were major sources of teacher absenteeism, low work investment, and ineffectiveness in helping students gain academically. Research on the working conditions of teachers suggested that this dismal and discouraging picture may, to no small extent, be reversed if the workplace features which inhibited or enhanced the workplace of teachers were addressed.

Seven distinct features of the workplace emerged from Johnson's (1990) study: physical, organizational, cultural, psychological, economic, political, and sociological. These features did not work independently of one another, but interacted with each other to create a setting in which work was to be done. Workers revealed in interviews that they were affected by the work conditions which surrounded them and that these conditions affected the quality of work they performed. Johnson further defined the seven features of the school workplace by subdividing them into specific areas in which observations and data collection were made. The physical features of the workplace were safety and comfort perceptions, along with space and resource availability. The organizational category included perceptions of authority, workload, autonomy, supervision, specialization, interdependence, and interaction by the teacher. The cultural aspect of the workplace was valued in the strength and supportiveness of the school's culture. The psychological workplace aspects included meaningfulness of the work to the teacher, learning and growth opportunity provided by the work environment, and the amount of stress the worker experienced. Economic aspects of the workplace were refined into incentives and rewards offered to the worker,
pay and benefits received, and job security. The political aspects of the workplace in Johnson's framework centered upon issues of equity and voice in governance within the overall organization. Sociological characteristics of the workplace included the clients, parents as well as students, peers, and status roles which teachers believed existed within the school setting. Further details of Johnson's (1990) workplace concept were placed in Chapter Two of this study.

This study provided an in-depth look at the year-round school's workplace using the conceptualization Johnson (1990) developed in her study of teachers at work. The information collected identified characteristics which were unique to the year-round school setting, provided suggestions for implementing meaningful changes in the workplace, and set a foundation for further studies in the year-round school environment.

**Definition of Terms**

The following defined terms were included in the study:

**Authority**: The perception of teachers as to who made decisions and the influence they had over the decision-making process which was operationalized by teacher's response to the interview questions.

**Cultural**: The degree to which teachers defined common goals and purpose in the workplace, behavioral norms and shared expectations among co-workers, along with the supportiveness perceived by the individual teacher from the school through interaction with colleagues, administrators, and the district as a whole defined the cultural feature of
the workplace. This definition was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Economic**: Teachers' perception of the pay and benefits received, incentives and rewards offered, and their job security defined the economic feature of the workplace. The economic feature was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Equity**: Teacher's perceptions of fairness in the workplace which were operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Extended contract teacher**: A teacher working a 219-day contract or longer.

**Internal rewards**: Teachers' feelings of professional fulfillment in work and the extent of intrinsic recognition received from work was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Meaningfulness of work**: Task requirements which teachers perceived as affecting their work satisfaction were operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Organizational**: Teachers' perceptions concerning how authority was distributed, the extent specialization of tasks occurred, work load expectations, discretionary control exercised, how performance was assessed, the extent to which workers interacted, and the interdependence of responsibilities defined the organizational feature of the workplace. The organizational feature definition was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.
Peer support: Peer actions which facilitated the instructional program of other teachers was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

Physical: Teachers' perception as to the comfort and security of the workplace, along with adequate space and resources allocation to complete their job defined the physical feature of the workplace. This term was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

Political: Teachers' perceptions of their treatment in the workplace as being fair and equitable, voice in the overall organization, and the exercise of power within the workplace defined the political feature of the workplace, which was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

Psychological: The extent to which the teacher viewed his/her work as meaningful, the amount of stress the individual perceived, and the opportunities for personal and professional growth or lack thereof in the workplace defined the psychological feature of the workplace. This definition was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

Principal support: Principal's actions which facilitated the instructional program of the school were operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

Regular contract teacher: A teacher working a 184-day contract regardless of placement in a year-round school or a nine-month school.

Role: The perception of teachers as to their job within the workplace and how they interpreted administrators', students', parents',
community's and school district's demands was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Sense of impotency**: The degree to which teachers perceived that circumstances beyond their control influenced student learning more than they did, which was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Sociological**: The characteristics of clients and peers' and teachers' perceptions of their roles and status in the workplace defined the sociological feature of the workplace. This feature was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Status**: Teacher's perceptions of their own status as well as their perception of how the public viewed the teaching profession were operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Student support**: The perception of teachers as to the students' willingness to learn was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Work investment**: The amount of perceived time teachers spent completing work expectations was operationalized by teachers' responses to interview questions.

**Year-round school**: A school attendance pattern whereby students' attendance occurred during a 12-month period rather than a nine-month, September-to-June, traditional-calendar school year, and attendance patterns followed a 60-15 plan with students in school 60 days with a 15-day vacation period to be repeated a total of three times so as to allow a total calendar year of 180 days of instruction for students.
Research Design

An ethnographic case study was used to ascertain the dimensions of a year-round school workplace and lay the foundation for further research. Ethnographies were special cases of field studies, which provided a cultural description of how people described and structured their world (Marshall & Rossman; 1989). Human culture was the crucial concept, one that the researcher described and analyzed fully. Ethnographers attempt to uncover and document participants' perspectives; in this vein teachers were interviewed and observed within their workplace. The researcher's goal was to describe the the year-round school's workplace without passing judgement based upon personal cultural context.

The case study design provided freedom to pursue an in-depth study of uncharted phenomena. Ethnographic studies have been used to describe phenomena within the setting in which they occur. Owens (1987) reported that human behavior was significantly influenced by the context in which it occurred and regularities within the context were often more powerful in shaping behavior than individual differences among the subjects present in the study. Understanding questions on: how the subjects studied interpreted their environment; how they felt and thought; what they valued; what their actions were; and what their perceptions of their environment were, allowed the researcher to describe the workplace of the year-round school based on the data gathered from direct interviews, observation and document analysis collected within the selected year-round school.
The naturalistic investigator views the design as providing an emergent plan for a highly interactive process of gathering data from which analysis will be developed. It is described here as an interactive process because data collection and analysis go on simultaneously, with the analysis giving direction to the data collection by suggesting what to check, when to seek confirmation, and how to extend the data collection itself (Owens, 1987, p. 185).

The phenomenon was explored through direct interview, observation, document analysis, and non-responsive data-collecting techniques. The researcher was the instrument used to collect the data. "Certainly, researchers make decisions about what data to gather, gather them, store and process them, usually without any standardized questionnaires or observation schedules" (Smith & Glass, 1987, p. 264). Personal thoughts and feelings concerning the data collection were recorded in order to identify areas of potential bias on the part of the researcher.

Data were collected during the summer of 1992. During the course of the study, documentation concerning how and when access to various information sources became available was recorded. A tape recorder was used to insure accurate accounts of the interviews and observations. Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the workplace provided structure by which to collect and organize the data. Her seven categories of the workplace facilitated acute analyses of data. After coding the data along the constructs of Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the workplace, the researcher looked for patterns within and among the categories, using the computer program "The Ethnograph." This program enabled the researcher to rearrange coded data into relevant clusters, workplace
features, which allowed for the synthesis and analysis of the vast collection of data in order to describe the year-round school's workplace.

The collection and analysis of data were interrelated (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Analysis consisted of an accrual of perceptions concerning the year-round school's workplace, which enabled patterns of meanings to emerge from the network of information collected and be interpreted through the subjects of the study and the researcher in order to reveal the integrity of the phenomenon, the year-round school workplace. In this manner, the analysis of data consisted of the synthesis of data using the computer program "The Ethnograph" in an effort to explicate the complexity of a year-round school's workplace. Provisional profiles were formulated for each feature of the workplace and the interaction of these features provided signposts for the generation of a description which accurately captured the workplace of the selected year-round school. This description could be used by other researchers in the pursuit of additional data relevant to the workplace of year-round schools or the concept of the workplace in general. Narrative descriptions of the various features of the school workplace were used to present the final analysis and interpret the meaning of the data collected.

**Organization of the Study**

The study was organized along the following order. Chapter One included an Introduction, Statement of the Problem, Assumptions, Delimitations, Limitations, Definition of Terms, Conceptual Framework, and the Research Design. Chapter Two presented a review of the literature concerning a general review of the history of year-round schools in the
United States, the history of year-round schools in Clark County, Nevada, concepts of the workplace and qualitative research and data analyses. Chapter Three described the research design and methodology of the study as well as offering a description of the selected school site, case study protocol, and review of the study's validity. Chapter Four contained data collection and analysis, presenting the results of the interviews in a manner corresponding with the constructs used by Johnson (1990) in describing the workplace. Chapter Five contained a brief review of the problem, significance of the study, workplace theory, and research design, along with a summary of results, conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Chapter Two presented a Review of Literature concerning the history of year-round schools, history of year-round schools in Clark County, Nevada, description of various year-round schedules, workplace features, and qualitative research description.

Historical Review of Year-round Schools

The concept of year-round school calendars was not a recent innovation in the history of American Schools. Some schools were open all year in colonial times. In the nineteenth century a number of school districts conducted educational programs throughout the year. New York, for example, was on a 49 week schedule, Buffalo had a 12-month calendar, and Baltimore, Cincinnati, and Chicago had 11-month schedules. In the early 1900's other school systems lengthened their school year, including, Albuquerque and Newark (Patton & Patton, 1976). Support for the extended school year was given impetus primarily by interested reform groups with financial support from philanthropists (Helton, 1975). The definition of a year-round school has varied from school district to school district. All school systems, regardless of type of plan had approximately 180 days of instruction spread over an entire year (Patton & Patton, 1976).
Few year-round plans were initiated after the onset of the economic crash of 1929, and the Depression took its toll of existing plans as revenues for the support of schools declined. Since most all-year schools cost more to operate, popularity waned as time passed. The year-round school was rediscovered in the 1960's and 1970's due to the influx of baby boomers into the school system and the unwillingness of electorates to expend financial resources on the construction of new schools. The 1960's were a time of increased discussion concerning the year-round school concept. Advantages and disadvantages were debated back and forth in educational journals and in mass-circulation magazines. Perhaps the most significant factors in creating interest were overcrowded school conditions and the desire to keep tax rates down (Howell, 1988). The early 1960's produced a few plans that were actually implemented, but a large number of authors proposed adoption of different plans. It was not until the late 1960's that school districts began to put these plans into effect. Year-round schools were reborn in 1969-71, peaked in 1976 with over 600 schools in 28 states, and by 1980 had declined to 287 schools. By 1986-87, the number had risen to 408 public schools in 14 states, mostly elementary schools. California's Proposition Thirteen accounted for 291 of the year-round school openings in the 1986-87 school year (Howell, 1988). Approximately 600 schools nationwide began the 1989-90 school year on a 12-month calendar, a 20 percent increase over the 1988-89 school year (Stover, 1989).

The adoption of the year-round calendar was based on external pressures which originated from social concerns centered upon
underprivileged youths, the demand to provide for a more adequate transition of the teenager into the work force, the search for solutions to the long summer recreational problem for urban youth, and in most cases overcrowded school buildings coupled with the desire to save money in construction costs (Helton, 1975; Moortgat, 1976).

In addition to the external pressures for changing the school calendar year, Moortgat (1976) noted internal pressures within the field of education that year-round schooling was thought to reduce. These internal pressures included overcrowded conditions which existed in many schools, the lack of adequate financial support, the desire to improve the status of the teaching profession, and the need to prevent student regression, (Helton, 1975, Moortgat, 1976).

However, at the same time that these internal and external pressures were exerted to influence a calendar change, opposing forces against any revision of the traditional nine-month school year applied countervailing force to maintain the status quo. Thus, widespread doubts existed over the merits of the year-round school concept. When local boards and administrators attempted to reach a decision about the value of year-round schools, they were often beset by claims and counterclaims from both the proponents and opponents of the concept. These claims generally centered upon three issues; economic, educational, and social.

As more school districts sought year-round school calendars to solve both external and internal educational problems, the importance of evaluating the various aspects of the year-round program became self-evident. Extensive research revealed that the economical effectiveness of
the year-round school and the effects of the year-round school on student achievement were uncertain. The research results were inconclusive as to whether the year-round school provides advantages or disadvantages in economic areas or student achievement (Helton, 1975; Moortgat, 1976; Harlan, 1973; McCraley, 1975; Matty, 1978; Smith & Glass, 1987). Other research on year-round schools provided descriptions of various year-round plans used in the United States as well as their history.

Research directed at the economics of year-round schools yielded a variety of findings. Some districts postponed or avoided large capital outlays on school facilities by adopting a particular year-round plan which increased building utilization. Instructional costs were lowered in some cases by not increasing staff salaries in proportion to the amount of increased work required by the additional students and the time the year-round calendar demanded. However, it was found that additional costs were incurred by the year-round plan for operational budget items such as maintenance, transportation, and heating/cooling (Howe, 1973; Baker et al., 1978; Knapp et al., 1978; Warren, 1975; Chapman, 1983).

The documented research on the educational issues in year-round schools indicated that 12-month schools did not endanger the health of students or teachers (Moortgat, 1976). Both students and teachers expressed a generally favorable attitude toward the particular plan in effect at their school. Failure rates of year-round students did not differ greatly from those of traditional-year pupils. Year-round administrators reported increased workloads without any increased compensation and teacher in-
service and training programs were eliminated or sharply curtailed under some year-round plans (Ricketts, 1976; Cordova et al., 1970; Kamp, 1980).

A review of data concerning the social issue in year-round schools revealed that parents generally had more favorable attitudes toward year-round schools after having had some experience with them. Merino (1983) indicated that some minority populations lacked the political voice to express concerns regarding year-round school calendars. No study to date focused on the attitudes of teachers in year-round schedules in classrooms with large numbers of minority students. Teachers in bilingual education programs were especially affected by the loss of long vacation periods that were often used to develop proficiency in a second language. Teachers of students with a wide range of abilities reported an increased burden in curriculum planning as problematic. Most arguments favoring year-round schools lacked documented evidence required for general acceptance (Carpenter, 1977; Hill, 1980; McDaniel, 1976; Russell, 1976).

In summation, the United States had one of the fewest calendar-day school years in the world. The concept of extending the school year in the U.S. was not new. In the early 1900's year-round schools were developed to accelerate student learning and provide opportunities for socially disadvantaged youths. Reformists thought that increasing the amount of time students spent in school would decrease crime and violence and increase the productivity of the work force (Moortgat, 1976). Most year-round school implementation had been triggered by overcrowding. The overcrowded school then continued on a year-round schedule, which increased building capacity, until student population declined or new
schools were built. While the number of students attending the school increased, however the actual number of instructional days did not change. The economic burden on schools caused by increased instructional days for students has been a major deterrent to the implementation of a year-round schedules of that nature. However, in some instances, extended-year programs for special education students had been mandated by the judicial system at the district's expense, when educational recoupment of learned skills by the student fell short of the three-month time allotment. In most instances, however, school districts implemented year-round schedules to alleviate overcrowding, and discontinued year-round scheduling when new buildings were available or student population declined. Year-round schools increased and receded with the ebb and flow of the community, depending upon the number of students within the community and the availability of space in the schools.

**Description of Year-round School Schedules**

**Four-quarter Plan**

In the four-quarter plan the calendar was divided into four quarters, and the student population was divided into four corresponding groups. Each group was required to attend three quarters and to take a vacation during the fourth quarter. Teachers had the option of working the fourth quarter if they wished. Other versions of the four-quarter plan required students to attend all four quarters, or required three quarters' attendance with optional attendance during the fourth quarter. This variation gave
students the option of attending all four quarters, thereby accelerating their progress through school. In 1968, Atlanta, Georgia schools adopted this type of four-quarter plan. Bluffton, Indiana used this plan in 1904, and a number of other systems tried it during the 1920's.

45-15 PLAN

The 45-15 plan appeared to be particularly adaptable to the rapidly growing suburban school systems because it tended to increase the amount of available classroom space without the immediate necessity of constructing new buildings. Under this plan a student attended school for 45 days and then was allowed a 15-day vacation. One-fourth of the student population was on vacation while the other three-fourths attended school.

The plan did not lengthen the period of time a student spent in school nor did it accelerate students for earlier graduation. Although attendance was staggered throughout the year, students continued to attend school a total of 180 days.

In most of the 45-15 plans, teachers had the option of working all year for a salary increase or follow the same vacation pattern as the students. In some cases teachers had the option of working a shorter year or teaching "intercession" courses during the 15-day vacation period.

The 9-3 plan was the same as the 45-15 plan, except that the time period is expressed in weeks instead of days. In 1969, the Becky-David school near St. Louis, Missouri, adopted a 9-3 plan, and in 1970 the Valley View, Illinois district adopted a 45-15 plan. The Clark County School
District (CCSD) in Las Vegas, Nevada adopted the 45-15 plan in 1973, later abandoning it for the 60-15 plan.

**Trimester**

The basic form of the trimester plan divided the school year into three trimesters of about 90 days each for a total school year of 270 days. Students attended two of three trimesters to satisfy minimum attendance requirements. The plan operated on a rotating basis with two groups in school and one on vacation.

As in the case of the four-quarter plan, other variations of the trimester plan have been implemented. One variation divided the school year into trimesters of 68 to 75 days each. Class periods were lengthened to provide the same amount of instructional time as the minimum 180 day requirement. Another variation known as the split trimester had two equal sessions of about 70 days each, and a third session which contained two terms of 35 days each. Attendance was required the first two and one-half sessions. Attendance was optional the last one-half term. The purpose of this plan was to permit acceleration at an acceptable rate. The Florida State Lab School operated on this plan from 1963 to 1966. Nova High School in Fort Lauderdale, Florida used the trimester for several years.

**Quadrimester**

Under the quadrimester plan, the school year was divided into four terms of 51 to 55 days each which created a school year of 204 to 220 days. Class period lengths were increased, and students completed two regular semesters in three quadrimesters. This plan was designed for
student acceleration in order that students might complete one year's work in three quadrimesters. New courses started as soon as current ones were completed, and students advanced into the next year's work much faster than under the regular school calendar.

**Quinmester**

The quinmester plan divided the school year into five sessions of about 45 days each. Students attended four sessions and had the option of attending the fifth quinmester or using it for vacation time. By choosing to attend the fifth quinmester, students accelerated their progress through school.

This plan was designed to permit a greater utilization of school facilities by having 80 percent of the students in school and 20 percent on vacation. Dade County (Miami), Florida initiated the plan in 1971.

**Extended Year**

In the extended year plan, student attendance ranged from 203 to 216 days. The school year was continuous. After completing the 180-day minimum attendance requirement, students received credit for completing a year's work. Since the school year was extended, the student immediately continued into the next year's work during the same school year. In this manner the student gained additional time each year on work for the next grade level.

This plan reduced the number of years a student attended school, since a student completed seven years work in six years. In the State of New York two pilot programs using extended school year plans were
conducted at Commack and at the School of Human Resources for the Physically Handicapped.

**Flexible All-year School**

The flexible all-year plan differed from other plans because it had no set beginning or end. Individualized time and calendar usage allowed students and teachers to vacation any time during the year. However, they were required to be in school for the minimum number of days required by law.

The individual student selected his/her school calendar and course of study with the assistance of the school staff. Acceleration was possible, but not mandatory under this plan. The plan operated in 1975 at the lab schools of Clarion State College in Pennsylvania and Mankto State College in Minnesota.

**60-15 Plan**

The 60-15 plan extended the school year approximately 11 1/2 months. The student population was divided into five tracks. One track was on vacation and the remaining four tracks remained in school. Students attend school for approximately 60 days and experienced a vacation period of approximately 15 days. Teachers rotated in and out with the students, experienced the same vacation days, and taught the same students throughout the school year. Specialist teachers worked an extended contract, usually 219 days. They scheduled 10 vacation days throught the year and provided instruction to all students attending the year-round school. Clark County School District of Las Vegas, Nevada
adopted this plan in 1990 after conducting research and experimenting with alternative plans.

**Year-round Schools In Clark County School District**

The first year-round school in Clark County, Nevada, opened in 1973. Fay Herron Elementary School under the guidance of Fenton Tobler began a 45-15 plan in response to overcrowding. A survey was conducted to assess the community's views on the solutions provided by the school board for the overcrowding problem prior to Fay Herron's transition to year-round scheduling. In essence, the community had two choices, either re-zone the area sending, some students to neighboring schools, or initiate a 45-15 calendar change. A survey was conducted to determine which plan parents preferred; over 65 percent were in favor of the year-round plan. Fay Herron became the first year-round school in the CCSD. Parents preferring a nine-month calendar received zone variances for neighboring schools, with the understanding that they, the parents, were responsible for transportation.

Fay Herron continued to be Clark County's only year-round school until it was joined by Tomiyasu in 1979, and then Gragson followed in 1980. Edwards, Galloway, and Mountain View changed to the 45-15 plan due to overcrowding in 1983. In 1984, Decker, Diskin, Dondero, Craig, Ira J. Earl, Hewitson, Mack, Ronnow, and Wengert joined the ranks of year-round schools. The next phase of year-round schools to open were Sewell in 1989 and Mendoza in March of 1990. In the fall of 1990, the
following schools opened as year-round schools: Clyde Cox, David Cox, Cunningham, McMillan, Thomas, and Woolly.

As of 1993, there were 27 year-round schools in Clark County. The primary influence on the year-round scheduling has been the internal issue of overcrowding and the lack of financing for new schools. There were several exceptions: Mendoza and several other elementary schools opened on a single track 60-15 plan. Students zoned for Mendoza had attended a year-round school prior to the construction of Mendoza, and parents demanded the year-round schedule. A single-track 60-15 plan was instituted at Clyde C. Cox, Lois Craig, Woolley, and Mendoza elementary schools in the fall of 1991; it did not provide the extra space utilization that the multiple track provided. The move to a single-track plan enhanced educational opportunities for students within the school by offering remedial and extracurricular activities during "vacation times."

CCSD policy called for the opening of year-round schools near nine-month schools in order to provide parental choice of a school calendar. Parent choice was one of the key components used to gain the acceptance of the year-round scheduling. Pearson Elementary School avoided the year-round schedule through parent protest at a school board meeting in the spring of 1990. The parents chose portable classrooms and flexible double sessions over the year-round schedule. As new schools were built, parent opposition to or support of the year-round schedule often determined the school's calendar.

In the spring of 1990, the school board passed a trigger policy regarding school overcrowding and year-round schedules. The policy
stated that when a school's student population reached a specific percentage above building capacity, it would automatically become a year-round school. This policy could greatly effect the success or failure of changing from a nine-month calendar to a year-round calendar. Merino (1983) indicated that the success or failure of year-round schools often depended upon the acceptance or rejection of the schedule by the community and in particular by the parents.

Another change implemented in all year-round schools commenced in the fall of 1990. This change was the conversion to a 60-15 year-round plan for all year-round schools operating in the CCSD. The advantages of moving to a 60-15 schedule from the 45-15 initiated the change. The first advantage was meeting the 180 day attendance required by state law. The 45-15 plan did not meet the state requirement due to holidays during the school year. The district had received waivers from the state concerning the attendance law to utilize the 45-15 plan. With the change to the 60-15 calendar, students met the attendance requirement. The school-year starting date coincided with the nine-month schools, and a minimum of two weeks between school years in which students and teachers do not report to the school was established. This change allowed time for maintenance and repairs to the physical plant, provided a common time when all of the children in a family were out of school, and allowed the office staff time to close out one school year prior to beginning the next. As well new teachers were able to attend in-services and money was saved by changing to the 60-15 plan by reducing the number of required
substitute days for specialist teachers (art, music, library, and physical education).

The disadvantages of converting to the 60-15 plan from the 45-15 plan were few. One was the need to plan for five groups of students in the 60-15 as opposed to four groups in the 45-15 plan. A second disadvantage was that the building capacity was reduced from 133 percent to 122 percent by the transition. This reduction decreased the cost effectiveness of the year-round school. Also, the number of students present in the building increased from 75 percent in the 45-15 plan to 80 percent of building capacity in the 60-15 plan.

CCSD, due to overcrowding, has had little trouble implementing a year-round schedule. There was little evidence which indicated that the move to year-round scheduling has been educationally sound or educationally harmful, cost effective or ineffective (excluding the money expenditures saved by reduced construction costs). The major roadblocks to program implementation were parents, but when faced with rezoning or double sessions to avoid year-round plans, parents in most cases have chosen the year-round program. While CCSD has implemented an ambitious construction plan, conflict over whether new elementary schools opened on a year-round or nine-month schedule persisted.

The School Workplace
Theoretical Base

Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the teacher's workplace provided the underpinning for a critical look at the year-round school.
Johnson envisioned seven workplace features that affect teacher job performance and ultimately, pupil performance. The seven features of the workplace consisted of: physical, organizational, cultural, psychological, economic, political, and sociological. Each of these features contained distinctive elements which further impacted teachers' perceptions of the workplace. The features and their subdivisions were examined within the framework detailed below:

**Physical**: Teachers' perception as to the comfort and security of the workplace, along with adequate space and resources available to complete the job, were used to describe the physical feature of the workplace.

**Organizational**: Teachers' perceptions of how authority was distributed, to what extent specialization of tasks occurred, work load expectations, discretion workers exercised, how performance was assessed, the extent to which workers interacted, and the interdependence of responsibilities were used to describe the organizations feature of the workplace.

**Psychological**: The extent to which teachers viewed their work as meaningful, the amount of stress perceived, and the opportunities for personal and professional growth or lack thereof in the workplace were used to describe the psychological feature of the workplace.

**Cultural**: The degree to which teachers defined common goals and purpose in the workplace, behavioral norms and shared expectations among co-workers, along with the supportiveness perceived by the
individual teacher from the school, fellow-employees and the district as a whole were used to(142,342),(987,827) describe the cultural feature of the workplace.

**Economic:** Teachers' perception of the pay and benefits received, incentives and rewards offered, and their job security were used to define the economic feature of the workplace.

**Political:** Teachers' perceptions of their treatment in the workplace as being fair and equitable, voice in the overall organization, and the exercise of power within the workplace were used to describe the political feature of the workplace.

**Sociological:** The characteristics of clients and peers and teachers' perceptions of their roles and status in the workplace were used to define the sociological feature of the workplace.

Recent research studies investigated the importance of the work environment or workplace on teaching, learning, and the success of schools (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1982; Hall, 1976; Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989, Soloranzo, 1983, Vance & Schlechty, 1982). "Teaching is a high turnover, early exit occupation. Working conditions leave much to be desired" (Carnegie Foundation, 1986, p. 98). The driving thought of the Carnegie task force was that unless the quality of teachers' working conditions are addressed, other problems facing our schools will not be solved (Lewis, 1986). Lortie (1975) used a number of sources and strategies to collect information on "teaching work" and the "outlook" of teachers. He analyzed historical reviews, conducted local and national surveys, studied the research of others, and conducted interviews. Lortie found that the sentiments of teachers reflected their daily tasks and the
realities of classroom life. He reported the salaries teachers earn and the conditions under which they work had an effect upon the way they viewed themselves and their work. Lortie's studies emphasized the need for professionalism in education for both teachers and principals. He defined teacher professionalism and laid the foundation for further research on the workplace. Examining the workplace of teachers, Johnson (1990) identified critical environmental characteristics by utilizing interview techniques and qualitative data analysis.

**Physical Feature**

Johnson (1990) reported that the physical aspects of the workplace contained four subcategories: safety, comfort, space, and resources. "If valued teachers are to commit their intellect, ingenuity, and enthusiasm to teaching, they must know that they will have the right space and the right tools to do the job" (Johnson, 1990, p. 79). Teachers also required a safe, comfortable workplace to conduct meaningful instruction. Educators and architects suggested that high-quality environments improve the educational program (Christopher, 1990). "The Interface Project and a study done on the effects of the physical environment of schools on students have quantified how and why the physical environment affects education" (Christopher, 1990, p. 2).

Safety and comfort issues centered around the conditions of the physical plant and the perception of teachers as to their physical safety and that of the students they teach. A 1989 report by the Education Writers Association indicated that at least 25 percent of the nation's schools were in an inadequate condition, of which 80 percent were estimated to pose
some type of environmental hazard to students and staff. "Teachers generally agreed that a well-maintained, clean school promoted higher morale among teachers and better behavior among students" (Johnson, 1990, p. 67).

Johnson and others discovered that the space and resources available not only affected teachers' commitment and job satisfaction, but also impacted on what was to be taught and how the teaching was to be done (Rosenholtz, 1989; deCharms & Muir, 1978). One of the most valuable resources a teacher possessed was time. In its report, "A Nation Prepared," the Carnegie Task Force (1986) noted that teachers spent between 10 and 50 percent of their time on non-instructional duties. These duties included extraneous clerical work and supervisory duties such as monitoring cafeteria, bathrooms, detentions, recess, buses, and hallways. Skilled support help was rarely available, nor the time to do the job the way teachers felt it needed to be done. The non-teaching assignments allowed the teacher less time to accomplish teaching duties such as teaching, tutoring students, correcting, grading, and conducting parent conferences (Johnson, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989).

The Carnegie Task Force (1986) also affirmed that teachers were constantly running out of supplies as well as time. Johnson (1990) discovered considerable evidence which suggested that teachers adapted their teaching to available supplies and equipment. "The bureaucratic rules regulating the purchase of supplies in public schools, coupled with administrators' reported penchant for controlling expenditures, greatly diminished teachers' influence over the supplies and equipment of the
trade" (Johnson, 1990, p. 70). Teachers used money out of their own pocket, illegal copying practices, and fund-raisers to buy supplies for instruction (Johnson, 1990). "A Nation Prepared" observed that other professionals had a host of machines and services which improved their efficiency in countless ways, from computers and copy machines to telephones and adequate work space (Carnegie, 1986). Teachers, however, were not afforded this luxury in regard to space allocation and equipment availability.

Christopher (1990) argued that most successful environments were friendly to the users, creating a space where teachers felt at home and welcome. Great schools provided a variety of spatial experiences from large group meeting halls to small reading alcoves. Each space was treated differently in accordance with use and need. Staff and students encountered a variety of experiences which fostered renewal and excitement (Christopher, 1990). Space within schools, Christopher pleaded, should be provided to teachers which reflected their professional standing. These spaces should be equipped with the necessary tools to assist the teacher in accomplishing their educational objectives (Christopher, 1990; Johnson, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Organizational Feature

The organizational aspects of the workplace included authority structures, autonomy, workload, the degree of task specialization, supervision of teachers, and the amount of interdependence and interaction between staff members (Johnson, 1990).
Bureaucratic management of schools proceeds from the view that teachers lack the talent or motivation to think for themselves. Properly staffed schools can only succeed if they operate on the principle that the essential resource is already inside the school: determined, intelligent and capable teachers. Such schools will be characterized by autonomy for the school as a whole and the collegial relationships among its faculty (Carnegie, 1986, p. 58).

The most popular model for organizational authority used in schools was better suited to business or government than to the function of education. Bacharach, Baur, and Conley's (1986) study maintained that bureaucratic organizations provide direction for work activities. However, the overuse of rules often associated with bureaucracies infringed upon autonomy, increased the mundaneness, and routinized teachers' work activities causing alienation, dissatisfaction, and decreased opportunities to experience challenges at work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Hoy, Blazovsky & Newland, 1983; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982). Conley et al. (1988) studied 87 school districts in New York and asserted that professionals accepted bureaucratization to the degree that it clarified their role in the organization. This view is held by Organ and Greene's (1981) study, which disclosed role ambiguity and routinization were dissatisfiers commonly identified by teachers in public school organizations.

Teachers in some schools were required to file reports listing the number of minutes they intended to devote to each subject, detailed accounts of their compliance with special education plans, and their own lesson plans for subsequent weeks. Often they suspected that no one read these documents (Johnson, 1990, p. 130).
Teachers often worked in an environment filled with bureaucracy. Rules made by others to govern their behavior were often viewed as paperwork exercises which complied with hyper-rationalized regulations. Schools responded to teachers as if outside sources such as consultants, school district experts, textbook authors, and politically elected or appointed officials possessed more relevant expertise than the teachers in the school (Carnegie, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989). This view of the teacher along with hyper-rationalized rules and regulations put forth by special interest groups operating internally and externally from the schools' organizational structure undermined teachers' authority, status, and workplace commitment (Rosenholtz, 1989). Power deprivation was divulged to be a significant predictor of the amount of stress experienced by teachers in the workplace (Freldman, 1986; Calabrese, 1987).

Principals and teachers must contend with strong organizational forces in public education that suppress variation in favor of standardized treatment of students in large schools and classes with uniform, though not necessarily distinguished, outcomes (Johnson, 1990, p. 110).

Bacharach, Baur, and Conley (1986) contended that three requirements had to be met before expectations for high performance from professionals could result. The first was placing quality people in organizational openings. They reported that educational organizations lacked the resources and incentives to compete with other segments of the economy to attract the top students to the teaching profession. The next requirement revealed was that professionals must be rewarded for their accomplishments. Unlike other professions, teaching rewards or acknowledgement of accomplishments proved difficult. Teachers worked
with students of varying abilities and did not complete the educational process of any one student. As a result, many teachers depended on the perceptions that they themselves, administrators, peers, parents, and students had in regard to work accomplishments. The final requirement stated was that the structure and work activity must be organized in such a way that professional employees can achieve their goals.

Hall's (1976) study of teacher job satisfaction concurred that critical factors for career success were linked to high levels of autonomy and support for goal-directed activity in the workplace. "When teachers find themselves restrained and inhibited by problems of the workplace ... it is reasonable to expect frustration and dissatisfaction to set in" (Goodlad, 1983, p. 180). Bacharach, Baur, and Conley's (1986) study, along with Benson's (1983) study, asserted that teachers needed to view themselves as professionals. The studies decreed that high levels of autonomy, self-evaluation, and involvement in decision making led to increased job satisfaction and self-perceptions of professionalism by the teachers. However, the researchers also observed that the professional needs of teachers often conflicted with their role as members of a bureaucratic organization, and bureaucratic organizations hinder professionalism through rules and procedures instituted in an attempt to increase predictability within the organization. Organizational workplace conditions of schools created some of the major problems associated with the lack of autonomy and professionalism (Rosenholtz, 1989).

Moe and Chubb (1991) declared that good schools gave maximum autonomy to their teachers and choice to the clients of the schools. An
article titled, "America's Troubled Principals" (Frehoff, 1992) reasoned that principals who extended autonomy to teachers are leaders not bosses. As such, principals of schools were required to work at creating an environment of trust and cooperation in the workplace. "America's Troubled Principals" advocated teachers' participation in decision making and encouraged principals and teachers to work together as team members striving for the same goal.

Because professionals themselves are expected to have the expertise they need to do their work, organizations that employ professionals are not typically based on the authority of supervisors, but rather on collegial relationships among the professionals. This does not mean no one is in charge, but it does mean that people practicing their profession decide what is to be done and how it is to be done within the constraints imposed by the larger goals of the organization (Carnegie, 1986, p. 39).

Judgement and choice concerning the methods, supplies, and organization of the work at hand allowed teachers to realize themselves as causal agents in their own performance. Personal experience of responsibility for the outcomes of work and believing that their achievements were attributable directly to their own efforts led to greater workplace commitment and job satisfaction. The extent to which work provided substantial freedoms, independence, and individual discretion in carrying out tasks defined the level of autonomy experienced in the workplace (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Johnson, 1990; Kanter, 1977)

Losing the capacity to control the terms of work, to determine what work to do and how the work was to be done or what its aim was to be, widened the gap between the knowledge of one's unique contributions and any
performance-based self-esteem derived from it. Results no longer reflected individual efforts, and people became estranged and alienated, unwilling to accept personal responsibility for their performance (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983; Kanter, 1977; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Discretion and control over classroom decisions directly influence teachers' success with students and their ability to accrue psychic rewards. Discretion over critical matters related to classroom instruction allows teachers to accommodate the varied learning needs of individual students within their class. To impair the adaptation of curricular content or instructional strategies to improve the fit between what teachers do, on the one hand, and students' differences on the other, is unwittingly to program both student and teacher for greater academic frustration and failure (Rosenholtz, 1989, p. 424).

Teachers experienced fewer psychic rewards due to less success with students or perceptions created by the workplace which led teachers to believe they were not responsible for student achievement. Psychic rewards for teachers and knowledge of success are cited as the most powerful motivators in the workplace. The strongest source of psychic rewards came from students. The second source was based on comments from colleagues, parents, and administrators (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Johnson, 1990; Kanter, 1977; Lortie, 1975; McLaughlin, Pfiefer, Swanson-Owens & Yee, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Professional independence and discretion bolster motivation, responsibility, and commitment, while lack of workplace autonomy is frequently cited as a reason for dissatisfaction, absenteeism and defection (Rosenholtz, 1989, p. 424).
Feldman's 1986 study warned that the lack of decision making powers and unimportant treatment of teachers had a dehumanizing effect which was believed to cause teacher burnout. Teachers felt they were not treated with respect and trust normally associated with professionals possessing any level of expertise. Johnson (1990) added that teachers who participated in decisions which affected their work experienced a degree of personal autonomy in the workplace that enhanced their professional identity and tended to express increased satisfaction from work. Brissie (1988) attested that lower levels of organizational rigidity and higher levels of participation were associated with lower levels of reported teacher burnout.

The demanding workload of teachers was proclaimed as a major source of overall work stress in Friesen and Prokop's 1988 study titled, "Why Teachers Burn Out." They included disciplining of students and meeting their needs, class size, split grades, shortage of time, policies and expectations of central office, and changing curricula as adding to the teacher's workload. Researchers noted that large class size and the nature of the students in regard to learning and behavioral disorders impacted on teacher productivity in the workplace (Bruner et al., 1982; Darling-Hammond, 1984). Teachers with large class size or unruly students found themselves policing instead of instructing (Blase, 1986; Goodlad, 1983). Teachers' perception of the workload they are under affected the amount of time and energy they spent on instruction (Friesen & Prokop, 1988; Hunter, 1977). Teachers who overextend their physical and emotional resources dealing with the workload of the school's
workplace experienced perceptions of waning effectiveness after five years of teaching, which deteriorated further after ten years.

**Psychological Feature**

Johnson (1990) defined the psychological feature of the workplace in terms of the meaningfulness of work, the availability of professional and personal growth opportunities, and the amount of stress experienced in the workplace. Mykletun's 1984 study addressed four commonalities in teacher-defined workplace features: social interaction at work, control over the work process, and the perceptions of meaning and pride in their work. Meaningfulness of the work related to the perception of the teachers as to the impact they had on the students they taught.

If work is perceived as unimportant, no matter how much feedback about good job performance people receive and no matter how much task autonomy they possess, there is little basis for self-fulfillment (Rosenholtz, 1989, p. 424).

Teacher's confidence concerning their instructional practices as causing positive changes in their students learning and behavior practices created the meaning teachers placed on the job they did (Rosenholtz, 1989). Teachers required knowledge of the success of their efforts; without such knowledge there was little reason to view their work as meaningful. Hackman and Oldham (1980) articulated that the knowledge of teachers' success can be defined as psychic rewards which are directly related to the meaning teachers placed upon the work itself. Most teachers derived their strongest rewards from positive and academically successful relations with individual students and from external recognition they received from colleagues, parents and principals (Lortie, 1975;
McLaughin, Pifiefer, Swanson-Owens, & Yee, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1989). Holdaway (1978) proclaimed that the most effective source of feedback related to teacher’s perception of accomplishment and success was the students within the classroom.

Dworkin’s 1987 study revealed that teachers who perceived their jobs as important also perceived that they had some control over their students; however, they perceived they had little control over their site administrator. The more important the job was, the more important they felt about themselves. He also acknowledged a significant relationship between perceptions of success in the workplace and positive feedback from students, colleagues, parents, and administrators. The absence of psychic rewards was related to teacher job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, and the desire to leave the workplace (Bredeson, Fruth, & Kaston, 1983; Kasten, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Helping children was recited as the number-one reason for teachers entering the teaching profession (Lortie, 1975; Roberts, Keith, & Page, 1983; Wood, 1978). Teacher efficacy, the belief that they can effect a change in student learning, created the meaningfulness of the work which was done in schools. Research studies have charged that the lack of efficacy, the belief that they cannot make a difference due to a host of undesirable workplace features, caused a staggeringly high attrition rate in new teachers (Mark & Anderson, 1985; Schlechty & Vance, 1983). The effectiveness of the vast majority of those teachers who remained in the profession waned considerably after five years and further decreased
substantially after ten (Katzman, 1971; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Murnane, 1975).

"Once mastered, jobs become routine, tedious, and monotonous unless there is further challenge that stretches people's talent and skills" (Rosenholtz, 1989, p. 424). Teachers need staff development opportunities in order to increase their effectiveness, renew their commitment, and enhance their knowledge and skills as professionals.

Teachers must be acquainted with work at the frontiers of the subjects they teach. They need to be very familiar with a wide range of sophisticated materials, emerging uses of technology, and approaches available to help students with especially difficult problems. They need, too, to be knowledgeable about issues of educational policy, the philosophy of education, and technical aspects of measuring progress (Carnegie, 1986, p. 78).

Johnson (1990) categorized personal and professional growth opportunities in the workplace as a part of the psychological feature of the workplace. Empowering teachers to expand their base of knowledge by providing in-services, encouraging membership in professional organizations, and providing the time necessary to pursue educational and professional goals created more effective teachers and ultimately impacted upon student learning.

Biklen's 1983 study revealed that teachers needed opportunities for occupational self-direction and freedom from over-inhibiting constraints in their work.

Teachers are under more pressure than ever before. They are bombarded by demands from a variety of sources, and these demands have left many wondering if remaining in the profession is worth the effort. Since the values internalized during teacher
training do not seem to operate in the schools, many have become personally and professionally discouraged. Special needs students demand that teachers become more sensitive to their needs; administrators pressure teachers to become more accountable for the effectiveness of teaching; career development specialists prod teachers to help students make better vocational decisions; and computer advocates insist that teachers become more knowledgeable in the application of the new technology. Pressure from so many sources increases, swirls around teachers, and makes them increasingly frustrated (Boy & Pine, 1987, p. 105).

Teachers argued that the greatest obstacle to their task in the workplace resulted from disruption of instructional time (Johnson, 1990). Interruptions of core instructional time due to pull out programs such as Chapter One and special education, announcements made on the intercom by office personnel, and student behavior were mentioned as sources of stress in the workplace. Blase (1986) contended that the major causes of stress for teachers appeared to be: concerns over control of time; lack of time; inappropriately high or low demands on personal capabilities; organizational characteristics that made tasks difficult to perform well; threats to personal needs and values; lack of support; and negative responses to continual sources of stress. Blase (1986) and Sarros (1986) testified that teaching is a stressful occupation. The perceived level of stress teachers experienced within the workplace was related to the work load and the amount of support they received from colleagues and the site administrators; this was found to be particularly true for elementary school teachers (Wiggins, 1988).
Cultural Feature

The culture feature of the workplace encompassed the strength and supportiveness of the culture found within the school. Halpin and Croft's 1963 study included the culture of an organization into a conceptualization referred to as the climate. Halpin and Croft (1963) stated that the climate of a school consisted of the socioeconomic status of the students, personality of the principal and teachers, quality of the students, parental attitudes toward the school, the physical plant, salary schedule, district policy, geographic region, grade level, and social interaction. However, Anderson's (1982) study defined the four distinct categories of climate as ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. Johnson (1990) asserted that the culture of the school was defined by the support those working within the workplace received from each other, established norms, and the clarity of goals and philosophy of the educational process.

Whenever there were people in a formal organization, there were informal groups. Barnard (1938) described informal groups as an aggregate of personal contacts and interactions, usually without a specific conscious joint purpose. This association has "common results," namely the generation of norms and folkways. The direct effects of organization included attitudes, understanding, costumes, values, norms, and ideals as embodied, expressed, and perpetuated through traditions or folkways (Barnard, 1938). Informal authority and communication within organizations established certain attitudes, understandings, customs, habits, institutions; and created the condition under which the formal organization arose (Owens, 1981). The information generated by informal
groups was not communicated through official documents. This information, however, affected individuals' experiences, knowledge, attitudes, and feelings concerning themselves and their work. The culture assisted the individual in maintaining feelings of personal integrity or self-respect.

Organizational culture was found to be expressed by the goals and norms which drove the way people acted within the organization. Emphasis was placed on symbolic communication and methods of documenting and analyzing traditions and lore as a measure of the organizational culture (Owens, 1981). Values and attitudes affected actions while symbolic acts influenced beliefs. The instrumental aspects of organizational administration gained in effectiveness when attention was given to the aesthetic and symbolic dimensions of human experience. Culture shaped people's responses in a strong, yet subtle way (Davis, 1984). Davis reported that culture shock was one of the major reasons why people failed when they left one organization and joined another.

The elements of culture were reported as values which provided a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day-to-day behavior (Davis, 1984). These values were not hard, like structure or policies, but if they were shared by a group of people, were thought to be the fundamental character of their organization (Owen, 1981). These values could be viewed as the philosophy which everyone followed. A successful school was one that followed through with its philosophy or values with action. A successful employee was one who believed in the values of the school and followed through with action. The values were
also communicated to the community which explained what parents could expect from the school.

The culture network was identified as the primary but informal means of communication within the organization (Davis, 1984). This network transmitted information and interpreted the significance of information received. The characters within the communication network included six distinct players: (1) The storyteller, who interpreted what happened based on their own perceptions. Usually these individuals were located in high positions and had access to a lot of information; (2) priests, who had been around a long time and knew everything and everyone; (3) whisperers who had the boss's ear, knew how to read the boss's mind, and built a strong support system throughout the school by remaining current with what was happening within the organization; (4) grapevine Gossips who mainly entertained people with the real story behind the announcement. These people did not have a real claim to power which distinguishes them from the storytellers; (5) spies who were identified as those who voluntarily or unconsciously fed information to others; and (6) cabals, labeled as a group of two or more people joined together to plot a common purpose (Davis, 1984). Together, these characters created the culture of the workplace by communicating behavioral norms for teachers within the school and communicating to parents and students what to expect from the school.

In workplaces with strong cultures workers can expect to find explicit goals and purposes that give meaning and purpose to their individual efforts and clearly define behavioral norms and shared expectations among coworkers. By contrast, workplaces with weak
cultures are more likely to tolerate disengagement, self-interest, and apathy (Johnson, 1990, p. 19).

A strong organizational culture possessed a system of informal rules or norms that defined how people were to behave most of the time. Once people knew what was expected of them, they wasted little time to act in a given situation. A strong culture enabled people to feel better about what they did, so they were more likely to work harder. Culture tied people together and gave meaning and purpose to their day-to-day lives (Owens, 1981).

The existence of multiple cultures in one group was normal. Informal groups existed within all formal organizations. Individuals joined informal groups to attain a self-perceived need. The individual continued his/her membership within the group as long as the group filled the perceived need of the individual. Conflict occurred when subcultures became disconnected from the organization, which caused a weakening or breakdown of the organizational culture (Davis, 1984).

In the absence of clear values about how to succeed in their task, weak school cultures had too many beliefs and could not agree on which were important. Different departments possessed different beliefs. The heroes of the culture were destructive or disruptive and did not build upon any understanding of what was important. The rituals of day-to-day life were either disorganized or contradictory. These schools were found to be inwardly focused, causing them to lose touch with the outside world or short-term focused which inhibited long-term planning.

The culture of a workplace can be strong without being positive or supportive. Some organizations with strong cultures make workers feel like menial laborers rather than entitled members. Some encourage
workers to compete mercilessly rather than attend to each others needs. Some promote compliance and drudgery rather than play and celebration. Some engender humiliation rather than pride (Johnson, 1990, p. 19).

The supportiveness and strength of the school's culture impacted on the way teachers acted and reacted in the workplace. Their willingness to share ideas and problems was related to their perceptions of the school's culture and their particular role within the school's communication network. The level of the support teachers experience in the workplace influences the way they feel about themselves and others.

**Economic Feature**

The economic feature included pay and benefits, incentives and rewards, and job security. Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman's 1959 report concluded that although increased salary had kept people from being dissatisfied with their job, it in itself was not a source of satisfaction. Ashton and Webb (1986) found that teachers became anxious when they believed any one of the following conditions existed: their salaries were lower than other professionals with comparable education and responsibility; salaries had not kept pace with inflation; stereotypes existed about teachers and teaching which lowered the status of the profession; achievements in their teaching went unrecognized by the public and their own administrators; and finally, that blue-collar workers often earned more than they did.

Stinson (1986) reported that American teachers, along with health technicians, lead all other occupational groups as multiple job holders. The National Center for Education Statistics (1986) found that 17 percent
of the 300,000 teachers employed in 1985 were employed outside the school system during the school year. Alley and Ballenger (1990) stated that four times as many teachers moonlight than any other occupation in the United States. They also contend that moonlighting teachers had less time for the preparation of lessons and a higher incidence of illness and absenteeism from work. Economic workplace conditions not only affected job satisfaction but directly harmed effective instruction by creating an environment where teachers felt drained of spirit and enthusiasm, especially when working with reluctant learners (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

However, extra pay incentives for working with reluctant learners was found to be insufficient in maintaining quality teachers. Zarkin (1985) and Bruno (1983) reported that "Combat Pay" was ineffective in attracting and retaining high-quality teachers in workplaces which were hostile to learning. The number-one reward cited by teachers was the knowledge that they made a difference with the students they taught (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989; Lortie, 1975). Adding additional pay without providing a workplace in which teachers perceived themselves as causal agents in students learning did not retain successful teachers.

According to the 1991-1993 agreement between the Clark County Classroom Teachers' Association and the CCSD, teachers assigned to a year-round school may be required to work additional days beyond the 184 days contracted for nine-month teachers. The assignment of additional days was determined by the year-round calendar, the subject taught by the teacher, and was referred to as an "extended contract." Teachers working extended contracts were compensated at their daily rate
of pay for each day worked beyond the 184 customarily contracted days. Daily rate of pay was determined by teachers' achieved education level in conjunction with years of teaching experience accrued. Retirement benefits were enhanced for those teachers who worked the extended contract since retirement income is formulated from annual earnings, which increased by the added days' compensation. Monetary incentives or rewards offered to teachers at year-round schools were limited to the specialists.

Finally, job security was based on a district-wide seniority list which was not an issue in this study due to the growth which existed at the time of the study within the school district as a whole. The extended contract with the increased benefits for retirement and additional pay for additional days worked were the only differences found in the economic feature of the year-round school and that of the nine-month school in CCSD.

**Political Feature**

The political features of the workplace focused on fair and equitable treatment, voice in the overall organization, and the exercise of power within the workplace. "The individual worker often speaks about the extent to which their opinions are solicited, recognized, or ignored by those in charge of their workplace" (Johnson, 1990, p. 18). Rozenholtz (1989) argued that norms of treatment and voice in the overall organization did not just happen. She believed they were products of "social engineering" by principals. Further, more opportunities for beginning teachers to participate in decision making with colleagues was found to broaden their knowledge of instructional options, strategies, and curricular approaches
The importance of teacher involvement in the political features of the workplace were far-reaching. Many teachers felt they had little influence over curriculum or policy decisions which affected the school and their classrooms in particular. They felt that although directives were frequently handed down without their input, they were expected to implement them (Hodges, 1976; Sparks, 1983). It is clear that policymakers have not resolved the issue of whether teachers are professional or semiskilled workers. Centralized control of schools has intensified, while an increased demand for accountability at the school site has been initiated by parents (Goodlad, 1983). The resulting tension affects all aspects of the workplace.

The power represented by participation in decision making was multidimensional. Authority was used when the teacher had the final say in the decision-making process. Influence was found to have a broader base than authority because it depended upon an informal power structure with uncertain outcomes (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980). The perception that teachers lacked authority over decisions or had less influence over decisions than they should resulted in a sense of powerlessness and dissatisfaction (Galloway, Boswell, Panckhurst, 1985).

Conley and Bacharach (1989) argued that teachers were dissatisfied with their workplace if decisions were not made in a rational manner. They further stipulated that the lack of promotional opportunities had less impact on teachers' attitudes than the perception of unfair practices or irrational decision-making processes made at the building site by the administration, the central office, or school board. The issue of fair
and equitable treatment within the workplace influenced teachers' perception of the workplace and their own professional status within.

**Sociological Feature**

The final area of the workplace, as presented by Johnson (1990), was the sociological feature of the workplace which involved parents, students, peers, status, and role. Johnson found that the relationships between the parents and the school were enhanced or limited by the school's workplace features, as well as the family's life circumstances. The role of the parent within the school was defined as meaningful or peripheral. Meaningful roles included the parent assisting with clerical, tutoring, special programs, and/or participating in school-site councils. Peripheral roles were defined as fund-raisers or chaperones. Lortie (1975) argued that parent involvement was controlled by teachers' gatekeeping actions. Parent involvement was a function of the teachers' perceptions of how parents were to be involved, not necessarily dependent upon parental desire or time. Teachers' perceptions concerning parental social and economic conditions often impacted upon home and school relationships.

Where teachers held positions of superior status, few parents complained, where teachers were out ranked in training or status by large numbers of professionals, they were subjected to more constant oversight and frequent criticism (Johnson, 1990, p. 95).

The question of how teachers view themselves as well as how parents view teachers seemed to be dependent upon the teachers' status as well as the parents' status within the community as a whole. Johnson (1990) reported that teachers' perceptions of parent cooperation and involvement
were enhanced when workplace features interacted to provide opportunities which engaged parents in the education of their children and mediated cultural differences between staff and parents.

Another aspect of the sociological feature proposed by Johnson (1990) was the student within the classroom. "Teachers believe that their prospects for success are increased when students believe in the promise of formal education" (Johnson, 1990, p. 85). A major factor in the amount of stress experienced by teachers in the workplace was student behavior or lack thereof. Teachers' perceptions of the students' effort and involvement in the act of learning impacted upon the amount of time and effort teachers invested in the act of teaching.

The final sociological feature of the workplace involved the status level and role teachers perceived themselves to hold. Role theory stated that the role of an individual is based on the interpretation the individual devised after assimilating information from superordinates, subordinates, and peers (Gross, Mason, & McEachern, 1958). The final picture formulated from these various sources of feedback to the individual concerning what the job was and how it was to be carried out determined how the individual behaved. The role the individual played within the school was based upon the interpretation of feedback the individual received from the administration, other teachers, students, parents, and the overall organization they served. The role of the individual changed when conflict occurred or the individual experienced work overload. In either case, the individuals adapted to the new information by expanding or contracting the definition of their role within the organization.
Qualitative Research Rationale

An ethnographic case study research design was used to describe the workplace of the year-round school. Details of the design and methodology of the study were also described in Chapter 3. Ethnographies, a special type of case study, utilized the perceptions of the participants involved in the study to describe the phenomena. Forehand and Gilmer (1964), Guion (1973), Schneider (1982) and Sirotnik (1980) reported three controversial issues in regard to studying an organization based on participant perceptions. First, was the conceptualization of the phenomenon as an objective process validated by a jury of experts, or a subjective process arising from experiences of individuals within? Second, was the reality upon which individuals acted objective or individually and socially constructed? Third, if the phenomenon was measured by perceptions, were these perceptions basic properties of the phenomenon or merely properties of the person perceiving it?

Two approaches were used to resolve these conflicts, idiosyncratic and organizational. Idiosyncratic conceptualization focused on the organization as a function of interaction between individual personal and organizational characteristics and were measured by the individual's perceptions. The organizational conceptualization studied the organizational properties and defined the workplace as a function of the perceptions of the teachers working within. The second and third issues centered on the reality which caused people to act objectively or individually in a social construct. This difficulty revolved upon the question of whether the perceptions of people working within the organizations
were basic properties of the organization or of the individual person perceiving it. In other words, were the behaviors of people within an organization determined by the characteristics of the individual or the organization? Halpin and Croft (1963) suggested that faculty's consensus in its perception of the school determined behavior. They believed that the collective perceptions were attributes of the organization rather than individual responses. Thus, by examining the perceptions of all teachers at the selected site concerning their workplace and identifying the common threads, a total picture of the year-round school's workplace was created.
CHAPTER 3

Research Design and Methodology

The purpose of Chapter 3 was to describe the research design used in the study. The first section of this Chapter 3 revealed research strategies used to develop a description of the year-round school's workplace. The second section described the process used to select the site of analysis for the study. The third section set the protocol for data collection. The fourth section described coding and analysis of the data. The fifth section described the researcher's theoretical sensitivity. The sixth section discussed construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability of the study. The seventh and final section defined the limitations and assumptions of the study.

Research Design

The study employed a qualitative, single case study design. The intent was to seek a holistic description and analysis of the year-round school workplace. Ethnographers try to uncover and document participants' perspectives (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The phenomenon of the workplace was examined using direct interviews, document analysis, and observation procedures. Viewing the phenomenon of the year-round school as a socially constructed phenomenon, this study was grounded by the constructs of Johnson's (1990) workplace theory. The study of the year-round school workplace used an interpretive paradigm.
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(Peterson, 1978) or what Guba (1981) referred to as a naturalistic inquiry, since the related elements of the study were subjective and required interpretation through participants within the year-round school setting. The case study design enabled the researcher to investigate a complex social unit consisting of multiple variables that could be of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon: the year-round school workplace. An in-depth study was conducted to determine the year-round school's workplace. The qualitative approach provided a means of examination of the workplace using the perceptions of teachers working within the context of that environment (Smith & Glass, 1987). The workplace was described by Johnson (1990) as a complex phenomenon which could not be studied in an artificial or contrived setting.

The case study is preferred in examining contemporary events when the relevant behaviors cannot be manipulated. Thus the case relies on many of the same techniques as a history, but adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian's repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing (Yin, 1989, p. 19).

Ethnographies had been viewed as special cases of field studies which provided cultural descriptions, telling how people described and structured their world (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Rationales for using this type of research strategy stemmed from five basic conditions. The first rationale was that human behavior was significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurred; thus, one had to study that behavior within the natural environment. Research had to be conducted in the setting where all contextual variables were operating. The second rationale was that past research had not been able to derive meaningful findings from
experimental research conducted on year-round schools. Most findings were inconclusive as to the effects of the year-round calendar on achievement and cost effectiveness. The third rationale was that the research techniques themselves in experimental research affected the findings. Lab questionnaires or tests had the potential of becoming artifacts. Subjects' responses may have been biased by suspicions, wariness, or they could have been aware of what the researcher wanted and tried to answer correctly. Additionally, subjects sometimes did not know their feelings, interactions, and behaviors, so they were not able to articulate in questionnaire responses. The fourth rationale was that understanding human behavior without understanding the framework within which subjects interpreted their thoughts, feelings, and actions could not be accomplished. Also, the coding and standardizing of responses could destroy valuable data by imposing word choices the subject would not normally use. Finally, field study research allowed for the exploration of the processes and meanings of the workplace operating within the setting of the year-round school. All of these factors made the selection of a ethnographic case study using qualitative analysis the most logical choice for conducting this study.

Verbal permission to conduct the study was received in April, 1992 from the Clark County School Districts Testing and Evaluation Department. Approval was obtained prior to conducting the study in accordance with the federal policies and procedures concerning the use of human subjects. An exemption form was completed by the researcher and signed by Dr.
Carl Steinhoff on June 17th, 1992. The exemption form was then filed with the graduate college.

**Unit of Analysis**

One year-round school was selected as the unit of analysis for this study. A "criterion-based sample" (Smith & Glass, 1987) was used in which a standard for selecting the unit of study was established. A "criterion-based sample" was established by the following parameters: the principal of the year-round school had to have at least four years of administrative experience with two of the four years assigned to the selected school site, and the year-round school had to operate on a five-track system using the 60-15 year-round plan. The year-round school was identified with the assistance of the Testing and Evaluation Department of the Clark County School District (CCSD). A list of the schools which met the criteria was developed and the actual site was chosen at random. Anonymity of the site and subjects was maintained through the use of aliases.

The school context selected for this study, hereafter referred to as G.K. Elementary, had a student population of approximately 900 students, a staff of 52 full-time members and served students from kindergarten through the 5'th grade. G.K. Elementary was located in an urban area of a large western, metropolitan school district.

G.K. Elementary was unique in that four nine-month schools operated within a three-mile radius of the selected site, and one of these was slated to open as a year-round school. However, due to parental pressure, the school was opened on a nine-month schedule which caused
overcrowding and the addition of portables to the new school's campus. The effect of this decision by the school board on the staff of G.K. Elementary created a unique opportunity to explore the perceptions of the G.K. Elementary teachers concerning nine-month school calendars and year-round school calendars. The change in calendar of the new school also provided access to data concerning political decisions made at the highest level of the organizational structure, and affect on the teachers' perceptions of their status, equity, and voice in the overall school district's organization.

**Protocol for Data Collection**

Yin (1989) reported that a case study protocol was more than an instrument. The protocol contained the procedures and general rules that were followed in the use of the instrument. The protocol was the major tactic used to increase the reliability of the study. The primary purpose of the protocol was to guide the investigator in carrying out the case study.

The first stage of the study was to gain entry and access to the phenomenon, the year-round school. Access was gained through a petition submitted to the Testing and Evaluation Department of the CCSD. Entry into the selected school was accomplished by meeting with the principal and assistant principal to provide a general overview of the study and review the interview question guideline. Following consultation with the administration, a faculty meeting was held at which time, the principal introduced the researcher as a doctoral student from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas interested in year-round schools. During this faculty meeting, the teachers were told by the researcher that the purpose of the
study was to describe the workplace of a year-round school. Teachers were requested to set up an interview time which would last approximately 20 minutes. During the interview, they were told that their responses would be confidential. The faculty meeting was repeated for those members who were out on track break during the initial introduction.

The methodology of data collection was a flexible, open-ended process (Smith & Glass, 1987) centering on the discovery of concepts, generalizations, and theories grounded in concrete experiences. The role of the researcher was known to all participants and was that of a nonparticipant observer during the data collection period. Several different types of data collection techniques were used to acquire information on the workplace features of the year-round school. Yin (1989) identified six sources of evidence available to the researcher. The first source was documentation which examined letters, memos, agendas, announcements, administrative documents, formal evaluations, and newsclippings or articles which appeared in the mass media. The second source of evidence was found in archival records which consisted of service records, organizational records, maps and charts, lists, survey data, and personal records. The third source of data was the use of structured interviews. The fourth source was direct observations made by the researcher concerning the workplace. Finally, the last source of evidence identified by Yin (1989) was the use of physical artifacts. Three principles guided the collection of data: the use of multiple sources of evidence; maintaining the chain of evidence; and the creation of an in-depth case study data base.
A case study protocol guided data collection and consisted of: an overview of the case study project for presenting the case study to the participants; a time line for scheduling field visits; an outline of questions that would guide the researcher's initial inquiry; and the identification of probable sources of evidence (see Appendices I, II, & III). A pilot study was conducted to reveal inadequacies in the initial design of the protocol and refine the interview questions. "The main purpose of these questions is to keep the investigator on track as data collection proceeds" (Yin, 1989, p. 77). Yin observed that the selection of the pilot case was usually based on convenience, access, and geographic proximity.

The data were collected during the last phase of the 60-15 school schedule. Nonparticipant data collections were made during this time. Five methods of data collection were utilized in this study. The primary method of gathering data was the personal interview. In addition, observations, documentation, archival records, and physical artifacts were employed. Teachers working within the selected school site were interviewed. The interview was used to gather descriptive data in subjects' own words so that the researcher developed insights as to how teachers interpreted the features of their workplace (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

Formal interviews were conducted with the teachers working at the selected school utilizing an interview schedule (see Appendix I). The schedule began with a statement of the purpose of the study, a request for demographic data, followed by questions structured by Johnson's (1990) seven-faceted conceptualization of the workplace of schools. Teachers'
perceptions as to the comfort and security of the workplace, the adequacy and availability of space and resources to complete the job delineated the physical features of the workplace. Teachers' perceptions of authority distribution, the degree of specialization, workload expectations, discretion workers exercised, how performance was assessed, the extent to which workers interact, and the interdependence among teachers and staff were examined to determine the organizational features of the year-round school's workplace. The extent to which the teacher viewed his/her work as meaningful, the amount of stress the individual perceives, and the opportunities for personal and professional growth or lack thereof in the workplace were described to determine the psychological features of the year-round school's workplace. The degree to which teachers define common goals and purpose in the workplace, behavioral norms and shared expectations among co-workers, the supportiveness perceived by the individual teacher from the school, fellow employees, and the district as a whole were utilized to describe the cultural features of the workplace. Teachers' perceptions of the pay and benefits received, incentives and rewards offered, and their job security were examined to describe the economic features of the workplace. Teachers' perceptions of their treatment in the workplace as fair and equitable, voice in the overall organization, and the exercise of power within the workplace were examined to determine the political features of the year-round school's workplace. The characteristics of clients, peers, and teachers' perceptions of their roles and status in the workplace described the sociological features of the workplace found in year-round schools.
A tape recorder, the presence of which was known to all participants, was utilized to assist in accurately recording teacher responses to the interview questions.

A good listener hears the exact words used by the interviewee. Sometimes, the terminology reflects an important orientation, captures the mood and effective components and understands the context from which the interviewee is perceiving the world (Yin, 1989, p. 63).

The use of the tape recorder provided for a more reliable record of the interview. The tape recorder also captured the emotional component of both the interviewee and the researcher, which allowed for a more in-depth analysis as well as protecting against bias on the part of the researcher. After each interview the researcher immediately documented perceptions and emotions relative to what was observed. No more than three interviews were scheduled per day, and the remainder of the day was spent observing the school's workplace. All interviews were transcribed by the researcher the day of the interview. "Listening as well as transcribing is essential for a full varied analysis" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 31). Although Strauss and Corbin (1990) felt that the researcher only needed to transcribe the information required for the study, they suggested that inexperienced researchers should transcribe all interviews. Therefore, all interviews were transcribed as they were collected. Analysis of data collected and the actual collection process took place simultaneously or would oscillate back and forth. Collected data analysis, self-analysis and imposed controls on data gathering were used to prevent the researcher from simply confirming the researcher's perception of what the year-round school's workplace was. A detailed chronological
notebook was kept to record questions the researcher had concerning transcribed interviews, the emerging picture of the year-round school, and possible new sources of evidence. This record was kept to track the development of the project, to visualize how the research plan had been affected by the data collected, and to remain self-conscious of how the researcher was influenced by the data (Borgdan & Biklen, 1982).

A documentation review of staff communications and official documents, daily announcements, memos, and notes left in the teacher's lounge area in the year-round school was conducted to ascertain any significant references to the workplace. These additional data were viewed as artifacts confirming observations and interview data. Borg and Gall (1983) utilized document analysis as a means of increasing the validity of the study by collecting nonresponsive sources of data which were compared with the interview data.

In reviewing documents, a good question to ask is whether there is any important message between the lines. Any inferences of course would need to be corroborated with other sources of information, but important insights may be gained in this way (Yin, 1989, p. 64).

Field observations focused on both formal and informal events (Yin, 1989). Observations of formal events included faculty meetings, staff meetings, and staff development in-services. Informal observations were conducted in the teacher's lounge, workroom, hallways, playground, and the front office of the school. Also, field notes were recorded in regard to the physical aspect of the school.

Archival records of board meetings, surveys performed by the district, personnel records, and maps and charts pertaining to the year-
round school were analyzed to corroborate and furnish insight on the developing description of the year-round school's workplace.

**Transcription, Coding, and Analysis of Data**

Transcription, coding, and analysis of data occurred concurrently. All interviews were transcribed the day of the interview and coding was initiated at that time. A three-step coding process was utilized according to methodology put forth by Strauss and Corbin (1990). All data obtained were transcribed and entered into "The Ethnograph" program developed by Seidel, Kjolseth, and Seymour (1988). Using the program, the transcriptions were line-numbered, coded, displayed, sorted, and printed according to identified sequences. The segments sequenced and isolated were then used for comparative analyses of other similar or different categorized segments.

Open coding was used to break down the data into categories as conceptualized by Johnson (1990). Emphasis was given at this stage of coding to the examination of any preconceived notions concerning the year-round school's workplace against the actual data. Concepts were labeled by identifying them in terms of properties and dimensions within the workplace framework.

Axial coding was used to examine categories identified in the open coding stage. Categories and features of the workplace were related to subcategories and subfeatures and tested continuously against the data to insure accurate placement. Data were scrutinized at this stage to determine additional conditions of each workplace feature. Incoming data
were consistently analyzed in terms of the developing workplace
description. As new information emerged from the data, existing
categories were continuously modified. Analysis of differences and
similarities among and within categories was considered critical in the
development of the emerging picture of the selected year-round school
workplace.

Selective coding was the process used to gain conceptual density
and specificity. All of the workplace features were refined and unified
around the interaction between and among the features. Each feature was
defined and described in terms of the commonly held perceptions of the
teacher working within the year-round school. Statements denoting
relationships between features were validated within the data.
Perceptions of the teachers were validated when possible with
nonresponsive data sources.

The analysis of data occurred throughout the study as an accrual of
perceptions from the teachers, which enabled patterns of meanings to
emerge from the network of information about their school, which was
used to reveal the integrity of the workplace theory and describe the
selected year-round school's workplace. In this manner, the analysis of
data consisted of the synthesis of all data which was then used to explicate
the complexity of the selected year-round school's workplace. "The
Ethnogragh" was used to organize the data through the use of open, axial,
and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Seidel, Kjolseth, and
Seymour's (1988) computer software, "The Ethnograph," was used to
code, recode, and sort data files into analytic categories based on
Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the workplace. Line-numbered transcriptions were reviewed, with segments marked, displayed, sorted, and printed according to identified sequences. The segments sequenced and isolated were then used for documentation analysis (Carini, 1975).

Documentation was an accrual of perceptions which enabled patterns of meaning to emerge from the collected data. These patterns were interpreted through the analysis of the observer in order to reveal the integrity of the workplace of the selected year-round school. Data analysis consisted of synthesizing a model or profile of the complex system of behaviors and perceptions which created the year-round school's workplace. Juxtaposing data, commonalities, differences, nuances, and shadings of processes were addressed graphically (Carini, 1975) during the analysis.

Theoretical sensitivity was utilized in the development of patterns and assisted in the interpretation of data.

Theoretical sensitivity refers to a personal quality of the researcher. It indicates an awareness of subtleties of meaning of data. One can come to the research situation with various degrees of sensitivity depending upon previous reading and experience with or relevant to an area (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 41).

Strauss and Corbin (1990) identified three sources of theoretical sensitivity: literature review, professional experience, and analytical process. The first source was gained through an extensive review of the literature concerning the year-round school and the workplace conceptualization. The review of the literature allowed the researcher to validate findings, develop explanations during data collection, analyze data, and evaluate theoretical constructs developed while organizing the
data (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The second source was gained through professional experience as an elementary school teacher. The third means of theoretical sensitivity was analytical process, which Strauss and Corbin (1990) viewed as the progression of one insight or idea sparking another. This information was gained by constant review of the data and the collection process by proposing questions such as: What's going on here? Does what I think I see fit the data pattern? What would verify or invalidate the emerging explanation? Would another explanation work in describing what is happening? (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The analysis was concerned with presenting an accurate description of the year-round school's workplace.

While in the end you may come to the same conclusion as those in the literature, your theoretical explanations will be far more dense because your questions took you away from the standard way of thinking, and allowed exploration of other answers of thought and hopefully gave new insights into the problem (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 90).

A provisional profile of the year-round school workplace was formulated to provide signposts for the generation of hypotheses to be used by other researchers in the pursuit of additional data relevant to the year-round school or workplace theory. The data was entered into a computer program. Then, the data were analyzed to detect the perceptions of the teachers as to overall workplace conditions of a selected year-round school. Narrative descriptions of the various features of the school workplace were used to present the final analysis and interpret the meaning of the data collected.
Construct Validity

Construct validity centered upon the establishment of correct operational measures for the concepts being studied (Yin, 1989). Three techniques were used to increase the construct validity of this study. The first technique was the use of multiple sources of evidence to support the development of the description of the year-round schools workplace. The second technique was the careful documentation of how and when data were collected. This documentation established a chain of evidence which could later be scrutinized for errors or bias on the part of the researcher. The third technique was to have informants review drafts of their interviews and make comments concerning accuracy and later, discussing a draft of the case study report with key informants. In addition, peer review was utilized to assist the researcher in reviewing how categories were formed and in the formulation of the description of the selected year-round school's workplace.

Internal Validity

According to Yin (1989), descriptive or exploratory studies due to their very nature do not require a check on the internal validity. However, Mathison (1988) argued that internal validity was increased if the researcher searched for consistent evidence in the data log to confirm or dispel developing patterns. This process was referred to as triangulation. Triangulation of data was used to increase the internal validity and was accomplished by using several sources of data to investigate the emerging description of the year-round school's workplace. Another technique used was theoretical triangulation. Theoretical triangulation was the interjection
of alternative explanations of the phenomenon used to increase the internal validity of the study. These explanations were noted by the researcher as relationships between the data were analyzed.

**External Validity**

External validity pertained to the establishment of the domain to which a study's findings were generalized.

The external validity problem has been a major barrier in doing case studies. Critics typically state that single cases offer a poor basis for generalizing. However, such critics are implicitly contrasting the situation to survey research, where a "sample" readily generalizes to a larger universe. This analogy to samples and universes is incorrect when dealing with case studies. This is because survey research relies on statistical generalization, whereas case studies rely on analytical generalizations. In analytical generalization, the investigator is striving to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory (Yin, 1989, pp. 43-44).

In this case, the theory was the workplace conceptualized by Johnson (1990) which provided the structure and guidelines used in the study. The grounded theory of the workplace established the broader theory to which the researcher generalized. A subquestion which continued to avail itself throughout the study focused on the perception of the year-round school's workplace as being the same, better, or worse than that of the nine-month school's workplace.

**Reliability**

In the ethnographic study, the emphasis for reliability was placed on doing the same case over again, not on replicating the results of one case by doing another case study (Yin, 1989). Reliability was achieved by demonstrating that the method and procedures of the study were
repeatable. Two techniques were utilized to increase the reliability of the study. The first technique was the use of a case study protocol and the second technique was the development of a case study data base which was retrievable for later analysis by other researchers (Yin, 1989).

**Assumptions**

1. Teachers' views of the workplace influenced job satisfaction and performance.

2. Teachers' perceptions impacted upon student achievement by influencing the way in which teachers interacted with students, parents, and the community.

**Limitations**

1. The study was limited to one year-round elementary school in the Clark County School District (CCSD).

2. Only teachers who had experienced both nine-month and year-round school calendars were interviewed in areas concerning a comparison between nine-month and year-round calendars.

3. Direct observations of classroom instruction were not permitted by the CCSD as a condition for obtaining permission to conduct the study.

4. The single case study limited the transferability of the study findings.

5. The study was limited to a period of one phase of the 60-15 year-round school calendar. Although frequent and persistent observation was maintained throughout the study, the actual collection of interview data was limited.
CHAPTER 4

Data Presentation and Analysis

Chapter 4 presented the findings of the study which were designed to describe the workplace of a selected year-round school using the conceptualization of the workplace as depicted by Johnson (1990). The following questions guided the development of the description:

1. What were the physical features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
2. What were the organizational features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
3. What were the psychological features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
4. What were the cultural features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
5. What were the economic features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
6. What were the political features of the selected year-round school's workplace?
7. What were the sociological features of the selected year-round school's workplace?

The findings were presented in eight sections. The first section provided findings relative to the description of the physical features of the year-round school's workplace. The second section described the
organizational features of the year-round school's workplace. The third section focused on the psychological features of the year-round school's workplace. The fourth section described the cultural features of the year-round school's workplace. The fifth section defined the economic features of the year-round school's workplace. The sixth section provided findings relative to the description of the political features of the year-round school's workplace. The seventh section revealed the description of the sociological features of the year-round school's workplace. In the eighth section, the interaction of the various features of the workplace of the selected year-round school were discussed.

Analysis of the Physical Features of the Year-Round School Workplace

The physical features of the workplace included teachers' perceptions of safety and comfort, along with the availability of space and resources found in the workplace for teachers to do their job. Johnson (1990) reported that the physical attributes of the workplace were noticed quickly by an observer, and because of their prominence often influenced initial job choice.

The researcher observed that G.K. Elementary school was one of the district's older facilities. The campus was enclosed by a wire mesh fence approximately six and one-half feet high. The school itself was made up of seven separate buildings and one portable classroom. A small sign on the front gate directed visitors to report to the main office upon entering the schoolgrounds. A small hallway served as the visitors waiting area. The view provided from this area was the health office and
the school front office area. The principal's office door also was within sight of the visitor's waiting area. Across from the principal's office was the supply room, which held paper, paint, poster board, markers, glue, scissors, pencils, and other materials. The shelves in the supply room were neat and appeared to be well stocked. The assistant principal's office was a short distance from the supply room on the opposite side of the corridor.

The next room in the main building was the teachers' workroom which held three copy machines of which during the course of the study only one was operating. A ditto or mimeograph machine was used often by teachers at G.K. Elementary to make copies. Teachers hand-carried paper from their allocated supply to the machines for use. A collection of used novels lined one shelf of the workroom; these were novels the teachers shared with one and another for recreational purposes. One telephone was located on a small desk near the entrance to the workroom.

Access to the library and the teachers' lounge/lunch area was gained through the workroom. The library was large and appeared to be adequately stocked with books and materials. The absence of computers was noted by the researcher, except for the one used for inventory by the librarian. The teachers' lounge/lunch area consisted of a room with four rectangular tables, an assortment of chairs, and a small couch crammed against one of the walls which was approximately a foot and one-half away from two of the tables. A small table against the south wall held a coffee pot which was rarely used during the summer, two microwaves, an old stove top, a refrigerator, and a soda vending machine. Between the
workroom and the lounge/lunch area were the teacher's mail boxes and a clipboard containing daily announcements which teachers were required to initial after reading. The overflowing mail boxes served as a reminder as to who was out on track break. At the southwestern end of the lounge/lunch area was the teachers' restroom, the only one in the entire complex. This restroom for a staff of 54 adults consisted of one toilet and two sinks. During the course of the study, teachers and other staff members expressed frustration over the lack of adequate restroom facilities for the adults on campus.

The remaining buildings the researcher observed were primarily classrooms for instruction with an occasional storage area, student restroom, or custodial work space located within. The classrooms were large in comparison to newer elementary schools built by the district in recent years. Each classroom opened to an outdoor corridor and had windows which could be seen through (see appendix V for a map of the school). Inside every classroom were bulletin boards, displays of student work, and visual aids to the instructional program. Teachers explained that parent open house had just occurred and that usually their rooms were not so elaborately decorated. The researcher noted that during the course of the 60 day study, room decor remained the same.

The maintenance of the building appeared to the researcher to run smoothly except for the air-conditioning in two sections of the facility. The principal arrived typically at 7a.m. and inspected the school grounds prior to the teaching staff's 8:00 a.m. starting time. Some teachers arrived for work 30 to 90 minutes before their contracted starting time to catch up on
work and planning. Others stayed after school or took work home to complete depending on their personal philosophy. Grounds were kept clear of debris in front of the school; however, along the back fence of the school next to the playground area litter was scattered. The buildings had been painted within the last six months, a beige/yellow color. A teacher noted the following:

The physical environment of the school is important to me. I don't think this is a very pretty school, and that affects me. I think more trees, plants, and flowers would help. As far as the physical features of the building itself, the district is very cheap and they choose colors of paint by whatever is cheapest instead of what would be more psychologically appealing. My room is not set up the way it normally would be because I've just been tired. Usually this room is my fight back from all the blandness, my sanctuary.

The appearance of the facility affected teachers, students, and parents by providing the environment in which teaching and learning took place. Understanding the physical plant in which the interviewed teachers worked was essential to understanding their perceptions of the workplace. In many ways the school building itself prescribed the tasks teachers performed and the way they felt about themselves and their work.

Safety and Comfort

The safety aspect of the physical features of the workplace of the selected year-round school was reported by teachers as not posing any problems. Teachers at this year-round school felt that neither their health nor that of the students were jeopardized by the year-round school workplace. When asked about the heat during the summer months, their responses ranged from "it would be just as hot at home or out and about
running errands" to "it causes some minor problems". The following
to "it causes some minor problems". The following
represents common problems identified by teachers at the selected year-
round school:

As long as the air-conditioning works, comfort is fine. I live in fear that the air-conditioning will go out. That's my main concern because it is so hard on the children and myself. The other thing is outside duty. It's really hard on me in the summer when the temperatures are above a hundred.

They (the students) are hot, sweaty and smelly, most of the time. The kids I have with that problem I notice all year, not just in the summer. It may be worse in the summer. They always want to hug you at this grade level and sometimes I have to tell them this is not a hug day.

The heat in the summer, I don't like the heat. The kids come in the morning and they are hot and I literally spray them down. We go over to the sink and I spray them with a spray bottle. I spray their faces, head, and neck two times a day. That takes time. They get sluggish because of the heat. One time I had the kids take their shoes and stockings off because they were so hot... but, I only made that mistake once... the odor was awful.

It's hot standing out there. It takes a while for their bodies (the students) to cool off. I am very frank with the kids about staying clean so I don't have an odor problem.

One thing that bothers me about a year-round school is the heat, now in Las Vegas it's so hot that these air conditioners... you got to feel it... on a hot day in the afternoon we're talking about thirty hot little bodies in here it's like EEE. It is so hot that just speaking in it is miserable. It's hard for me. It would be hard for me, it would be hard for them. I can see why they get off track, because it's so hot and it's not conducive to very good behavior, and in other places it might not be such a problem, but here with the heat.... you know they get really restless when it's hot and sticky and it's just miserable.
This researcher observed on one occasion a child in the health office after lunch. The child was returning from the restroom and a strong perspiration odor was present.

Due to the age of the school, one problem cited by many teachers was the lack of electrical outlets in the classroom which created safety concerns. The most frequently cited concern of teachers working at the year-round school was the building's maintenance. Teachers felt that in the past when year-round schools first started, cleanliness of the facility represented a safety and comfort problem. However, all but two of the teachers interviewed responded that in this particular school it was not a problem. When asked why, three responses were consistently presented. The first response was that the custodial staff was top-notch at this school.

I see the custodian always present. If you need him, I mean, I go to the office and it's amazing how quickly he responds. It's like wow! He is very efficient. The other custodians that work here are very accommodating. In fact, I found out they were feeding my fish. I was on my first track break and they called me at home saying I was out of fish food. I had been coming in and feeding them and the custodians were feeding them too. They just go out of their way, you know, very nice.

The second response was the belief that the change to the 60-15 plan with the two-week break between school years had made the difference. This was the typical response of teachers who had worked both schedules:

When we were on the 45-15, we ran all the way to the end of July and then we started again August first. We did not have time to get the school cleaned and it... it really got.... I really noticed how bad it was because dust was collecting up in the lights, and on the rafters. ... we got a new blacktop put in and when they started running the paving machine... dirt was falling everywhere and I know one year, when I came to set up again for the next year, I brought my own vacuum cleaner.
I cleaned this classroom. Now they come in while we are off and the building has been a lot cleaner.

Another response was that the principal ran a tight ship when it came to facility maintenance. Many teachers commented that the cleanliness of the building was no different than that of nine-month schools in which they had previously worked. However some concessions had to be made:

Um.....you would have to probably ask the custodial staff about that. Just from the visible standpoint I would say no, but from what I understand about the workings of the school it's a little difficult to keep everything clean all of the time.

No, I see no problems, we have a custodian here at all times, they work after school. They have about three weeks in August and everyone is out and they go crazy cleaning everything. When I went from a nine-month to a twelve-month, I wanted to come in early and get set up and I was just in the way while they were cleaning.

Overall the building has to be maintained, you know, while we are here. The year before last we had work being done and we had some problems....cars in the parking area were sprayed with the roofing material they were using to repair the roof ... stuff like that because we're not empty a long enough time for everything to get finished.

I think so, well they are not able to come in like they need to replace the carpeting in these rooms and they can't do it one room after another, consecutively. They have to do rooms when teachers are out on break, then come back out when the next teacher's room is empty. They get it done eventually, but it doesn't seem like it is economically feasible, when they have to send crews out multiple times to do one job. Now the cleaning during the summer time they have special crews that come out the second week of shut down and they strip floors and shampoo carpets. They do an excellent job.

**Space and Resources**

The allocation of space and distribution of resources were cited in the review of the literature by a number of authors as a crucial aspect of
the workplace. Space was an important issue particularly in the primary grades at G.K. Elementary. When asked what it was like to be a teacher in transit, most teachers responded that it was no big deal. However, when asked to describe how changing rooms worked, it was apparent that being a teacher in transit was a big deal. Of the teachers interviewed, 25 percent stated that if they were required to change classrooms during the year, they would seek employment at a nine-month school. G.K. Elementary teachers did not change classrooms during the study due to a statewide class size reduction program which took place in the primary grades (K through third), and the "teaming" of these primary teachers which reduced classroom needs, providing additional space.

There's teaming going on now with a 1 - 15 teacher to student ratio per classroom. Some classes have two teachers with 30 kids because we don't have enough rooms. I wouldn't work well teaming with another teacher, I'd want my own class. You have to be two teachers who really click together and the principal has done that. He has a way of knowing who can and who cannot team.

This teaming situation provided all teachers the opportunity to compare required classroom changes the previous year, to remaining in the same room throughout this year. All teachers preferred to have their own space uninterrupted throughout the year. The following responses were representative of teacher's perceptions concerning the sharing of space on a rotating year-round schedule:

Year-round schools are no different in comfort, safety and resources than nine-month schools. The space is a problem when you rove. Right now everything is in my own room but when you rove you have to take some materials with you and leave some. If you are moving into a pack rat's room, who saves everything, you have boxes stacked under desks and
things piled up on top of things and you have to teach in that clutter. That bothers me.

Think about your apartment or house. Take everything out of your house and move it to the apartment next door for nine to twelve weeks. Then take it all down and move it to another apartment. Primary teachers have a lot of materials. We are real-hands on. We are big on the room decor and bulletin boards, things like that. Moving is hard.

Yes, provided I don't have to move my things from room to room. I did that for three years and that is too much to ask of any human being. At my last school after every track break I came back to a different room. I never had a stable room.

Moving was a big deal to me. I would spend the whole week before I went on break, ahead of time packing up my room, and then it would take the whole weekend putting it all back up before the students came back. Just because it was important to me. It was an unbearable work load.

I never had anything stolen. But, I lost things because I wasn't sure where I packed it. It's an adventure finding things again.

They don't have all the materials I have! It is a big deal for me. I have tons of materials. It's not a big deal for a teacher who doesn't put up a lot of bulletin boards and doesn't save the student's work or have a multitude of things that you have made. When you have accumulated all these things you feel you need to teach properly, like math manipulatives are very important to me, then moving is a big deal.

I didn't like it at all! You need to make arrangements with another teacher to take your kids for the afternoon so you could pack up. My problem was I have a lot of stuff and I didn't have a place to store it so I would have students help me load up my car and take things home. Then I had to find a place to put my things in the room where I was moving next where they would not be in the way or where they would not get stolen.

Yes, I hated it! It's... I didn't like it at all. I moved three times in one year. I hated it! If I had to change rooms again I wouldn't stay in a year-round school. It's too much work!
Other teachers stated that the room had to be totally their room. As a result when the rotating room schedule was in effect, two days were utilized before leaving the room to pack and another two days were required to unpack. Usually, weekends were spent at school packing and unpacking instructional materials. "I don't think it affected my instruction, it just took away from my free time". The implication that other teachers working in the year-round workplace had ceased putting up bulletin boards and spent less time and effort developing instructional visual aids to assist students' learning was noted by the researcher.

Five teachers interviewed stated that changing classrooms during the school year made them more organized and did not bother them.

I keep everything in boxes, so I just grab my boxes and move, plus we all had one big main closet to keeping things in. It keeps you organized. Teachers tend to keep things too long. This way you're going through your stuff, organizing and getting rid of it. I am not moving now and I like it, but to move was no big deal. It was a nice change.

Actually you get used to it and the kids get used to it. It's not that bad. It does force you to keep organized and you tend to throw out things and keep only the essentials.

These teachers felt that moving throughout the year was a stimulating experience for the students. When asked if they would prefer moving, the answer invariably was: "No, I like having my own classroom."

Most teachers felt that sharing space in the manner that was required when rotating classrooms was too much to ask of them. Too many personal instructional materials had to be packed up, stored, or carted home when track breaks started, then brought back out when classes resumed. Thus, rotating classrooms impacted on the availability of
materials used to teach. The perceptions were that as time progressed, teachers tended to do less with the learning environment of their classrooms. Bulletin boards were changed less frequently, learning centers were scaled down or removed entirely, and the spontaneity of teaching was limited because materials were scattered in different places.

There were advantages to it, I didn't have to worry about bulletin boards. I would just go in and use what was there.

Well, you're never organized because your always moving so you can't find things you need. Materials I needed were not available because of the moving and it affected how I taught. It's horrible and wears me out. Your stress level is so intense it affects your home life. My husband told me to get out of year-round because I was so frazzled. If you taught upper elementary it might be different because the kids can help you, but in primary what can they do? It's crazy, but this year I stay in this room and I love it! The year-round school is great, but no teacher should have to rove.

I find that sometimes I'll be thinking of something that I have, but I don't have it with me right now and it's at home. So that's kind of a hassle. I can't get as much done here as I would like to.

Another problem area, acquiring teaching resources, was identified due to the school district's policy of operating on a nine-month schedule. Required assistance with special education students, speech therapy students, and teacher curriculum services were not available during the summer months.

..for an example, we have to call a special program committee meeting when a child in the special education program is not functioning well in a regular classroom or is progressing in a resource classroom, so maybe they need a more restrictive setting or a less restrictive setting. You must present a case for your decision to move the child to the special program counselors, and if they agree with you and vote on it, the child is placed in the recommended environment. The decision has to be passed by this
committee. If a child has a problem develop in the summer session ... well the committee is not in session... they are on a nine-month schedule. It can create problems.

One teacher spoke of calling the district warehouse system to order paper and being told that they could not deliver because they were preparing for school to start. However, paper and other supplies delivered by the district warehouse to schools was not cited as a problem; in fact, many of the teachers were unaware that the district warehouse was not open during the summer months; this was due in part to the planning and organization of the administration of the school and the efficiency of the front office staff.

We can't order materials through the month of June because I believe the warehouse does inventory at that time. We just have to be prepared to order materials, or make sure we have enough for the month of June.

Since the district is so big, I think they serve twelve-month schools as well as they serve nine-month schools. They are always slow. Nine-month schools, they didn't have supplies. They run out of supplies too. We have to provide our own supplies so what's the difference?

The warehouse is shut down in the summer. We were usually out of things at my other year-round school. But I haven't seen it happen here. Our office staff is good at planning ahead.

Many teachers reported that they often spent their own money to purchase instructional materials for their classroom. Others confided that the one resource they wanted most was a space allocation which met the needs of their program. The perceptions of the teachers concerning resource availability was that their teaching situation was different from that of the nine-month schools in the area of space, and this was true only when rotating classrooms.
Analysis of the Organizational Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

The organizational features of the year-round school's workplace encompassed teachers' perceptions as to: how authority was distributed; the extent to which task specialization occurred; work load expectations; the discretion teachers exercised in accomplishing their tasks; performance assessment methods; and the extent to which teachers interacted both socially and professionally beyond normal requirements.

Interdependence of Responsibilities

Two sources of interdependency of responsibility were observed. The first source was the fact that most primary teachers at G.K. Elementary shared a classroom with another teacher in a teaming arrangement. Each teacher was responsible for a specified group of students; however, lesson presentation, planning, and assisting individual students during class time was accomplished in a joint effort by both teachers. Teachers participating in a team reported they enjoyed sharing ideas and working with one and another.

However, as the interview developed, many expressed a desire to have some time alone with the students to which they were assigned, or wished they had more space to work within. This researcher noted that a few primary teachers were not working in teaming arrangements. When asked why, they responded that they were too set in their ways and enjoyed working alone. All of the teachers interviewed working at the primary level believed that it took the "right" two people to be able to work together and get along in order to make teaming work.
Specialists provided the second level of interdependence observed in the year-round school's workplace. Students were taken as a class to participate in physical education, art, music, and library skills. This arrangement provided preparatory time for the regular classroom teacher as well as specialized instruction for the students. Sharing students was the only interdependence link observed between specialists and regular classroom teachers. Joint projects and interdisciplinary units were not observed during the course of the study between specialists and classroom teachers. As reported in Johnson's (1990) study, teaching was an act done in isolation. Teachers did not, except for those teaming in the primary grade, work with other teachers.

**Teacher Interaction**

Teachers were observed interacting in the lounge/lunch room area of the G. K. Elementary school. Discussions centered upon track break travels, food, personal stories about friends and family, amusing anecdotes, and on occasion, school. School talk was focused primarily on students, ranging from behavior to family situations. Comments concerning students' behavior generated suggestions from colleagues as to possible solutions or advice. The researcher observed that not all teachers utilized the lounge/lunch room. When questioned as to where the other teachers spent lunch breaks, the typical response was that they stayed in their rooms during lunch. The regular lunch crowd was made up of the same teachers, who often sat at the same table, typically in the same chairs. Faces changed periodically when one track came off track break and another left.
A division of teachers into two groups was noted by the researcher. Extended contract teachers with the exception of two were not present in the lounge/lunch room. They had established the routine of eating together in the library; why this occurred was unclear. The two exceptions to this pattern were relatively new to the staff and both expressed a desire to be less apart from the teachers teaching on a regular contract. They felt strongly about eating and relating with the regular classroom teachers. Questioning by the researcher revealed nothing that would explain the cause of this division or why it still existed. When questioned why the new specialists were breaking with tradition the response was:

I believe that specialists should .... take the initiative to become involved with the rest of the staff and they don't do that when they go off and eat somewhere else other than with the rest of the staff. I don't separate myself out. When there is an activity I join in. You get to know and develop a relationship with them and you can get insight into students through just that kind of cooperation. Every so often we can work together as a unit. ....

Interaction on a professional level was informal and occurred at lunch time or in classrooms. This interaction usually revolved around a problem in the workplace. The problems discussed in decreasing order of occurrence were: student behaviors; problems concerning other teachers; discussions over administrative support; and finally the dearth of parental involvement. Teachers also shared materials and ideas during this time. However, the meetings where primarily venting sessions for the teachers involved.

The researcher noted a lack of interaction between certain primary teachers. Further discussion and observations revealed that a division
existed due to a difference in teaching philosophies concerning reading. Some type of conflict had occurred and the end result was that the whole language-based instructors felt as if they were not supported by their colleagues nor the principal. As a result, they excluded themselves from the lounge/lunch area and had made arrangements to transfer to other schools for the following year.

The staff of G.K. Elementary did not participate in after-hour socials while the study took place. Food items were provided twice during the course of the study by grade-level departments. The items were placed in the lounge/lunch area, and staff members helped themselves. The staff did not congregate at the beginning or end of the day. The impression left with the researcher was that employees arrived at the workplace, did their jobs, and departed.

Performance Assessment

Teachers were individually assessed by the site administrators. Most teachers felt that the observation and evaluations made by the administrators were necessary, adding that without them some teachers would not complete lesson plans. Lesson plans were checked during observations by the administrator, and teachers leaving for track break placed lesson plans in their mail boxes for the administrator to check and initial. Experienced teachers viewed lesson plan checks and observations as routines which had little impact upon what they did or how they did it. Less-experienced teachers were concerned about meeting expectations of the administration.
However, if a new administrator was to be appointed to the school, teachers reported that they would not be as comfortable with the observation and evaluation process. They stated that they would not know what the administrator expected of them and the initial observations and evaluations would be stressful. Most teachers at G.K. Elementary felt that observations and evaluations were conducted in a reasonable manner and did not add to their workload. Other teachers felt that the principal did not play an important role in the school and that when he was out of the building, they were not aware of it. The principal was not known to take vacation days and spent many hours on campus.

Discretionary Decision Making

Teachers at G.K. Elementary school felt they were empowered to make decisions concerning the materials used in the course of instruction and methodology, excluding the reading program in the primary grade. Discretionary decisions concerning supplies and methods used in the instructional process were reported as being no different than at a nine-month school. Materials and supplies were chosen at grade-level meetings by teachers. Textbook selections were school-wide; therefore, a committee of teachers and the administrator met to select textbooks for each subject area. All teachers interviewed had purchased instructional aids out with personal funds, which the school would not or could not supply due to budgetary constraints. Teachers reported these personal purchases were for extras they viewed as important, and that adequate supplies of materials were made available by the school. The following
examples were typical responses made by teachers concerning discretionary powers:

   We are pretty much empowered. We have input into the materials, we just ... I don't know.

   ...lot of control over the way we teach and how we teach. (I feel we teachers have)

   I don't think a year-round schedule would differ in any way from a nine-month schedule in terms of empowerment of teachers. A lot of it would depend on your administrator and his philosophy.

   No, empowerment is no different from nine-month schools. We still have our curriculum.

Teachers at G.K. Elementary school were provided a copy of the district curriculum guide which established what was to be taught at each grade level, prescribed how many minutes per week were to be spent teaching each subject, and offered suggestions concerning how to teach the required concepts. All teachers were aware of the curriculum guide and taught the concepts required by the district; however, most modified the guide to fit their style of teaching and felt free to continue with more challenging materials and concepts if the stated objectives had been mastered. Discretion, however, was limited:

   I'm told that I'm to use the basal, and I'm supplied with a certain basal. I don't get to choose; however, I can supplement it with the literature of my choice. So I do have control over that area. I'm supplied with a math book that I'm expected to use and as far as textbooks, those are the only two required. The math books are okay.

   Well he comes in periodically and checks them (lesson plans) and if he tells me that he wants it done a certain way then I'm going to do it because he is my boss and I'm working for him. So I'm doing it that way, but it's not exactly my choice.
This school, the administration is very much by the book. He is very much goal-oriented. Follow the five sets in the essential whatever, follow your lesson plans. Make sure you have an objective for everything.

He doesn't check my lesson plans, but I've heard from others that he checks theirs a lot. He is very staunch about coordinating lesson plans with school district curriculum guides.

Teachers' perceptions of discretionary decision making power was based upon the relationship the teachers had with the principal at the selected year-round school. If they perceived their relationship with the principal to be secure, they were more likely to feel that they held discretionary decision making powers. If the teacher's perceived that the principal didn't like them, they were more likely to feel that their decisions were limited.

**Workload**

The workload of the year-round teacher encompassed curriculum, planning, noninstructional duties, and classroom management. All teachers at the selected year-round school used the curriculum guides provided by the school district. The researcher observed that the same curriculum guides were used for both the nine-month and year-round schools. When asked if there were any changes teachers at the year-round schools made to adapt the curriculum guides to the year-round schedule, the answers were typically as follows:

You have to be innovative in special education. So what I do and the other resource teachers, we teach in three week units. 'Cause the kids are here for three weeks and then part of them go on break. For example, in resource rooms, special education we have all five tracks of kids in our room. Theoretically, at any point one-fifth of your students are out on track break, so when track one is out, two, three, four, and
five are in. So, when track two is out one comes in and the rest stay. So every three weeks you have a change in students so what we have done this year ... we have taught in three-week units and we get them in completion. You know, that's when you can incorporate whole language and it really fits into this schedule. Otherwise you have kids at different levels. Spelling: for example say you have three reading groups, three spelling groups and spelling group A, half of them are on break. This creates two separate spelling groups in group A, but if you teach in three-week units you're done and completed and you can start over again with the new kids.

I don't go by when they are going out (on break). I try to wrap up if they are going to be leaving and not start something new just before they leave. Sometimes it doesn't work out and they don't seem to mind. It doesn't bother me. The only thing for me is I get bored because a track will be progressing along and another track comes in and I have to go all the way back and start over with them. I end up repeating the same lessons maybe 12, 20, or 30 times depending on how long the project is and how many students are involved.

The five tracks cause me to have different schedules for their (regular contract teachers) classes. So I've got to be very organized.

The fact that when you're teaching a unit and you have to shorten it to fit the breaks or continue it after the break when it's lost momentum.

Planning in the year-round school added to the workload of the teachers. Teachers reported that additional planning was necessary to keep organized. The following comments exemplify the extra planning work created by the year-round schedule:

Be organized...It's difficult to keep track of kids coming in and out from special education, and other special programs. Just keeping up with the scheduling can be a nightmare. If you are not organized your right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. I really think that teaching in units is real beneficial because you're in for twelve weeks and out for three, you can divide those twelve weeks into three-week units or four. You need to impose more structure on your planning.
They (nine-month teachers) go through the same stress and the same workings that we do in a year-round school. Stress levels I experience come in the beginning of the school and after you do schedules. Scheduling is a bear, ...a real bear..., because in nine-month schools you have the same schedule for the whole year. I have to deal with five different schedules. Every time a phase goes out the schedule changes, different times for specialist classes, different duty schedules, ... It's like starting over.

The emphasis on organization and planning was stressed over and over in every interview. The researcher questioned for whom the planning was, the teacher or the administrator. In most cases, teachers asserted that the planning and organization were to assist them in providing a consistent and logically structured educational program for students. All teachers interviewed felt that some form of lesson plan was necessary, at the very least, to keep track of breaks and phase changes which brought about scheduling changes throughout the year. Some teachers expressed concern over the level of detail lesson plans were required to have. If the purposes of lesson plans were to keep the teacher organized and on track, they questioned the necessity for elaborating them beyond their own personal requirements. These teachers believed that overly detailed lesson plans added to their workload and served only to appease administrators, who may or may not look at them. Lesson plans were viewed as necessary; however, overly detailed plans were viewed as additional unnecessary paper work for the teacher.

One of the things that does come to mind, if anything, is that when we leave, we're always supposed to leave our lesson plan book in our mail box. We leave for a three-week break, or however long it is, (and) we're supposed to have already left our lesson plans made for the week that we come in. And sometimes I think that's kind of a strange thing to do because something may happen to me in the three-week (often times
more than three weeks) break that I'm gone that might make me change what I was going to come back and do, and the plans I left are completely changed.

Noninstructional duties required of teachers added to their workloads. Noninstructional duties included any task which imposed upon a teacher's time to spend with students, plan lessons, or involve parents in the education of the child. All teachers at G.K. Elementary were required to type their own documents, run off duplicate copies of instructional materials, and cut, color, and paste together visual aids utilizing their limited time. One teacher reflected on the lack of assistance:

I have taught in Mississippi, it was a nine-month school. I had a full-time aide in my room all day, every day, and she was totally wonderful, and that relieves a lot of stress. She ended up doing all the busy work. She did all the bulletin boards, all the running off of materials... she allowed me to spend more time on teaching the children. What a difference that made.

Other noninstructional duties required of the teachers were playground duty, lunchroom duty and additional paper work due to federal, state, school district, and school site demands. All teachers participated in a rotational duty schedule which involved watching the students during different parts of the day. Teachers generally did not look forward to spending this noninstructional time of their work day and looked forward to being through with it. Specialist teachers working the extended contract served this type of noninstructional duty every day. Additional paper work required of the teacher by increasing demands for accountability also added to teachers' workloads.

I quit teaching for a while. I just got burned out around the time that PL-94-142 was passed and being implemented in California. All the paperwork that we were bombarded with, I mean it ... I found myself spending less and less time with
kids and more and more time doing paper work. I was spending so much time writing plans and permissions and chasing parents all over the place. That's the kind of thing that's really frustrating. It seemed to be more streamlined in this school district, but now it looks like somehow they're (the school district) going to go back to making it more intrusive. So I mean ... we can't help shooting ourselves in the foot in terms of all the legal hassles with permission slips and writing IEP (Individual Educational Programs) goals out. Every time that somebody finds a way to make it easier, somebody else has to find a reason why that won't work and we have to do it the long, hard way. Personally, I believe in spending more time with the kids and less time with the pencil. Most teachers I know feel this way. But I think there are a lot of bureaucrats, the people who get paid a salary to work with the federal and state government through the legislation. I think a lot of those people on the federal and state level, they're concerned with the letter of the law and you have to meet the letter of the law. Maybe somebody ought to stop and think about changing the law so that it meets reality rather than changing reality to meet the law. The focus should be on helping the child in the best way possible. Isn't that why we are here? I think some people lose sight of that. The further away from the kids you get, the more you need paper work to justify your job. Look at all these papers. Look, three-ring binders full of stuff that I have to do. I've got to look at and fill out and they really don't look at it. This isn't rocket science. Basically we have people working for people. It's the same thing as planting a tree, if you have a problem you get help. You work together and solve the problem. Sometimes I feel like we are trying to make it into brain surgery.

I don't think year-round has anything to do with stress. I'm stressed. The amount of stress comes from the amount of paper work and the behavior of some of the kids and everything. If anything the breaks we get in year-round schools are really stress-reducing.

The additional workload created by noninstructional tasks and the lack of adequate support staff to assist teachers in the workplace increased frustration levels of the teachers and decreased the amount of time teachers spent with their students.
Task Specialization

The researcher observed specialist teachers working on the extended contract represented the degree of specialization which occurred in the year-round school's workplace. They provided specialized services for physically challenged students as well as students identified as having learning disabilities. Other specialists provided instruction in specialized areas such as art, music, physical education, and library skills. All specialists worked on an extended contract, usually 219 days, which increased their workloads.

I worked the extended contract. It was a brain blower! In those days we received twenty days off other than regular holidays. The money was not worth it.

You can't keep it up. Every three weeks it changed. I don't know how people handle extended contracts.

The demand on time for the restructuring of instructional plans every three weeks to accommodate students returning from track break. Extended contract teachers and 180 day contracted teachers reported that long-range lesson planning frequently started with the scheduling in of breaks and changing preparatory times with each of the five phases of the year-round school. Reduced vacation time and the need to stay highly organized throughout the year were cited by specialist teachers as some of the sacrifices associated with extended contracts. The one piece of advice given by all specialists was to stay organized due to their perception that once off track, it is impossible to bring it back on track.

Another sacrifice was the repetitiveness of instruction.

Well I just go into automatic. I get tired of it. It's like I say not again. I lose some of my energy in the presentation. But, it's
new to the kids, it's not old hat to them. I need to give them my all even if it's the second, tenth, or twentieth time I've presented the same lesson.

The year-round school offers regular contract teachers opportunities to enjoy vacation times at different times during the school year. Teachers at G.K. Elementary cited these vacations as an advantage and often chose to teach on the track that afforded them the best vacation opportunities. Some teachers viewed the track breaks provided by the 60-15 plan as extra time to catch up on school work. "You have more time. If you want to on the three weeks off, you can come in and run things off or just catch up on what you are doing. There's much more time to work on your curriculum." Other teachers advised not to work on school work during breaks. They felt that the time needed to be used to get away and rejuvenate so upon re-entering the workplace teachers felt well rested. Upon further investigation of these conflicting viewpoints, the researcher discovered that the more experienced teachers tended to view the break time as their time, whereas the less experienced teachers tended to use their breaks to catch up on work or reflect upon their instruction during this time.

I like track five because of the breaks and the way you can wrap things up .... report card, everything. I found if I wasn't wrapped up I would take things home and spend my breaks working. Now I find I don't get myself in that trap. If you have breaks in between you let things pile up and say I'll catch up over break. Once I'm home for a few weeks or have come back from a trip, I can gear up again. It's like the beginning of school all over again. You have enthusiasm, you start neat projects. Your going to redo your room. Also, I think if you have a particularly rough class and you find things have not been working out, it gives you a chance to say okay, that didn't work. We will start over with new rules and start with a clear slate.
All teachers on regular contracts enjoyed the frequent breaks provided by the year-round school calendar. Only one believed the breaks were not long enough to provide travel opportunities and as a result, was considering moving to a nine-month calendar. Specialist teachers were not afforded these breaks.

I get jealous because I feel I am getting cheated concerning time out. I understand that I need to be here and I enjoy being here, but when other teachers get three-week breaks ......I really need the money right now.

Teachers interviewed working on the extended contract planned to continue the next year. They stated financial reasons as the key factor in choosing to work the extended contract. Almost all of the 180 day contracted teachers denounced the extended contract option and were adamant concerning the need for breaks from teaching as these provided required rejuvenation periods.

Authority

Teachers acknowledged the principal as the primary source of authority in the workplace. They viewed their power base as influential. The degree of influence the teacher perceived was based on their relationship with the principal. Teachers who transferred to G.K. Elementary by request of the principal felt they had discretionary decision-making authority in the classroom and influenced decisions made in the overall operation of the school. Teachers new to the profession or this site were less likely to perceive they had discretionary authority in their classrooms and often reported they did not have influence on any aspect of the school's operation. Teachers working at G.K. Elementary who were
neither new to the school, profession, nor part of those who transferred over with the principal, felt that they had authority to choose the methodology of instruction and materials used in the instructional process. They seemed to feel as if that was enough authority and did not seek additional responsibilities to enhance their power base, often saying they had trouble enough finding sufficient time to do their own jobs and were not looking to do someone else's.

Disciplining students beyond the classroom was the only area in which all teachers confided a desire to have more authority over. The general consensus was that when a student was sent to the office for behavioral problems, nothing happened. A discipline plan had been developed by the teachers and an assistant principal. Unfortunately, when the assistant principal was transferred, the plan was never fully implemented and quickly fell apart. As a result, many teachers did not send students to the office for behavioral problems and expressed frustration due to a lack of options for disciplining students.

Organizational features encompass more than developing schedules, maintaining the physical plant, and evaluating teachers based on review of lesson plans and scant observation. The organizational feature of the workplace demands that the administration become the educational leader of the school as well as the manager. The role of the principal must encompass that of a manager, an instructional leader, and a facilitator of interaction and communication between teachers, parents, and students.
Analysis of the Psychological Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

Meaningfulness of Work

Meaningfulness of the work teachers do was measured by the teachers' perceptions of how successful they were with students. The year-round school's workplace provided the teachers with an increased opportunity to evaluate the progress they had attained with students in several ways. All teachers felt that students attending the year-round school required less review time due to the shortened breaks between learning sessions. Students also matured throughout the summer months, which enabled teachers to feel more productive as students progressed. Teachers could readily compare progress made with the previous group of students with new students starting the year out due to the shortened breaks. The frequent breaks allowed time to evaluate and change learning strategies that were not working, rest periods to rejuvenate for both teachers and students, and extra planning time for beginning teachers to improve techniques, gather materials, and self-evaluate what they were doing. The following quotes were representative of teachers' perceptions of the meaningfulness of their work in the year-round school's workplace:

Working in the year-round school makes me feel like I am a better teacher. More experienced, more flexible, it's easier to handle situations that come up because you have more time to think.

Because I have the whole year with them, even though I am only with them one hundred and eighty days like nine-month teachers, I really do see a whole year's growth in my children.
I have more energy because I teach at a year-round school and have track breaks during the year.

The breaks, I think that after sixty days you just aaaaah, and then you get this tremendous three-week break and you're ready to go again. Also many of the three-week breaks are combined with other vacation times so they are longer. You come back and you're ready. I have more energy, I feel and the kids go, they get tired of seeing you and listening to you and they need a break too.

My pet peeve with the nine-month was that when students came back from Christmas break I couldn't believe their maturity level! How great it was, but the year was half over. In the year-round school the kids mature for the whole year and I can take advantage of that maturity.

I feel more important working at the year-round school because of the breaks. I can get myself together and people are always interested in it.

It's hard to gear back down to the student's ability level from one group to the next due to the lack of time between school years. The students change so much during the year you can really see the progress you have made with them... but we need more time between school years to gear down for the next group.

I feel like I am really getting somewhere with the kids.

Well, you get a break. I get the entire month of November off. So I come back refreshed. It's too long of a stretch from January to June without a break.

Although no research evidence existed to support teachers' perceptions as to the lack of review time needed for year-round students, teachers cited their experiences with students from first to fifth grade which supported their perceptions. The experiences centered around the teacher coming in off of a track break, starting a lesson review, and students informing the teacher that they had already done this. Some primary students had no trouble telling the teacher the exact page in the
math book where they had left off three weeks previous. Teachers reported that due to the shortened time period between grade levels, they did not spend the first three months of the year reviewing the previous grade material. A question which concerned the researcher was if the students were not spending three months reviewing previous grade level material like nine-month teachers were perceived as doing, and the curriculum of the nine-month and the year-round schools were the same, what was done with the time saved?

**Level of Stress**

Most teachers reported that they experienced less stress working in the year-round school due to the frequent breaks.

The only difference I think between year-round school and nine-month school is when you feel like you're tired of school, oh, I just can't handle it any more, I am sick of it. You think okay! I can make it. I can make it I only have this many more days until break.

Because of the breaks, you know, you have this much to cover and then a break. If your on track and you have one of those times when you don't feel good, but you can't really say you are sick, but you really don't feel up to it. I can say track break is coming up I can make it.

I think those frequent breaks make it less stressful for both teachers and student.

I say I experience less stress in a year-round school because people are more up. Different ones are going out and when they are getting ready they are just really on the upper burner and then you think you have just so many more days until you're on break. It seems to be... everybody is happier.

However, the year-round school was more stressful if it involved changing classrooms throughout the year because of the enormous increase in the
workload it created. Teachers on the extended contract perceived their stress level as higher than other teachers working at the site due to the limited break time.

I get jealous because I feel I am getting cheated concerning time out. I understand that I need to be here and I enjoy being here, but when other teachers get three week breaks ..... I really need the money right now. I think the options they (the school district) have concerning our time off as specialists is really limited.

The researcher discovered that the school district offered specialists several contract options. The options were a 229-day contract, a 219-day contract, a 209-day contract and a 184-day contract. At the selected year-round school all specialists worked the 219-day contract. Further investigation revealed that most year-round school specialist teachers in the district worked the 219-day contract. When the question of contract choice emerged, the researcher found that the only choice involved was accepting the 219-day contract or finding a nine-month school to work at except for speech therapists and counselors. Some teachers reported being pressured into working the extended contract.

The pressure goes something like this, you'll go into a building and the principal will say all of my specialists work 219 days, if you want to work any less days you need to consider working somewhere else. So it means going back into the job pool.

We have a choice, I can't remember what the choices are. We are all taking the 219-day contract, that's the way the district wants it.

It was stated our schedule is 219 days and that is what all specialists work and you will work that contract. I said what about the ten extra days and he said, we don't do that at my school because you get too burned out, and that was that.
One specialist teacher reported that she had demanded the 229-day contract due to financial problems. She was given the contract the year before the study was conducted. She confided that after working the 229-day contract for one year, it was indeed too stressful, vacation days were necessary, and as a result she elected to work a 219-day contract despite continuing financial problems. Another specialist reported that she usually worked beyond the 219-day contract because she felt a substitute would not be capable of running her classroom. She would have preferred the 229-day contract but felt she did not want to cause problems. As a result, she often worked days for which she was not financially compensated.

Two specialists worked the 229-day contract because substitutes would not be provided by the district in their absence, and both felt obligated to be at work every day to provide continuous assistance to the students they served. Both of these specialists described themselves as workaholics and stated that they would probably be working somewhere else if off during track breaks.

All teachers reported that they felt stress in the workplace. When questioned on the matter of working during the summer months when nine-month schools were out, one-third of the teachers reported that it had very little effect on them:

You don't even think about it, you just go by your 60-15 schedule. The kids adapt to the schedule, you and your kids just get into a little rut. I don't really think about it.

You have breaks at other times of the year. We have a teacher who likes to go to Germany during Oktoberfest, so his track is off on break at that time. I have friends who go to the basketball tournaments in March. They pick a track when they can be off at that time. So you can experience a lot of
different opportunities for vacations when you work at a year-round school.

Well there aren't any school zones to slow down for. I like to work in the summer because it's so hot outside and I don't have a pool. There are nicer times to take vacations.

Track choice emerged as an important issue for teachers in this study. Teachers were found to have clear preferences toward track assignment. These preferences were properties of the individual teacher and appeared to be correlated with the teacher's life style and vacation plans. The researcher questioned how track assignments were made. Teachers related how they were assigned to the track they currently worked. In all cases, teachers with experience at the school site had selected the track they were assigned. New teachers to the site and less experienced teachers were assigned to the remaining tracks. Each year as teachers transferred or retired from G.K. Elementary, various tracks became available. Teachers with the most seniority had first choice of the available tracks, and if they were not interested in changing tracks, the opportunity passed down to the next senior teacher(s) until the track was filled. New teachers were placed on the tracks which remained. The researcher observed that most of the senior teachers on the G.K. Elementary staff were on track five. Track five vacation periods were longer than three weeks because they occurred during regular school holidays. Also, track five most closely mirrored the nine-month school schedule. Regardless of the track assignment, most teachers asserted that they preferred working on a year-round schedule despite some of the stress it sometimes caused.
It seems that the week before break the kids get a high. I don't, but they get talkative and they are anticipating the break. Behavior is bad! But I don't know if it's the kids or me which has changed, maybe I am less tolerant. I guess getting ready to go on break is stressful.

It's stressful, I think at times there's more stress and sometimes there's less. I think that when you are going out on break you can convince yourself that you can make it and lower the amount of stress you feel. Well, it seems like there is always something to do which adds to the stress. It's really hectic when you have to do double open houses, double programs...

You don't really get a break from the kids. If you've got two, three weeks off you can get away from the building, but the kids are still in the back of your mind or you go on break, but you're in school catching up or getting ready you never really relax. I really liked year-round until this year. I've got a difficult class, and I really need a longer break this year.

Since I don't have any small children at home it doesn't make it a problem. If I had children who were small and wanted to play with children in nine-month schools that would be a problem. This year it's been kind of a hard time. I really was ready to get out when the nine-month school ended, but I am alright now.

I can relate to that because my husband is at home right now. Living with someone is hard because we usually get up together and now he doesn't have to. I have to go to work and I am the one doing all the housework, so it's hard. I want to be with him. I don't want to be at school.

It doesn't affect me now. When I first started I really missed my summers off and it took a couple of years to get used to working in the heat. It's the hottest part of the year, end of July and August. It really affected me more than anyone else because my program is outside most of the time. Now I take my time-out days usually in July and have adjusted physically to the heat.

I think if you looked at the long-term effect of year-round school schedules on teachers, even though they get frequent vacations you would find teachers become more burned out. I've seen it with teachers who have worked in the year-round schools for a long time. The teachers who stay seem to care
more about their vacation times and are less dedicated to the kids or education.

Teachers working at the year-round school confessed that the summer phase of the year-round school was different from other phases.

I am just tired because ah...this time of the year everything's gotten real peaceful, sort of the lazy summer... things now are just lulling me to sleep here. But I don't feel negative about working through the summer. Working through the summer, in a lot of ways, is very nice because there are fewer referrals, I have fewer kids, a lot of them don't show up during the summer because their families have taken them off somewhere. So I have a chance to spend time doing more things with the kids that I have.

You change a little in the summer months. I dress more casually. It's hotter so you don't want to wear stockings and look professional like you would normally and the kids are hot so they get more exhausted.

I think as the school year continues the momentum that starts at the beginning of the year fades. This time coming back was almost like, okay let's just get this over with. I feel it from the kids too.

I am waiting to go on vacation, I'm tired and I want to go.

I would like to tell other teachers on staff because parents have told me they don't like the way teachers dress in the summer. It's just in the summer they tend to get lazy. I don't think they look professional in shorts or without nylons. We want to be treated like professionals so we need to dress and behave like professionals and the dress gets too casual in the summer.

Well, kids slack off in the summer, attitudes change. I think it helped when the district said all kids could wear shorts. It used to be only when the nine-month schools were out, students at year-round schools could wear shorts. So when the nine-month schools got out there was a major attitude change.

Well, I really don't feel like working.

It's there! From a teaching stand point when we roved stress was caused by losing my room. I need my own space. I
didn't want anyone getting into my stuff. I didn't have friends on my track and became more isolated. The stress came for me because I felt that I had lost my school. I didn't feel connected. When we would meet after school it was a struggle to get everyone there and meetings became complaint sessions lacking educational focus.

Teachers at the year-round school used the phrase "pace yourself." This phrase implied that work was spread over the entire year, and teachers new to the year-round school would have dead time in the summer if all was accomplished before the remaining school days had expired. Another suggestion which was made was to save activities which generated student interest until the last phase; in this way, students were more likely to attend school. The implication that the school environment differed during the summer was evident in most of the interviews. However, when the researcher asked if teachers felt that the summer phase was less educationally focused, the general response was no, but a few informants disagreed with the others and confided that the educational program was greatly influenced by a "lazy summer" syndrome.

The stress level of teachers was perceived as the same or lower in most cases than that of their counterparts working in the nine-month schools. Supporting Johnson (1990) and others, teachers at the selected year-round school attested that student behavior and noninstructional tasks were identified as potential sources of stress.

I don't think it's .... I don't feel stress because of year round, I feel stress working with difficult students or dealing with petty problems that come along. I mean, just normal school time situations when we have to do schedules, you worry about what the teachers are going to say.

I don't think the stress I feel has anything to do with year-round school. I am stressed by the amount of paper work and the behavior of some of the kids and everything.
I don't think stress levels are any different in a year-round or a nine-month school. It all depends on your administrator, the type of class you have and it also depends on the demands you place on yourself. Some people create the stress they are under.

I think teaching is a really draining profession, because of what I call "Schizophrenic" thought. You are thinking about what's going on with this kid in front of you, plus you're monitoring the whole room and keeping track of the materials. Getting things out to use as examples. The time crunch is boom! boom! and there is a lot of stress involved in keeping going. Maybe as time goes on I'll get more efficient and relaxed with that. It's really hard.

All teachers pointed out that changing classrooms during the year added to the stress and workload of working in a year-round school. Some unique aspects of stress in the year-round school's workplace were identified as part of the psychological feature of the year-round school's workplace. This interaction of workplace features caused reduced stress perceptions for teachers who did not view the work environment as a source of friendship and increased the stress of teachers who sought close friendships within the workplace.

**Professional Growth and Development**

The professional growth and development of year-round teachers was affected by the year-round schedule. Teachers working at the selected year-round school reported that they had difficulty finding programs which offered classes they needed to complete a degree program at times that they could attend. Teachers who were currently working on advanced degrees were enrolled in alternative universities which offered classes on weekends. In-services provided within the workplace had to be conducted two or more times. This scheduling was
due to the fact that teachers working at G. K. Elementary were not all present at any time during the school year other than the few opening days of school at which time they reported the need for time alone in their classrooms preparing for the new year.

Another problem was that professional organizations and seminars held meetings during the summer months when nine-month schools were out. Professional development was cited as a problem by most year-round teachers. The educational level and teaching experience of the teachers interviewed at G. K. Elementary was shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Teachers with Bachelor degrees</th>
<th>Teachers with Master's degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers working in the year-round school workplace faced several challenges in obtaining advanced degrees and attending professional growth classes, seminars, and professional organization meetings. These challenges were created by the year-round schedule itself.
Year-round school forced me into getting my advanced degree from Leslie College (correspondence courses), because there was absolutely no way I could take a summer off. I think, that I have trouble giving it my all. I don't have the time or energy to study and do the course work.

I feel fortunate that I've been able to find a graduate program that is offered on weekends.

Well, for me it's been okay because I've already got my Master's degree. I really have no desire to go any higher than that. So I haven't worried about trying to work in classes or anything like that. All I need is my six hours (every five years to maintain state certification). I think it would be hard on people who are trying to get their Master's degree and working. Everything has to be my classes, I guess you don't have time off to take courses in the summer.

It's hard when you work at a year-round school. It's difficult taking classes. There were two classes offered at night and three during the day this summer. The one I needed for my endorsement was offered during the day and I couldn't take it because I had to work.

With me I already have my 32 (credit hours) and above so it's been no problem. I have heard some teachers have been handicapped by it because summer classes are taught in the day and they can't get what they need... night classes to attend. It really hasn't bothered me because I already had my 32 before coming to work at a year-round school. I take classes now by choice.

Well a little bit, I never expected to teach this long. So I didn't get a Master's degree earlier and now working in a year-round school I find it's hard to keep my energy up to take those night classes and work through the summer.

When I first started my Master's, at that time there were no classes available at night during the summer time. All the classes you took had to be night courses. All the summer classes were offered during the day, again geared toward nine-month schools, and it made it very difficult and tiring and time-consuming and that was really stressful.

I am going to UNLV to get my Master's degree. It's hard to work full-time and get the classes I need. It's very taxing on your health. It's going to be difficult.
That's the biggest complaint I have about a year-round school. I would love to have summers off so that I could take Dr. Gort's literature class. It's a lot of work. He offered it this summer for four days, four nights and four afternoons. I thought to myself that's going to be tough because I was doing my ordering and I had the end of my high-priority objectives to finish up, new inventory and I decided I can't take all of that time that it would take me to complete the work that course required. So I didn't do it this year. I really would have liked to take that course.

That is one of the difficulties. It's hard to take classes. There are always classes out there to take, but they may not be the ones you want. If a course is offered during the summer many times it is offered during the instructional day. For me, if I were younger and wanted to pick up a Master's, I think it would be very difficult. I work with people who try to take night courses or attend NOVA University on weekends. I think their instructional program suffers. They just don't have the time to put into the students. The work they usually did at home to keep up is left undone, which really leaves them stressed and tired all the time. This is particularly true if they are working on an extended contract.

Some teachers felt that picking up courses for recertification or working on additional degrees was not affected by the year-round schooling. However, most teachers felt that the year-round schedule did impede their professional growth and development. Professional organizations often held seminars during the summer months which year-round teachers were unable to attend. Teachers at G.K. Elementary felt that conditions and opportunities for professional growth were improving as universities and other organizations made changes in the scheduling of events and classes to accommodate the year-round school teachers. However, the demands of the workplace often prevented the teachers from "giving it there all" in the course they were enrolled in or the classes they taught at the selected year-round school site.
Analysis of the Cultural Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

Common Goals

The researcher noted few signs of common goals within the selected year-round school. Teachers revealed in their interviews that they cared about the children they taught and held a common belief that year-round schools were better environments than nine-month schools for student learning. However, as the interviews progressed, the teachers seemed less certain about how beneficial year-round schooling actually was in regard to their professional growth, rejuvenation, and levels of job stress. The frequent breaks seemed to be the crucial aspect of the year-round school workplace.

Few teachers felt that year-round schools should not be continued. The researcher thought that during the course of the interviews, teachers seemed to be defensive of any statement which they perceived as anti-year-round. Teachers reacted in a protective manner toward the concept of the year-round school. The first incident which led the researcher to examine the protective nature of the teachers being interviewed occurred on the second day of the study when two teachers cancelled their interview sessions. When questioned as to why they did not want to participate in the study, they responded that they felt the researcher did not like the year-round school schedule. As the conversation continued, the researcher was able to convince the teachers that the study was descriptive in nature and its intention was to describe the workplace from their perspective. Interviews were secured from 36 of the 41 teachers
working at G.K. Elementary. The school nurse and one kindergarten teacher working on a nine-month schedule were not interviewed by the researcher due to lack of availability. Two of the teachers did not want to take part in the study and did not care to comment on the reason. The remaining teacher was not interviewed due to a scheduling problem on the part of the researcher.

The second incident occurred one year prior to the study when an elementary school near the selected year-round school opened on a nine-month schedule instead of a previously planned year-round schedule. Teachers' reactions toward the change in schedule reflected betrayal and anger.

If they would only try it. They would see that year-round school is great. They are just used to the three months off in the summer and it's a joke, because if they saw how much better the year-round schedule is . . . and it is . . .

Some teachers left because this school went year-round. Some teachers have old outmoded ideas that teachers need to have the summer off.

People's opinions get to me sometimes and that makes me mad. They think that it's terrible, how awful they say, like working in the summer is the worst thing in the world. So I find myself defending the year-round school. It's really no big deal.

The final factor which added to the defensive position taken by most teachers on staff was the absence of secondary year-round schools in the district. When asked if year-round schooling would benefit everyone, many teachers responded that it would not as long as there were no secondary schools operating on the year-round schedule. They felt that the school district lacked commitment to the year-round school schedule,
and that parents who accepted year-round were let down by the absence of the year-round schedule at the secondary level.

Maybe if kindergarten through twelfth grade went year-round it would be for everyone. I think there would be an adjustment period, but it would work.

Year-round is fun. It’s a challenge and it would be successful if there were a system that incorporated secondary schools into the year-round system. Because until you get junior high or middle schools along with senior high schools into a year-round plan the year-round school is not going to work. People are going to be against it. Because the argument people use is, well what if I have kids in junior high and high school and the kids are in year-round elementary what are we going to do about child care. That’s the most important argument against year-round elementary schools.

If they (the school district) would make it where everybody was year-round and the senior highs and the junior highs were year-round I think it would be wonderful. I actually would prefer it really, I think. I could see that continual learning process and there is not that stagnation from sitting in boredom and not thinking the entire summer. I think the brain is like a muscle. If you don’t exercise it, it gets flabby and is not going to want to do anything. It’s going to be sore when you try to use it. I don’t think the summer off is good for junior high and senior high kids, because there is so little for them to do here.

The fabric that bound these teachers was not a clear set of educational goals. Instead, the researcher alleged that the common bond was their identity as year-round school teachers. The teachers seemed to live from break to break. The track breaks the year-round schedule provided appealed to the teachers, especially those with seniority.

**Supportiveness**

The supportiveness teachers perceived originated from two sources in the workplace. The first source was support from the principal of the
school and the second source was from other teachers working within the year-round school's workplace. Teachers perceived the principal to be very well organized. He was definitely the central power figure at the school, possessing both authority of position and respect from the staff. Teachers affirmed that the principal controlled and directed the daily events within the school. Very few teachers claimed to have influence over decisions made by the principal. The following quotes represent the teachers' views concerning the administrative support they perceived:

Basically he doesn't take days off. I usually know because his truck is not out front. He really is thorough about everything and if he is out he leaves instructions.

He is not out very often. It seems like he is always here.

I had a problem with trying to get done with everything last year. I was really frustrated. He (the principal) would always come in and tell me to schedule in my breaks first and then do your (my) long-range plans to make sure that you (!) spread things out, instead of trying to cram everything into a nine-month schedule like I was accustomed to. He helped me adjust that way.

The principal is super here!

I think we are empowered here. The principal is wonderful. He lets us do what we feel is working with our classes. He has great suggestions. I like him because he doesn't make us jump one hundred percent into the new things going on in the district. He lets us work into all the new teaching methods gradually.

The principal is very organized.

Not all of the teachers perceived administrative support in the same light. In fact, many of the new teachers who were whole-language-based felt they received little support from the administration and often interpreted his suggestions as demands for them to give up on their approach to teaching
reading. Their perception of the administration was that he supported the older staff members who did not want to change. Two teachers stated in their interview that they were leaving the school due to the lack of support they received from the principal.

He (the principal) is very staunch about coordinating lesson plans with school district curriculum guides. This is a very skill-based school. It's not an up and coming school as far as trying new teaching methods. A lot of the whole-language-based programs are not used and other new ideas are brushed aside. Newer teachers on the staff have felt really tied up by that and frustrated by that and are leaving because of it.

Other teachers reported that they were not concerned with the support they received from the administration.

As long as I follow my curriculum, he should leave me alone. I'm not told this is the way you should teach this, but he has been on me to try new methods. I've never been told don't ever teach that lesson again. I mean you only use your good sense. I mean if you can't make an educational judgement after going through your training, then you have chosen the wrong career.

Teachers' perceptions as to the support they received from the principal depended upon whether or not they received consistent support from the administration. In the case study, the school's division over how reading was to be taught, whole-language as opposed to skill-based, caused new teachers to seek support at the same time older teachers sought reassurance. As a result, the older teachers felt they were being nagged to change, but were not required to change over to whole-language. New teachers felt that because they were told to use the basal textbook, that they were not supported in their whole-language instruction. New teachers complained that they had been instructed by their training in
college to view skill-based approaches to reading as obsolete, and basal textbooks as watered-down garbage. The principal's role as perceived by the teachers was to maintain order, assure schedule structure and teacher accountability to agreed-upon standards and procedures. However, because of past inconsistencies the principal's support was viewed by some teachers as tenuous at best.

I put a lot more time into preparation and scheduling, some teachers don't. Some principals don't care as far as keeping kids on the right plan and making sure your not repeating lessons with the same kids. When kids came off break they missed skills because teachers did not keep organized lesson plans. Other teachers taught the same lesson to all the kids whether they were coming off track break or just going out. When students were out they just missed whatever skill was taught during that time. But that has a lot to do with the principal. I think it depends on the type of principal you have. I've worked right here with teachers who don't keep track of the kids' instruction. That bothers me, the principal needs to make certain (that) teachers are doing their jobs correctly.

The experience you have teaching is influenced by the principal. My last principal really helped me get organized and had a better understanding of me personally. He was far more structured than this principal.

The second source of support teachers received was from colleagues. The year-round school schedule by its very nature created barriers to this source of support. The five-track system separated the teachers at various times, causing a hardship on sustained relationships. Teachers described the problem as follows:

I find that, well a lot of the people you don't, I don't think there is as much camaraderie in the year-round school. I mean for me there isn't. I used to have more friends before we went year-round.
You don't get as close to teachers as you do in a nine-month school. You are close, but you don't develop the strong ties. I don't think because of the moving in and out, or at least in the two years I've been here I don't think we have close ties.

Well, you don't get to know some of the teachers very well because they are on different tracks than you are. So you just don't get to know everyone.

Well, that's great, because if you don't get along with someone they go out part of the time and you go out. I don't, I am not big on socialization with faculty and it works great for year-round because you rarely see people. Even to this day I couldn't name some of the people at this school because they are gone and I am gone.

You miss people you know, you miss seeing somebody and sharing ideas when they are out.

It's hard to keep things tight. Oh hi, I remember you! And to make it even better we have two lunch schedules. It's really hard to find ways to create ties especially with the intermediate grades.

I have a sense of, from teachers I've talked to in private, I don't feel the cohesiveness between the staff as much as I would like to. Things could be done to welcome new teachers. I don't feel like a part of the school, there is some frustration.

It's difficult to find friends. There wasn't any for quite a while that I wanted to share dinner with. They are at different stages of their lives.

I am really not a social person. I always have things to do. I work through my lunch. I don't have as much time as others do.

That it does (the question was does the year-round schedule add to the isolation of teachers) and I am glad for that personally. So if you're big on socialization then year-round is not for you, because you're off and they're off and you really don't get to know the people that well. Which is good because it minimizes arguments and cliques. It just gets your in-fights and petty arguments down to a minus four. That I didn't realize, that was a surprise to me, a very pleasant surprise.
Another source of isolation was identified by teachers as inherent in certain tracks: Track one with a late starting date and track two which had breaks too soon in the school year.

Oh, I can think of one, when you are on track one you start three weeks after everyone else (so) you sort of feel like your out of place. Like you don't belong. Everybody is up and going, they have their H.P.O. (high priority objectives) done. They are up and running. But you are just starting, you missed having everyone working on preparing (their classroom) and you feel isolated. There were all kinds of meetings that you missed and they try to update you, but something is always left out. You're always asking questions and feel behind.

If you are on track two, get to know all the faces before you go out on track break or you will never get to know everyone. If you don't you are still trying to get to know everyone at Christmas time.

The lack of cohesiveness between staff members was especially difficult for teachers new to the year-round school. This lack was apparent by the fact that they did not join the other teachers in the lounge for lunch and attempted to recruit the newest teachers into their cabal. The true price of the rift was that these teachers were leaving the school due to their perception of the support they received. The division between the whole-language-based instructors and the skill-based instructors was not the only division this researcher noted. Specialist teachers with the exception of two did not interact very much with the regular classroom teachers. This division may have resulted from the scheduling that specialists were required to do in regard to setting preparatory periods for the regular classroom teacher. Several interviews mentioned petty problems between staff members in regard to setting schedules for preparatory periods. These problems may stem from the lack of a clear set of goals for the
organization as a whole and the undercurrent expressed by some teachers that felt that the specialist programs provided the "fluff" in the education and the regular classroom instruction was at the heart of the educational process.

Analysis of the Economic Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

The year-round school workplace provided no special monetary rewards and incentives to teachers working in the school. The CCSD offered the same contract benefits to year-round school teachers as it did to teachers in the district working on the nine-month schedule. Job security was based on the number of years the teacher served in the district and was tabulated based on the teachers' date of hire, no exceptions were made for teachers working on an extended contract. Due to the growth experienced in the district, job security was not an issue. In fact, opportunities to transfer to other schools within the district occurred every spring. Some teachers at G.K. Elementary who were unhappy with the workplace elected to transfer to other schools in the district the following school year.

Specialist teachers: i.e., art, music, physical education, special education, counselors, reading specialists, librarians, and speech therapists, all worked on extended contracts. These contracts provided additional pay and benefits in accordance with the number of extra hours worked. Pay was based on the number of years of experience the teacher had with the district and the educational level (advanced degrees plus credit hours) the teacher had attained. Specialists at G. K. Elementary
school worked the 219-day contract except for the speech therapist and the counselor who worked the 229-day contract. Most teachers were uncertain as to exactly how much more money they were making, and estimates ranged from $5000 to as high as $10,000 more per year. These estimates did not include retirement benefits accrued by working on the extended contract. All of the extended contract teachers interviewed confessed that the additional income was a difficult financial incentive to pass up.

The salary increase is a big, big advantage. I am getting four thousand dollars more a year. One thing I do know, if I were not a year-round specialist, I would not be buying a house right now. It makes a big difference in affording a house, higher education goals, a car and insurance. A big difference. But, If I were not so financially strapped I would choose a nine-month schedule. When I have children I think I would like a nine-month contract. I don't know how some people do it. I don't feel this district is very accommodating to the needs of its teachers.

I work an extended contract and earn more money and that saves me from having to look for a summer job.

Yes, I would (miss) the extra money, the retirement benefits. Because I am going to retire in nine years if not before. I'll have my thirty years in. The extra money would really be nice.

You would need the money then, but also if you go back to the nine-month situation, where if you're in a nine-month school year, family ... you know ... you need to work. You have to go out and scrounge up a part-time job and it's summer time ... With year-round you've got it already built in, so your an expert in a profession why not do what your trained to do? The thing that you know best.

Personal vacation and family interaction is definitely affected. I like most make adjustments because of a lack of money. Money limits everything I do. I count myself fortunate in a way because I make more money.
The extra money earned was cited by teachers working the extended contract as saving them from finding a summer job to supplement their income. The regular contract teachers agreed that working the extended contract would keep teachers from moonlighting. However, most of the teachers not working on the extended contract and two teachers currently working on the extended contract felt that the money was not worth losing the break time.

No, I couldn't work the extended contract if I wanted to. But, I wouldn't give up my breaks. Maybe I'll work the extended contract my last three years so I can increase my retirement benefits. I like year-round school. But as my travel opportunities increase I would want a nine-month school.

I would be happier if this were a nine-month school. The main thing that makes me stay is, here at this point in my life I need the money. Two years from now, I'll be able to start looking for a new position in a nine-month school.

I don't know, I thought about it. It's a nice boost in salary ... I really don't want to give up the breaks. When you say economic the first thing I think of is that I am not very good at balancing my checkbook.

Ah, the money's not worth it. I, to me you really need to have those breaks. Some people can work. I enjoy being off, which is by the same token why I never sub (substitute teach) while I'm on break. I mean I've done it once or twice in the three years that I've been here. (if) A friend needed a favor so I would do it. To me time is precious and if I have time to have fun, or to enjoy myself, then I tend to take it.

I have substituted, only because I really needed the money. I think you need the breaks, I think they are really important. But when you are desperate for money...

Actually, I think it's better, because that (working the extended contract) tends to get you burned out. ... even when you had your break days you still had kids in your room, so when you took a vacation you had to make plans for
the substitute. It was endless work. At the time I had children in my room that were hard to handle. That is stressful.

In the long run I would say no, extended contracts are not worth the money, because I do feel tired. Yesterday I was feeling so bad I almost called in sick. But I wanted to make it to that last day before vacation. You just never feel rested.

The extended contract's, lack of breaks, students re-entering and leaving their program every three weeks, scheduling duties, was the extra money worth it? The researcher found a variety of perceptions concerning the answer to that question. School district records showed that most teachers working year-round contracts continued to work them until they quit the profession or retired. The conclusion might be that the extended contract was not over-taxing on the teacher and the financial benefits were worth the additional workload. However, the tendency to live life from paycheck to paycheck, with spending patterns paralleling income expansions, may also explain the lack of attrition from the extended contract. A penalty was also assessed to teachers working on the extended contract who transferred to nine-month contracts.

Monetarily I need the money that comes with the extended contract so I would seek out another year-round school if I lost my contract here. At this point in my life I need the money. Extended contracts are highly competitive because of the retirement benefits, so it would be hard to get another school. There are two or three schools that have regular teachers on extended contract, but they have to have already worked an extended contract. They were grandfathered in by the union. I don't think a regular contract teacher could demand the year-round schedule and get it.

It would really change my life. You set up all your house payments and car payments around your salary. I'm the sole supporter of my family. I have a sick husband and a 92-year-old mother-in-law. It would devastate me to lose that money. I have to have it until I retire.
I don't know if you heard this, but another thing which has happened is when we signed the extended contract, we were issued a check... not for the original amount, but based on your current salary. If you transfer to a nine-month school this money has to be paid back. I don't know how that works, but in some cases... I know people who had to pay a couple of thousand dollars back to the district when they transferred to a nine-month school.

The teachers working the extended contract had more to lose by changing contracts than a cut in salary; they also lost the enhanced retirement benefits coupled with a substantial monetary pay-back penalty. When asked if they would like to work on a nine-month or a nonextended contract, they typically responded by assessing their current need for the extra money.

Unless I win the lottery, I can't afford not to work on the extended contract.

Nonextended contract teachers had the opportunity to earn additional income by substitute teaching during their track breaks. A division in beliefs concerning working on track breaks was noted by the researcher. One group of teachers felt that break times should be utilized as rest periods and school should not be thought about until they returned to the job. Another group viewed track break as time to catch up on school paper work, read professional literature, or substitute for other teachers. Most teachers who substituted on their breaks substituted exclusively at G.K. Elementary.

Subbing (substitute teaching) on my off time. You get new ideas, cohesiveness. It's nice when there's a teacher out and they want you to sub. It's like a pat on the back from a colleague.
Teachers who substituted felt they were able to do a better job because they knew the children, school routines and procedures as well as the teacher's style and expectations.

Analysis of the Political Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

Fair and Equitable Treatment

Teachers at G.K. Elementary reported they felt that the year-round school workplace at the building level was the same as nine-month schools. Teachers at this particular school did not report any unfair treatment and felt they received equal treatment. However, this perception may have existed due to the rotating schedule which separated the staff. The lack of continuity in the teaching staff may have caused the teachers to be unaware of what was going on with any staff member other than themselves. This frequent ebb and flow of teacher attendance may have prevented issues from reaching a boiling point. Teachers rotating in missed what was happening while they were out and those going out were packing up, cleaning up, and wrapping up as they prepared for vacation. Each teacher was isolated from the rest of the staff at different times during the year.

I think as in any work situation in the world, people are (either) going to get along with each other or they are not. As far as people being treated equally, I don't see any favoritism or unfavoritism in a year-round school as being more or less than that found in a nine-month school. You're always going to have a clique in any workplace. I don't really see an established clique at this school.
The researcher was left with the impression that year-round teachers had neither the time nor opportunity to compare how one teacher was treated over another. This is not to say that every teacher felt they had the same influence over the workplace. Often, teachers who felt strong ties to the administration thought that the school was completely fair and equitable in its treatment of teachers. Teachers who were alienated by the administration hinted that as long as a teacher did things the way the principal felt they should be done, fair treatment would result. Most teachers, however, admitted that they came and did their job regardless of what happened outside their classroom doors.

**Voice in Overall Organization**

Most teachers at G.K. Elementary confided that they had little interest in matters which did not directly involve them. They were involved in decisions regarding textbook selections, purchasing of materials used during the course of their instruction, and participated on committees of their choice. The crucial element which determined their involvement was the amount of time they perceived they had. The greater amount of time teachers perceived they had, the greater was their involvement in decision-making committees.

Teachers asserted that the one place they felt they lacked voice was with the school board. They were particularly angry concerning the recent decision to open a new elementary school on a nine-month schedule instead of the year-round schedule on which it had been slated to open. The teachers at G.K. Elementary interpreted this decision as a direct
assault against the year-round school. Adding to this perception was the school district's lack of interest in opening a year-round secondary school.

Once given the opportunity they may be able to adapt to the year-round school. But, some people have their minds so set against year-round schools no matter what you say they will find fault with it. Where year-round schools are lacking is at the secondary level. I really think that we have a lot of parents who would pull their kids out if they have kids in a secondary school because the schedules are too different. If this district got off its butt and designated a couple of junior highs to be year-round and a few high schools you would see a lot more parents who would want their kids in year-round school.

The perception the teachers held in regard to the district's lack of support for the year-round school calendar was further strengthened by the warehouse distribution system of the district which closed during the summer and stopped service to the year-round schools. All of these factors left the teachers with the perception that they not only lacked voice in the larger school organization but increased feelings of isolation between the teachers and the school district as a whole. Teachers were apprehensive about the future of year-round schools and as a group, generally defended all aspects of the year-round school on the surface of the interview and in the teacher's lounge. However, as the interview progressed and the teachers became more at ease, they revealed what it was like to work in a year-round school, describing the good and the bad as part of the year-round school's workplace. Ninety percent of the teachers interviewed expressed a desire to continue working on the year-round schedule. They reported that they enjoyed the frequent breaks and could not imagine going back to a nine-month schedule.
Exercise of Power within the Workplace

The principal was clearly the central power driving the workplace of the year-round school. His power base was derived from the authority of his position. The absence of an informal leader on the staff raised questions as to the effect year-round schedules have on the informal organizations operating within the year-round school’s workplace. The front office staff at the selected year-round school scheduled students onto tracks pursuant to parental request, ordered supplies, and kept track of expenses and other paper work involved in operating the school.

The secretaries and/or the office staff have all been extremely competent and extremely authoritatative and were used to doing a lot of things that bordered on administrative tasks. I have always felt that the administrators gave them that kind of leeway because they were trusted people. So I never felt they were overstepping their bounds. But I do feel that they were put in a position where they could take some extra leadership roles, and I feel they did so very effectively.

Well, maybe some of the administrative support staff have more power because they have more responsibilities. Administration take vacations and the office personnel take over. I know they make up most of the classes.

Oh, I think if you truthfully look at thing(s), sometimes the support staff does run the school. If you think of the office staff as the nucleus, and you know, if it wasn’t for them we wouldn’t be here... I think it’s like that in nine-month schools also.

Teachers at G.K. Elementary reported that they would seek advice or assistance from any one of three sources depending upon the situation. The first source was the principal, if they perceived themselves to have a strong positive relationship with the principal. The second source was identified as fellow-teachers. Typically, they discussed student behavior
problems and personal problems. The third source of assistance came from the front office staff, where teachers would usually go for information.

Analysis of the Sociological Feature of the Year-Round School Workplace

Characteristics of the Clients

The sociological feature of the selected year-round school encompassed teachers' perceptions of the students, parents, their roles as teachers in a year-round school, and their status as teachers. All teachers in the study testified that student behavior affected the manner in which they taught. Teachers perceived working with difficult children to be the most challenging aspect of their job and for some, it was the root cause for quitting the profession.

I don't want to work on the extended contract. Before the economy got so bad teachers needed a break because they had people pushing and pulling at them all day. You have discipline problem(s), we have at risk teachers! I have a little boy in here that I think puts me at risk sometimes. He is on a different medication now. He slaps kids, he slugs kids. I feel like I have to really watch this kid all the time. I take him with me wherever I go. I can't leave him with a group of children or someone will get hurt. It's frustrating because I feel the doctor should have talked to me. The other medication he was on was working and this new drug is causing him to act like Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde. They changed his medication because the doctor and the mother felt that the medication he was previously on was addictive, but this other stuff just isn't working.

The teachers perceived the behavioral aspects of students to be representative of student attitudes towards authority and the educational system as a whole. Student behavior impacted upon teacher workload
and either placed increased levels of stress on the teacher or relieved stress depending upon the type of behavior.

Exhausting! Last year was more exhausting than this year. But it gets to a point where you're sick of these kids. Then there are other kinds that are a joy to be with and you look forward to seeing them. Then there are those that suck everything out of you every time you see them. You get really tired of their attention seeking behaviors. So I spend a lot of time doing step-by-step planning and try to encourage them, redirecting their energies, reinforcing and reinforcing good behaviors. Praising them and at the same time I am trying to watch everyone else. As a result I feel really splintered.

Teachers perceived the current system of assigning students to tracks created a disparity in the distribution of students with behavior problems. They implied that students who were bussed to the school were most likely to end up on a track together, and oftentimes the least desired track by most teachers.

I don't know if that's one of your questions, but a lot of my ... I have to say all of my behavior problems excluding a couple, are bussed and I thought that was just a freak coincidence, but I've talked to a couple of other teachers and it's not a coincidence. So I'm wondering gosh, what is it? Is it the students' way of saying well it's not fair that we have to be bussed? When we have a school this close by or is it something else? Is it the neighborhood they are in? I don't know.

Track two had some really terrible classes on it. My theory was that the principal allowed parents to request tracks for their kids and no one ever requested track two. So you tended to get the parents who don't care enough to look at the calendar and select a track. So I had awful classes when I was on track two. To be honest I felt I could take those kids knowing there would be a break coming up. I didn't have to have them for very long periods of time.

The extended contract teachers at the selected year-round school did not have the frequent breaks to escape from the challenges created by
student behavior. When teachers working the 180-day contract were asked if they would work the extended contract, all but two stated that the rest periods provided by the breaks were required to ensure they would not "burn out". The teachers also reasoned that students benefited from their breaks.

I don't get a choice to work the extended contract. I don't think ... I don't know if I would. It would depend on the kids, if the kids were a bunch of morons I would need the breaks.

Oh yeah, it's something to look forward to. If this kid is getting on your nerves you know you only have a couple of more weeks and they are gone for a while.

I think students don't get as worn out from playing. This gives them a break when they are really getting frustrated with school. I didn't believe that until I worked at a year-round school.

Teachers believed that student attendance was impacted during the summer session of the year-round school. Students' physically reporting to school as well as mental alertness seemed to wane, according to most teachers interviewed. The reasons given for this noted decline ranged from racial/ethnic affiliation to the end of the nine-month school year or parents operating mentally on the traditional nine-month calendar.

Attendance is a problem for my Hispanic kids. They have to ride the bus from North Las Vegas. If no one does anything about the fourth grade schedule next year I am afraid I'll see even more absences. The Hispanics are very family-orientated and use the summer (to) visit.

It's hard to teach in the summer because it's warm and the kids see their friends are out of school. The heat is a problem it's about ninety degrees by nine o'clock a.m., ....I had a little boy fall asleep yesterday, but that wasn't because of the heat. The families have Jr. High kids and they don't have bedtimes because they are on vacation and this little first grader did not go to sleep until after eleven p.m. He was up watching
television with his Jr. High brother. So the kids are on
teach starters even though they have a full trimester left.

The kids aren't real enthusiastic about coming to school
anymore, you know, or they're a lot more tired because
brothers and sisters are staying up, they want to stay up, they
got too little sleep. They don't want to get up in the morning.
They don't want to go to school. They are not as enthusiastic.

I have one student in particular that since the nine-month
schools got out has decided that school is out. The people
around him are out of school, so he feels he should be. Part
of the problem stems from the parents. They think that it's
summer so they can just take off whenever.

Some parents are very unhappy when they don't get the track
they wanted. Parents are resentful of the office. They take
their kids out of school whenever they want. If they come in
late there are problems catching up.

The perceptions of the teachers as to parental support directed
toward the school's workplace varied. Some teachers viewed parental
support being the same as that in a nine-month school. Others felt support
was dependent upon the socioeconomic status of the parent. The concern
that parents used the educational system as a babysitting service plagued
many teachers.

When the nine-month school gets out, and if any of the
students have siblings that are older and do attend nine-
month schools, there starts to be kind of a ... a little bit of a ... around May/June, end of May, June there starts to get a kind
of restlessness and then they phase back into the fact that
they have to stay. One thing I do find ridiculous is all that
parents choose a track for the student to be on. The idea is to
set up your vacation to fit in with the track breaks and choose
a track that will fit the vacation time. I know you can't always
tell your boss this is when I want my vacation, but I get very
aggravated when a parent comes in and says we're going to
be gone for the next two weeks on vacation, would you
please have work for my son or daughter, and then all I can
do is send a book and say well you're going to have to work
on your vacation. They rarely come back with anything done.
Summer camp, a student of mine left for summer camp two weeks and then went on vacation with mom. They usually check to see if it is okay, if there is any problem. I'm sure they would make arrangements, but these are students who would benefit from summer activities.

Families take vacations at other times of the year and just pull kids out of school. Elementary school children's families seem to feel that when it's vacation time for the parents it does not matter that the child misses school. If they miss, fine. I had one little boy who was out three weeks and came back with chicken pox, was out another week, then went on vacation for three more weeks. The parents asked me to send him homework. Well, I told them what needed to be done during the time the child was out and he was out of the country. Well, he came back with nothing. When I asked him where his work was, he told me it was not done because he did not have a pencil.

Well, I had somebody come up to me yesterday and wanted to know was there anything important being planned next week, because there was a church bible school that she wanted her daughter to go to. Unfortunately I said we're starting testing that week and we're also having a field trip next week, so it wouldn't be advantageous for that child to be gone. The mother understood that and that was fine. But, (in) other cases the parents come in and say, the child has afternoon camp would it be detrimental if this child left for a week or whatever and a lot of the time it's like, you know, she would probably get a lot more going to camp for that one week than staying here so I make those kinds of adjustments.

You get parents who don't want to be in a year-round school and they try to blame things on the year-round school schedule. They have a period of time when forms are sent out for track selection and the first 20 requests are granted. The rest they use to try and balance the classes. But, it doesn't work because I have 22 boys and 8 girls. I have had parents say that because of the breaks their child performs badly. They just get the hang of school rules and then they go on breaks and have to start learning all over. They feel the breaks are disruptive. Those parents are the exception, most like year-round school. Some of the large LDS (Latter-day Saints) families who have children in Junior high or high school don't like year-round because it splits up the family.
Some children come too early, I think. Parents drop them off on their way to work and I feel like it is not safe. They are unsupervised. We sent a note home this week ... I don't know. We are continuously telling parents don't bring your child so early.

I hardly ever see parents. I think we have a parent population here which is stressed out, they are too busy, too tired, too co-dependent, too sick. They really have a hard time caring about what's going on with their kids. I see even less because of what I teach. I think if I were in a neighborhood with more highly educated upper-class people, I would see more parents.

I think in any school the parent/school relationship is only going to be as strong as the parents are interested in their child.

I used to work on a track that when we would go out on vacation when the nine-month schools ended for the summer. I used to always let those kids know if you don't come back from break you may fail. We still had like a quarter of the school year to go. Some of the parents think that it's okay, like the rest of the year is not all that important, and then you have on the other hand when they (school district) had to put a cut-off date in May to stop all these parents from registering their kids in a year-round school so that they had a babysitter for their kids during the summer. They didn't want them home.

Students' attitudes and behaviors are often reflective of the society in which the school exists. Parents living within the attendance zone of the selected elementary school were surveyed by the school district in 1988 subsequent to the implementation of the 60-15 plan in lieu of the 45-15 plan. Of the parents included in the sample group, 18 percent returned the survey as opposed to 60 percent in an identical survey for another school, servicing a different neighborhood. Parents responded using a Likert four-point scale, with 4 representing "strongly agree" and 1 representing "strongly disagree." Parents rated the continuance of the 60-15 plan, space permitting, over the 45-15 plan with a 3.19 positive response.
However, when asked in the survey if they preferred the 60-15 over a nine-month schedule, the approval rating fell to 2.75. Most parents returning the survey commented that with the year-round schedule they believed their children retained more knowledge, required less coercion to study, and opportunities for vacations as a family became more available.

The apparent support for the year-round school schedule by parents in the community was based upon 18 percent of the parent survey group responding. The remaining 82 percent surveyed did not respond. This information corresponds with many teachers' perception that parents were too overwhelmed with jobs, financial burdens, and life in general to take an active role in their child's education.

Role Perception

Teachers' perceptions of their roles as educators were influenced by how they interpreted the many messages sent to them within the workplace. One important message source was the principal. Teachers possessing a strong relationship with the principal reported that they believed the workplace enhanced their ability to reach students. This perception of support from the principal was an affirmation that the teacher was doing his/her job in an acceptable manner. Other teachers, usually the more experienced, viewed the principal as the maintenance director of facilities and supply sergeant. They did not view the principal as an instructional leader, but as a cog within the educational system's wheel. The last type of relationship with the principal was almost adversarial, where some teachers perceived the principal as a hindrance to their educational program. They felt they were not supported and were forced
into teaching methods they believed were ineffective and antiquated based upon their professional training.

It's like every time I try to innovate or do something new it's always all the negative. I don't get compliments about my efforts or anything like that. He gives me all the negatives, but says if you want to, keep doing it. So I do. But that's because I am stubborn. I think if anybody else were to be talked with (like that) they would stop. I am angry. I felt that I was doing the right thing! Because of that I don't want to get close, because the more they (administration) get their hooks into me the more they will interfere with what I am doing.

The expectations the principal communicated to the teachers on the staff in some cases meshed with the perception the teachers held regarding their roles as educators. In these cases, the teachers sensed support in their beliefs; thus, their roles within the organization were clear. In other cases where the principal's expectations were viewed as unimportant or in opposition to the teacher's perception of his/her role, the resultant was role conflict. In five cases observed in this study the teachers were leaving the subject school due to such a conflict.

Another source of feedback teachers received came from each other. All teachers agreed that the primary purpose they served was helping children. They reported that they felt students retained more knowledge because of the year-round's frequent breaks versus the long summer vacation of the nine-month schedule. Their perceptions concerning retention of material could not be verified and in fact, is contradicted by a 1991 research report conducted by the school district.
"Regarding less review time, better retention of knowledge, and other purported educational advantages, no clear conclusions in favor of either schedule were found (CCSD 1991, p. 17)."

Teachers in the year-round school continued to proclaim the benefits of the shortened breaks for students and teachers.

Well, I think ... we're just continuously going, we're not, you know, you don't really ever stop because you're not out long enough, your break time is just short enough that I mean, you come right back in and the next day ... three weeks you really don't feel like you had left. There are no big gaps there. You feel like the children (are) ready to pick up. I don't see any forgetting of what we learned. They can tell me where on this page and they know exactly where we left off.

I think that the fact that they don't have a long break between grades helps. But each time throughout the year, when you come back it takes a little bit of time to get back on track. In the long run I thing the gain (from the year-round) is stronger.

I think in a way I am a better teacher because I have more breaks so I am refreshed. When I am tired or stressed I don't do as much, but for some teachers they say the breaks don't refresh them because they know they are coming back to the same kids and the same problems and they can't get that off their mind. But, I've trained myself. When I come back I have to literally look at the roll to remember those kids' names. I've trained myself to totally forget school during those three or four weeks. I think that is really important. I don't even come to school. I go home, that's my break, I don't think about school at all. Why should it be different for me than nine-month teachers? I think that is important to being successful. Year-round teachers will do that. I block it out.

The most important source of feedback for teachers regarding their roles as educators was the students. Year-round schooling afforded teachers the experience of student growth and maturization processes on a continuous basis as opposed to a nine-month period. When coupled
with the perception of reduced material review requirements, teachers alluded to their roles in a positive manner regarding student achievement.

I see a lot of growth in my students both emotionally, socially, and academically.

Teachers reported that the frequent breaks and the lengthened time period in which the 180 days of instruction took place created an environment which increased student learning. This perception of increased student learning provided positive feedback concerning performance-based self-esteem for the teachers which reaffirmed their role as a teacher.

However, student behavior also provided feedback which led teachers to believe they had little control over student learning in some instances. These teachers lamented that students did not believe in the educational system and rebelled against it. Teachers working with students who send constant feedback focused on devaluing school and learning, experienced low performance-based self-esteem.

In addition to the principal's and students' feedback, the parents and community provide feedback to teachers as to how they were to do their job and how well they were accomplishing the task of educating children. The community feedback acknowledged by the interviewed teachers was that parents did not want the year-round schedule. This feedback came with the opening of a new school on a nine-month schedule after parents complained about the school district's original plan to open the school on a year-round schedule. Lack of value was also noted by the absence of support personnel to assist teachers in noninstructional duties.
I taught in a private school for a year and a half. The first year it was a very small school and just starting. I had ten students -- one of those ideal situations. Five students were at the top of the class, three middle level and two below grade level. Every thing was so ideal, you could use everything education professors told you.

The lack of support personnel left the teachers with the perception that they were not valued as instructors imparting valuable skills and knowledge. Instead, they were part-time teacher, part-time babysitter and in some cases, valued more for their custodial care than for the educational services they provided.

**Status**

Teachers working at the selected site made frequent reference to being in an environment more closely related to the "real world." Emphasis was not on educational advances, techniques, or issues; instead, teachers talked about up coming vacations and nonwork-related activities. When asked about their perceptions concerning their professional status, most teachers laughed. The comment which followed was usually "this is just a job, like any other job. Why should I be treated differently?". The researcher noted an attitude similar to blue-collar workers putting in the required time on the job and finding other areas in their lives about which to be enthusiastic and excited about. When questioned by the researcher, the typical response from these teachers was:

(Teacher was planning to quit and was asked if there was anything that would change her mind?) No! Well, if they increased the pay and the kids didn't get worse. (what if they increased the pay but student behavior doesn't get better?) No, I don't think so. It would be fun if the kids showed respect. Lack of respect is going to make it harder
and harder for people going into teaching other than women with children who want to work the shorter hours.

When I started teaching, teachers had respect. Parents controlled their children more. Now children have no respect, (and) in most instances they don't have respect for anything which represents authority. They don't feel like they have to learn, and you don't get the support from the community. My mother was a teacher and my brother's mother-in-law was a teacher for 42 years. My mother taught for 30 some years. Neither one of them would even think about teaching if they had to teach under the circumstances we work under right now. This is the same for nine-month schools too. My advice to new teachers would be get out, find something else to do. I realize somebody has to teach, but it is a situation where you are burnt out fast. About the only people you can find that can stick to it, and some of them take breaks, are women with families.

I am currently teaching . . . and I'm winding down for the end of the year and it's been an experience this year. I think I've learned about the changing attitudes of boys and girls towards the educational system and just the way society and outside influences are contributing to how we should change education.

The status of the teacher was not affected by the year-round schedule as it was by the students' behavior within the classroom. However, this researcher observed that teaching in the year-round school seemed to take away from teachers feeling that their job was special. The privilege of the profession, having the summer off to pursue other avenues, was missing in the year-round school. Because of this omission, the status of the teacher was changed, somehow lowered. The impression was that teaching in the year-round school created the belief that teaching was just another job.
CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter 5 encompassed six areas of the study. The first section restated the research problem. The second section reviewed the significance of the study. The third section extrapolated the workplace theory put forth by Johnson (1990). The fourth section described the workplace features and stated the conclusions reached concerning each of the features, comparing them to the descriptions provided by Johnson (1990). In the final section, recommendations for administrators, higher education institutes, and suggestions for further study were made.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to examine the workplace of a selected year-round school. Specifically, the study described teachers' perceptions of the year-round school workplace as conceptualized by Johnson (1990). These perceptions were analyzed to ascertain their validity and to generate a picture of the year-round school's workplace. Descriptions which emerged were then compared back to Johnson's (1990) study to strengthen the developing theory of the workplace of teachers.

Significance of the Study

Recent studies on the school's workplace or work environment discovered that educators were driven by the physical and nonphysical
aspects of their workplace (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). These studies suggested that reform efforts have failed in the past and will continue to fail in the future unless workplace features which enhance teacher task performance were identified and supported within the educational organization as a whole.

Johnson (1990) revealed that workplace features impacted teachers perceptions of the job they performed by controlling the conditions under which the job was done. Teachers contributions of commitment, involvement, and effort were related to identified workplace features which either enhanced or inhibited the act of teaching. Epstein (1986) and Schneider (1985) charged that academically successful schools through greater teacher effort and involvement, were able to secure greater parental support for, and assistance in, their children's learning than unsuccessful schools. The foundation of a school's academic success rested upon its ability to inspire teachers to make meaningful contributions. Workplace conditions affected the levels of commitment, involvement, and effort teachers experienced at work.

There has been an increasing tendency among rapidly expanding school systems to select year-round school schedules as a means to accommodate student population increases; therefore a need for examining the consequences of this alternative became evident. Research concerning academic achievement levels of students, financial savings, implementation procedures, and historical studies had been done. These studies determined that year-round schools offered no significant advantages in the area of student achievement. Financial
savings were difficult to assess, facility construction requirements were reduced, yet the operation of year-round schools was found to cost more than the nine-month schools, and historically year-round schools were based more on financial resources available than on educationally grounded principles.

Yet no study to date had focused on the year-round school's workplace. The workplace in which the teaching-learning act took place impacted on the commitment and effort teachers were willing to exude toward task performance. The perceptions of the teachers toward each of the workplace features impacted student achievement levels, parental support for the school, and the success of proposed changes in curriculum and other areas of reform. The change in calendar from nine months to 12 months required a study of teachers' perceptions of the year-round school's workplace. Review of the literature revealed several areas of the year-round school's workplace which were distinctly different from nine-month schools.

**Workplace Theory**

The theoretical base of this study was the conceptualization of the workplace elucidated by Johnson (1990). The school work environment has been the subject of many recent studies (Conley et al., 1988; Goodman, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989), wherein characteristics of the workplace were found to inhibit or enhance teachers' task performance.

"A workplace is more than a physical setting: it is also the context that defines how work is divided and done, how it is scheduled, supervised, compensated, and regarded by others" (Johnson, 1990, p. 1).
The comprehensiveness of the workplace as envisioned by Johnson (1990) enabled further examination of a complex phenomenon by identifying specific features within. She developed a framework which defined various features of the workplace of schools. Thus, the teachers' perception of the quality of the workplace impacted on the way parents and students viewed the services which the school had provided.

Many studies in recent years confirmed that the work environment or workplace had impacted the content of what teachers teach, how they went about teaching, and how teachers viewed themselves and their job (Johnson, 1990; Conley, Bacharach, & Bauer, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989).

The workplace features of a school modified the ability of the teacher to perform the task of teaching. "If teachers are to succeed in meeting the many social and academic needs of their students, they must work in schools that make good teaching not just possible, but likely" (Johnson, 1990, p. 28). Federal and state mandates, administrators, school district regulation, community special interest groups, teachers, and students all interacted within the context of a school. The sum of these interactions and the physical setting in which the work occurred created the workplace in which the educational process unfolded.

Gecas and Schwalbe (1983), Hackman and Oldham (1980), and Kanter (1977) concluded that work motivation and commitment had less to do with personal qualities teachers brought to the workplace than with the design and management of the task within it. Workplace conditions not only affected the way teachers perceived themselves and their job, it also determined the actual act of teaching by controlling what materials were
used to teach, the amount of time spent, and dictated specific subject goals and objectives (Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). The design and management method used to orchestrate workplace features into a workplace had a profound effect on the perceptions of the teachers working within the conditions it created.

**Research Design**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers at the selected site from June of 1992 through August of 1992 to acquire answers to the previously mentioned questions. Respondents were asked to discuss many aspects of their workplaces. Respondents typically became engaged in the interview and added detail and depth to the description of the year-round school's workplace. The interviews, all of which were tape recorded, lasted between 20 minutes and an hour.

All of the interviews were transcribed, then indexed, using "The Ethnograph" computer program. A filing system was designed for organizing the large amount of data using Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the workplace as file categories. Multiple codes were assigned to data which fell into two or more categories. The data were systematically reviewed by printing out all teachers' comments concerning each of the workplace features. The range and distribution of responses assisted in the formation of the description of each feature of the year-round school's workplace. As the description of each feature of the workplace developed, the emerging description was analyzed for accuracy by triangulation of nonresponsive data and review of the
research by participants to ascertain if alterations to descriptions were needed.

This qualitative approach offered an appropriate method for examining complex workplace issues and generating possibilities for further research. The study had both the benefits and defects of data gathered intensively from a relatively small group, inevitably sacrificing breadth for depth, revealing a great deal about one year-round school, but not permitting statistical generalizations to a larger population. However, the rich and complex data that emerged from these intensive interviews, observations, documentation, records, and physical artifacts provided valuable insights for teachers, administrators, policy makers, and training institutes who seek to improve the educational process.

Descriptions and Conclusions

Summary of the Physical Features

The teachers' perceptions of the physical features of the year-round school workplace showed that there were differences in the physical features of a year-round school versus those of a nine-month school. These identified differences were related to the changing of classrooms by the 180-day contracted teachers. Other aspects of the physical feature of the year-round school were found to be the same for both year-round and nine-month teachers. Johnson's (1990) study describing teachers' perceptions of the workplace was confirmed by the teachers in this study. They had neither the equipment nor the assistance normally associated with other professionals in the workplace, resources to complete the job
were often purchased by the teachers, and the space provided other than classrooms for teachers to work was inadequate. Safety was not an issue for many of the teachers interviewed.

Teachers experienced the benefits of working in an older school which provided larger classroom space. They were required to put up with the lack of electrical outlets, air-conditioning malfunctions in a desert climate, and cramped lounge, restroom, and work areas. The utilization of space when rotating was found to be a workplace problem by all teachers. The changing of rooms took time away from the instructional program, for some a half day, for others longer. Teachers who had accumulated vast amounts of personal materials which they used in their instructional program were more likely to feel the burden of the room changing than those who did not. Primary teachers whose students were too young to assist with the room changing also experienced greater difficulty in moving. The lack of ownership of the classroom and constant strain of moving for some teachers caused a reduction in the amount of time and effort spent on creating an interesting learning environment for the students. For others, it created an increased demand on their personal time in order to maintain a stimulating environment for the student.

Johnson's (1990) study describing the physical features of teachers' workplaces was, in view of this study, an accurate account of the physical conditions under which teachers work. Teachers interviewed in this study did not view the physical feature of their workplace as stimulating or inspiring; instead, it was tolerated or endured. In the case of the year-
round school, the rotation of classrooms for most teachers was something to be dreaded.

**Summary of the Organizational Feature**

The organizational feature of the year-round school was perceived to be similar to that of a nine-month school by the teachers working within. The five-track rotation of 180-day contracted teachers and students impeded teacher interaction and interdependence due to the differing teacher work schedules. The teaming of teachers in the primary grades enhanced opportunities for interaction and interdependence.

The assessment of teachers was viewed by teachers on a continuum ranging from helpful to threatening and was accomplished in the same manner as nine-month schools in the district in regard to procedures and time lines, with the exception of an extended time line for probationary teachers. Discretionary decisions were limited by the district-imposed curriculum, administrative reading philosophy, and the relationship teachers perceived they had with the principal.

Teachers reported that workloads were greatly increased by sharing classrooms on a rotating schedule throughout the year and that they preferred staying in the same classroom. The teachers also indicated that much of the workload centered around noninstructional duties which reduced their interaction time with students.

The year-round schedule required only three report card reporting periods versus four in the nine-month schools; however, the year-round school schedule demanded more paper work due to increased
scheduling and lesson planning requirements. Task specialization was found to be the same for both year-round and nine-month schools. The authority of teachers over the organizational feature of the workplace was based on the relationship the teacher perceived to have with the principal of the school. Those teachers who perceived that they were supported by the administration felt they had total control over their classrooms and influenced many of the decisions at the school. Those who did not feel supported by the principal felt they had some control over their classrooms and possessed no influence over other aspects of the school's operation. Experienced teachers felt that they had control over what happened in their classrooms and had not the time nor the desire to be involved with any aspect of the overall organization which did not directly affect them or what happened in their classrooms.

Many of the comments teachers at the selected year-round school articulated concerning the organizational feature of the workplace mirrored the responses and sentiments of the teachers interviewed by Johnson (1990). The additional workload placed on teachers created by special interest groups, particularly the increased paper work created by Federal government programs, was often thought of as decreasing the amount of time the teachers spent with the students. This paper work, teachers proclaimed, did not enhance the education of the child receiving services. Teachers believed its purpose was to justify an additional layer of bureaucracy in the educational system. This condition was not isolated to year-round schools, but believed to exists throughout the educational system. Teachers at the selected year-round school resented anything
which encroached upon the time they had available to assist students in the learning process.

**Summary of the Psychological Feature**

Teachers working at year-round schools often felt that the frequent breaks allowed them opportunities to rejuvenate, re-evaluate, and in some instances catch up on school work. These breaks had advantages and disadvantages in regard to student learning and teacher stress levels. Most teachers believed that working at the year-round school reduced stress levels and identified student behavior as the number-one source of stress in teaching. Professional growth and development were negatively affected by the year-round school schedule, due largely to time constraints. As a result, year-round school teachers used alternative programs when seeking degree advancement, such as those which offer weekend classes. Specialist teachers faced an increased burden due to the limited amount of time off.

Specialists may also have been at a higher risk of burnout than the 180-day contracted teachers due to isolation from the regularly contracted teachers, the lack of rejuvenation periods caused by working extended contracts, and the additional workload created by students rotating in and out of their program every three weeks. The isolation of specialists from the other teachers observed by the researcher may partly be attributed to resentments harbored by other teachers based upon the specialist's scheduling responsibilities. The scheduling of specialized classes in nine-
month schools is done once, remains unchanged throughout the year, and these periods with the specialists are "preparatory" periods for the regular teachers where they have no students to supervise. The year-round schools require specialists to modify their class schedules every three weeks to accommodate track changes, thereby impacting on the scheduling of teachers' preparatory times. Preparatory times by their nature are viewed as work breaks away from the students during the day; therefore, when their occurrence varies so regularly due to the requirements of co-workers, the possibilities for conflict abounded. As with any occupation, work breaks or rest periods are highly coveted, especially when their rescheduling may result in a teacher having two preparatory periods one day and none the following. These concerns were voiced by teachers in regard to the scheduling of planning periods and were often accompanied by complaints concerning who taught the more important classes.

Summary of the Cultural Feature

The strength and supportiveness of the year-round school's cultural feature was difficult to assess. The isolation of teachers working on nine-month schedules was well documented. The year-round schedule increased the isolation by not providing a common meeting time for teachers during the course of the school year. The common starting time to which the year-round schools had changed did not provide sufficient time for teachers to get to know one another. This difficulty was especially true for teachers working on the second track and posed an additional problem for new teachers due to the fact that experienced teachers
preferred most other track assignments over track two. Thus, new teachers to the school were assigned to track two.

The communication network in the year-round school was weak, and many teachers reported they were uncertain as to what was going on while they were on break and upon coming back spent additional time figuring out what was going on. No stories were told which reflected group norms for behavior, goals of the school, or identified informal leaders past or present.

Some teachers at the school viewed this lack of support and cohesiveness as a blessing. They preferred not having to interact with others and enjoyed the independence and autonomy they felt it created. The principal organized the physical maintenance of the facilities, the ordering of instructional supplies, and the assessment of teachers. The enhancement of the school's culture or climate was not on his agenda. As a result, the year-round school's cultural feature of the workplace was weak.

Summary of the Economic Feature

Teachers working at the year-round school had the opportunity to increase their income in two ways. The first way was to work an extended contract. The extended contract increased the number of days the teacher worked. Each additional day of work was compensated monetarily according to the teacher's hourly rate of pay which was based on their educational level and the number of years of experience. Only specialist teachers hired to teach art, music, library skills, physical education, or provide special services to physically or mentally challenged students
were qualified to work the extended contract. Teachers who worked the extended contracts received fewer vacation days and were required to plan activities when vacation days were taken. In addition to the extra planning required, they also had the additional challenge of keeping track of students who rotated in and out of their program every three weeks. This rotation dramatically increased the workload of these teachers.

Another option to increase teacher's salaries working at the year-round school was available to the regular contracted teachers. During track breaks teachers had the option of substitute teaching for the school district. Most teachers who substitute taught during their breaks did so for teachers they knew. Several stated that they only substituted for G.K. Elementary teachers. They hypothesized that substituting for teachers in their own building provided themselves, the teacher who was out, and the students with a greater amount of consistency; this in turn, allowed the teacher who was out to feel less concern over what was happening in the classroom. The students were instructed by someone qualified and knowledgeable of the school's procedures. A third benefit was to the teacher, whereby substituting afforded him/her the opportunity to experience another grade level or investigate how a colleague organized and arranged their work, their room, and their students.

Financial compensation for the teachers who substituted was not their normal hourly rate of pay, as it was with the extended contract teachers' added workdays. Instead, teachers received $80 a day, the same rate of pay of regular substitutes in the district, who were often less qualified and less experienced than these teachers. For some teachers at
G.K. Elementary, working for less money did not appeal to them and they did not accept any substitute teaching jobs on their breaks. Others felt that the breaks were far more valuable as a rejuvenation period; therefore, they did not substitute due to the perceived needed rest.

The economic feature of the year-round school's workplace was similar to the economic conditions described in Johnson's (1990) study. Teachers working the extended contract earned salaries ranging from $2000 to $8000 more per year than those working the regular 184-day contract. Teachers expressed a desire to earn more money.

This researcher was concerned that teachers working the extended contracts continued to work despite levels of burnout or stress due to the common practice of living up to and in some cases beyond the salary levels earned. The added incentive for teachers preparing for retirement to seek out an extended contract position in order to enhance their retirement benefits was a concern. Extended contracts offered in the workplace of selected year-round schools had an inherent potential to attract teachers contemplating retirement to a job which required an increased energy level, increased demand on organizational skills, and increased levels of stress.

Summary of the Political Feature

Teachers at G.K. Elementary viewed the principal as the boss. The principal controlled directly and indirectly the year-round school's workplace. New teachers abandoned their perceptions as to how lessons in reading should be structured on the principal's demand. The principal dictated how lesson plans were to be structured and required lesson plan
checks which he initialed at least three times a year. Teachers were required to sign the daily announcement sheet which hung in the teacher's lounge/lunch area. Some teachers were so regimented into signing documents as proof that they had read them, that when they were asked to review their interviews and write comments on them, the interviews came back to the researcher dated with a message which stated, "I have read this," and the teacher's name was signed beneath the statement. Indirect control over the environment was accomplished by a sense of presence. The principal usually was the first to arrive and the last to leave. His presence in the building was powerful.

The absence of a strong informal leader in the school may have been a factor caused by the revolving teaching staff. This absence may have added to the power of the principal or the front office staff which some teachers felt was capable of running the school. Teachers functioned in this environment as independent entities with little interaction or interdependences. Experienced teachers were less concerned about anything outside of their own classroom. They viewed themselves as independent and sought to handle their jobs with as little interference from outside their classroom as possible. Teachers who were experiencing high levels of stress from student behavior sought assistance from the principal, but perceived him as ineffective in dealing with discipline problems. Inexperienced teachers reported that they felt their opinions and teaching methods were not valued and as a result, some transferred from G.K. Elementary.
The political feature of the year-round school did contradict with Johnson's (1990) report. Most teachers at the selected year-round school felt they did not have the time or energy to be concerned with issues which did not directly affect their classrooms. There was one exception to this feeling and that was the perceived lack of support for the year-round schedule. Teachers were disturbed by the lack of year-round schools at the junior and senior high school levels. They felt that this condition undermined the support parents lent to the year-round school schedule and added fuel to the fire of those apposed to it.

Teachers desired less interference from special interest groups, but expressed no desire to have any empowerment outside their classroom in regard to anything save the disciplining of students.

**Summary of the Sociological Feature**

The effect students had on the sociological feature were the most important aspect of the year-round school's workplace. The way students acted affected teacher's perceptions of performance, role, and status. Teachers who perceived students behavior as positive toward the educational process felt successful and gained status through a sense of accomplishment. Teachers who perceived student behavior as antagonistic toward the educational process reported feelings of apathy and anger. They pointed to the lack of parental support, low socioeconomic conditions and lack of administrative support concerning discipline as contributors to the failure of students to learn. These teachers were more likely to place the locus of control in regard to student behavior
and learning outside the classroom door. Frustrated, they often told the researcher how far off retirement was or expressed a desire to quit.

Teachers felt parents would be more supportive if the school district provided the option of a year-round school in the junior high and high schools. Parents were not actively involved in the actual operation of the school, but were afforded a choice of track assignment which ultimately choose the teacher their child would have for that year. This situation held implications concerning school choice proponents in that a vast majority of the parents whose children were bussed into the school did not take advantage of this option. This result may have occurred due to a lack of knowledge about the teachers on the part of the parent caused by the geographical distance from the school, apathy, or a host of other reasons. The implications for choice proponents, in this researcher's view, was that unless the parent population has adequate preparation to make a choice the end result will be no choice at all, and students will be placed automatically or in the school which is most convenient, not necessarily the one which would have afforded the child with the best education.

The status of the teachers working in the year-round school, in this researcher's opinion, was lowered due to the increased isolation, lack of collegiality, increased barriers to personal and professional growth opportunities, and the frequently expressed attitude that teaching was just another job. The special status associated with teaching and having the summer off was noted by the researcher and some of the teachers working at the selected site. The breaks for rejuvenation were not long enough in some cases and in others the pressures of catching up on paper work
eroded the time break time away. Attending class to maintain certification or advance on the pay scale had to be done during the school year, which impacted on the time and energy teachers directed toward their instructional program. Many reported feeling exhausted and tired all of the time.

Johnson's (1990) study reported upon the importance of teachers' perceptions of the sociological feature of the workplace. This study concurred with Johnson's (1990) study. The sociological feature of the year-round school's workplace often influenced where teachers placed the locus of control for what happened in their classrooms. As a result, establishing a strong connection with the community and more specifically with the students in regard to buying into a joint ownership of the school experience was in this researcher's view the key to creating a strong, positive sociological feature in the school's workplace.

**Interrelatedness of Features**

The workplace features were closely interrelated such that at times, it was difficult to determine in which category a perception belonged, and sometimes overlapped three categories. In addition, one feature often created perceptions in another feature. For example the physical separation from the school at various points in the year, created by space utilization, weakened the informal authority groups to the point of destruction. The rotation of students impacted upon the workload of teachers, thereby increasing stress levels experienced by teachers. A change in any one of the workplace features would invariably produce a ripple effect influencing all the other features of the workplace.
Administrators seeking to change any aspect of the workplace would be well advised to contemplate the implications the proposed change may have on the school's workplace as a whole. Many times changes are hastily initiated with insufficient consideration of potential consequences on the teachers, students, or the educational system. The demands for increased academic accountability and cost effectiveness, often in conjunction with deteriorating social factors where educators and the educational system were viewed with contempt, have influenced the school's workplace with few positive results.

Recommendations for Administration, Higher Education Institutes, and Suggestions for Further Study

Administrators

The following recommendations were made to year-round school administrators to enhance the workplace of the year-round school.

1. Roving or changing classrooms are a causative factor in the way teachers teach because they affect the availability of instructional materials and influence the feeling of ownership for both teachers and students within the school. As a result teacher roving should be limited. Initially teachers should not rove if they teach kindergarten, first, second, or third grade, because they spend large amounts of time decorating their rooms to create a diverse learning environment. Packing and unpacking throughout the year should be avoided. Further Administrators must seek out teachers whose instructional styles
are flexible and capable of improvising in order to be the rovers in the school. These teachers are more likely to make use of the materials existing in the room. New teachers do not in general have many instructional supplies to be packed and unpacked; however due to the additional stress and workload new teachers are under, it is inadvisable to use them to rove from class to class.

2. The very nature of the year-round workplace lends itself to increased levels of isolation, decreased opportunity for personal and professional growth, and a lack of support from peers. The principal of the school should take the initiative in creating a supportive environment by sponsoring social, educational, and culture-creating events. The principal should encourage the establishment of rituals and annual events which require all teachers to actively participate.

3. The establishment of clear goals and objectives within the school which are implemented at every level will establish a pattern of behavior expectations, and provide the school's workplace cultural feature a framework upon which to build.

4. Firm, fair, and consistent behaviors by the principal concerning student discipline problems which are sent to the office would have an effect on teacher's perceptions of stress, support, and control. Principals must provide this support to ensure teachers' success in instructing an increasingly difficult student population. Student behavior problems were identified as sources of stress.
Recommendations for Institutions of Higher Education

The following are recommendations to higher education institutes in regard to the training of teachers:

1. Alternative higher educational programs are gaining strength with teachers working in the year-round school. Many expressed the desire to attend universities but could not due to the time constraints and the lack of available classes. In recent years, more night courses were added to the class schedule, but these are not enough. Greater flexibility in course offering and an increased number of independent or correspondence courses are required by those teachers working in the year-round schools.

2. New teachers to the staff of the selected year-round school should be taught multiple approaches to the teaching of reading. Many schools use approaches at variance with what is taught at the university. Higher education institutes must connect themselves with the real world teachers work in. To prepare teachers to work in an environment which does not exist, to advise them to use methods which will be rejected by older more experienced teachers and administrators, is to ultimately prepare them for failure. Support groups for new teachers as well as courses offered at times when teachers can attend and receive new ideas would benefit both the experienced and inexperienced teacher.
Suggestions for Further Study

The following suggestions are made for further study:

1. A study over a longer period of time to determine if there is a behavior change in teachers and students during the last trimester of the year-round school schedule as apposed to the first and second trimester.

2. A study should be undertaken which would determine the effect of the workplace on student achievement.

3. A study to determine the effect year-round school schedules have on attendance patterns of students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.
APPENDIX I

Interview Questions
Hello, my name is Kelly Sturdy and I am conducting a study on the year-round school's workplace. The purpose of this study is to describe the workplace of a typical year-round school. I will begin by asking you specific questions concerning your educational background and teaching experience. We will then move on to more general questions regarding the workplace of your school. Please feel free to add any comments you feel will assist in describing what it is like working in a year-round school. All responses will be kept confidential. The name of the respondents will not be recorded.

**Demographic characteristics:** Teacher's experience, educational level, and age.

1. Briefly review your academic background, including the schools that you attended and the degrees that you earned.
2. Describe your current assignment (grade, subject). What type of teaching structure do you work in (self-contained, open classroom, team, cluster, department).
3. How long have you been teaching? How many years have you been in this district? At this school? At this grade level?
4. Have you ever worked in a year-round school before this? If so where?

**Political:** Teachers' perceptions of their treatment in the workplace as fair and equitable, voice in the overall organization, and the exercise of power within the workplace.
1. Describe the extent you are involved with decision making at the following levels:
   A. Classroom decisions (materials used, arrangement,...).
   B. School building decisions (room assignment, grade, do you have input into agenda for faculty meetings?).
   C. School district decisions (do you influence policy or reg.).
   D. School board decisions (do you have influence concerning changes which will directly affect you or your teaching?).

2. Who sees that things get done in this school?

3. Who sets the standards for good teaching, behavior, and facilitation of learning?

4. Does this differ from what you expected? If you have worked in other schools does it differ from the way they operated?

5. What is it about this school (the workplace) that makes it possible for you to do your best teaching?

6. What compromises your best teaching?

7. Where is the locus of control (do you have say so) for:
   A. determination of teaching techniques?
   B. class composition?
   C. grade level assignment?
   D. track assignment?
   E. materials and supplies for the classroom?
**Economic:** Teachers' perception of the pay and benefits received, incentives and rewards offered, and their job security.

1. Are there any economic benefits of working at this school?
2. Are teachers recognized financially for the job they do?
3. Are there any financial incentives to increase the time and effort you expend on the job?
4. Do you think about job security? Would you think differently if you were assigned to a nine-month school?

**Physical:** Teachers' perception as to the comfort and security of the workplace. Along with adequate space and resources available to complete the job.

1. Describe your workplace in terms of:
   A. physical setting for the teaching-learning process.
   B. cleanliness.
   C. aesthetics and general lay out of the building.
   D. safety and comfort.
2. Do you feel these qualities would be different in a nine-month school?
3. What is it like working in this building?
4. How do you feel about your personal safety when at work?
5. Describe the buildings general appearance? Describe the neighborhood your school is located in? Describe the affect building appearance and school location have on the way you do your work?
6. What types of materials are available to you for doing your job? Do you feel this differs from teachers working in a nine-month school.

7. Describe the sources of money available to you to buy teaching materials? Do you feel this differs from teachers working in a nine-month school.

8. How do you decide on the room arrangement in regard to the 60-15 revolving schedule? Where do you store your teaching materials during breaks?

**Organizational:** Teachers' perceptions of authority distribution, the degree of specialization, workload expectations, discretion workers exercised, how performance was assessed, the extent to which workers interact, and the interdependence among teachers and staff.

1. How are textbooks selected?

2. Are you satisfied with the extent of freedom or autonomy that you have in your teaching?

3. Who decides what will be taught? Could you decide or make changes in the curriculum if you felt it would benefit your students? Does the year-round school schedule affect curriculum? Is there a prescribed curriculum that you must follow in your area?

4. Describe any supervision, assistance, or training of other teachers you do?

5. Who supervises or evaluates your teaching? Could you describe how that works? Describe the effectiveness of those
evaluations? How helpful are they? How might evaluations be improved?

6. Who decides how much time you allot to each subject area? Who decides what type of teaching structure you use? Are you free to arrange the classroom as you see fit? Are you free to take risks in your teaching? Are you encouraged to do so?

7. Do you feel you are treated as a professional at work by
   A. peers
   B. parents
   C. principal
   D. students

**Psychological:** The extent to which the teacher viewed his/her work as meaningful, the amount of stress the individual perceives, and the opportunities for personal and professional growth or lack thereof in the workplace.

1. How important do you feel your work is to pupils? Does this assignment at the year-round school enhance your ability to serve the students?
2. Explain how the year-round plan affects your personal and professional growth.
3. What is the greatest source of stress in this year-round school?
4. What administrative tasks or obligations do you have (lesson plans, attendance, money collection, individualized education
plans)? Do you find these reasonable or burdensome? Are you requested or required to participate in extracurricular activities?

5. What makes you feel good about your work here at this school?

6. Did you select the year-round school schedule? Why did you enter teaching? Are you still in teaching for the same reasons? Have your goals for teaching been fulfilled?

7. Do you intend to continue teaching?
   A. If so, Why? What could lure you away from teaching?
   B. If not, are there changes that would encourage you to stay?

8. Has the year-round setting influenced your decision?
   A. Is there something burdensome about the year-round school?
   B. Is there something uplifting about the year-round school?

**Cultural:** The degree to which teachers define common goals and purpose in the workplace, behavioral norms and shared expectations among co-workers. Along with the supportiveness perceived by the individual teacher from the school, fellow employees and the district as a whole.

1. Do you perceive a higher status due to working at a year-round school? Explain your answer.

2. Some organizations are said to have strong cultures, to be unified by a set of values, goals, or traditions. Is that true in your year-round school?
3. Teachers in all schools sometimes say that they are isolated from other adults in their work. How much contact do you have with other adults during the day? Where does it take place and what is its purpose? Are there others in your school who teach your subject/grade level? Do you have opportunities to share ideas and materials with them or with others who teach your subject or grade level in the district? Do you feel that working on a year-round schedule affects how much interaction you have with others?

4. Is there a time when the entire staff is present at any one time? Does this affect staff cohesiveness?

5. Do you ever participate in any of the following:

   A. Social rituals: The way individuals are addressed, (formally or informally) at work, after-work happy hours?

   B. Work rituals: Meeting with peers during lunch, on preps, arrival and departure times, or teacher's lounge message board used for informal communication.

   C. Were there any management rituals present for:
      1. Rites of passage: training or orientation?
      2. Rites of enhancement: awards?
      3. Rites of degradation: censure, demotion or firing?
      4. Rites of conflict reduction: collective bargaining?
      5. Rites of integration: staff dinners or picnics?
      6. Rites of renewal: employee assistance programs?
Sociological: The characteristics of clients and peers and teachers' perceptions of their roles and status in the workplace.

1. Do parents play an active role in this year-round school? How does that affect your work?
2. Are students equally attentive during all phases of the year-round schedule?
3. Do you feel that the year-round schedule is beneficial for all of the students?
4. Is there a track which most students, parents, and teachers prefer? If so how is this issue resolved?
APPENDIX II

Observation Schedule
OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

PHYSICAL WORKPLACE FEATURES

Comfort
Record temperature of the building at 9 a.m., 12 p.m., and 3 p.m. in the teacher's lounge, hallway, and playground area.

Note condition of the building in regard to cleanliness; record as excellent, good, fair, or poor. Examine floors, walls and counters.

Ergonomics, building and equipment are design for comfortable use.

Location of workrooms, restrooms and teachers lounge.

Furnishings in the teacher's lounge reflect a professional status.

Security
Are materials left out in the workroom?

The specific amount and types of vandalism which occur.

The number of items reported stolen in the office.

Any security precautions taken for personal safety?

Space
Workroom design.

Storage space.

Classroom rotation.

Resources
Supply room contents.

Supply request procedures.

Special funding acquirement procedures.

Type of equipment available for teachers to utilize.

How teacher aid time is used and by whom.
Political Workplace features
Fair and Equitable treatment
observe the way supply and material requests are handled

Space allocation determined by a fair rational system

Voice
observe how complaints are handled

observe the amount of time between action/reaction

Power
Who gets what they want and why

Who is the informal leader

Organizational
Authority distribution
observe formal and informal decision making

who gets things done

Specialization
Number of students the teacher interacts with

Number of times the teacher is sought out for assistance by others

Workload
Arrival and departure times

use of time during the day

Discretion
Number times teachers are allowed to bend rules

Evaluation
number of formal evaluations which take place during the research period

number of times the administration is out and about on campus in the presence of teachers and students.
Psychological
Meaningfulness of work.

Dress and appearance of the teachers as Casual, Semi-Casual, or Professional.

Number of times teachers mention how important their job is while talking to others within the school.

Stress
The amount of aspirin taken during the day.

Number of self reported headaches.

Signs of fatigue, yawning, laying the head on a table, ... etc.

Personal and professional growth opportunities.

A. The number available during the summer.

B. The number offered during time periods in which YRS staff may participate.

Economic
Pay and Benefits received.

Incentives and rewards.

Job Security.

Cultural
Common goals and purpose.

Is there a mission statement posted.

Hallway displays reflect a common goal or purpose.

Are there any types of plaques which record the history of the school in any way
Behavioral norms
Do any behavior patterns emerge in the day to day routine of the school (i.e. lunch room seating, morning rituals, after work rituals)?

Supportiveness
Number of encouraging, supportive remarks heard.

Any gestures like hugging, placing a hand on the shoulder, etc.

Sociological
Number of parent phone calls to the school during the day.

Number of parent visits to the school.

Number of times the school sponsors a parent/student/teacher involvement activity (i.e. fund raisers, sleep overs, read-a-thons, etc.).

Number of students referred to the office due to discipline problems.

Number of times teachers call parents to discuss a child.
APPENDIX III

List of Documents
Documents Analyzed

Teacher Handbook

Formal communication documents within the building (memos, announcements)

School District policy and regulations concerning year-round schools which pertain to the school workplace

Parent newsletters

Student newspaper

Attendance and record keeping procedures
APPENDIX IV

THE ETHNOGRAPH PROGRAM WITH AN EXAMPLE DATA FILE
The Ethnograph is a computer program designed to assist in the mechanical aspects of qualitative data analysis.

These programs present an efficient alternative to the often cumbersome task of managing field notes, transcripts, documents, and other types of text data collected and analyzed in ethnographic/qualitative research (Seidel, J., Kjolseth, R., & Seymour, J., 1988, pp. 1-2).

The Ethnograph does not interpret data.

Metaphorically, the interpretive work involves cutting and pasting activities: the researcher begins by mentally organizing the data into categorical and conceptual collections. The mental effort then is transformed into the mechanical work of cutting and pasting. Qualitative analysts have traditionally approached this task armed with some combination of scissors, tape, glue, and many photo copies of their raw data, as they literally cut and paste their materials (Seidel, J., Kjolseth, R., & Seymour, J., 1988, pp. 1-3).

The Ethnograph program allows the researcher to code, recode, and sort data without physically cutting and pasting the raw data. The program eliminates the need to have data scattered about in stacks and piles as the researcher codes, recodes, and sorts through the vast amount of material gathered during the course of the study.

The process started by converting the raw data into a format compatible with the ethnograph program. The interviews were transcribed by hand at which time the researcher noted emotional tone of responses and recorded responses word for word. Once completed the transcripts were typed using courier 10 character/inch non-proportional spaced font. Margins were set at 1.0 inch for the left and 3.6 inch right. The word processing program used was Word Perfect version 5.0.
Transcripts were then saved in the ASCII format and file names were made to correspond to the dimensions necessary for their incorporation into the Ethnograph program (ie. Kelly16.eth).

Files were then incorporated into the Ethnograph program and numbered. The researcher viewed a numbered transcript of each transcribed interview in this manner. The interpretive task of coding the data was completed by the researcher as parts of the transcript are coded by hand on the numbered print out of the data. Each transcript was coded individually before comparisons among the interviews were made. In this study the data was coded using Johnson's (1990) conceptualization of the school's workplace. Teacher responses were coded as physical, organizational, psychological, cultural, economic, political, or sociological features of the year-round school's workplace. After coding the numbered transcript, the codes were transferred to the computer program by selecting the code option on the procedure menu. Responses which corresponded to more than one category were coded as such. The computer program had the capacity to code seven overlapping responses within one segment of data. Each interview transcript was coded in this manner.

As coded segments were printed, reviewed, recoded, and sorted the description of each of the seven workplace features emerged. The program allowed the researcher to view data coded for each individual workplace feature from each interview transcript on one print out. Thus, all teachers comments concerning the physical aspect of the year-round school could be viewed. This process was used to compare
responses from the various interviews and generate a description based on the perceptions of the teachers working within the selected year-round school's workplace. Examples of this process were labeled as follows:

Example one is a list of the interview data files generated by the transcription of the data using Word Perfect.

Example two is a screen print out of the procedures menu within the ethnograph program.

Example three is a screen print out of the number file menu.

Example four is a screen print out of the catalog menu.

Example five is the list of codes utilized.

Example six is an example of a numbered transcript which has been hand coded.

Example seven is an example of the same transcript used in example six with the hand coded segments entered into the Ethnograph program.

Example eight is an example of a code search for the physical features of the workplace labeled in interview 16.
Example one:

Directory C:\ETHNO:

816 Free: 5,275,600 Used: 676,598

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>&lt;Dir&gt;</th>
<th>ETHNO</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>9,472</th>
<th>ETHNO</th>
<th>.003</th>
<th>9,516</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>26,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>52,594</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>11,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>17,318</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>19,888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>21,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>12,914</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>9,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>10,807</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>10,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>8,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>14,188</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>14,652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>6,683</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>16,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>10,468</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>29,331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>27,355</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>29,889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>24,820</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>24,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>22,014</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>26,829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>ETHNO</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>6,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>10,697</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>17,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>9,005</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>14,404</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>9,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>30,562</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>12,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>44,952</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>5,652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>27,931</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>14,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>9,885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>10,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>25,514</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>25,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>24,531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>78,982</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>25,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>31,227</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>13,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>11,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>11,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example two:

ETHNOGRAPH PROCEDURE MENU

N - NUMBER Data Files
C - CODE A Data File
P - PRINT Numbered/Coded Files
S - SEARCH For Coded Segments
M - MODIFY Coding Schemes
L - LIST Code Words
G - CATALOG Data Files
T - TEMPLATES for Fecssheets
D - DIRECTORY Change Data File Directory
Q - QUIT

Select Option:

Example three:
Example four:

CATALOG - OPENING MENU

CURRENT DATA FILE DIRECTORY: C:\ETHNO

OPENING MENU

C - CREATE a Catalog
M - MODIFY a Catalog
D - DIRECTORY List Files/Change Directory
R - RETURN to Procedure menu

Select Option:

Example five:

SUMMARY of Code Sets for KELLY16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET#</th>
<th>START CODE</th>
<th>STOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34 #PSYCHOLOG</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49 #ORGANIZ</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58 $SOCIOLOG</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>69 #SUMMATT</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>77 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>95 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 #ORGANIZ</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>109 #PHYSICAL</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>115 #ORGANIZ</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>124 #CULTURAL</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>136 #PSYCHOL</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 150 #PSYCHOLO 154
16 169 #PSYCHOL 171
17 185 #SOCIOLOG 186
18 190 #ORGANIZ 194
19 196 #SOCIOLOG 200
20 204 #PSYCHOLOG 208
21 218 #PSYCHOLOG 219
22 224 #ECONOMIC 228
23 225 #PSYCHOLOG 228
24 227 #ORGANIZ 228
25 232 #ORGANIZ 237
26 233 #PSYCHOLOG 237
27 239 #ORGANIZ 246
28 244 #PSYCHOLOG 246
29 250 #ECONOMIC 251
30 255 #PSYCHOLOG 257
31 261 #PSYCHOLOG 263
Example six:

NUMBERED VERSION OF KELLY16

Case-16

Demographic Information.

Five years of study in Washington, one  
year Tacoma, two years UNLV, 28th  
year teaching.

What is the highest degree you have  
earned?

BA.

In this school?

Three years.

In this district?

Twenty four years.

Grade level?

About ten years.

Current teaching assignments?

Fourth grade, self contained. We use  
specialists thank goodness.

Did you specifically choose to work at  
a year round schools?

Yes, for a very selfish reason. I  
wanted to take a trip to Europe and  
the only way I could go due to the  
time, the trip was offered was to go  
to the year round school. So that's  
why I choose the year round school.

Why stay?

I like the flexible schedules?

Physical, describe?
I don't see any difference in any of these things. Other than when you teach in the summer there are some discomfort days. When the air conditioning goes out and on duty.

How does that affect you?

It's hot standing out there... It takes awhile for their bodies to cool off (students). I am very frank with kids about staying clean so I don't have body order problems.

Is the warehouse distribution geared to serve year round school?

I don't think. We have never had problems with supplies. In the past we have had some problems with buses. Buses arrive late in the summer when they have no other place to be. To me that's kind of strange. I think the bus driver slacks off in the summer.

Does working a year round school schedule affect buildings overall maintenance?

No, they just paint while we are in school. No impact.

Administration problems?

No because even if we don't have a vice principal the office has a stand by, there all ways someone.

Do you feel you have more control over what you do and how you do it because you work in a year round school?

No.
Transit problems?

Well, the first year we had a roving teacher. When volunteered and she roved every three weeks. Which was unbelievable. The next year we moved every six weeks or something. It wasn't a big deal. We cooperated over what boards would be left up and we had rolling carts.

Extra work involved in curriculum because of year round school.

Same.

Bulletin boards did you have the same quality visual aids when you rotated?

Not really. In some cases you did. I don't think it affected the instruction the educational TV used to be a problem because it would only go so many months, but now they do.

What is it like working in a year round school when nine month schools are out?

We cry. I don't know June comes and then it was gone.

Do you notice any difference in dress or attendance after June in the year round school?

No.

What is it about year round school which makes you a better teacher?

I don't know. I am here more because of the breaks. I take fewer mental health days. My attendance is better. Stress is probable a little less.
Anything in year round school compromises your teaching?
No.

Professional growth affected by year round school?
Taking classes has not been a problem. Classes are available and now there are classes available for students as well. Some kids can’t afford it, but it is available.

What adjustments do you make to work at a year round school?
None.

New teachers?
I don’t think it would make any difference. Just be prepared.

Does year round school schedule affect staff interaction?
No. It doesn’t seem to make any difference. I travel, year round schools allow me to do that.

Support staff power?
No difference.

Parent relations?
No.

Anything in the year round school which inhibits or enhances students leaving?
I think for the younger ones there’s less forgetting, time.

Do you see it in your fourth graders?
Yes. We now have a curriculum guide which lets us go on. For example; fourth graders were not allowed to divide with a two digit divisor and now we can go on.

So the transition time between grade levels is the true advantage to year round schools.

Yes.

Is year round school for everyone?

(Laugh) I doubt it. Some teachers have left because the school was going year round. Some teachers have old out molded ideas that teachers need to have an summer off.

Any difference in Blacks, Whites, Hispanics...?

I don’t think year round school facet makes any difference.

Important?

No, less burn out, possibility, but not more important.

What if you worked the extended contract?

I worked the extended contract. It was a brain blower. In those days we got 20 days off other than regular holidays. The money was not worth it. We got 3 5 extra days paid.

Talk to me about it what was it like?

Well, you had four tracks and three were there as you rotated. You had to make sure everyone got all the curriculum at some point that was real difficult. And the fact of using them.
While working those four years were you aware of all the extra effort you were expending?

Yes. You can’t keep it up. Every three weeks it changed. I don’t know how people handle extended contracts.

Advantages?

None, I don’t want to sub. I am gone when I am on break.

Contract choice?

Yes. It’s not worth any amount of money to give up your breaks even with the extra money.

Option?

I would stay at this school regardless of schedules because I am retiring in two years.
Example seven:
CODED VERSION OF KELLY16

Physical, describe? 45

#-PHYSICAL
I don't see any difference in any of these things. Other then when you

% -ORGANIZ

 teach in the summer there are some discomfort days. When the air conditioning goes out and on duty.

How does that affect you? 53

#-PHYSICAL
It's hot standing out there. It takes awhile for their bodies to cool off (students). I am very frank with

$-SOCIOLOG

 kids about staying clean so I don’t have body order problems.

Is the warehouse distribution geared to serve year round school? 61

#-PHYSICAL
I don’t think. We have never had problems with supplies. In the past we have had some problems with buses. Buses arrive late in the summer when they have no other place

#-SUMMATT
to be. To me that's kind of strange. I think the bus driver slacks off in the summer.

Does working a year round school schedule affect buildings overall maintenance? 74

#-PHYSICAL
No, they just paint while we are in school. No impact.

Administration problems? 80

No because even if we don’t have a vice principal the office has a stand by, there all ways someone.
Do you feel you have more control over what you do and how you do it because you work in a year round school?

No.

Transit problems?

Well, the first year we had a roving teacher. When volunteered and she roved every three weeks. Which was unbelievable. The next year we moved every six weeks or something.

It wasn’t a big deal. We cooperated over what boards would be left up and we had rolling carts.

Extra work involved in curriculum because of year round school.

Same.

Bulletin boards did you have the same quality visual aids when you rotated?

Not really. In some cases you did. I don’t think it affected the instruction the educational TV used to be a problem because it would only go so many months, but now they do.

What is it like working in a year round school when nine month schools are out?

We cry. I don’t know June comes and then it was gone.

Do you notice any difference in dress or attendance after June in the year round school?
CODID VERSION OF KELLY16

No.

What is it about year round school
which makes you a better teacher?  133

#-PSYCHOL

I don't know. I am here more because
of the breaks. I take fewer mental
health days. My attendance is
better. Stress is probably a little
less.  136

Anything in year round school
compromises your teaching?  142

No.

Professional growth affected by year
round school?  147

#-PSYCHOLO

Taking classes has not been a problem.  150

Classes are available and now there
are classes available for students
as well. Some kids can't afford it,
but it is available.  151

What adjustments do you make to work at
a year round school?  156

None.  159

New teachers?  161

I don't think it would make any
difference. Just be prepared.  163

Does year round school schedule affect
staff interaction?  166

#-PSYCHOL

No. It doesn't seem to make any
difference. I travel, year round
schools allow me to do that.  169

Support staff power?  173

No difference.  175

Parent relations?  177
CODED VERSION OF KELLY16

No.

Anything in the year round school which inhibits or enhances students leaving?

#-SOCIOLOG
I think for the younger ones there's less forgetting, time.

Do you see it in your fourth graders?

#-ORGANIZ
Yes. We now have a curriculum guide which lets us go on. For example; fourth graders were not allowed to divide with a two digit divisor and now we can go on.

#-SOCIOLOG
So the transition time between grade levels is the true advantage to year round schools.

Yes.

Is year round school for everyone?

#-PSYCHOLOG
(Laugh) I doubt it. Some teachers have left because the school was going year round. Some teachers have old out molded ideas that teachers need to have an summer off.

Any difference in Blacks, Whites, Hispanics...?

I don't think year round school facet makes any difference.

Important?

#-PSYCHOLOG
No, less burn out, possibility, but not more important.

What if you worked the extended contract?
I worked the extended contract. It was a brain blower. In those days we got 20 days off other than regular holidays. The money was not worth it. We got 35 extra days paid. Talk to me about it what was it like?

Well, you had four tracks and three were there as you rotated. You had to make sure everyone got all the curriculum at some point that was real difficult. And the fact of using them. While working those four years were you aware of all the extra effort you were expending? Yes. You can’t keep it up. Every three weeks it changed. I don’t know how people handle extended contracts.

Advantages?

None, I don’t want to sub. I am gone when I am on break.

Contract choice?

Yes. It’s not worth any amount of money to give up your breaks even with the extra money.

Option?

I would stay at this school regardless of schedules because I am retiring in two years.
Example eight

KELLY16 Yes, for a
SORT CODE: PHYSICAL

#-PSYCHOLOG $-PHYSICAL
: Yes, for a very selfish reason. I 34 -# -$
: wanted to take a trip to Europe and 35 |
$: the only way I could go due to the 36 $
$: time, the trip was offered was to go 37 $
$: to the year round school. So that’s 38 $
$: why I choose the year round school. 39 -# $:

: Why stay? 41 $\$

: I like the flexible schedules? 43 $

: Physical, describe? 45 $\$

#-PHYSICAL
: I don’t see any difference in any of 47 -# $\$
: these things. Other then when you 48 |

%-ORGANIZ
: teach in the summer there are some 49 |
: discomfort days. When the air 50 |$
: conditioning goes out and on duty. 51 -# -$ -%

KELLY16 I don’t se

SC: PHYSICAL

#-PHYSICAL
: I don’t see any difference in any of 47 -#
: these things. Other then when you 48 #

%-ORGANIZ
: teach in the summer there are some 49 # -$
: discomfort days. When the air 50 # |
: conditioning goes out and on duty. 51 -# -$ -%

KELLY16 It’s hot s

SC: PHYSICAL

#-PHYSICAL
: It’s hot standing out there. It takes 55 -#
: awhile for their bodies to cool off 56 #
: (students). I am very frank with 57 #

$-$SOCIOLOG
: kids about staying clean so I don’t 58 # -$
: have body order problems. 59 -# -$

--------------------
I don't think. We have never had problems with supplies. In the past we have had some problems with.

No, they just paint while we are in school. No impact.

Well, the first year we had a roving teacher. When she volunteered and she roved every three weeks. Which was unbelievable. The next year we moved every six weeks or something. It wasn't a big deal. We cooperated over what boards would be left up. and we had rolling carts.

Bulletin boards did you have the same quality visual aids when you rotated? Not really. In some cases you did. I don't think it affected the instruction the educational TV used to be a problem because it would only go so many months, but now they do.
APPENDIX V

MAP OF THE SELECTED YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL
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