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Abstract

Academic scholarship had not extensively investigated whether sponsoring, coaching, or leading (sponsoring) school based extracurricular activities (ECAs) influenced the sense of happiness experienced by educators. The present author hypothesized that extracurricular activity (ECA) sponsorship would lead to an increase in an educator’s sense of emotional happiness with their school community. The existing thesis’ author proposed the following research question: *To what degree, if any, does sponsoring ECAs in an elementary school setting increase an educator’s sense of happiness?* Within the current thesis, a thematic literature review examined influences on educator wellness, barriers to sponsoring, and the benefits of extracurricular activities for educators. Hills and Argyle’s (2002) Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) provided measures of happiness to test the existing hypothesis. An anonymized, five-member sample, consisting of an unknown combination of teachers, vice principals, and principals (educators) from Nanaimo-Ladysmith School District 68 (SD68), completed the OHQ before, and after, a minimal six-week period of ECA sponsorship. The mean for the existing sample’s OHQ responses statistically verified that sponsoring ECAs had not increased the sample’s sense of happiness. Supplementary statistical data analyzed from the sample’s OHQ responses corroborated that the present study had resulted in a null hypothesis. Research errors made by present author have limited the existing study’s implications and contributions relating to academic scholarship.
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Chapter 1 – Problem to be Investigated

Purpose of Study

The author of the present study proposed to examine whether sponsoring extracurricular activities (ECAs) influenced, if at all, an educator’s overall happiness. The current study’s findings were intended to be used to help improve, if possible, the sense of emotional fulfillment educators experienced while working within their school communities. Data from the present study was examined to determine whether an increase in happiness could be linked with ECA sponsorship. The author of the current study hoped their findings would advance knowledge on the subject of how ECA sponsorship influenced teachers’ happiness.

The existing author anticipated that all research data would be securely protected and successfully anonymized. The present thesis’ author presumed that educators would be willing to participate in the current study. Moreover, the present author assumed this study would not be prevented by a lockout, strike, or job action occurring in British Columbia’s public schools.

Justification of the Study

Whiteley and Richard (2012) surveyed teachers’ perceptions regarding classroom preparation time and participation in ECAs. Whiteley and Richard’s sample consisted of 80 secondary school teachers who were working in British Columbia’s North Okanagan-Shuswap School District No. 83 (SD83). It was found that 91 per cent of the 80 respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that providing ECAs at school was important (Whiteley & Richard, 2012). Moreover, findings reported by Epp (2004) and Powell and Lee (2003) found that the positive implications of ECAs lead to improved classroom interaction between students and their educators. ECA volunteering helped educators become more aware of their students’ needs, capabilities, and development. Concurrently, students developed newfound respect and
appreciation for ECA coaches and advisers (Epp, 2004; Powell & Lee, 2003). Among the research implications identified by Epp (2004), sponsoring and leading ECAs was recognized to help educators fulfill their moral purpose. Epp (2004), Powell and Lee (2003), and Whiteley and Richard (2012) demonstrated that educators recognized the importance and valuable rewards associated with sponsoring ECAs.

Through leading and sponsoring ECAs, educators strengthened their relationship with students and students’ families (McDonald, 2013). Levine (2016) observed that parents and guardians may advocate for specific interests such as Gay-Straight Alliances, organized sports, and religious studies. While an educator was not obligated to parents’ interests, McDonald (2013) suggested sponsoring ECAs fortified relationships within school communities.

Pabayo, O’Loughlin, Gauvin, Paradis, and Gray-Donald (2006) investigated the extracurricular sports ban by Montreal secondary teachers that occurred September 1999 to January 2000. Pabayo et al. discovered that leisure time physical activities were not maintained by students during the Montreal teachers’ job action. By comparison, Pabayo et al. (2006) confirmed that student participation in physical fitness was significantly more probable once extracurricular sports were reinstated. Furthermore, Pabayo et al. asserted that ECA sports programs were believed to have increased a sense of belonging for not only students and their families, but also school personnel (Pabayo et al., 2006).

McDonald (2013) found that teacher respondents believed participating in ECAs provided professional benefits: teachers felt increased respect from parent groups, administrators, and fellow teachers; ECA sponsors shared difficult to find resources with fellow advisors and coaches; sponsor teachers worked with one another for the benefit of their learning community; educators developed professional networks with sponsors from other schools; and ECA sponsors
and leaders formed their own social groups. While McDonald’s (2013) findings indicated that sponsoring ECAs provided benefits to teachers, replicated studies were not conducted to validate McDonald’s conclusions. The author of the current study endeavored to advance knowledge about ECA sponsorship by conducting the existing study.

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

The present study’s author investigated whether an educator’s sense of happiness was influenced by sponsoring ECAs. Before collecting data, the author of the current study anticipated that ECA sponsorship was linked to higher levels of happiness among elementary school educators. The existing study’s author proposed the following research question: to what degree, if any, does sponsoring ECAs in an elementary school setting increase an educator’s sense of happiness? The author of the present study hypothesized that the current study would find evidence to show that sponsoring, coaching, and leading ECAs leads to an increase in an educator’s emotional happiness with their school community.

**Definition of Terms**

The author of the existing study chose a few select terms to operationally define to be clear to the present paper’s audience. For example, the operational definition of the term ‘ECAs’ was defined in the current study to represent all learning opportunities, occurring within the boundaries of public school grounds, which were not provided during classroom teaching. ECAs occurring within SD68 have included: athletics, computers, gardening, and music.

The operational definition of the term ‘educators’ was defined in the present study as principals, teachers, and vice principals working within a public school district. Educators fulfilled administrative, supervision, and teaching duties occurring within public schools.
The operational definition of the term ‘full-time equivalent’ was defined in the existing study to indicate the percentage of full-time salary that an educator was contracted to work. For example, a 1.00 full-time equivalent contract equated to 100 per cent full-time salary. Whereas, a 0.75 full-time equivalent contract equated to 75 per cent full-time salary.

The operational definition of the term ‘happiness’ was defined in the present study as an educator’s sense of contentment and pleasure throughout everyday life. Happiness signified career satisfaction, satisfaction of daily existence, and interactions within a school community.

The operational definition of the term ‘sponsoring’ was defined in the existing study as a commitment by an educator to supervise school based ECAs for students. By sponsoring, the educator may have also coached or led students in learning while participating in ECAs.

**Brief Overview of Study**

The present study investigated to what degree, if any, sponsoring ECAs improved the happiness of educators. The sample was comprised of educators who were working in British Columbia’s Nanaimo-Ladysmith School District No. 68 (SD68). The author of the current study clearly communicated to prospective research subjects that participation in the existing study was strictly voluntary. In addition, candidates were provided with information about the current study, and were advised of their unconditional right to withdraw at any time from the present study.

Participants completed Hills and Argyle’s (2002) Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) which consisted of 29 questions that were answered on a six-point Likert scale. Following the completion of the OHQ, each subject sponsored an ECA that lasted for a time-period of six weeks or longer. After completing ECA sponsorship, subjects answered a second OHQ. The current study’s author calculated and compared each subject’s overall measure of
happiness (MOH) score in the first and second OHQ. Any variance between the scores of the first and second OHQ demonstrated an increase or decline in a participant’s happiness. After all data was clearly documented and interpreted, the author of the present study declared their findings.
Chapter 2 – Review of Related Literature

The author of the existing study noted that the topic of educators sponsoring ECAs had not been extensively examined in academic publications. Correspondingly, the present author observed that the connection between ECA sponsorship and the wellbeing of educators also needed to be addressed by educational scholars. To contribute academically towards future scholarship, the literature review for the present study addressed three questions related to the theme of educators:

1. What factors are believed to have influenced the wellness of educators?
2. Are there barriers which have prevented educators from sponsoring ECAs?
3. Has ECA sponsorship been verified to provide any benefit for educators?

Influences on Educator Wellness

Kidger et al.’s (2016) study noted that existing research had assessed the mental health of teachers in comparison with other professions. Additionally, they found that studies had evaluated mental disorders among teachers. Previous research, however, had not examined school psychosocial environments for explanatory factors that may have influenced teachers’ mental health. Moreover, while teachers’ mental disorders had been measured, prior research did not include measures of mental wellbeing among teachers. Kidger et al.’s (2016) findings supported the present author’s assessment that teacher wellbeing had not been satisfactory studied in peer reviewed publications. Specifically, more research was needed to investigate how school psychosocial environments influenced mental disorders in educators.

The primary purpose of Kidger et al.’s (2016) study was to investigate the self-reported prevalence of depression and levels of wellbeing among secondary teachers. However, the study’s secondary function was to assess school-level and individual dynamics connected with
teachers experiencing severe depression and poor wellbeing. Kidger et al.’s study served as the key literary source for the present author’s research into how mental disorders in educators were influenced by psychosocial environments.

Kidger et al. (2016) found major depressive indicators as well as low levels of wellbeing amongst teachers. In addition, Kidger et al. concluded that work-related dissatisfaction and stress among teachers was linked with higher depressive symptoms and poorer wellbeing. The authors’ conclusion was supported by data showing ‘univariable’ models and ‘multivariable’ models for wellbeing outcomes and depressive symptoms. Findings of the study indicated associated influences, which included: sickness absence; working while sick; below average pupil attendance; supporting a colleague; not being able to fulfill a desire to talk with a colleague; and the imminent change of a school’s status to academy (Kidger et al., 2016).

The educator’s emotional investment in their school’s status, as well as their need to interact with colleagues, could be linked to educator identity. To assess this statement, the present author noted Obenchain, Balkute, Vaughn, and White’s (2016) research, which found that sub-identities, such as professional identity, personal identity, cultural identity, and civic identity, formed the teacher’s identity. Derived from Obenchain et al.’s description of teacher identity, the existing author surmised that an educator’s sub-identities could be affected by school psychosocial environments. This assumption however, connected the educator’s identity to their workplace environment. Furthermore, the assumption also held that an educator, who observed their identity from a favorable perspective, would simultaneously have experienced a positive sense of emotional happiness and wellness. Nevertheless, psychosocial influences have been verified to impact relationships shared between co-workers who sponsor ECAs. Powell and
Lee’s (2003) study observed that educators bonded through supportive opportunities derived from ECA sponsorship.

Acton and Glasgow (2015) found that professional relationships with administration, colleagues, and students were inseparable from a teacher’s emotional intelligence, emotional responses, and personal emotions. Acton and Glasgow determined that teachers’ wellbeing was enhanced and sustained by positive school environments, which promoted trusting and collegial relationships that were mutually supportive and professional.

**Barriers to Sponsoring**

Within the structure of semester timetables, inconsistent preparation time was investigated by Whiteley and Richard (2012) as a potential obstacle for ECA sponsorship by secondary teachers. Whiteley and Richard observed that full-time teachers entitled to one daily block of preparation time, in either the first or second semester, had no preparation block during the alternate semester. A full semester without preparation time limited the availability and energy of teachers to have volunteered as ECA sponsors.

Similarly, Powell and Lee (2003) observed that preservice teachers’ attitudes about ECAs changed significantly after their first field experiences. ECAs were viewed by preservice teachers to be stressfully, time consuming. Kidger et al. (2016) found that higher depressive symptoms and poorer wellbeing in teachers was linked with feeling dissatisfied or stressed at work. Renard (2003) proposed that new teacher attrition rates could be improved, by requiring a minimum two years of classroom experience before teachers coached ECAs.

In the Whiteley and Richard (2012) study, 58 per cent of respondents had participated in at least one ECA during the year. When teaching all four blocks in a semester, 24 per cent of respondents stated that they continued to participate in ECAs, whereas 41 per cent of
respondents declared that they did not participate in ECAs. Regrettably, by not participating in ECAs, Epp (2004) suggested that teachers denied themselves fulfilling and rewarding experiences as ECA coaches, sponsors, or leaders.

Whiteley and Richard (2012) found that secondary teachers wanted evenly distributed preparation time during both semesters. Whiteley and Richard projected that balanced preparation throughout two semesters increased a typical teacher’s willingness to coach, sponsor, or lead an ECA. Conversely, Epp’s (2004) thesis observed that the number of teachers participating in school-based ECAs had been decreasing over time. Factors that Epp attributed to declines in ECA participation included: aging teacher population, curriculum alterations, funding slashes, and increased administrative duties.

Pabayo et al. (2006) observed that teacher associations have used ECA sponsorship withdrawal as a tactic to create pressure during collective bargaining negotiations. From 2011 to 2012, the present author served as a preservice teacher amid the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation’s (2012, February 28) escalating job action. While on practicum at Chemainus Secondary School in Cowichan Valley School District No. 79, the current author was made aware that ECA sponsorship was a union related topic among teachers. In due course, the members of the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation (BCTF) held a three-day strike (CBC News, 2012, March 1). However, Bill 22 - the Education Improvement Act (introduced by Minister of Education George Abbott) was passed, which legislated teachers to suspend job action, and immediately ended the strike. Nevertheless, throughout the remainder of the present author’s spring teaching practicum, teachers did not appear to be involved in any form of ECA sponsorship (Province of British Columbia, 2012, March 15).
Benefits for Educators

Epp (2004) sought to identify the internal rewards which inspired teachers to volunteer as school-based coaches, leaders, and sponsors. In addition, Epp wanted to determine in what way teachers had been positively affected by ECAs. Similarly, McDonald (2013) studied the professional benefits of sponsoring ECAs from the perspectives of teachers. McDonald also investigated whether ECA sponsorship provided teachers with increased social capital and a feeling of belonging with community and school. As previously written, Pabayo et al. (2006) also found that ECA sports programs were believed to have increased school personnel’s sense of belonging.

McDonald (2013) observed that ECA participation provided teachers with an improved sense of belonging, which included social grouping and resource sharing with colleagues, while establishing external connections with parents. Epp (2004) found that involvement in ECAs augmented teachers’ relationships, enhanced personal gratification, fulfilled moral purpose, improved classroom management skills, and increased recognition. Similarly, McDonald’s findings also suggested that teachers, who sponsored ECAs, believed they had become stronger classroom teachers. Rapport and relationships with students had improved, and teachers felt more connected with their school community. Moreover, McDonald found that participating in ECAs benefitted teachers with status attainment from increased social capital.

To summarize, Epp’s (2004) research determined that involvement in ECAs offered extensive intrinsic benefits for teachers. Correspondingly, McDonald (2013) also found that ECA sponsorship benefitted teachers. While both scholars have shared similar findings, Epp’s thesis, and McDonald’s dissertation, work needs to be tested and expanded upon, to validate the benefits ECAs may provide educators.
Concerns Resulting from Literature

The existing thesis’ literature review, examined through the lens of the current author’s preservice and professional teaching experiences, has lead the present author to conclude that psychosocial environments influence an educator’s decision to participate or not participate in ECAs. Within politically charged environments, such as job action, sponsoring an ECA could place a teacher at risk of economic, professional, and social reprisal. For instance, the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation’s (2018) Code of Ethics states that a member’s actions cannot destabilize their union’s collective strategies and ongoing job actions. Once a job action has escalated to work-to-rule, BTCF members cannot sponsor ECAs without knowingly acting in prejudice against their professional union’s policy.

Contrastingly, early career teachers and preservice teachers may perceive a social responsibility, or an opportunity to build social and professional capital, by participating in ECAs. The existing author has seen early career teachers, including themselves, absorbed in ECA sponsorship before solidifying 1.00 full-time equivalent employment. Simultaneously, while writing the present thesis, the existing author observed and interacted with preservice teachers who were coaching ECAs. However, Powell and Lee’s (2003) findings had indicated that preservice teachers’ attitudes about ECAs changed after acquiring initial field experiences. Nevertheless, preservice teachers, and early career teachers, may feel reluctant to decline ECA participation during the initial steps of their teaching careers. The present author has concluded that the external stressors, which pressure educators to either avoid or embrace ECA sponsorship, in order to be accepted by their psychosocial environment and professional networks, should be studied in greater depth by future academic scholars.
Chapter 3 – Procedures and Methods

Description of the Research Design

The existing study examined the degree of influence, if any, that sponsoring ECAs in an elementary school setting had on an educator’s sense of happiness. The present study used a verbatim copy of the OHQ to collect survey data (see Appendix A for the full survey). The OHQ was created by Hills and Argyle (2002) to provide a designated measure of a respondent’s happiness.

In the current study, participants volunteered to complete the OHQ. Participants responded to the OHQ’s 29 items which were answered via a six-point Likert scale (Hills & Argyle, 2002). After completing the OHQ, each participant sponsored an ECA that spanned a minimum time-period of six weeks. Once ECA sponsorship was completed, participants were asked again to complete the OHQ. Scores from the first and second OHQ were calculated, analyzed, and compared for each of the individual participants and the entire sample.

Description of the Sample

Due to financial limitations and time restraints, the sample for the existing study was selected by means of convenience sampling. A concise, written outline of the current study was emailed to representatives of the Nanaimo District Teachers’ Association (NDTA), Nanaimo Elementary Teachers of Physical Education Association (NETPEA), and Nanaimo-Ladysmith School District No. 68 (SD68). The outline detailed the present study’s purpose, design, and involvement of participants, and offered SD68’s educators an opportunity to participate in the existing study.

Research subjects who volunteered for the present study met the following prerequisites: the educator was contracted to work in an elementary school; the educator confirmed their intent
to begin sponsorship of an ECA in the autumn of 2017; the educator’s ECA sponsorship spanned a minimal time-period of six weeks; and the educator was willing to answer the OHQ both before and after six weeks of ECA sponsorship. The initial 10 educators who fulfilled all the prerequisites for involvement in the existing study were to be designated as the sample.

Description of Instruments Used

Participants in the existing study received an email which provided the web address of www.hostedincanadasurveys.ca and registration codes to access and complete two surveys. The author of the current study used the OHQ for both online surveys. Hills and Argyle (2002) derived the OHQ from the Oxford Happiness Inventory (OHI). In comparison to the OHI, Hills and Argyle found the OHQ to be an improved instrument for measuring happiness.

Hills and Argyle (2002) constructed the OHQ with 29 items that were separately answered by means of a six-point Likert scale: 1 point for strongly disagree; 2 points for moderately disagree; 3 points for slightly disagree; 4 points for slightly agree; 5 points for moderately agree; and 6 points for strongly agree. The OHQ’s items were worded to present a rough balance between negative and positive statements. The OHQ had 17 items that were scored from 1 to 6 points. However, 12 items in the OHQ were scored in reverse of how a participant answered the items on the six-point Likert scale.

Hills and Argyle (2002) found that the total score of a participant’s responses to the OHQ’s 29 items designated a MOH. A lower score, such as 70, designated a lower MOH, whereas a higher score, such as 130, designated a higher MOH. The lowest possible raw score for the OHQ was a calculation of 29. The highest possible raw score for the OHQ was a calculation of 174.
Explanation of the Procedures Followed

In the autumn of 2017, prospective research subjects received written information about the present study. Educators were informed that participation in the current study was voluntary. Candidates were also advised that participants had the unconditional right to withdraw at any time from the existing study. Furthermore, unless an individual member of the sample requested their name to be revealed, the participant was guaranteed anonymity. The written information briefed the sample’s candidates on the purpose and design of the present study. In addition, candidates were informed that participation in the current study would require a minimum of six weeks of ECA sponsorship commencing in the fall of 2017. Lastly, the existing study’s author met in person with each candidate. After discussing the current study, candidates read and voluntarily signed consent forms to become research subjects in the present study. The author of the existing study brought the participants’ signed consent forms to Vancouver Island University (VIU). Consent forms, and a flash drive containing data from the current study, were stored within a locked cabinet located in the Faculty of Education's Graduate Chair's office.

Members of the sample received codes to register and access the present study’s online survey at Hosted in Canada Surveys (HICS). At the survey’s start, participants were again advised of their right to discontinue participation in the current study at any time. Before ECA sponsorship commenced, participants answered the OHQ’s 29 items. The data for participants’ OHQ responses was stored in an HICS paid survey account. In addition, participants’ survey data was saved in a flash drive which was kept in a locked cabinet inside VIU’s Building 356.

During the autumn of 2017, each participant sponsored an ECA that spanned six weeks or longer. Following completion of their ECA sponsorship, participants received new codes to register and complete a second online survey at HICS. Before responding to the second OHQ’s
29 statements, participants were advised of their right to cease participation in the existing study. Data from participants’ responses to the second survey was stored in a paid survey account at HICS. A copy of the data from both the first and second survey was saved within a flash drive secured within VIU’s Building 356.

**Discussion of Validity**

The current study’s survey data was hosted, collected, and stored in a HICS paid survey account. When the existing study was conducted, HICS was compliant with the Personal Health Information Protection Act, and adhered to the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (“Data Security Protection Statement,” n.d.).

The present study included two OHQ surveys to measure the happiness of participants before and after ECA sponsorship. Hills and Argyle (2002) designed the OHQ as a revision of the OHI. The OHQ’s statements were constructed to provide an approximate balance of negative and positive statements. Hills and Argyle concluded that the balanced wording of the OHQ’s statements was anticipated to decrease risk of respondent bias. When compared to the OHI, the construct validity of the OHQ was the favoured measured (Hills & Argyle, 2002).

Before ECA sponsorship, participants completed the OHQ’s 29 statements. Following six weeks of ECA sponsorship, participants again completed the OHQ. The calculated score of each participant’s responses to the OHQ indicated a measurement of happiness. The result of the first and second OHQ provided two calculated scores for analysis. Variances between a participant’s first and second scores demonstrated a measurable change in the participant’s happiness. In addition, the mean (total sum of all surveys divided by the number of participants) score of the first OHQ survey was compared to the second OHQ survey’s mean score.
Description and Justification of the Statistical Procedures Used

Quantitative data from the current study was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The OHQ was completed by participants twice via online surveys. The first survey provided a raw score that designated a measure of the participant’s happiness before ECA sponsorship. The second survey provided a raw score that designated a measure of the participant’s happiness following ECA sponsorship.

Participants’ raw scores for the surveys completed before ECA sponsorship, and after ECA sponsorship, were displayed in a paired bar graph. The left vertical bar displayed data from the first survey, while the right vertical bar displayed data from the second survey. The paired bars representing each participant were separated from bars displaying the data of other participants. Any variance between a participant’s first score and second score was exhibited via the height of the left bar and right bar.

A five-number summary of the sample’s raw scores for the first survey and second survey was displayed in a box and whisker chart. The lowest, the first quartile (Q1), the median, the third quartile (Q3), and the highest raw scores for both surveys were graphically displayed in two vertical box and whisker plots. The left box and whisker plot displayed data from the first survey, while the right box and whisker plot displayed data from the second survey.

Descriptive statistics provided a numerical summary of data from the sample’s first and second surveys. The minimum and maximum values, as well as the mean, median, and mode, were reported for the first survey, second survey, and the difference, if any, between the first and second surveys’ scores. The difference reported the OHQ’s raw score as well as a standardized derived score represented in percentage.
The sample was reported having experienced ‘no increase’ in sense of happiness, from sponsoring ECAs in an elementary school setting, if the mean of the second survey increased from the mean of the first survey by 0% to 2%. The sample was reported having experienced a ‘minimal increase’ in sense of happiness if the second survey’s mean improved from the first survey’s mean by 2.1% to 5%. The sample was reported having experienced a ‘moderate increase’ in sense of happiness if the second survey’s mean increased by 5.1% to 10%. The sample was reported having experienced a ‘significant increase’ in sense of happiness if the mean of second survey improved by 10.1% or more.
Chapter 4 – Results

The current study’s sample contained five research subjects identified as Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, and Echo. Each member of the sample independently responded to 29 statements which comprised the OHQ. Following, participants proceeded to sponsor an ECA which spanned a minimum six-week period. After ECA sponsorship, the sample’s members again responded to the OHQ’s 29 statements. Pre ECA OHQs and post ECA OHQs were collected by the existing study’s author and organized into anonymized data sets.

An OHQ statement response is represented by a location on a six-point Likert scale. To confirm the correct MOH, the existing study’s author quadruple verified each statement response, which was then represented as a location and a numerical value. Locations and values were presented in data sets for the sample and individual participants.

Response Values for the Sample

There were 146 possible locations (values) for a completed OHQ. The mean for the OHQ’s 146 possible results equated to 101 and a response location (value) of 3.48 per statement. Whereas an OHQ score tallied as 87 required value 3 to be the average response to each statement. Continuing, the minimum calculable OHQ score was 29, which needed 1, the lowest value, to be selected for each response. In contrast, 174 was the maximum OHQ score, which meant 6, the highest value, had been assessed for all 29 responses.

A two-thirds value (66.67%), scored as 116 out of a possible 174, showed that value 4 was the average statement response. The present author observed OHQ score 116 (response value of 4) to be a point of reference when comparing data in the present study. Pre ECA OHQ and post ECA OHQ data showed 116 to be the lower threshold of happiness for the sample.
The sample’s pre ECA and post ECA results have been included with anonymized subject identities in Figure 1. The sample consisted of five participants identified as Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, and Echo. Prior to beginning ECA sponsorship, all five subjects recorded an OHQ score of 119 (119, 119, 125, 133, 144) or more. Pre ECA OHQ scores being greater than 116 demonstrated subjects were experiencing happiness prior to starting ECA sponsorship.

Following ECA sponsorship, post ECA OHQ scores for two subjects decreased to 115 and 116. In contrast, results of 133 and 134 were recorded for two participants, while one subject’s OHQ score increased to 148. To compare, an OHQ score equated to 145 would
represent value 5 as the average response for all OHQ statements. An OHQ result of value 148 signified that one participant had approached the uppermost levels of measurable happiness.

**Individual Subject Data**

The author of the present thesis examined the separate Oxford Happiness Questionnaires (OHQs) completed by Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, and Echo. In addition to comparing data from tallied OHQ scores, the present author contrasted and compared participants’ unique responses to statements.

**Subject Alfa.** Prior to ECA sponsorship, Alfa’s first OHQ score calculated to be 119. After sponsoring ECAs, Alfa’s second OHQ was valued at 148. Comparing pre ECA and post ECA results indicated that Alfa’s second MOH increased by 29. For the present study, an OHQ score increase of 29 determined that Alfa had experienced a *significant increase* (value 15 or more) in their MOH.

Calculated as a percentage, the second MOH increased from the first MOH by 19.86% (20%). When compared to the pre ECA OHQ, Alfa’s 29 responses for post ECA OHQ were as follows: 22 responses increased in value (15 by value one, 7 by value two), seven responses had no change in value, zero responses decreased in value.

**Subject Bravo.** Before sponsoring ECAs, Bravo’s first OHQ score tallied 125. Following ECA sponsorship, Bravo’s second OHQ calculated to be 116. Comparing pre ECA and post ECA results demonstrated that Bravo’s second MOH decreased by 9. For the present study, an OHQ score decreased by 9 showed that Bravo experienced *no increase* in their MOH.

Computed in percentage, the second MOH decreased from the first MOH by 6.16% (6%). When compared to the pre ECA OHQ, Bravo’s 29 responses for post ECA OHQ were as follows: eight responses increased in value (5 by value one, 2 by value two, 1 by value three), six
responses had no change in value, 15 responses decreased in value (11 by value one, 2 by value two, 2 by value three).

**Subject Charlie.** Preceding ECA sponsorship, Charlie’s first OHQ score was 144. Subsequent to ECA sponsorship, Charlie’s second OHQ was valued at 115. Comparing pre ECA and post ECA results determined that Charlie’s second MOH decreased by 29. For the present study, an OHQ score decrease of 29 established that Charlie experienced no increase in their MOH.

Summed as a percentage, the second MOH decreased from the first MOH by 19.86% (20%). When compared to the pre ECA OHQ, Charlie’s 29 responses for post ECA OHQ were as follows: zero responses increased in value, nine responses had no change in value, 20 responses decreased in value (11 by value one, 9 by value two).

**Subject Delta.** Prior to sponsoring ECAs, Delta’s first OHQ score calculated to be 133. Following the sponsorship of ECAs, Delta’s second OHQ was valued at 134. Comparing pre ECA and post ECA results showed that Delta’s second MOH increased by 1. For the present study, an OHQ score increase of 1 indicated that Delta experienced no increase in their MOH.

Totalized in percentage, the second MOH increased from the first MOH by 0.69% (1%). When compared to the pre ECA OHQ, Delta’s 29 responses for post ECA OHQ were as follows: seven responses increased in value (4 by value one, 3 by value two), 14 responses had no change in value, eight responses decreased in value (7 by value one, 1 by value two).

**Subject Echo.** Before ECA sponsorship, Echo’s first OHQ score calculated to be 119. After ECA sponsorship, Echo’s second OHQ was valued as 136. Comparing pre ECA and post ECA results revealed that Echo’s second MOH increased by 17. For the present study, an OHQ score increase of 17 established that Echo had experienced a significant increase in their MOH.
Assessed in percentage, the second MOH increased from the first MOH by 11.64% (12%). When compared to the pre ECA OHQ, Echo’s 29 responses for post ECA OHQ were as follows: 15 responses increased in value (12 by value one, 2 by value two, 1 by value three), 12 responses had no change in value, one response decreased in value (1 by value one).

**Testing the Hypothesis**

Proving the present author’s hypothesis required data sets to show the sample had experienced either a minimal, moderate, or significant increase in its MOH. A minimal increase (2.1% to 5%) necessitated the mean OHQ score for the sample to be a value between 3.07 (3) to value 7.3 (7). A moderate increase (5.1% to 10%) indicated the sample’s mean OHQ score was within value 7.45 (8) to value 14.6 (14). A significant increase (10.1% or more) required the sample’s mean OHQ score to be value 14.75 (15) or greater. Contrastingly, had research data showed no increase in the sample’s MOH, the present author’s hypothesis was disproved. The requirement for no increase (2% or less) indicated the mean OHQ scores for the sample increased by value 2 (2.92) or less.

**Data Sets.** Before sponsoring ECAs, the sample’s first set of OHQ scores were: 119, 119, 125, 133, 144. After ECA sponsorship, the second set of OHQ scores for the sample was: 115, 116, 134, 136, 148. The present paper’s author applied descriptive statistics to both sets of OHQ scores. The box and whisker chart provided in Figure 2 shows the values, central tendency, statistical dispersion, and quartiles for both data sets.

Pre ECA OHQ scores showed a sample minimum of 119 and a sample maximum of 144. The difference between the first data set’s sample minimum and sample maximum was calculated as range 25. In comparison, the sample minimum of the post ECA data set decreased
to 115, while the sample maximum increased to 148. The second data set’s sample maximum and sample minimum equaled range 33.

![OHQ Scores Box and Whisker Chart. Pre ECA OHQ Scores designated with blue. Post ECA OHQ Scores represented in orange.](image)

The first data set’s lowest and highest scores were correspondingly 119 and 144. Pre ECA OHQ scores showed the Q1 as 119, while the Q3 was 133, which determined the interquartile range (IQR) to be 14. Comparatively, the post ECA OHQ’s lowest and highest scores were respectively 115 and 148. The second data set showed the Q1 to be 116, the Q3 was 136, and the IQR calculated as 20.

The sample’s pre ECA OHQ scores showed the mode to be 119, the median as 125, and the mean at 128. Post ECA OHQ scores showed no existing mode, the median at 134, and the mean to be 129.8. Comparing pre ECA OHQ scores with post ECA OHQ scores, the second data set’s mean, representative of the sample’s average MOH, increased by value 1.8. Calculated in
percentage, the sample’s average MOH increased by 1.2% after sponsoring ECAs. Therefore, the increased value of the second data set’s mean was located within the present study’s perimeters for no increase (increased value 2% or less) in the sample’s MOH.

Consequently, the current author has concluded that the existing study’s data sets have established a null hypothesis. The present study did not find evidence to show that sponsoring, coaching, and leading extracurricular activities leads to an increase in an educator’s emotional happiness with their school community.

Likert Scale Locations

To verify the null hypothesis, the current study’s author examined the individual OHQ statement responses by each participant. The OHQ’s Likert scale provided a response range spanning from location 1 to location 6. The average response for each OHQ statement, prior to sponsoring ECAs, was location 4.41379 (4.4). In comparison, the average response for OHQ statements completed after ECA sponsorship moved to Likert scale location 4.47586 (4.5). Rounding decimals to the nearest tenth, the average, pre ECA OHQ statement’s location was 4.4, and the average, post ECA OHQ statement’s location was 4.5. The latter statement responses, completed after ECA sponsorship, increased location by 0.1 (0.06207) on the Likert scale. Using the present study’s parameters, a 0.1 change on the Likert scale should be measured as negligible movement.

Change in Location. Representing the Likert scale’s location as scored values, the present author reflected on the calculated mean for pre ECA OHQ and post ECA OHQ statements: The mean for the first set of completed OHQs was value 128. Correspondingly, participants’ mean response for their second set of written OHQs was value 129.8. Following ECA sponsorship, the sample’s second OHQ had increased by an average score of value 1.8.
Calculated in percentage, an OHQ score augmented by value 1.8 equated to a 1% (1.23288%) increase in the sample’s MOH. According to the preconditions of the existing study, a 1% increase equaled value 2% or less, which demonstrated there was no increase in the participants’ sense of happiness following ECA sponsorship.

No Account of Outliers

The existing author considered the polarization of Subject Alpha’s and Subject Charlie’s pre ECA, and post ECA, OHQ scores. The present author had wondered whether Alpha’s and/or Charlie’s data represented mild or extreme outliers for either data set. Furthermore, the current author pondered whether the present study’s design should have omitted data from outliers. To examine these questions, inner fence measurements were determined for both data sets, then compared with data provided by subjects Alpha and Charlie.

The pre ECA OHQ’s lower inner fence (LIF), calculated as \( Q_1 \) (119) - IQR (14) \( \cdot \) 1.5 = LIF (98), was value 98; while its upper inner fence (UIF), calculated as \( Q_3 \) (133) + IQR (14) \( \cdot \) 1.5 = UIF (154), was value 154. By means of these calculations, Subject Alpha’s pre ECA score of value 119 was higher (value 21) than the pre ECA Data Set’s LIF value 98. The computations also demonstrated that Subject Charlie’s pre ECA score of value 144 was below (value 10) the pre ECA Data Set’s UIF value 154. Consequently, the present author has substantiated that Subject Alpha’s and Subject Charlie’s OHQ results would not have represented mild outliers for the pre ECA data set.

The post ECA OHQ’s LIF, calculated as \( Q_1 \) (116) - IQR (20) \( \cdot \) 1.5 = LIF (86), was value 86; while its UIF, calculated as \( Q_3 \) (136) + IQR (20) \( \cdot \) 1.5 = UIF (166), was value 166. Applying these results, Subject Alpha’s post ECA score of value 148 was lower (value 18) than the post ECA Data Set’s UIF value 166. Calculations for the post ECA data set also demonstrated that
Subject Charlie’s post ECA score value 115 was above (value 29) the post ECA Data Set’s LIF value 86. Accordingly, the existing author also verified that the OHQ results of subjects Alpha and Charlie could not have been mild outliers for the post ECA data set.

The existing author has confirmed that Subject Alpha’s and Subject Charlie’s data remained well within the lower and upper inner fence measurements for both data sets. Therefore, separate from the existing author’s curiosity regarding the mirrored, polarized data collected from both subjects, there is nothing unusual about either Subject Alpha’s and Subject Charlie’s OHQ statement responses. Which means that for the current study, the sample’s data sets incontrovertibly equated to a null hypothesis.

**Null Hypothesis Confirmed**

Having verified both data sets showed no evidence of statistical outliers, the present author reflected on the inconsistency in the sample members’ MOH scores. After ECA sponsorship, the MOH score for each subject changed as follows: Alfa +29 value, Bravo -9 value, Charlie -29 value, Delta +1 value, and Echo +17 value.

A completed OHQ had 146 possible results (ranging from 29 value to 174 value). The existing author, however, preferred to comment about changes in OHQ data by means of percentages. Subsequently, observed in percentage, Subject Alpha’s MOH increased 20% (19.86301%), which was 9.9% higher than the present study’s 10.1% or greater prerequisite for a significant increase. Likewise, Subject Echo’s increased MOH, determined to be 12% (11.64384%), was situated 1.9% above the qualification for a significant increase. The increased MOH demonstrated by both subjects, Alpha and Echo, were in concurrence with the existing hypothesis.
Chapter 5 – Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary of Data

Research data from the existing study established a null hypothesis. To quadruple check, the current author completed three additional reviews of all OHQ statements and calculations. Abiding to the present study’s prerequisites, which were observed and used to calculate data four consecutive times, the existing author found the null hypothesis was irrefutable.

Thoughts and Inquiries

Reflecting upon the present study’s quantitative design, the current author believed the absence of empirical data had limited their understanding of the sample’s data sets. Had qualitative research been included, the perspective of participants would have helped the existing author elaborate on the current study’s null hypothesis. However, the data set comparisons, which have determined that two subjects experienced significant increases in happiness, did not provide any explanation for why these positive changes occurred.

Three research subjects experienced a MOH increase of 2.0% or less, which met the current study’s precondition for no increase in happiness. Although Subject Delta’s MOH had increased 1% (0.68493%), their shift in happiness represented a negligible change. Inversely, subjects Bravo and Charlie both experienced a decreased sense of happiness. Subject Bravo’s MOH decreased by 6% (6.16438%) and established the participant had been happier before sponsoring ECAs. However, Subject Charlie’s MOH, which decreased 20% (19.86301%) after ECA sponsorship, warranted speculation.

Without empirical records, such as recorded interviews, participant journals, or written field notes, the existing author could not explain the decline in positive emotions experienced by the two latter subjects. Nonetheless, the present author wondered whether Subject Charlie’s pre
ECA OHQ score had been too elevated to be reasonably maintainable across a period spanning six weeks. Calculated in percentage, Subject Charlie’s pre ECA MOH of 80% (79.45206) decreased to 66% (66.43836%). After sponsoring ECAs, Subject Charlie, who recorded the minimum score in the post ECA data set, may have conceivably stabilized from a previously excessive sense of happiness. Should any merit be accredited to the likelihood of emotional stabilization, it would have been reasonable for the present author to suggest that Subject Alpha’s post ECA MOH, computed to be 82% (82.19178%), might not have been maintainable beyond another six weeks.

**Limitations, Oversights, and Recommendations**

As a researcher, who had not previously conducted an academic study, the present author found that VIU’s Master of Education in Educational Leadership (MEDL) cohort-based model was systematically effective in supporting thesis research. VIU’s multiple semester approach, which allowed cohort members to conceptualize, construct, and execute their thesis research throughout regular coursework, strengthened the current author’s evolving understanding of academic research: The present study was drafted, written, and revised during the existing author’s MEDL studies at VIU. The current author’s research idea was conceptualized in MEDL 500 Foundations of Educational Leadership studies with VIU’s Dean of Education, Dr. Harry Janzen. During the following semester’s coursework in MEDL 550 Research in Education, Dr. Bonnie Davidson instructed the present author in transforming the current study’s raw concept into a succinct, written research proposal. Following two subsequent MEDL courses, the existing author studied with their Faculty Supervisor, Dr. Jim Ansell, in MEDL 580 Leadership in the BC Context. During this period, Dr. Ansell mentored the present author in making further revisions to the study.
Having completed the current study, the existing author reflected on how they would have improved upon their thesis proposal. Reflection enabled the present author to recognize critical assumptions and oversights which limited the present study’s implementation. Moreover, reflective deliberation, regarding the design, process, and concluding null hypothesis, led the current author to expound upon the planning development, errors in judgement, research limits, and future recommendations which were pertinent for the present study.

**Inherent Bias.** Through the months preceding enrollment in VIU’s MEDL program, the existing paper’s author was concerned about the future of BC public education. Throughout their brief teaching career, the present author had observed curriculum shifts that resulted in band programs being cut at specific schools. While they remained positive about BC’s new curriculum, the existing paper’s author believed that generalized teaching would replace specialized teaching. To illustrate, the current author believed BC’s education policies had corroded the stability of band programs. Without proper funding support, the author of the present paper conjectured that band would become an ECA. As band was included in the present author’s teaching specialties, their preoccupation about the importance of ECAs in public education depicted an evolving, positive bias.

While attending master’s studies, the current author augmented their previous ECA experiences (band, performances, and table top games), by sponsoring an elementary school football team. Despite teaching arts education, balanced with nights and weekends devoted to master’s studies, the present paper’s author was ardently enthusiastic about football sponsorship. Reflecting upon previous ECA experiences, the present author speculated that sponsoring band, games clubs, and football ECAs repeatedly provided a sense of happiness. It was from this bias of personal experience that the existing author conceived their hypothesis for the present study.
In reflection, the present study’s author suspected their bias towards ECAs inadvertently impacted data assessment. The existing author examined the sample’s OHQ scores for no increase, a minimal increase, a moderate increase, and a significant increase in happiness. Decreases, however, did not receive a classification, but were instead categorized with no increase (up to 2% score increase) results.

The present author’s decision to not include decreases was pragmatic. Based on the current study’s design, whether distinctly represented, or amalgamated with the no increase results, the data represented provided identical calculations for assessing the hypothesis. Notwithstanding, decreased results would have provided data to be compared with more comprehensive studies in the future. Furthermore, had the sample’s OHQ scores paralleled Subject Charlie’s 19.86% declination, the omission of decreases would have represented a significant oversight in the existing study’s design.

**Error in Priorities.** The present author was meticulous in preparing the current study’s ethics application to the VIU Research Ethics Board (REB). Upon receiving the VIU REB’s answer, the existing study’s author immediately addressed the application’s required revisions. Then, June 30th, 2017, the present paper’s author received approval for the existing study by the VIU REB. After receiving VIU REB’s approval for research, the current author immediately refocused their concentration to VIU master’s classes.

Having completed five weeks of master’s coursework, the present author returned their attention to the present study. However, SD68’s District Administration Centre did not officially open until August 21st, 2017. The subsequent research application spanned more than nine weeks before SD68 approved the present study. While awaiting research approval, critical
opportunities were unavailable for publicizing the present study, and potentially, recruiting research subject candidates.

Nanaimo Ladysmith Public Schools’ (2017) District Administration Centre was closed on July 14th, 2017 through to Friday, August 18th, 2017. Thereafter, as of Monday, August 21st, 2017, the District Administration Centre was engaged in the 2017-2018 school year’s start-up. In retrospect, the present author realized that they should have applied to SD68, for permission to conduct research, via email on the night of June 30th, 2017. The current study’s research application could have been assessed by SD68 staff during the conclusion of the 2016-2017 school year. There were eight business days, from Tuesday, July 4th, 2017 to Thursday, July 13th, 2017, which could have resulted in early approval for the existing study.

**No Benchmark.** The existing study’s design involved 10 research subjects, which in due course, resulted in five recruited participants. The sample’s data was to be used to determine the validity of the existing hypothesis. However, the design of the present study did not include a control group, and therefore, the sample’s data was not compared with any benchmark.

The current author should have included a control group in the existing study’s design. Had this occurred, the present author would have been able to assess OHQ statements completed by educators who had abstained from ECA sponsorship. This would have enabled the current author to have contrasted and compared the sample *verses* the control group during each phase of OHQ testing. For example, the average pre OHQ score for each group should have been similar. Any disparity between the control group’s and the sample’s average scores would have signified a validity problem. Additionally, as demonstrated in the present study, the mean OHQ score for one group may have remained stationary after ECA sponsorship. Should this scenario have
occurred, the difference between the sample and control groups, would have strengthened the present author’s interpretation of the data sets.

**Conclusion**

The current study’s author hypothesized that there was a correlation between ECA sponsorship and an educator’s sense of happiness. Using quantitative research methods, the existing author found no correlation to link the happiness of educators with sponsoring ECAs. Consequently, the present author determined the existing study had resulted in a null hypothesis.

**Improvements.** A control group should have been included in the present study’s design. Consequently, the current author recommended that future studies include benchmarks. In addition, the author of the existing study determined that qualitative methodologies could have been combined with the present study’s quantitative research methods. Empirical data, specifically, field notes, interviews, and journals, would have been examined by the current author for making inferences about increases and decreases in OHQ score values. Furthermore, the present author determined that methodological triangulation might have also featured multiple samples, which were varied in testing across the span of the traditional school year. For example, the sample could have been subdivided into three groups, which respectively completed the OHQ and started ECA sponsorship in October, January, and April.

**Implications.** The present thesis was the existing author’s inaugural work in academic research. Within the boundaries of the current study, the null hypothesis was valid. Individual members of the sample had respectively, increased and decreased in happiness after ECA sponsorship. The two data sets, which provided statistics for five research subjects, had not revealed a discernable pattern for participants’ OHQ scores.
However, the present author erred in the design and prioritizing of research for the existing study. Subsequently, the implications of the current author’s findings had limited significance for academic scholarship. The present author believed their research provided an early, academic step for future studies correlating educators’ happiness with participation in ECA sponsorship.

**Final Thoughts.** The existing author continued to theorize that volunteering helped people experience a stronger sense of connection with their society. However, there are important factors, whether emotional, monitory, physical, psychosocial, or spiritual, which may influence a volunteer’s happiness. Therefore, even if ECA sponsorship could be proven to increase an educator’s sense of happiness, the emotional benefits might not be recognizable until the educator’s spiritual, psychosocial, physical, monitory, and emotional needs were also met.
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Appendix A

Hills and Argyle’s (2002) Oxford Happiness Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS. Below are a number of statements about happiness. Would you please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each by entering a number alongside it according to the following code:

1=strongly disagree; 2=moderately disagree; 3=slightly disagree;
4=slightly agree; 5=moderately agree; 6=strongly agree.

You will need to read the statements carefully because some are phrased positively and others negatively. Don’t take too long over individual questions; there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers and no trick questions. The first answer that comes into your head is probably the right one for you. If you find some of the questions difficult, please give the answer that is true for you in general or for most of the time.

1†. I don’t feel particularly pleased with the way I am (–)

2. I am intensely interested in other people

3†. I feel that life is very rewarding

4. I have very warm feelings towards almost everyone

5. I rarely wake up feeling rested (–)

6. I am not particularly optimistic about the future (–)

7. I find most things amusing

8. I am always committed and involved

9. Life is good

10. I do not think that the world is a good place (–)

11. I laugh a lot

12†. I am well satisfied about everything in my life

13†. I don’t think I look attractive (–)

14. There is a gap between what I would like to do and what I have done (–)

15. I feel happy

16†. I find beauty in some things

17. I always have a cheerful effect on others

18†. I can fit in everything I want to

19. I feel that I am not especially in control of my life (–)

20. I feel able to take anything on

21†. I feel fully mentally alert

22. I often experience joy and elation

23. I do not find it easy to make decisions (–)

24. I do not have a particular sense of meaning and purpose in my life (–)

25. I feel I have a great deal of energy

26. I usually have a good influence on events

27. I do not have fun with other people (–)

28. I don’t feel particularly healthy (–)

29†. I do not have particularly happy memories of the past (–)

Notes. Items marked (–) should be scored in reverse. †Indicates components of the OHQ short scale. The sum of the item scores is an overall measure of happiness, with high scores indicating greater happiness.
Appendix B

Recruitment Letter

Attention Elementary Educators:

My name is Dylan K. Sharpe, I am an elementary teacher working in School District 68, and I am a graduate student conducting a study under the supervision of Dr. Jim Ansell in the Faculty of Education at Vancouver Island University. My present study examines whether sponsoring extracurricular activities influences, if at all, an educator’s overall happiness. Findings will be submitted as part of the present author’s master’s thesis to Vancouver Island University’s Faculty of Education. The present study’s research data will exist in the figures and tables, as well as the present author’s observations and findings, which will be printed and possibly published in the submitted thesis. Findings are intended to be used to help improve, if possible, the sense of emotional fulfillment educators experience while working within their school communities.

The study population consists of educators (principals, teachers, and vice principals) who are working in SD68’s elementary schools. Participation requires sponsoring, leading, and/or coaching an extracurricular activity (starting 2017 fall) that will span a minimal time-period of six weeks. Participants will also be asked to answer an online survey both before and after six weeks of extracurricular activity sponsorship. Each participant may withdraw from the present study for any reason and at any time. Data provided by participants will be anonymized to ensure anonymity. The initial 10 educators who fulfill all the prerequisites for involvement in the present study will be designated as the sample. To learn more about participating in the present study, please email: dylan.kaye.sharpe@stumail.viu.ca

Sincerely,

Dylan Kaye Sharpe, B.Mus., B.Ed.
Appendix C

Active Consent Form

**Educator Happiness: Influences of Sponsoring Extracurricular Activities in an Elementary School Setting**

**Principle Investigator**
Dylan Kaye Sharpe  
Master of Education  
Vancouver Island University  
dylan.kaye.sharpe@stumail.viu.ca

**Student Supervisor**
Dr. Jim Ansell, EdD.  
Faculty of Education  
Vancouver Island University  
jim.ansell@viu.ca

The author of the present study is a graduate student in Vancouver Island University’s Master of Education in Educational Leadership program. The author’s present study, entitled “Educator Happiness: Influences of Sponsoring Extracurricular Activities in an Elementary School Setting,” examines the degree of influence, if any, that sponsoring extracurricular activities in an elementary school setting has on an educator’s sense of happiness. The author of the present study hopes his findings will advance knowledge on the subject of how extracurricular activity sponsorship influences teachers’ happiness.

Research participants are asked to sponsor an extracurricular activity in an elementary setting spanning a period of six weeks. Research participants are also asked to complete two online surveys (completing the first survey prior to extracurricular activity sponsorship, and completing the second survey after six weeks of sponsoring extracurricular activities. Approximately 30 minutes will be required from your time to complete each survey (one hour for both surveys).

The data collected from the present study’s two online surveys does not involve risk of mental distress, privacy, loss of status, loss of reputation, or loss of professional/employment opportunities. If you choose to participate anonymously, your data will be anonymized without any coding to minimize risk of re-identification.
If you choose to participate, your data will be collected and stored in a paid survey account at Hosted in Canada Surveys (HICS). – Please note that HICS is compliant with the Personal Health Information Protection Act, and adheres to the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act. – Unless you specifically request in writing for your name to be revealed, your participation is guaranteed anonymity. Otherwise, all data that you provide will be anonymized and irrevocably stripped of any direct identifiers. The author of the present study will not keep a code to allow future re-linkage.

Your survey data will be hosted, collected, and stored in a Hosted in Canada Surveys (HICS) paid for online survey account. Your signed consent form will be brought to Vancouver Island University (VIU) and stored in a locked cabinet located in the Faculty of Education's Graduate Chair's office. In addition, a backup copy of your online survey data will be saved to a flash drive which will also be stored within a locked cabinet located in the Faculty of Education's Graduate Chair's office. The author of the present study, the author of the present study’s research supervisor, and the Faculty of Education's Graduate Chair will have access to the present study’s survey data and participants’ consent forms.

Your data, including data saved in online surveys and the backup flash drive, will be destroyed after the data has been submitted as part of the present author’s thesis to Vancouver Island University’s Faculty of Education. However, the present study’s research data will continue to exist in the figures and tables, as well as the present author’s observations and findings, which will be printed in the submitted thesis.

Within six months of the present author’s thesis having been submitted to Vancouver Island University’s Faculty of Education, the author of the present study will purge online survey data (deleting files and closing account), digitally shred the flash drive files before then physically destroying the flash drive, and physically shred all signed consent forms (estimated date of May 1, 2019).
The results of the present study will be published in the present author’s master’s thesis, and may also be used for conference publications, presentations, and published in peer-reviewed journals.

Your participation in the present study is completely voluntary. As a participant, you can withdraw at any time from the present study, for any reason, and without explanation prior to the completion of answering all questions in the present study’s second online survey. Should you withdraw from the present study, you are guaranteed that your data will not be included in the present study.

I have read and understand the information provided above, and hereby consent to participate in this research under the following conditions:

I consent to my data in the present study's online surveys being recorded.    ☐ Yes    ☐ No

I consent to my data in the present study's online surveys being published.    ☐ Yes    ☐ No

Participant Name _________________________________________
Participant Signature ________________________________ Date _______________

I, Dylan Kaye Sharpe, promise to adhere to the procedures described in this consent form.

Principle Investigator Signature ________________________________ Date _______________

If you have any concerns about your treatment as a research participant in this study, please contact the VIU Research Ethics Board by telephone at 250-740-6631 or by email at reb@viu.ca.

Participants should be provided a copy of the signed consent form.