

From Indignation to Indifference: Teacher Concerns About Externally Imposed Classroom Interruptions

LAWRENCE J. LEONARD
Louisiana Tech University

ABSTRACT In an era in which schools are expected to achieve more for their students, many teachers remain frustrated by the increasing results-driven demands made on them. A facet of teacher work life in which many feel disempowered is addressed in this study—the regular infringement of outside intrusions into the classroom learning environment. A stratified random selection of teachers in the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan was surveyed regarding their experiences and feelings about such time-consuming episodes. This study was designed to provide supplementary data to an earlier investigation into the nature and frequency of externally imposed classroom interruptions by attempting to ascertain their perceived impact. The results dramatically illuminate the extent of the problem as well as the array of teacher perceptions of and reactions to it.

Key words: external classroom interruptions, learning environment, teacher concerns

Persistent pressure to improve student learning demonstrated by measurable outcomes has prompted numerous structural and procedural reforms in public education. In the last decade, state education departments and local school districts have struggled repeatedly to identify the best formulas for balancing greater student achievement with new notions of accountability. Taxpayer resistance to further expenditures, however, has compelled those in positions of governance and administrative authority to find innovative ways to attain higher goals with limited added resources. Consequently, making better use of what is currently available to educators has become a common credo in many jurisdictions worldwide. For some persons, the obvious solution to the demand to do more with less seems to be the better use of extant teaching and learning opportunities.

One manner of attempting to achieve the objective of more efficient schooling is to optimize instructional periods by curtailing wasted class time. In this article, I build on earlier empirical research reported by Leonard (1999) that determined that the consumption of class time by externally imposed classroom interruptions is excessive and may be

more extensive than even teachers realize. Some educators consider the encroachment on classes by elements beyond the perimeters of the classroom walls to be a non-issue, and, consequently, tend to treat it with indifference or even with positive acceptance. For others, it is a circumstance that creates conditions considered to be near intolerable and clearly counterproductive to schooling purposes. In this report, I submit an array of teacher viewpoints and provide strong additional evidence that, in many schools, a serious problem persists.

Instructional Time and School Effectiveness

Students of the school effectiveness movement, which developed from the heightened resolve in the 1970s to recognize the potential success of all students, are familiar with the conflicting research of the period addressing the extent of school influences on student outcomes. Earlier theories that schools have limited impact on student outcomes (e.g., Bloom, 1974; Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks et al., 1972) gave way to other conceptions of school effectiveness that strongly challenge that position (e.g., Levin & Nolan, 1996; Moos, 1979; O’Rielly, 1975; Walberg, 1988).¹ However, whether the amount of instructional time made available in schools is sufficient, as well as the nature of its usage, continues to foment considerable debate. For instance, after an extensive search of the literature, Freeland (1980) concluded that “research in recent decades has confirmed that added instructional time does not always lead to intended results” (p. 11).

A decade later—and following another relevant literature review—Cotton (1990, as cited in Nelson 1990) was similarly skeptical about a positive correlation between time expenditure and student-learning outcomes. Furthermore,

Address correspondence to Lawrence J. Leonard, Department of Curriculum, Instruction, & Leadership, College of Education, P.O. Box 3161, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA 71272-0001. (E-mail: leonard@latech.edu)

but with the possible exception of at-risk students, the Virginia State Department of Education (1992) contended that most field studies lacked “sufficient rigor to draw causal relationships about the cumulative, long-term effect of altering instructional time” (p. 84). Notwithstanding those conclusions, there are those who strongly profess the opposite to be the case.

For Kuceris and Zakariya (1982), time on task was considered to be the most effective tool that schools have available to ensure student achievement. That supposition was clearly apparent in a 1993 report issued by the National Center for Education Statistics (1993) in which the effective use of classroom time was said to be the single greatest influence on student learning opportunities and outcomes. Moreover, the alleged lack of rigor in time-and-learning studies was repudiated by Levin and Nolan (1996). They were unequivocal that “there is a statistically positive relationship between time devoted to learning and scores on achievement tests” (p. 105). Nonetheless, simply increasing the amount of instructional time available may be insufficient, and equal attention may need to be given to the actual use of that time.

For instance, Moore and Funkhouser (1990) contended that “gains in student achievement are likely to occur when increases in instructional time are combined with effective teaching practices and curricula that are tailored to learning needs” (p. 16). Or, as Levin and Nolan (1996, p. 106) reported, “Spending more instructional time with a poor teacher or on poorly devised learning tasks will not increase student learning.” A review of three studies undertaken by Nelson (1990) also concluded that sound teaching methods and classroom techniques must be used in conjunction with additional allocated time. Because school authorities are reluctant to expand either the length of the instructional day or the academic year for reasons pertaining to fatigue, staffing costs, family vacations, and student employment opportunities, the obvious option would be to make more effective use of the instructional time already available (Leonard, 1999). Creating such an imperative is unlikely, however, without first establishing that prevalent circumstances are unacceptable.

Use of the School Day

Over the years, there have been a number of published reports addressing the time disposition of the typical school day. An apparent problem with time wastage in public schools seems to have endured through much of the 20th century. Gilman (1973) replicated a 1920s excursion by educational innovator Sidney Pressey to his daughter’s elementary school, and, as in the earlier investigation, determined that much of the school day was wasted on organizational inefficiencies coupled with teacher and administrator mismanagement. Later, Gilman and Knoll (1984) determined that about 60% of the typical high school day was consumed by noninstructional events such as class

transitions, recess and lunch periods, and nonacademic activities. Similar conclusions were reached by Boyer (1983), Goodlad (1984), and the Virginia State Department of Education (1992). Earlier, an intensive study using randomly selected observation methods and involving a much larger number of schools was undertaken by the Austin Independent School District (Hester & Ligon, 1978). The investigators determined that between only 47% and 50% of the typical student’s 6 1/2-hr day was used for instructional activities. By undertaking measures to reduce time permitted for managerial and noninstructional activities, the Austin school system reclaimed an average 23.5 min per school day—a figure that translates into as much as 16 full instructional days per school year.

Concerns about the use or mis-use of class time continue to be expressed in the literature. For instance, Levin and Nolan (1996) noted that the amount of time spent on instruction can vary widely from class to class and from school to school—much of it as a direct consequence of system, teacher, and administrator policies. Ranallo (1997) contended that only a portion of allotted time becomes productive instructional time because much of it continues to be “absorbed by assemblies, special events, timetable adjustments, unexpected interruptions, discipline matters, etc.” (p. 64). Similar concerns were expressed by Seeman (1994, p. 115) who attributed much time wastage to “bad or loose school rules” such as policies that permit time-consuming episodes like fundraising, outside noises, and classroom intrusions. An example of such asserted administrative mis-practices was outlined in a report originating in Texas (Lutz & Lutz, 1987). The authors submitted that the local school board deliberately circumvented state-mandated time requirements in order to provide for athletic practices and games that removed students from the classroom for lengthy periods. Such administrative policies and organizational norms extricate much of the control that teachers might otherwise have over their classes and determine how their instructional time is expended.

Erosion of Instructional Time

Few published studies have attempted to ascertain the nature and extent of externally imposed classroom interruptions. Lysiak (1980) placed outside disruptions into two distinct categories: planned and unplanned. Planned interferences included events such as pep rallies and assemblies; unplanned interferences included public address announcements and students and adults coming into the classroom. Whereas planned interruptions consumed “large amounts of time,” the unplanned variety, depending on the class context, ranged from no time to 27 min (p. 14). Furthermore, Lysiak determined that as grade levels increase, so does the amount of time consumed by both categories of interruptions. Without citing specific time estimates, Ranallo (1997) argued that the ratio of engaged time (time on task) to allotted instructional time (formally scheduled time) in schools was “often

shockingly low.” He argued that concerted efforts should be made to maximize students’ engaged time by several strategies, including “not interrupting students who are working” (p. 64).

Limiting the number of intrusions into the classroom setting is essentially protecting the *learning environment* (venue in which instruction and learning occurs) from potential negative effects of the *supporting environment* (the sociophysical systems that surround the learning environment). Tessmer and Harris (1992) contended that the “environmental press” of this “surrounding influence” can have a powerful effect on student learning and behavior. Whether educators are aware of these conditions—or even if they choose to disregard them—Tessmer and Harris suggested that the capacity exists for deleterious outcomes. Educators use the following analogy:

To ignore the environment when planning instruction is like ignoring the weather when planning a picnic: You can plan a “perfect” picnic without considering the weather and blame the weather if it rains on your picnic, but your picnic is still a failure because you didn’t consider the weather! (p. 18)

The extent and nature of environmental or external intrusions into the classroom setting was the subject of a study conducted by Leonard (1999). Using direct observation research methodology in 12 schools in three school districts in western Canada, Leonard calculated that the typical class was interrupted by outside sources approximately 12 times per day, or 2,000 times per school year. Those frequencies were substantially higher than even teachers estimated. Particular sources and frequencies of the interruptions tended to vary somewhat over school size and type; high schools and schools with larger enrollments were inclined to experience greater numbers of interferences emanating from outside the classroom. Overall, other students, teachers, and the intercom were found to be the greatest interlopers. The research described here was designed to provide additional evidence about the nature of class interruptions and how teachers perceive that those interruptions effect them and their students.

Method

The preceding review of the literature presents strong evidence that the wastage of instructional time in many schools is an ongoing problem that may severely inhibit learning opportunities for students. The study detailed here was designed to expand on recent research undertaken and reported in Leonard (1999) about one major category of class time erosion, that is, externally imposed classroom interruptions. The intent was not only to gather more data about the nature and extent of the problem but also to achieve a fuller understanding of its impact, particularly from the perspectives of teachers. For those purposes, a stratified sample of 1,000 classroom teachers (500 from rural schools and 500 from urban schools) out of a total of approximately 12,000 teachers in the Province of

Saskatchewan was selected randomly to complete a survey questionnaire. Teachers to whom the surveys were mailed for self-completion were employed in 472 different schools including all common configurations, that is: primary, elementary, middle, secondary, and all-grades schools.² The teachers completed 557 (55.7%) of the surveys and returned them to me.

Appropriate procedures were undertaken to collate the data in terms of the frequencies, sources, and perceived effects of the externally imposed interferences in classroom teaching. For this report, the terms *interruption*, *intrusion*, *interference*, *disruption*, *impingement*, and *encroachment* are used more or less interchangeably and are defined essentially as any occurrence, episode, or happening that breaks the planned flow or continuity of a lesson. External or extraneous interruptions are considered to be those that originate from outside the classroom or class group. I did not address disruptions that originated from within the confines of the classrooms because they are largely considered to be a matter of classroom management practice. The findings of this study are presented in the following paragraphs.

The 557 randomly selected teachers who responded to the survey questionnaire addressing aspects of externally imposed classroom interruptions were asked to indicate the typical daily number of such occurrences. Response options ranged from *not at all* to *7 to 8 times* to a specified *other*. The largest single proportion of respondents (39.7%) indicated that they experienced between one and two intrusions per day (see Table 1).

This percentage was followed by three to four (34.8%) and five to six (13.2%) occurrences of class interruptions. Combined, more than half (54%) of the teachers estimated that their classes were interrupted from the outside at least three to four times each school day. There was noticeable consistency across class grade levels—54.3% of both the elementary and high school teachers were included in this frequency category, whereas 51.8% of primary teachers made a similar report. However, the data indicate that high school classes were considerably more likely to experience frequent interruptions (i.e., at least five to six). Twenty-five percent of the secondary school teachers reported the high rate compared with approximately 15% of the lower grades

Table 1.—Frequency of Externally Imposed Classroom Interruptions, Reported by Randomly Selected Teachers (N = 557)

Estimated daily interruptions	Number reporting	% of total
Not at all	9	1.6
Less than 1	26	4.7
1–2	220	39.7
3–4	193	34.8
5–6	73	13.2
7–8	27	4.9
More than 8	6	1.1

schools. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the estimated frequency of externally imposed classroom interruptions by school type.

As Table 3 illustrates, the school public address system (intercom) was by far the most often attributed source of externally imposed classroom interferences. Four out of five teachers (80.2%) reported that their classes were regularly imposed on by intercom communications, more than twice as often (36.9%) as the second highest rate of message delivery. Slightly less than one third (31.7%) of the respondents referred to unspecified visitors, other teachers (16.2%), and other students (14.6%) as sources of external interferences. Additional interruption sources included parents (11.4%), the telephone (10.9%), and school administrators (8.2%). Less frequently identified intrusion sources included deliveries, calls to school assemblies, student council activities, loud hallway noises, and safety drills. The Appendix contains a complete summarized listing of the teacher-identified sources of externally imposed classroom interruptions.

The data clearly reveal that there was wide variation in how teachers perceived the impact of the encroachments on them and on their students. In response to the open-ended

survey question regarding the impact of the interruptions, more than half of the respondents (56.5%) indicated that they considered the intrusions to have serious negative consequences, whereas slightly more than a third (35.8%) reported that they had little or no manner of effect. Another 6.5% contended that the effects of such intrusions were highly contingent upon contextual factors such as the nature of intrusion, the particular class involved, and the point in the scheduled lesson where the encroachment occurred. The remaining 1.2% did not make any relevant comments about the actual question asked. The range of recorded reactions to the interruptions ranged from near indifference to vigorous indignation.

The 6 teachers who viewed extraneous impingements in a more positive light wrote of the need for schools to maintain open lines of communication and to promote a collaborative learning environment. A female elementary teacher with more than 20 years of experience stated, "We welcome anyone to our room and involve them in whatever we are doing. They are simply a part of the class day." Another female elementary teacher considered activities such as fundraising during class time to be an obligatory component of school life. She stated that "Although these interruptions occur, they are necessary as it is important to remain informed and working towards common fun [activities] and fund-raising goals fosters school community spirit." One male high school teacher even felt that outside encroachments were "welcome breaks." However, and as is apparent from the data presented in subsequent paragraphs in this section, the sanguine sentiments of those teachers were not shared by the vast majority of respondents.

A relatively new female teacher at a small all-grades school contended that appropriate measures can be taken to lessen the potential consequences. She said, "There aren't enough to be a problem. Some interruptions occur, however students learn how to deal effectively with interruptions and how to keep going once the interruption has been removed." Another primary grades teacher made a similar statement:

"My kids are used to it! They just keep working or listening. They are taught to ignore [them]—and they are usually short interruptions."

Thirty-five of the 554 randomly selected teachers who responded to the question about the impact of the intrusions suggested that class context was a pivotal factor. They spoke of such variables as the nature of the class group, the subject matter being addressed, and the placement of any given intrusion in terms of the class period and the school day. A female primary teacher said, "I'm used to it. Sometimes they are more inconvenient than others. It depends on what we are doing at the moment." A male secondary teacher seemed largely to concur: "I've never liked them. Depending on what I'm doing they can be very disruptive or not disruptive at all." That teacher believed that intrusions were sometimes problematic, albeit necessary, adjuncts to school life, stating that "It happens so regularly

Table 2.—Percentage of Teachers Estimating Frequency of Externally Imposed Classroom Interruptions, by School Type (N = 557)

Grade level	Estimated number of daily interruptions						
	None	< 1	2-3	3-4	5-6	7-8	> 8
Primary (K-3)	2.1	4.8	41.3	36.6	13.1	2.1	0.0
Elementary (4-8)*	2.0	5.4	36.8	38.7	11.3	3.9	0.4
High school (9-12)	1.0	3.9	40.0	29.3	15.1	7.9	2.0

Note. Includes three middle schools (Grades 6-8).

Table 3.—Most Common Origin of Externally Imposed Classroom Interruptions and Number of Times Identified by Surveyed Teachers (N = 557)

Origin of interruption	Number of times identified	% of teachers identifying
Intercom	450	80.2
Message delivery	207	36.9
Unspecified visitors	178	31.7
Other teachers	91	16.2
Other students	82	14.6
Parents	64	11.4
Telephone	61	10.9
Administrators	46	8.2
Student council activities	37	6.6
Assemblies	31	5.5
Student services	25	4.5
Extracurricular activities	21	3.7
Fundraising	20	3.6
Tardy students	19	3.4

I almost expect it. It can be very distracting—especially on a hard to settle class, but we take it in stride. We're not just a classroom on its own and in order to promote school community most of these interruptions are needed."

Such tolerant viewpoints were relatively few, however; most respondents were more definite on how they viewed such occurrences. The intrusions were considered to either have no bearing on regular class proceedings or to be largely unbearable. A few respondents noted that the staffs at their schools had made efforts to reduce the effects of classroom intrusions by having the secretary screen calls or by scheduling intercom announcements near the beginning or end of class periods. One teacher suggested that posting a "Do not disturb" sign on the classroom door could have the desired outcome.

Despite the noted potential for reductions in the number and influences of episodes on externally imposed classroom interruptions, as well as for the capacity of others to perceive them as necessary and even beneficial components of school life, over half (303 out of 554) of the respondents determined that they caused serious problems. Those respondents spoke forcefully of how students are distracted from their work, how teachers have to re-teach material, and how classes must include matters that often prove to be superfluous. With respect to irrelevancies, the following comment by an elementary teacher who estimated seven to eight daily interruptions of her class was representative of several other teachers:

Constant P.A. announcements that aren't even for the students. They are for the janitor or to announce staff meetings or any other thing the principal doesn't want to walk around to do. It's very disruptive and irritating. Gets us off track. Students can't concentrate and forget [the] train of thought. I get frustrated because we have to stop to listen on the off chance it might be directed at us.

Many teachers also spoke of being frustrated by the continual erosion of instructional time. The following quote was given by a female high school teacher with more than 20 years' experience:

They create gaps in learning—diminish time on task, short circuit important developmental time, particularly in skills subjects. They also mean teachers have to speed up to cover material because they have less time. Slower students get left behind. Also, there is no time to do any "fun" stuff that keeps weaker students motivated.

The loss of focus for students and teachers was a recurring expressed concern. One teacher with a telephone in her classroom reported that at least seven calls a day came in to her classroom for the students, which required them to leave the classroom. Getting some students, particularly those with special needs, refocused on their tasks was a major problem for some teachers. As another primary teacher noted, "ADHD children act up. Autistic children become overstimulated or fearful. I have to stop and look for material for others so I have to review the lesson in progress and then carry on." Others spoke of the difficulties that such distractions created in

terms of getting through planned lessons in the time allotted. As the following comment illustrates, unscheduled visitors were seen as particularly burdensome:

I plan on so many minutes and a long interruption means I may not finish something or be able to end the way I planned. Parents may want to ask me questions in the hall. That may leave 25 kids with nothing to do until I return. I like to know when kids will leave so I can plan for it. It is basically saying: Whatever is going on in the classroom is not as important as anyone else who wants to interrupt.

The sentiments of the majority of the teachers might be summarized by the following 2 teachers: An all-grades school female teacher said, "Interruptions are never at an opportune time"; a veteran male high school counterpart chastised that "they are never welcome or are in any way productive to the learning process." Those points are addressed further in the Conclusions section.

Discussion and Conclusions

The data presented in this report illustrate clearly that externally imposed classroom interruptions are a major concern for many teachers. Almost all (98.4%) of the 557 randomly selected Saskatchewan teachers who responded to the survey indicated that they experience interferences from outside the physical parameters of the classroom. In terms used by Tessmer and Harris (1992), those findings could be stated as the *supporting environment* encroaching upon the domain of the *learning environment*. Almost half of the teachers (46%) reported that they experience such interruptions only two or fewer times daily. Of the remaining respondents, slightly more than a third (34.8%) reported intrusions of three or four times daily; the remaining 19.2% estimated at least five or six such occurrences.

By far, the most frequently noted source of class interference, named by 4 out of 5 teachers, was the public address system, or intercom. That intrusion was followed by the identified sources of message delivery, unspecified visitors, other teachers, other students, parents, and the telephone (see Table 2). Although there was wide variation in the reported impact that those interruptions made on classes, more than half of the teachers indicated that they considered them to constitute a serious problem. Those teachers were often very ardent in their written expressions of the damaging effects of the intrusions, particularly in terms of how they distracted students and squandered instructional time.

In the earlier study on this subject, Leonard (1999) concluded that teachers may underestimate the number of times that their classes are intruded on from the outside. Direct classroom observations in 12 schools in three school districts determined that the average interruption frequency was twice that considered to be the case by teachers and that the typical class experienced external interference almost 12 times per school day, or 2,000 times per school year. Leonard suggested that, over time, many teachers may become insensitive to classroom intrusions and that the

problem may be more trenchant than even teachers fully realize (p. 468). If those earlier research conclusions are valid, the reported frequencies of external interruptions in this study, although disquieting, also may reflect conservative estimations, and, consequently, a problem that remains substantially underrated.

The Leonard (1999) study also reported that many teachers find such circumstances to be wholly counterproductive to the established goals of schooling. For Leonard, the solution lay in concerted efforts to formulate policies at both the district level and the school level that clearly acknowledge when problems of external interruptions exist, and then to endeavor to implement and monitor planned corrective actions. He concluded as follows:

If instructional time is indeed considered to be sacrosanct, it needs to be more apparent through appropriate policies and actions that protect students and their teachers from unjustified interferences so that they can best get on with the task that under ideal conditions is inherently demanding and fraught with uncertainties. (p. 472)

The underlying philosophy of such proposed policies would be that every effort should be expended to create the kind of learning environment that optimally nurtures student learning. Schools that are firmly learner centered are “distinguished by practices, structures, and policies that promote motivation, learning, and achievement for *all* students” (McCombs & Whisler, 1997, p. 131). In particular, teachers of at-risk or special needs students were among the most vocal in their derision of prevailing interruptive practices. Loss of focus by the students, they said, simply meant that they tended to get “left behind” or “become overstimulated and fearful.” McCombs and Whisler suggested that schools should be organized around conceptions of use of time that are promulgated on what is best for students, rather than on adult convenience.

Although policies establishing the importance of appropriate time usage can provide direction and support for those at the school site level, it is at the support level that the daily routines and patterns of practice are embedded in cultural norms. Notwithstanding that in recent years the move toward empowered school learning communities has increased, it is still the principal who continues to play a critical role in maintaining an orderly and academically focused school environment (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1991; Ysseldyke, Christensen, & Thurlow, 1987). A report compiled by the Virginia State Department of Education (1992) addressing the interaction between instructional time and student learning called for school administrators to refocus the scheduling of instructional practices with greater sensitivity to learning needs. The report states the following:

Educators and others agree that management of allocated times is of the utmost importance in assuring productive student learning. School administrative and instructional practices influence the use of scheduled time for student instruction. Practices that foster student effort and match student learning needs with instructional tasks enhance student productive learning. (p. 83)

The research into one component of time usage reported here strongly suggests that many teachers continue to feel that outside forces prevent them from optimally meeting the needs of their students. Almost everyone recognizes that there are important matters that, by necessity, must encroach upon instructional time. The deliberate and persistent restriction of those class intrusions to ones that are imperative may provide a feasible solution. That conclusion also was reached by Stuck and White (1992) following their investigation at 13 school sites across North Carolina. The authors recommended adopting schoolwide strategies to curtail classroom interruptions by reducing or eliminating external distractions.

Although newer conceptions of learning communities may encourage regular interaction between groups and individuals as a daily part of the collaborative culture (Leonard & Leonard, 1999), many or most of the interruptions identified by the surveyed teachers did not seem to be of that nature. Rather, the intrusions were characterized largely by routine notices and unwanted visitations during scheduled instructional periods. Some teachers reported that they considered the episodes to be largely innocuous, whereas many others clearly harbored exigent resentment toward both the nature and frequency of the external impositions. The evidence suggests that, on at least one level, the issue is largely contextual in that students and their teachers may respond very differently to similar happenings. In effect, teacher-registered reactions ranged from casual indifference to explicated indignation. The realization of optimal standards of the learning environment would seem to compel professional educators to attempt to reconcile the apparent incongruencies of what constitutes best practice.

Notwithstanding the recorded perceptual variances in both this study and the earlier Leonard (1999) empirical research, there are many schools that have adopted policies that strongly reinforce stated philosophies about the importance of protecting the learning environment; others clearly have not—or, at least, have failed to act on them. It is at the latter schools that time erosion and teacher frustrations are likely to be prevalent. Also, it is probable that such schools are not maximizing learning opportunities for their students, and, consequently, may be struggling to meet those prevailing demands for improved outcomes.

NOTES

1. For a more extensive discussion of the research about the effect of schools on student outcomes, see Leonard (1999) and Saurez, Torlone, McGrath, and Clark (1991).

2. There were only three exclusively middle grades schools (i.e., Grades 6–8) within the researched population. Consequently, respondent data from those schools were combined with the elementary designation data (i.e., Grades 4–8).

REFERENCES

- Bloom, B. S. (1974). Time and learning. *American Psychologist*, 29(2), 682–688.
- Boyer, E. L. (1983). *High School: A report on secondary education in*

- America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Freeland, K. (1980). *Have you seen Comenius lately?* Indiana: Morehead State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 778)
- Gilman, D. (1973, Winter). One problem: Inefficiency is a big waste of time. *Junior and Middle School Bulletin*, p. 5.
- Gilman, D., & Knoll, S. (1984). Increasing instructional time. What are the priorities and how do they affect the alternatives? *NASSP Bulletin*, 68(470), 41-44.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hester, J., & Ligon, G. (1978, March). *Where does the time go? A study of time use in public schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 307)
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heys, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kuceris, M., & Zakariya, S. (1982). *Time on task: Using instructional time more effectively*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Leonard, L. (1999). Towards maximizing instructional time: The nature and extent of externally-imposed classroom interruptions. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(5), 454-474.
- Leonard, L., & Leonard, P. (1999). Reculturing for collaboration and leadership. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(4), 237-254.
- Levin, J., & Nolan, J. (1996). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lutz, F., & Lutz, S. (1987, April). *Reforming rural education: A look from both ends of the tunnel*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Lysiak, F. (1980). *Time utilization study: Classroom observation 1979-80*. Fort Worth, TX: Fort Worth Independent School District, Texas Department of Research and Evaluation.
- McCombs, B., & Whisler, J. (1997). *The learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, M., & Funkhouser, J. (1990). *More time to learn: Extended time strategies for Chapter 1 students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 317 279)
- Moos, R. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). *Time in the classroom. Indicator of the month*. Report No. NCES-94-398. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 667)
- Nelson, S. (1990). *Instructional time as a factor in increasing student achievement*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- O'Rielly, R. (1975). Classroom climate and achievement in secondary school mathematics classes. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 21, 241-248.
- Ranallo, J. (1997). *Student conduct management: The passionate side of teaching*. Vancouver, BC: Eduserv.
- Saurez, T., Torlone, D., McGrath, S., & Clark, D. (1991). *Enhancing effective instructional time: A review of the research*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Educational Policy Center, University of North Carolina.
- Seeman, H. (1994). *Preventing classroom discipline problems: A guide for educators* (2nd ed.). Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.
- Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1991). Schools as affectors of teacher effects. In H. Waxman & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Effective teaching: Current research* (pp. 161-179). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Stuck, G., & White, K. (1992). *Maximizing time to teach and time to learn*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Educational Policy Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 373 402)
- Tessmer, M., & Harris, D. (1992). *Analysing the instructional setting: Environmental analysis*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Virginia State Department of Education. (1992). *Instructional time and student learning: A study of the school calendar and instructional time*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 555)
- Walberg, H. J. (1988). Synthesis of research on time and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 45(6), 76-85.
- Ysseldyke, J., Christenson, S., & Thurlow, M. (1987). Instructional factors that influence student achievement: An integrative review. *Monograph, Instructional Alternatives Project*. University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 977)

APPENDIX

Summary List of Externally Imposed Classroom Interruptions Identified by Randomly Selected Teachers

Intercom	Message delivery
Unspecified visitors	Other teachers
Other students	Parents
Telephone	Administrators
Student council activities	Assemblies
Student Services	Extracurricular activities
Fundraising	Tardy students
Fire drills	Attendance sheets
Bus safety drills	Recycled paper pick-ups
Hallway noise	Deliveries
Specialist	Field trips
Nurse/dentist visits	Social workers
School photos	Caretaker
Driver education	Power failures
Fluoride program	Lunch orders