International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MODERN EDUCATION (IJMOE)
www.ijmoe.com

EXPERT VALIDATION OF TEACHER'S ACADEMIC WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Wan Mohd Khairi Wan Ibrahim[1], Azim Azuan Osman[2*], Suhaidah Hussain[3]

[1] Faculty of Industrial Management, Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah, Lebuh Persiaran Tun Khalil Yaakob 26300, Kuantan Pahang, Malaysia.
Email: wmkwi79@gmail.com
[2] UUM College of Business, Department of Technology Management and Logistics, Sintok, 06010 Bukit Kayu Hitam, Kedah
Email: azim.azuan@uum.edu.my
[3] Faculty of Industrial Management, Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah, Lebuh Persiaran Tun Khalil Yaakob 26300, Kuantan Pahang, Malaysia.
Email: suhaidahh@ump.edu.my
[*] Corresponding Author

Article Info:

Article history:
Received date: 30.10.2025
Revised date: 18.11.2025
Accepted date: 05.12.2025
Published date: 22.12.2025

To cite this document:

Wan Ibrahim, W. M. K., Osman, A. A., & Hussain, S. (2025) Expert Validation of Teacher's Academic Workload Assessment Tool for Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Modern Education, 7* (28), 939-954.

DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

Abstract:

The academic workload of teachers is an important factor to assess, as it significantly influences both educational outcomes and teacher well-being. This study was conducted to validate an instrument, through expert consultation, for measuring teachers' workload in secondary schools. A review of the literature highlights that excessive workload can contribute to teacher burnout, declining job satisfaction, and adverse effects on students' academic achievement. These challenges are further intensified by the modernization of the education system and increasing administrative demands, which add to the complexity of teachers' professional responsibilities. The current study aimed to authenticate a tool, via expert validation, specifically created to assess the workload of teachers in secondary schools, with a focused consideration of its ramifications for research activities. To ensure the instrument's validity, a panel of experts in educational leadership, curriculum, and teacher professional development evaluated its clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness. The Content Validity Index (CVI) and inter-rater agreement (IRA) methods were employed to determine the level of consensus among experts. The results showed that the instrument achieved a high level of content validity across all domains, confirming its appropriateness for assessing teachers' academic workload in the secondary school context. However, a small number of items required revision based on expert recommendations. This validated tool provides a reliable foundation for future empirical research, policy

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

formulation, and administrative practices aimed at optimizing workload management. By offering a systematic approach to evaluating academic workload, the instrument contributes to improving teacher well-being, supporting professional development, and promoting more effective and sustainable educational practices.

Keywords:

Academic Workload; Content Validity Index (CVI); Expert Validation; Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA); Secondary School

Introduction

Workload is conceptualized here as the effort or cost borne by an individual, relative to their capacities, in attaining a certain level of performance on a task with defined demands (Hart & Staveland, 1988). Teachers' workload consists of many essential professional duties: preparing and delivering lessons, assessing and grading student work, managing administrative tasks, participating in meetings, handling documentation, and supervising extracurricular activities (Ab. Wahab et al., 2024; Chua et al., 2013; Ma & Wei, 2023); shaped by escalating societal demands for educational quality (Wang et al., 2025). Moreover, this workload is shaped by the interplay among task requirements, personal competencies and expertise, feedback mechanisms, as well as the physical, cognitive, and various other exertions necessary to fulfil responsibilities (Jerrim & Sims, 2021). Beyond their professional efficacy, the effects of teachers' workload extend to their holistic wellbeing and levels of job satisfaction (Wang, 2024; Zhou et al., 2024). Consequently, a heightened workload can detrimentally impact teacher engagement, leading to burnout, health problems, and increased turnover, thereby compromising the continuous development of educational institutions and the achievement of school goals (Zhang et al., 2021).

Teaching has become an increasingly attractive career choice; however, it entails multifaceted and intensifying responsibilities that substantially escalate teachers' workload, as evidenced by growing empirical concerns (Ab. Wahab et al., 2024; Cao et al., 2023). Teachers' core duties include educating, instructing, and fostering students' holistic development—encompassing academic, physical, emotional, spiritual, and intellectual dimensions—to support national progress (Chua et al., 2013; Schuelka & Sherab, 2019; Ulfatin et al., 2020). These extend beyond classroom instruction to lesson preparation, assessment, administrative tasks, homework correction, meetings, paperwork, and extracurricular activities (Ab. Wahab et al., 2024; Ma & Wei, 2023) all amplified by surging societal demands for higher educational quality (Wang et al., 2025). Consequently, this perceived workload surge undermines teachers' psychological states, work engagement, and overall well-being (Wang et al., 2025; Zhou et al., 2024).

The Ministry of Education has defined and maintains its mission and vision to support educational reform and transformation (Ahmad, 1998). Unfortunately, these initiatives have contributed to an increase in teachers' workload in schools, particularly through additional responsibilities like systematic research implementation (Creagh et al., 2025; Haniff & Abdullah, 2024), thus necessitating an assessment of their impact on educators' wellness and learning results (Avola et al., 2025; Cann et al., 2024). Therefore, understanding the relationship between workload and teacher well-being is essential for developing truly effective solutions that not only satisfy teachers but also sustain continuous school development (Haque,

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

2025; Zhang et al., 2021). Hence, it is imperative to design an evaluative instrument (Chua et al., 2013; Wan Ibrahim et al., 2024) that enables a holistic understanding of research participation levels, highlights improvement areas, and informs future strategic actions (Bougie & Sekaran, 2020). Moreover, the accurate measurement of teaching staff workload plays a critical role in shaping policies aimed at advancing professional competencies and strengthening organizational effectiveness (Tatto, 2021).

Literature Review

The workload placed upon secondary school teachers represents a significant obstacle within the educational landscape, characterized by varying interpretations, perspectives, and effects on the calibre of instruction as well as the overall well-being of teachers. A comprehensive examination of this phenomenon elucidates critical elements that affect teacher workload and its consequent ramifications. A significant concern that exacerbates the burden on teachers is the extensive bureaucratic and administrative obligations imposed upon them. (Wang et al., 2025) agreed that the academic workload for teachers is profoundly affected by non-academic responsibilities, restricting their time for lesson development. Additionally, they are burdened with supplementary obligations stemming from administrative functions. The necessity for teachers to meticulously record classroom engagements and student achievements can result in considerable temporal constraints, which may ultimately exacerbate teacher turnover because of occupational discontent (Bukhari et al., 2023; Gobena, 2022).

A common origin of workload pertains to bureaucratic and administrative responsibilities. For instance, Asman et al. (2023) agree that an excess of clerical tasks constrains teachers' capacity to adequately prepare for instructional sessions, whereas Orange (2014) observes that the necessity to document classroom engagement and student performance introduces temporal pressures, which may culminate in occupational discontent and turnover. Similarly, Bourlakis et al., (2023) and Rademaker et al. (2023) contends that the escalating requisites associated with technology integration exacerbate workload, underscoring the imperative for robust leadership support to mitigate overload.

From a psychological standpoint, Pan et al. (2023) emphasize that insufficient training paired with restricted autonomy exacerbates the adverse consequences associated with substantial workloads. Wang (2024) further elucidates that workload exhibits a negative correlation with organizational support and work engagement, thereby highlighting the critical role of nurturing school environments in preserving teacher satisfaction and enhancing performance.

Furthermore, the ramifications of elevated workloads experienced by teachers extend beyond teachers themselves to encompass student outcomes, suggesting that substantial workloads considerably diminish the calibre of pedagogical practices (Kim, 2019; Ogundare et al., 2022; Stężycka & Etherington, 2020). This observation resonates with the findings articulated by Göksoy & Akdağ (2014), who underscored the intrinsic relationship between teachers' perceptions of their workload and the efficacy of their pedagogical practices. This unequivocally demonstrates that highly workload among teachers results in a deterioration of pedagogical quality, which subsequently exerts adverse effects on student learning outcomes and academic performance.

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

From a demographic standpoint, scholars investigating the phenomenon of job satisfaction have identified that teachers at the secondary school level exhibited diminished levels of job satisfaction attributable to increased workloads in comparison to their counterparts in primary education (Assaf & Antoun, 2024; Chalghaf et al., 2019; Conlon, 2014). Mitigating these inequities is paramount for cultivating a more just pedagogical environment and improving comprehensive educational results (Haque, 2025). Consequently, the results revealed that there is a pressing need for a valid and reliable instrument which can capture a multidimensional aspect of teacher workload, while remaining attuned to both contextual realities and policy demands.

The design of this instrument embraced a crucial phase of expert validation to ascertain that it remains both elaborate and contextually suitable. Expert validation encompasses a methodical evaluation performed by individuals possessing specialized expertise and experience in the pertinent field, aimed at assessing the clarity, relevance, and representativeness of the items incorporated within the instrument (Polit & Beck, 2006). This methodology bolsters the content validity of the tool by verifying that the items sufficiently encapsulate the construct of teachers' workload in accordance with the theoretical and practical dimensions inherent to the teaching profession (Yusoff, 2019). The insights provided by expert judgment also yield invaluable feedback regarding the appropriateness of terminology, cultural relevance, and potential redundancies, thus facilitating the refinement of the instrument to enhance its precision and applicability (Zamanzadeh et al., 2015). In the context of this study, expert validation was conducted not solely to evaluate the relevance and clarity of the items but also to ascertain that the instrument accurately mirrors the Malaysian educational landscape, policy directives, and the professional challenges encountered by teachers within schools (Tatto, 2021; Yaakob et al., 2019).

While several established instruments exist for measuring workload; such as the NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) developed by Hart & Staveland (1988), the Teacher Stress Inventory (Fimian, 1984), and adaptations of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), these tools were primarily designed for general occupational or psychological contexts, or they emphasize stress and burnout rather than the holistic responsibilities of teachers. Moreover, instruments developed in Western contexts may not fully capture the unique expectations, cultural values, and educational policies influencing teachers' workload in Malaysia (Yaakob et al., 2019). The instrument developed in this study is therefore distinctive, as it integrates not only instructional and administrative demands but also incorporates elements of research involvement and professional development activities, reflecting the current reform initiatives in the Malaysian education system. By addressing these contextual dimensions, the instrument provides a more comprehensive and culturally relevant measure of teacher workload, thereby offering insights that can inform both policy and practice.

Teachers encounter various duties shaped by administrative obligations, bureaucratic tasks, and limited autonomy, which obstruct their lesson planning and adversely affect their health. These stressors diminish job satisfaction, elevate turnover rates, and undermine pedagogical quality, thereby affecting student performance outcomes. In contrast to primary school educators, secondary school teachers bear greater burdens, underscoring the imperative for equitable workload management strategies. Current assessment tools, such as NASA-TLX, the Teacher Stress Inventory, and adaptations of the JD-R model, are predominantly context-general or focused on stress, thereby constraining their applicability to the educational landscape in

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

Malaysia. Consequently, this study has developed and validated a culturally pertinent instrument that encompasses dimensions of instruction, administration, research, and professional development, thus ensuring both contextual relevance and alignment with policy frameworks. This positions the instrument in a unique capacity to facilitate evidence-based reforms aimed at enhancing teacher workload management and the overall quality of education within Malaysian schools.

Methodology

This research endeavour was initiated with the main aim of creating and validating a measurement tool for research culture specifically tailored for secondary schools in Malaysia.

Tool Development

The initiation of the teacher workload assessment instrument's development was predicated upon a comprehensive examination of the extant literature pertaining to workload measurement in educational settings. Key constructs of academic workload were identified, including facilitator of learning and assessment, development and implementation of co-curricular activities, engagement in professional learning, and formation of collaborative relationships with beneficiaries. Based on these constructs, a survey questionnaire aimed at assessing academic workload among teachers was carefully crafted, consisting of twenty items. The items were intentionally designed to encapsulate the essential constructs of academic workloads of teachers within secondary schools, thus ensuring consistency with both the theoretical framework and the practical realities of the school environment.

Each item was assessed using a 7-point Likert scale, where a rating of 1 indicated "very not manageable at all" and a rating of 7 indicated "very manageable." This methodological approach was chosen to enable precise evaluations of each dimension of academic workload while simultaneously reducing ambiguity in participant responses.

Content Validation & Inter-Rater Agreement

Fraenkel et al. (2012) define content validity as the degree to which a measurement instrument adequately captures the construct it is intended to assess. In this study, content validity was established through the involvement of a panel of ten subject matter experts. The panel comprised individuals with substantial experience in educational research and secondary school practices, as well as methodologists with specialized expertise in survey design and validation (Carpenter, 2018; Fisher, 2020; Rubio et al., 2003) to evaluate each item in the questionnaire for relevance, clarity, and representativeness in relation to the construct of teacher workload.

The validation process employed two complementary approaches: the Content Validity Index (CVI) and Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA). Item-level CVI (I-CVI) was calculated to gauge the degree of consensus among experts regarding the relevance of each item, with a cut-off value of 0.80 set as the minimum acceptable threshold (Polit & Beck, 2006). The Scale-Level CVI (S-CVI) was also computed to evaluate the adequacy of content coverage across the entire instrument. Items that did not meet the required threshold were revised based on expert feedback to enhance their clarity and representativeness. To further strengthen the process, inter-rater agreement was assessed to ensure consistency across expert judgments, providing additional evidence of the instrument’s reliability.

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

In addition to the CVI, Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA) was calculated to determine the consistency of expert judgments across the instrument items. The IRA provides an additional layer of validation by confirming that experts not only considered the items relevant but also demonstrated a high degree of agreement in their evaluations (Hallgren, 2012). An IRA threshold of 0.80 was set as the minimum acceptable level, consistent with established recommendations for reliability (Polit & Beck, 2006). Items that scored below this benchmark were flagged for further revision or removal to ensure that the instrument maintained both statistical rigor and practical relevance. This combined use of CVI and IRA enhanced the robustness of the validation process, ensuring that the final instrument reflected expert consensus in both content coverage and rating consistency.

Expert Feedback and Revision

Beyond the numerical assessments, qualitative feedback from the expert panel provided valuable insights for refining the instrument. Common concerns raised included redundancy between certain items, ambiguous phrasing that could lead to misinterpretation, and the need for stronger alignment with the Malaysian educational context. For instance, some items were identified as overlapping in scope, while others required adjustments to better reflect the realities of administrative and co-curricular responsibilities faced by teachers. In response, revisions were made through an iterative process: redundant items were consolidated, unclear wording was simplified, and culturally relevant terms were incorporated to ensure contextual appropriateness (Boateng et al., 2018; Osman et al., 2021). This step was essential in strengthening the clarity, accuracy, and applicability of the instrument, ensuring that it accurately represented the multidimensional construct of teacher workload.

Finalization of the Tool

Following the incorporation of expert feedback and the confirmation of satisfactory CVI and IRA values, the final version of the teacher workload instrument was established. The instrument retained four core constructs—Facilitator of Learning and Assessment, Development and Implementation of Co-curricular Activities, Engagement in Professional Learning, and Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries—which together provide a comprehensive framework for assessing the multifaceted dimensions of academic workload among secondary school teachers. Each construct demonstrated strong content validity and inter-rater agreement, with items revised to enhance clarity, eliminate redundancy, and ensure contextual alignment with the Malaysian education system. The finalized instrument is therefore positioned as a reliable and contextually grounded tool, ready for subsequent pilot testing and further psychometric evaluation.

Future Validation

Although the content validation process provided strong preliminary evidence of the instrument's validity, additional validation is required to establish its psychometric properties, including reliability and construct validity (Martín-dorta et al., 2021). The subsequent phase will involve a pilot study with secondary school teachers to generate empirical data on workload dimensions. These data will undergo exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to examine the construct validity of the instrument (Gleeson et al., 2023). Furthermore, reliability analyses, including Cronbach's alpha calculations, will be conducted to determine the internal consistency of the workload scale and ensure its robustness for broader application. Undertaking these steps is critical to developing a psychometrically sound instrument that can

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

inform policy decisions, support teacher wellbeing, and contribute to the overall effectiveness of the education system.

Result and Discussion

Results

The findings of this study focus on the content validation process undertaken for the academic workload assessment instrument. The evaluation conducted by the expert panel yielded important insights into the instrument's validity, with analyses at both the item and scale levels providing strong evidence of its effectiveness. Boateng et al. (2018) note that a panel comprising five to seven experts is generally sufficient for content validation, if they represent diverse areas of expertise. Accordingly, this study utilized seven of the eight returned rubrics for analysis. Table 1 presents the CVI and IRA values at both the item and scale levels. The results confirm that the academic workload construct achieved the established thresholds for content validity and inter-rater agreement, thereby supporting its acceptance. Nonetheless, several revisions were made based on expert feedback, particularly to address issues of clarity, redundancy, and alignment with contextual realities.

Among the cohort of ten experts, eight submitted the validation instrument; two out of the ten experts provided responses to evaluate the items, yet it is plausible that their inability to return the completed instrument within the designated month was attributable to their demanding professional commitments. Following a comprehensive evaluation, seven experts whose validation instruments were deemed satisfactory were selected for subsequent analyses.

Lynn & Redman (2006) posits that a minimum of three experts is sufficient for content validation. Conversely, Rubio et al. (2003) recommend a panel comprising three to ten experts to ensure diversity in expertise. In the present study, seven experts were engaged, representing academia, consultancy, and professional practice, thereby meeting the recommended threshold outlined in the literature. Following the established formula, Table 5 presents the extracted values used for the calculation of the Content Validity Index (CVI) and Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA). The demographic characteristics of the seven experts who successfully completed the validation form are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Profile of panel experts

Expert Code	Gender	Education	Designation (Organisation)	Relevance
Expert #1	Male	PhD	Associate Professor (Public University)	23 years' experience in quantitative research and as academician in public university
Expert #2	Female	PhD	Language Teacher (Public University)	14 years' experience in teaching as Language teacher in the University and familiar with quantitative methodology
Expert #3	Male	PhD	Associate Professor (Public University)	Fifteen years of experience associate professor in the School of Education a University in Malaysia. With a specialization in educational management and

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

Expert Code	Gender	Education	Designation (Organisation)	Relevance
				administration, he possesses extensive knowledge and expertise in various education-related areas.
Expert #4	Female	PhD	Senior Lecturer (Leadership Institute)	Having taught for two decades with a specialization in innovation and quality, the individual brings the expertise required to guarantee that the research culture questionnaire remains accurate and contextually relevant.
Expert #5	Male	Degree	Public School Teacher	The individual's 14 years of experience as a teacher and involve in school innovation activities equips them with the practical insights and expertise needed to validate the content of a research culture questionnaire effectively.
Expert #6	Male	PhD	Public School Teacher	The individual's 15 years of teaching experience, combined with a PhD in leadership, uniquely positions them to effectively validate the content of a research culture questionnaire, ensuring its accuracy and relevance to educational settings and leadership dynamics.
Expert #7	Male	PhD	Lecturer (Public Teachers' Training Institution)	With nearly two decades of professional experience, he has developed substantial mastery of educational topics. His involvement in research and innovation development reveals a comprehensive skill set and expansive knowledge base encompassing a wide spectrum of educational disciplines

In accordance with the methodological stipulations, Table 2 delineates the pertinent information requisite for the computation of both the Content Validity Index (CVI) and the Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA). In particular, the table aggregates the evaluations provided by experts for each item, thus supplying the critical data points—such as the degree of consensus among experts—that underpin the ensuing calculations of CVI and IRA values. This

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

methodical extraction and presentation of values guarantee transparency within the validation process and promotes a comprehensive understanding of how expert assessments were converted into measurable indices of content validity and inter-rater agreement.

Table 2: Summary of experts' ratings in validation form

Item Code	Expert #1	Expert #2	Expert #3	Expert #4	Expert #5	Expert #6	Expert #7	nr
FL01	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
FL02	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
FL03	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
FL04	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
FL05	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
CO01	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
CO02	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
CO03	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
CO04	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
CO05	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
PL01	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
PL02	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
PL03	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
PL04	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
PL05	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	6
FI01	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	5
FI02	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	5
FI03	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	7
FI04	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	5
FI05	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	5

Table 3: CVI and IRA for Academic Workload Constructs

Construct (Academic Workloads)	Item code	n_r	I-CVI	S-CVI	Σn_a	I-IRA	S-IRA
Facilitator of Learning and Assessment (FL)	FL01	7	1.000	1.000	7	1.000	1.000
	FL02	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	FL03	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	FL04	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	FL05	7	1.000		7	1.000	
Development and Implementation of Co-curricular Activities (CO)	CO01	7	1.000	0.9143	7	1.000	0.9143
	CO02	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
	CO03	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	CO04	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
	CO05	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
Engagement in Professional Learning (PL)	PL01	7	1.000	0.9143	7	1.000	0.9143
	PL02	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
	PL03	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	PL04	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
	PL05	6	0.8571		6	0.8571	
	FI01	5	0.7143	0.7714	5	0.7143	0.7143

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

Construct (Academic Workloads)	Item code	n_r	I-CVI	S-CVI	Σn_a	I-IRA	S-IRA
Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries (FI)	FI02	5	0.7143		5	0.7143	
	FI03	7	1.000		7	1.000	
	FI04	5	0.7143		4	0.5714	
	FI05	5	0.7143		4	0.5714	

Note. N_r = Number of Experts Rated the Item As "Representative" (Score 3 And 4). Σn_a = Sum of Individual Item's Agreement (Score 3 And 4).

Table 3 delineates the Content Validity Index (CVI) and Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA) metrics for the items encompassed within the four constructs of academic workload. For the construct Facilitator of Learning and Assessment (FL), all five items (FL01 to FL05) were unanimously rated as representative by the panel of seven experts (nr = 7), resulting in perfect I-CVI and I-IRA values of 1.000 across all items. The scale-level indices (S-CVI and S-IRA) also achieved 1.000, indicating complete consensus that the items accurately reflect this dimension of workload.

In the construct Development and Implementation of Co-curricular Activities (CO), three items (CO01, CO03, and CO05) achieved full consensus with I-CVI values of 1.000, while CO02 and CO04 recorded slightly lower I-CVI values of 0.8571, reflecting minor divergence in expert evaluations. Nevertheless, the scale-level indices (S-CVI = 0.9143; S-IRA = 0.9143) remained well above the 0.80 threshold, confirming the overall validity and reliability of this dimension.

For Engagement in Professional Learning (PL), similar patterns were observed. Items PL01 and PL03 reached I-CVI values of 1.000, whereas PL02, PL04, and PL05 were rated at 0.8571. The corresponding scale-level indices (S-CVI = 0.9143; S-IRA = 0.9143) provided robust support for this construct's validity, with only minor refinements required for certain items.

The construct Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries (FI) revealed comparatively lower agreement among experts. While FI03 achieved full consensus (I-CVI = 1.000), the remaining items (FI01, FI02, FI04, and FI05) recorded I-CVI values between 0.7143 and 0.7143, with FI04 and FI05 yielding slightly lower IRA scores (0.5714). The scale-level indices (S-CVI = 0.7714; S-IRA = 0.7143) did not fully meet the ideal threshold of 0.80, suggesting the need for further refinement of this construct to strengthen its representativeness and clarity.

Discussion

Overall, the findings highlight that three constructs—Facilitator of Learning and Assessment, Development and Implementation of Co-curricular Activities, and Engagement in Professional Learning—exhibited strong content validity and inter-rater agreement, while the construct Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries requires further refinement to ensure clarity and contextual relevance.

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

A Content Validity Index (CVI) value of 0.80 is deemed adequate for confirming the existence of content validity pertaining to a specific variable, reflecting a substantial agreement among experts concerning the importance of the elements integrated within the measurement tool (Davis, 1992; Osman et al., 2021). Furthermore, an Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA) value of 0.80 indicates a commendable degree of inter-rater reliability in the evaluation of a specific variable (Rubio, 2003; Osman, 2021). Additionally, a 0.80 Inter-Rater Agreement (IRA) indicates a significant reliability among evaluators regarding a specific variable (Rubio, 2003; Osman, 2021).

Overall, all items within the academic workload construct satisfied the criteria for content validity and inter-rater reliability. Nonetheless, four items—FI01, FI02, FI04, and FI05—fell marginally short of the minimum S-CVI and S-IRA threshold of 0.80, each obtaining a score of 0.7143. This outcome was due to two experts (Expert #1 and Expert #2) assigning low ratings of 1 and 2 to these items. In contrast, the remaining five experts provided higher ratings of 3 and 4, indicating more favourable evaluations. Accordingly, these items are recommended for retention, with revisions made to their wording to improve clarity and ensure the intended meaning of the questions is effectively conveyed. Table 4 presents the comments of Expert #1 and Expert #2 on the four items.

Table 4: Expert #1 and Expert #2 feedback

Item code	I-CVI / I-IRA	Overall Experts Comment
FI01, FI02, FI04, FI05	0.7143	Expert #1 – These items are important and clear. However, they seem unrelated with collaborative relationships. Expert #2 - The items do not explicitly address the formation of collaborative relationships with parents, the community within and outside the school, and KPM management. To better align it with this context, consider revising them.

Table 4 presents the comments of Expert #1 and Expert #2 on the four items. Their feedback suggested that the wording of these items might cause ambiguity and reduce clarity. To address this, the items have been revised and refined, particularly in terms of sentence structure, to ensure clearer phrasing, better alignment with the intended construct, and improved comprehensibility for respondents. These corrective actions have strengthened the content validity of the items while maintaining their original meaning.

Conclusion

This article has provided a comprehensive examination of the methodological procedures involved in conducting a content validity study, which is an essential element in developing robust assessment tools and research instruments. The involvement of a panel of experts—comprising methodological academic scholars, language experts, and practitioners—has proven instrumental in evaluating the Academic Workload measure. The diversity of expertise among the panel members not only enhances the evaluation process but also brings forth a rich tapestry of insights that contribute to the refinement and clarity of measurement items. This multifaceted approach is critical in ensuring that the assessment tool accurately reflects the multifarious dimensions of Academic Workload.

International Journal of Modern Education
IJMOE
EISSN: 2637-0905
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

The extensive scrutiny performed by qualified analysts generated noteworthy evidence affirming the validity of the content and the inter-evaluator reliability of the tool designed for assessing teacher workload. Three out of the four constructs—Facilitator of Learning and Assessment, Development and Implementation of Co-curricular Activities, and Engagement in Professional Learning—attained elevated CVI and IRA values, thereby confirming their robustness in effectively encapsulating the multifaceted dimensions of teacher workload. Notably, the construct Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries exhibited a lower level of consensus; however, the feedback procured provides explicit guidance for refinement aimed at enhancing its clarity and contextual relevance. The collective findings support the notion that this tool can reliably measure academic workload in secondary schools in Malaysia, although additional empirical investigations are crucial to establish its construct validity and reliability in practical use.

Recommendations

Based on empirical findings, a series of recommendations are articulated to enhance the academic workload and to ascertain its relevance across varied educational paradigms. At the outset, pursuing further statistical validation through a pilot study with secondary school educators is of utmost importance, succeeded by both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to substantiate construct validity. Furthermore, engaging in reliability evaluations is sensible, incorporating elements like Cronbach's alpha along with composite reliability measures, to ensure the internal consistency for all constructs. Thirdly, a process of iterative refinement of the Formation of Collaborative Relationships with Beneficiaries construct is warranted, particularly through the elucidation of item phrasing and ensuring coherence with the practical realities of teacher-stakeholder collaboration within Malaysian educational institutions.

Further, the addition of this tool within educator development schemes and workload assessment frameworks would allow educational policymakers and leaders to recognize spots of overwork and to introduce data-driven solutions focused on boosting teacher wellness. Lastly, subsequent research endeavours may investigate the instrument's adaptability for application in alternative cultural and institutional contexts, thereby broadening its applicability as a standardized evaluative tool for measuring teacher workload in both domestic and global settings.

Acknowledgement

No external funding was received for this study. The authors acknowledge the institutional support of Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah and thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

References

Ab. Wahab, N. Y., Abdul Rahman, R., Mahat, H., Hudin, N. S., Ramdan, M. R., Ab Razak, M. N., & Mohd Yadi, N. N. (2024). Impacts of workload on teachers' well-being: A systematic literature review. *TEM Journal*, *13*(3), 2544–2556. https://doi.org/10.18421/tem133-80

Ahmad, R. H. (1998). Educational development and reformation in Malaysia : past , present and future. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *36*(5), 462–475.

Asman, J., Poobalan, G., Mustapha, M., Talip, R., Padan, R., Kaliappan, S., Syd Ali, S. A., & Mohd Aris, A. (2023). Factors affecting teacher workload in low-enrollment schools:

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

A survey of Sarawak state schools, Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *12*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v12-i4/19541

Assaf, J., & Antoun, S. (2024). Impact of job satisfaction on teacher well-being and education quality. *Pedagogical Research*, *9*(3), em0204. https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/14437

Avola, P., Soini, T., & Anne, I. (2025). Interventions to teacher ell - being and burnout: A scoping review. *Educational Psychology Review*, *37*(11), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-09986-2

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A Primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *6*(June), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Bougie, R., & Sekaran, U. (2020). *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building Approach* (8th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bourlakis, M., Nisar, T. M., & Prabhakar, G. (2023). How technostress may affect employee performance in educational work environments. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, *193*(October 2021), 122674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122674

Bukhari, S. G. A. S., Jamali, S. G., Larik, A. R., & Chang, M. S. (2023). Fostering intrinsic motivation among teachers: Importance of work environment and individual differences. *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*, *11*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2021.1925182

Cann, R., Sinnema, C., Rodway, J., & Daly, A. J. (2024). What do we know about interventions to improve educator wellbeing ? A systematic literature review. *Journal of Educational Change*, *25*, 231–270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-023-09490-w

Cao, Y., Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Toom, A. (2023). A survey research on Finnish teacher educators' research-teaching integration and its relationship with their approaches to teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1900111

Carpenter, S. (2018). Ten steps in scale development and reporting: A guide for researchers. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *12*(1), 25–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2017.1396583

Chalghaf, N., Guelmami, N., Re, T. S., Maldonado Briegas, J. J., Garbarino, S., Azaiez, F., & Bragazzi, N. L. (2019). Trans-cultural adaptation and validation of the "teacher job satisfaction scale" in arabic language among sports and physical education teachers ("Teacher of physical education job satisfaction inventory"—TPEJSI): Insights for sports, educational, and occ. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(OCT), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02234

Chua, Y. P., Tie, F. H., & Don, Z. M. (2013). Creating an education research Acculturation Theory for research implementation in school. *Education and Urban Society*, *45*(4), 506–526. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124511413124

Conlon, L. (2014). Job satisfaction and stress of teaching professionals in DEIS and Non DEIS schools and between primary and post-primary. *Dublin Business School Journals*, *1*(4), 1–44.

Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., Hogan, A., Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., & Stacey, M. (2025).

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065

Workload , work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders : a systematic research synthesis and school leaders. *Educational Review*, *77*(2), 661–680. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607

Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, *5*(4), 194–197. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897(05)80008-4

Fimian, M. J. (1984). The development of an instrument to measure occupational stress in teachers: The Teacher Stress Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *57*(4), 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1984.tb00169.x

Fisher, S. (2020). *7 Ways to preteset your survey before you send it*. Market Research. https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/6-ways-to-pretest-your-survey-before-you-send-it/?fbclid=IwAR0BVDBgLceDDBqhRDoHNtDVHxsiUg-IMt416h_TUTLS52gW39Qszbyo8v0

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Gleeson, J., Cutler, B., Rickinson, M., Walsh, L., Ehrich, J., Cirkony, C., & Salisbury, M. (2023). School educators' engagement with research: an Australian Rasch validation study. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *35*(2), 281–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-023-09404-7

Gobena, G. A. (2022). Teaching stress on in-service teachers' motivation: Its implication for quality-education in Ethiopian secondary schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, *7*(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2022.7212a

Göksoy, S., & Akdağ, Ş. K. (2014). Primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of workload. *Creative Education*, *05*(11), 877–885. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.511101

Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing inter-rater reliability for observational data: An Overview and Tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *8*(1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.08.1.p023

Haniff, M., & Abdullah, S. (2024). *Negative Implications of Workload among Teachers : A Systematic Literature Review*. *13*(3), 2515–2527. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i3/22193

Haque, M. T. (2025). Professional development and literacy in the context of the perceptions of the secondary high school teachers of Bangladesh about their job challenges, accommodation problems, and workload in their professional life. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *13*(2), 469–478. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.13n.2p.469

Hart, S. G., & Staveland, L. E. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of Empirical and Theoretical Research. *Advances in Psychology*, *52*(C), 139–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9

Jerrim, J., & Sims, S. (2021). When is high workload bad for teacher wellbeing? Accounting for the non-linear contribution of specific teaching tasks. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

Kim, K. N. (2019). Teachers' administrative workload crowding out instructional activities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *39*(1), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1572592

Lynn, M. R., & Redman, R. W. (2006). Staff nurses and their solutions to the nursing shortage. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *28*(6), 678–693. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945906287214

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065
Ma, Y., & Wei, C. (2023). Homework correction burden and strategies for junior high school English teachers : An interview study. *World Journal of Education*, *13*(5), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v13n5p1

Martín-dorta, W. J., Brito-brito, P. R., & García-hernández, A. M. (2021). Development and content validation of the ceecca questionnaire to assess ability to communicate among individuals with aphasia based on the nanda-i and noc. *Healthcare (Switzerland)*, *9*(11). https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9111459

Ogundare, A. A., Ambode, A. B., & Babalola, F. E. (2022). Relationship between teachers' work load and students' academic performance in senior secondary schools in Irepodun Local Government, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Kashere Journal of Education*, *3*(2012), 17–25.

Orange, A. (2014). What they left behind: A case study of teachers' experiences with school improvement at evergreen elementary school. *Qualitative Report*, *19*(37), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1010

Osman, A. A., Lim, K. T., Roslin, E. N., & Ismail, J. (2021). Validation of lean transformation sustainability assessment tool for manufacturing industry: Experts' insights. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, *2339*(May). https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0044536

Pan, H. L. W., Chung, C. H., & Lin, Y. C. (2023). Exploring the predictors of teacher well-being: An analysis of teacher training preparedness, autonomy, and workload. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *15*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075804

Polit, D., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *29*, 489–497. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur

Rademaker, T., Klingenberg, I., & Süß, S. (2023). Leadership and technostress : a systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, *75*(1), 429–494. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00385-x

Rubio, D. M. G., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifyng content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research*, *27*(2), 94–104. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.2.94

Schuelka, M. & ;, & Sherab. (2019). The value of research culture in Bhutan. In *The Druk Journal* (Vol. 5, Issue 1).

Stężycka, P. E., & Etherington, S. (2020). Teacher motivation: A study of Polish secondary school EFL teachers. *Tesl-Ej*, *24*(1), 1–28.

Tatto, M. T. (2021). Developing teachers' research capacity: the essential role of teacher education. *Teaching Education*, *32*(1), 27–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2020.1860000

Ulfatin, N., Mustiningsih, Sumarsono, R. B., & Yunus, J. N. (2020). School-based management in marginal areas: Satisfying the political context and student needs. *Management in Education*, *36*(3), 124–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620959739

Wan Ibrahim, W. M. K., Hussain, S., & Osman, A. A. (2024). Expert validation of a research culture assessment tool for secondary schools. *International Journal of Academic Research and Progressive Education and Development*, *13*(4), 2577–2585. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i4/23859

Wang, H., Sun, Y., Wang, W., & Liang, H. (2025). Exploring the relationship between teachers' perceived workload, challenge-hindrance stress, and work engagement: a person-centered approach. *BMC Psychology*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02537-y

International Journal of Modern Education
EISSN: 2637-0905
IJMOE
Volume 7 Issue 28 (December 2025) PP. 939-954
DOI: 10.35631/IJMOE.728065
Wang, Y. (2024). Exploring the impact of workload, organizational support, and work engagement on teachers' psychological wellbeing: a structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*(January), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1345740

Yaakob, M. F. M., Yusof, M. R., & Ibrahim, M. Y. (2019). Exploring strategic management and teachers workload in school. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, *8*(6 Special Issue 3), 258–261. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.F1041.0986S319

Yusoff, M. S. B. (2019). ABC of content validation and content validity index calculation. *Education in Medicine Journal*, *11*(2), 49–54. https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2019.11.2.6

Zamanzadeh, V., Ghahramanian, A., Rassouli, M., Abbaszadeh, A., Alavi-Majd, H., & Nikanfar, A.-R. (2015). Design and implementation content validity study: development of an instrument for measuring patient-centered communication. *Journal of Caring Sciences*, *4*(2), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.15171/jcs.2015.017

Zhang, D., He, J., & Fu, D. (2021). How can we improve teacher ' s work engagement ? Based on chinese experiences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*(November). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.721450

Zhou, S., Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2024). Factors associated with teacher wellbeing : A meta - analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09886-x