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Abstract

Teachers' Attitudes toward the possible effects a longer school year might have on a district were investigated. A sample size of 64 teachers from a suburban school district in New Jersey were given a descriptive survey with 22 statements or questions pertaining to the effects of a longer school year or day. Questions were developed from literature review findings and from a focus group discussion with teachers on the possible effects a longer school year/day could have on a school district. The results indicated that teachers were unwilling to teach a longer school year/day unless they were compensated for the time. Compensation was the most important factor in a teacher's attitude toward working a longer school calendar. In addition, when given the option of teaching a longer school day, there was no difference between elementary and middle school teachers. Teacher related issues received the most agreement to than other statements and those issues were the best predictors of teachers' attitudes towards a longer school calendar.
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Teachers’ Attitudes Toward the
Effects of a Longer School Year or Day

Approximately 150 years ago, when our nation was mostly agricultural, our present day school calendar was designed to accommodate families. Children were needed during the summer months to harvest the crop or learn a trade. Today, few families need their children to harvest the crop or perform chores around the house. Yet, we still follow the agrarian-based school calendar. With both parents working, the children are home hours before the parents.

In recent years a popular, and often controversial, alternative has been the extended school year/day or year-round schooling. The idea of a longer school year is not new, it has been used by urban schools to relieve overcrowding since the turn of the century. An extended school year can be accomplished by lengthening the amount of hours in a school day (from 6 to 7 or 8) or by increasing the amount of days in the school year (from 180 up to 220). The most popular plan is lengthening the number of days in the school year (Hoffman, 1991).

There are only two plans that increase the number of school days: the "45/15" plan and the quarter plan. The 45/15 plan consists of four 45-day school sessions. Each session is then followed by a 15-day vacation session. Ironically, this
plan fails to extend the school year. The students still receive 180 days in this school year. The only thing it does is make schools year-round. In the quarter plan, the school year is divided into four quarters of 12 weeks each. Such a plan leaves four weeks of vacation to be distributed throughout the year and allows a student to potentially finish four years of work in three years (Smith, 1983).

Over the past two decades, controversy has surrounded the recommendation of extending the school year. The most prominent concern regarding extending the school year is its effect on academic achievement; does increasing school time raise academic performance?

In April of 1983, the National Commission on Educational Excellence issued a report entitled "A Nation at Risk." This report strongly recommended that school districts consider extending the school day to seven hours and the school year to 200 or 220 school days (NEA, 1987). The rationale for such a proposal rests upon studies of international comparisons.

Such studies claim that students in foreign countries learn more and achieve higher scores on international achievement tests than their American counterparts. This is attributed to the fact that foreign students spend more time in school; eight hours a day 220 days a year. In all of these international comparisons, however, there is an absence of supportive data. None of the studies done by the International
Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) are mentioned (NEA, 1987).

The IEA studies serve as a standard data source for international comparisons. They are the only studies that have tests specifically designed for the purpose of international comparative testing. The results of these studies have consistently concluded that the total of instructional hours during a school year has no significant relationship to achievement in a particular subject. However, this still leaves the possibility that providing more hours of instruction in a specific subject will increase achievement in that subject.

The literature on time-on-task deals with the relationship between time and learning. The studies view time as a necessary resource for learning to occur. However, providing more instructional time is not necessarily going to increase learning. As Nancy Karweit (1984) states:

Learning takes time but providing time does not in itself ensure that learning will take place. More time may result in more learning—if inadequate time was the major cause of the problem in the first place.

The "other factors" involved that must be considered are student attentiveness to the material and the "quality" of instruction. Research has consistently shown that the relationship between time-on-task and achievement is
positive.

The main conclusion of these studies is that specific teaching skills and behaviors have a significant impact on student achievement. As a matter of fact, Nancy Karweit (1982) estimates that it will take one hour of extra instructional time a day, 180 hours a year, in a specific subject to get a .25 of a standard deviation increase in achievement in that particular subject alone.

An increase of .25 is significant but not spectacular. In a study cited by Levin (1984), the outcomes of various ways to make classroom instruction more efficient were studied. Cross-age tutoring, computer-assisted instruction, reducing class size, and increasing instructional time by 30 minutes were measured for their effectiveness. Reducing class size and increasing time were the least effective in terms of cost. Computer assisted was the second most cost-effective technique, leaving cross-age tutoring to be the most effective technique with a .68 of a standard deviation increase.

Bishop et al (1986) studied the effect of extending the school day from six periods to seven in a rural high school in Virginia. A pre-post design of 1207 students' GPAs were analyzed with all the GPAs for students participating remaining the same. His findings suggest that with the longer school day, students taking the maximum course load experienced lower GPAs. A decrease of .05 points on the overall GPA from the previous year was noted with the overall failure rate
increasing from 5.4% to 5.7%. The effect of the extended day could not be determined as the cause for the decrease in grade averages or failure rates and each academic department was asked to evaluate the progress of students. Bishop's study is an admirable attempt at trying to quantify the effects of a longer school day, but using grade point averages as a measure has its flaws. The study failed to take into account that GPAs can be affected by SES, student motivational level, stress in the student's environment, or a negative interaction between student and teacher. There are many variables that can interfere with earning a high GPA.

What Bishop et al (1986), the NEA (1987), and others conclude is that quality of instructional time is more important than quantity. The overall suggestion seems to be to reduce time lost on non-instructional activities (i.e. discipline and material hand-out) before extending school. Time spent completing instructional activities has direct correlation with achievement, not time allocated for instruction (Ellis, 1984). In other words, material needs to be attended to in order for learning to take place.

In a study done by Wheeler (1987), the effects of a longer school day on achievement were measured by scores obtained on the California Assessment Program of sixth-graders. The study included 1,030 schools with an approximate sample size of 75,000 sixth-graders throughout California. The variables manipulated in this study were: CAP scores; sixth-grade
enrollment; SES index for sixth graders’ families; percentage of students classified as non-English proficient; families receiving aid; self-contained or departmentalized classrooms; length of the school week; and minutes per week allocated to ten subject areas.

From the data collected, Wheeler arrived at four conclusions. The first conclusion is that more time in science is related to improvement in all three skill areas (reading, writing, and math) across Socio-Economic Status (SES) except for high SES. A second finding is that increased time in mathematics is associated with performance in all three areas for low SES. Another finding is that the length of a school week is positive and significant for all SES groups except the middle class. Finally, the relationship between test scores and time allocation differ by SES group. In other words, the results suggest that seven more minutes a week in science or five more minutes a week for math at low SES schools would be associated with a one-point scaled score increase in writing. For the middle SES group, six to ten more minutes per week in math or science, or fourteen minutes a week less in social studies would be associated with a one-point gain. There were no time allocations for specific subjects related to the CAP writing score for the high SES group.

There are other studies that support Wheeler’s (1987) findings and believe that increasing the amount of time in school will raise academic performance. However, in a study
done by Hossler et al (1988), the relationship between increased time and achievement was found to be negligible. She noted that there are no studies that directly measure the impact of an extended year nor of a longer school day. Studies that exist are short-term and report only small and insignificant gains in achievement. In fact, Levin (1984) warned that adding time may actually reduce the level of student achievement because of fatigue.

Directly related to student fatigue are the effects that a longer school year or day have on low achievers and those who are at risk for dropping out. Natriello and Dornbusch (1984) have cautioned that with the high-demand classrooms, some low achieving students must be provided with additional direct help if they are to succeed. In addition, those students who are at-risk for dropping out are more likely to do so with the increased demand for achievement and time in school. Often times these students may be faced to choose between school and work (the low-income students who work to help support their families may not quit their jobs). Additionally, added school time and homework might interfere with extracurricular activities; the only bond to school that at-risk students might have. Whatever the reasons, added school time results in a four percent increase in the dropout rate for students who are at risk (McDill et al., 1985).
All studies about the relationship between an extended school year/day and achievement have reported mixed findings and are generally inconclusive about its effect on achievement. Honzay (1987), Karweit (1985), and the National Education Association (1987) believe that "More is not necessarily better." These researchers propose that instead of increasing the amount of time a student is in school, the time that the students are already in school should be better allocated.

In a study done by Good (1983), the amount of time in a school day devoted to academic instruction was measured. The percentage of time a student is engaged in instruction varies from study to study, but basically they all indicate that only 50 to 60% of the school day is actually used for instruction (Honzay, 1987). Davidson and Holley (1979) found that students spend 20% of their day engaged in non-instructional activities such as: (1) Listening to announcements, (2) Taking out or putting away supplies, (3) Bathroom trips, (4) Discipline, or (5) Awaiting for teacher instruction. When they subtracted this time, as well as recess and lunch, from the school day, approximately 3 and 3/4 hours remained for teacher instruction.

Perhaps the most shocking study on the use of instructional time came from Sanford and Evertson (1983). The researchers studied four mathematics and English classes to discover the time spent on classroom instruction. The results ranged from 6.34 minutes to 33.25 minutes spent on instruction during an entire class which is presumed to be approximately 40
hours.

The NEA (1987), concluded that a more effective use of current school time be examined instead of implementing a longer school day/year.

Another concern arises as districts think about implementing a longer school year or day. It is cost. There are mixed findings on the cost of extending the school year. Some literature says that it is cost-effective and others think it is not. Most literature supports the later viewpoint; an extended school year is not cost-effective.

The increase in cost ranges from a 3 to 14% increase in spending depending upon the study. Ellis (1984) cited that an extended school year will cost the nation $20 billion dollars a year in addition to the estimated $125 billion (Smith, 1983) a year for the current school year. An increase of ten days would add $5.5 billion to school personnel costs.

Within those costs are compensation in teachers’ salaries for increased time, maintenance costs for year-round use, and the renovations that must be performed to keep the school open during the summer months (i.e., the installation of a central cooling unit).

One critical dimension of any plan to implement an extended school year program is teachers’ attitudes toward such a plan. Few studies have investigated teachers’ attitudes about extended school year programs or rationales behind such plans. This study investigates these attitudes among a sample
of suburban teachers.

Most of the research that is available has reported negative teachers' attitudes toward change in the traditional school calendar. This dissatisfaction stemmed from the burden that some teachers felt would be placed on them during a longer school year. In addition, the traditional summer vacation would be disrupted. In May of 1984, the Educational Research Service asked a nationwide sample of teachers the following question: "If a commensurate increase in salary were available, would you be willing to work a longer school day or year?" Fifty-two point two percent of the teachers said they would be unwilling to work a longer school day or year.

The effects of teachers' attitudes should not be underestimated. In a survey done by Hunt (1974) of 117 school districts, the most important predictor of whether or not a district implemented the longer school year was teacher attitudes (Hoffman 1991).

Hoffman's (1991) study examined the teachers' attitudes in a small North Carolina school district. One hundred and twenty eight teachers responded to a descriptive questionnaire that was designed to answer whether: (1) Regardless of sex the majority of male and female teachers will be opposed to changing to a year-round schedule, (2) Regardless of years of teaching experience, a majority will be opposed to a year-round schedule, and (3) Regardless of grade level taught, there will be a majority others opposed to a year-round schedule.
Findings support all three hypotheses, however, the questionnaire only contained four questions and appears to be limited in supporting the hypotheses. However, research has generally found that teachers are opposed to a longer school year even if compensation is offered. This study proposes that teachers’ attitudes today have changed toward a longer school year. At present, teachers are more educated about the longer school year and will be willing to work during the summer because it provides them with a job. Additionally, teachers will view the longer school year as a viable solution to today’s social ills, for example, with a longer school year or school day, children are not given as much unsupervised time, which may lead to a decrease in teen pregnancy or drug/alcohol abuse.

Hypotheses:

The purpose of this study is to examine teachers’ attitudes toward the change in the traditional 180-day calendar. Previous studies have found teachers’ attitudes to be negative towards an alternative for the agrarian school calendar. This study proposes that even though their attitudes toward a longer school year are negative, they are willing to work the longer year if they are compensated.

Based upon the information obtained from the literature review and the discussion group with six middle school teachers, the researcher developed the following hypotheses:
(1) Teachers will disagree with the idea that the school year should be extended by 30 days and the school day lengthened by one hour.

(2) Teachers would be willing to work a longer school year if there was a commensurate increase in salary.

(3) When compared to elementary teachers, middle school teachers would be more willing to work a longer school day.

(4) The majority of the teachers will think that low and high achieving students will benefit the most from a longer school calendar.

(5) Teachers will disagree with the positive aspects of a longer school day/year.

(6) Teachers will agree with negative aspects of a longer school day/year.

**Method**

**Participants**

One Hundred and ten questionnaires were sent to teachers in a kindergarten through eighth grade suburban school district in New Jersey. Of those questionnaires, 64 were returned with 33 of them from the elementary schools and 31 of them from the middle school, equivalent to a 58% return rate. Sixteen percent of the surveys returned were male respondents, leaving the other 84 percent to be female respondents.

**Materials**

The method of collecting information was a questionnaire designed and pilot tested on ten teachers from a different
school district. All questions on the survey were derived from previous research findings or from discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a longer school year with six teachers in a focus group setting. The questionnaire consisted of 22 questions of which 19 pertained to the affects of a longer school year or day.

Ten teachers received the questionnaire to field test face validity of the instrument. In response, there were few minor adjustments made in the wording.

**Design and Procedure**

Each teacher in the school district received a questionnaire in a brown 9" x 12" mailing envelope that was placed in their boxes at the front office. Within each envelope was a questionnaire and a cover letter accompanying it to explain the study. The letter also informed the teachers of what form a longer school year might take and how it might be achieved. Also enclosed were the instructions for the teachers to complete the questionnaire and return it within a week.

Upon completion of the questionnaire, the teachers returned it to the researcher’s mailbox via the same envelope. All participants were instructed to not identify themselves on either the questionnaire or the envelope to ensure anonymity.

Questions 4 and 5 were combined into a scale called Teacher Attitude (TA) in order to understand what best predicts why teachers are unwilling to work a longer school year/day. A
reliability test on the TA scale yielded a coefficient alpha of .54, a scale of moderate reliability.

**Scoring**

Of the 22 questions on the questionnaire, 15 of them were on a Likert type scale from 1 to 5 (one reflected the attitude of Strongly Disagree and five corresponding to Strongly Agree; see questionnaire). Of the remaining 7 questions, 3 questions were for demographic purposes and the remaining four (questions number 9, 11, 12, and 21) were percentage questions, what percentage of teachers responded to a given choice.

**Results**

As for hypothesis number one, teachers do not think that the school year should be extended by 30 days (see figure 1; M= 2.3, S= 1.1, n= 64, 95% C.I.= 2.05 to 2.5). Teachers are also against extending the school day by one hour (see figure 2; M= 2.1, S= 1.2, n= 64, 95% C.I.= 1.8 to 2.4). This is consistent with Hoffman's (1991) findings and indicates that teachers are unwelcome to change in the traditional school year calendar. One teacher expressed his/her outrage by writing, "I work an eight hour day already, Isn't that enough?"

However, teachers are willing to work a longer school year if a commensurate increase in salary were available, (see figure 3; M= 3.2, S= 1.3, n= 64, 95% C.I.= 2.8 to 3.5). This finding is indicative of how the teachers are willing to work a longer school year when compensated as opposed to not favoring it when not compensated for the extra time (hypothesis one).
On two of the questionnaires, in the additional comment section, and in conversation with several of the teachers, the single most important factor in deciding whether or not they worked a longer school calendar was compensation. This finding is different from the Educational Research Service's 1984 study (Hoffman, 1991) where 52.2% of the teachers were unwilling to work a longer school day or year for a commensurate increase in salary.

When Middle School teachers were compared to elementary school teachers there was no difference between the groups as to who was willing to work a longer school day (T = .86, p > .05, r = .11). Middle school teachers were no more willing to teach a longer school day than the elementary teachers and so hypothesis number three was rejected. There was no prior literature on this hypothesis, the idea to test it came from casual conversations with teachers. Many of the middle school teachers expressed the desire to not have the same group of kids all day. Based on this statement, the experimenter wanted to test the idea that the middle school teachers would be much more willing to teach a longer school day than elementary teachers because they do not work with the same group of kids for seven hours.

Teachers were asked what type of student they thought would benefit from a longer school day or year (low achievers, average achievers, or high achievers). Respondents overwhelmingly chose high and low achievers over the average
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achiever, supporting hypothesis number four. However, some of the teachers checked off more than one category, causing higher total scores. As a result, the total percentage of respondents for question 12 was greater than 100%. Therefore, no conclusion can be drawn from the data collected and hypothesis number 4 is inconclusive.

There were no trends in teachers attitudes towards question numbers 8 and 10. They were not sure if a longer school year would provide more flexibility in their schedule (see figure 4; \( M = 2.8, S = 1.2, n = 64, 95\% \text{C.I.} = 2.5 \text{ to } 3 \)). The teachers were uncertain that more time in school would increase student achievement (see figure 5; \( M = 2.9, S = 1.2, n = 64, 95\% \text{C.I.} = 2.6 \text{ to } 3.2 \)).

Overall, teachers were in disagreement to question number 13. They did not think that a longer school day would lead to a decrease in drug or alcohol abuse by students (see figure 6; \( M = 2.5, S = 1.0, n = 64, 95\% \text{C.I.} = 2.3 \text{ to } 2.8 \)).

There were two different opinions to question 14. One group thought that a longer school year would provide more time for special programs and the other group who did not (see figure 7; \( M = 3, S = 1.2, n = 64, 95\% \text{C.I.} = 2.7 \text{ to } 3.3 \)).

In summary, teachers tended to have mixed attitudes toward the "positive" attributes of a longer school year or day (question numbers 8, 10, 13, and 14). There were ambiguous feelings towards two of the positive qualities, a disagreement with one of the other aspects, and differentiating viewpoints
on the last. Therefore, hypothesis number 5 seems to be supported, teachers disagreed with the positive aspects of a longer school year.

Teachers did agree with all of the negative aspects of a longer school year except one, a longer school year would result in a greater incidence of student "burn out." There is no trend to question 15 (see figure 8; \( M = 3.3, S = 1.3, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 2.9 \text{ to } 3.6 \)). However, the teachers did feel that a longer school year would result in a greater incidence of teacher "burn out" (see figure 9; \( M = 3.7, S = 1.1, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 3.4 \text{ to } 4 \)). When asked if they felt that a longer school year would be burdensome to teachers and students they agreed (see figures 10 & 11; \( M = 3.5, S = 1.3, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 3.2 \text{ to } 3.8 \); \( M = 3.5, S = 1.2, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 3.3 \text{ to } 3.8 \text{ respectively} \)).

They agreed that a longer school day would result in a higher drop-out rate for those students who contribute to the family income by working after school (see figure 12; \( M = 3.5, S = 1.1, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 3.3 \text{ to } 3.8 \)). This is consistent with Natriello and Dornbusch's (1984) cautions about the possible effects a longer school day might have on low achievers and low SES families.

Finally, teachers agreed that a longer school day could dampen school spirit if after school sports and activities were eliminated (see figure 13; \( M = 3.5, S = 1.1, n = 64, 95\% \text{ C.I.} = 3.2 \text{ to } 3.7 \)). In summary, hypothesis 6 is supported with the
teachers agreeing to the negative qualities a longer school day/year may bring to a district.

The experimenter was interested in what items best predicted the teacher attitude scale (questions 4 and 5) and if they were willing to work the longer school year for compensation (question 6). Twelve of the 22 questions were divided into two subscales. The first subscale was called Student Impact (SI) and consists of those statements that deal with student issues (9 statements in all). Subscale two is called Teacher Impact (TI) and contains those statements that deal with teacher issues (3 statements in all). These two subscales were used in a stepwise backward linear regression equation to determine which subscale is a better predictor of the teacher attitude scale (TA) and question 6.

Sixty one percent of the variance in the teacher attitude scale was accounted for by using the three variables of teacher impact, student impact, and sex of respondent. The teacher impact subscale accounted for 19% of the variance found, suggesting that issues pertaining to teachers are the best predictors for acceptance of a longer school year/day.

For question 6, 50% of the variance was attributed to the same three variables as above. However, a conclusive decision could not be obtained because the student impact subscale and teacher impact subscale are felt to be complimentary to each other. Therefore, just how much each subscale contributed to the variance is unclear. What does seem clear is that the
effects a longer school day/year would have on teacher issues is the best predictor for teacher acceptance of a change in the traditional school calendar.

Discussion

The results of this study have supported hypotheses 1, 2, 5 and 6, but not hypotheses 3 and 4. Based on the findings from the questionnaire, there are several inferences that can be made about teachers' attitudes toward the effects that a longer school year or day has on their district. First, teachers do not want an extra hour added to the school day nor 30 days added to the 180-day year. However, they would be willing to work the extra time if they were compensated, a different finding to the Educational Services' 1984 survey. The best predictors for acceptance of a longer school calendar are teacher issues, just how much it effects the teacher's work.

Additionally, teachers agreed to all the negative effects that a longer school year would have on a district and disagreed with all of the positive affects. If anything, this research has served its purpose to add to the miniscule amount of data on teachers' attitudes toward a longer school year. It may also be valuable for administrators to know how the faculty thinks a longer school year will affect their district and if they would be willing to work it. The researcher hopes that this study has given more information about teachers' attitudes
besides the fact that they are negative toward a change in the traditional calendar.

Many teachers have expressed that if there were to be any change to the traditional school calendar, they would prefer the 45/15 plan. Although the plan does not extend the school year, they feel it allows more flexibility in the teacher’s scheduling and a chance to vacation in popular areas during the "off" season. In addition, they feel that less time will be spent on reviewing material in the beginning months of the new year. As a matter of fact, one teacher took the time to write down a plan that she thought would work. Teachers are a valuable resource to tap when implementing any school plan.

Due to restraints on the researcher such as time limitations, modest financial resources, and a small sample size, a definitive study was not possible. Because the sample size was only 64 and consisted of suburban teachers, it is not an accurate reflection of urban, rural, nor nation-wide attitudes of teachers.

If a study were to be done on teachers’ attitudes, it would need to sample urban, suburban, and rural school teachers. In addition, the study should consider the students, custodians, administrators, and community members of the school district because a longer school year affects the whole community, not just the teachers.
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For each of the following statements, please indicate your answer by circling one choice.

1. In what type of school district do you work?
   Urban  Suburban  Rural

2. What level of students do you instruct?
   Elementary  Middle School  High School

3. What is your gender?
   Male  Female

4. The public school year should be extended by 30 days.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

5. I am in favor of extending the school day by one hour.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

6. If a commensurate increase in salary were available, I would be willing to teach a longer school day or year.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

7. I would be in favor of a longer school year because it would provide teachers with summer employment.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

8. A longer school year will allow more flexibility in a teacher’s schedule.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5

9. If an extended school year were implemented, approximately what percentage of students would receive academic help?
   0%  25%  50%  75%  100%
Missing Page
18. A longer school day would be burdensome to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. A longer school day would result in a higher drop-out rate for students who work after school to provide additional family income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. A longer school day would dampen school spirit by eliminating or limiting the types of after-school sports and activities for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. If classroom time were increased, I would prefer it be accomplished through:

- longer school days
- longer school year

22. The issue of an extended school day or year is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
The public school year should be extended by 30 days.
I am in favor of extending the school day by one hour.
If a commensurate increase in salary were available, I would be willing to teach a longer school day or year.
Flexibility in a teacher's schedule will allow more.
Response

Student achievement
More time in school will increase
incidents of drug and alcohol abuse
students will be less involved in
With an extended school day/year,
An extended school year allows more time for special programs (i.e., tutoring services).
greater incidence of student burn out

A longer school year would result in a
Greater incidence of teacher burn out
A longer school year would result in a
A longer school day would be burdensome to teachers.
A longer school day would be burdensome to students.
Students
higher drop-out rate for low income
A longer school day would result in a