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CHAPTER I

THE NEED TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL TIME WASTERS

A few years ago Prestbo (1978) described the proliferation of time management seminars and consultants in a way that conveys the taint of hucksterism that is still associated with it:

How's that, friend? You say your arms ache from lugging bulging briefcases of work home every night? And your secretary bought a giant calendar so she could list all your meetings? And you have three reports due by 5 p.m. but the boss wants you to show his nephew around the place and maybe take him to lunch?

Well, march right over here to this time-management seminar. We'll show you how to get things done, make use of every minute, have weekends with your family and have a clean desk. (p. 22)

Yet, there is a genuine demand for ...ing to cope with the difficulties of allocating time effectively in the face of serious issues. This demand is coming from school administrators as well as from managers in business and industry. Paul B. Salmon (1978), executive director of the American Association of School Administrators, noted that time constraints will get worse as issues facing school administrators become more complex, and that time to deal with them may be the most essential ingredient for effectiveness.

Community education directors seem to have two major concerns about allocating time. There is concern for efficiently scheduling time in order to cope effectively with a myriad of demands and
expectations held by diverse individuals and groups in the school system and community. Inefficient scheduling of time can reduce the number of desirable outcomes achieved.

There is also concern for taking all the time necessary to help community groups develop knowledge and skills that are required to implement community education, even though tangible results could be obtained more rapidly by professionals. In this area of demands and expectations, allocating time competently may not appear to be efficient to an outside observer.

In spite of these two concerns, there is little empirical documentation of how community education directors allocate their time. It is not presumed in this study that directors waste time, but it is assumed that directors desire to allocate time as effectively as they can within their situation. The three purposes of this study are to develop an objective method which can be used by community education directors to rate the effect of allocating time to selected activities often classified as time wasters, to investigate how different conditions under which the method is used affect the responses made by the directors, and to compare the interpretability of two types of scoring. Since this is an instrument development study, the results will test the feasibility of the instrument rather than describe time allocation behavior for a broadly defined population of community education directors.
In this study a time waster is defined as an activity which, in relation to another activity, is less effective in accomplishing desired goals or objectives within a specified time period. Because it is difficult to convince busy administrators, including community education directors, that keeping an accurate time log over an extended period is worth the inconvenience, and because it is difficult and expensive to obtain and analyze detailed time logs, there is value in developing a brief self-report Time Allocation Inventory (TAI) which yields information about activities which may be time wasters. If this information can alert a director to the possibility that more effective allocation of time is possible, given his or her actual situation, then more detailed data collection and analysis may be regarded as appropriate. The functions of the TAI are to provide information about time allocation which can be used to increase effectiveness, and to "prime the pump" for more detailed analysis of time allocation patterns.

Consideration of Priorities

Awareness of current priorities assigned to goals, objectives or tasks is a prerequisite for objectively estimating the relative importance of an activity for accomplishing desired goals or objectives. Since formulation of personal priorities in detail is a long process, there is value in determining whether a brief exercise for creating this awareness has an effect on inventoring potential time
wasters. An exercise in which a director rates his or her own priority for common tasks, and indicates additional tasks which have high priority in his or her situation, can provide a context for inventorying potential time wasters. Some directors in this study completed such an exercise to determine whether there is an effect on TAI scores.

**Perceptions of Ideal Time Allocation**

If directors describe a hypothetical trained, experienced, effective director as having the same pattern of difficulties with allocating time that they have themselves, the implication is that there is no room for self-improvement. If, however, directors describe the hypothetical director as being disrupted less in accomplishing goals or objectives than they themselves are disrupted, then there is room for self-improvement. Some directors in this study completed the TAI as they believed a hypothetical experienced, trained, effective director would respond, to determine whether or not such instructions affect TAI scores.

**Overview of the Investigation**

The study was conducted in two phases. In Phase I three instruments were developed to meet criteria for field testing: the Time Allocation Inventory (TAI), an exercise for considering priorities assigned to goals or tasks, and a questionnaire for obtaining information on exposure to training in time management. During this phase
of the study instructions for responding to the TAI as a hypothetical effective director were developed, data for checking the proposed research design for Phase II were analyzed, and administrative procedures for Phase II were finalized.

In Phase II of the study data were collected from community education directors to test two propositions. The first is that directors who complete a task priorities exercise will give ratings of the effect of potential time wasters that differ from ratings given by directors who do not complete such an exercise. The second proposition is that directors will rate selected activities often classified as time wasters as occurring more frequently and interfering more with achieving goals than they rate the same activities as they believe that hypothetical effective directors would rate them. Two different types of scores were used to test these propositions, and the findings were related to experience in time management.

In Chapter II a rationale is developed for refining measures of time wasters for community education directors and other educational administrators. An operational definition for "time waster" is given, and the importance of considering priorities and perceptions of time allocation in an ideal situation is discussed. Chapter III describes the independent and dependent variables used in the study, with particular attention being given to the development of the TAI. The procedures followed in Phase I and Phase II are described. Chapter IV includes the results of Phase I and the modifications in the instruments and procedures made on the basis of the data collected.
Chapter V includes the results of Phase II, and Chapter VI summarizes the study and discusses implications for research and practice.
CHAPTER II

A RATIONALE FOR REFINING THE MEASUREMENT OF PERCEPTIONS OF TIME ALLOCATION

In spite of concern expressed in the literature about the need for community education directors to manage their time well, there is little empirical documentation of how they actually allocate time. In this chapter, review of relevant empirical studies reveals ambiguity in the procedures that have been used to document time allocation. Review of consultant perspectives on time allocation suggests some considerations for refining measures of time allocation. A more precise operational definition of "time waster" is developed, and the importance of considering priorities and perceptions of time allocation in an ideal situation is discussed. The chapter concludes with a summary of the ambiguities to be addressed by this study. It is the purpose of this study to develop and field test instruments and procedures for measuring time allocation that may be more objective, and hence may yield less ambiguous results, than the procedures described in the literature.

Concerns About Using Time Effectively

Community education leaders in public schools are expected to work long hours and produce a great deal with limited resources. Totten and Manley (1969) described the community education director as a person who needs excellent health and vigor in order to respond
to unending demands while on the job. "The director comes on duty at noon during each school day, stays on the job until late evening, and is at work on Saturday and throughout summer weeks" (p. 144). After briefly discussing the results of three seven-day time logs kept by three directors, in which twenty-six types of activities and services were identified, they concluded the discussion with several recommendations:

Although quite busy, the community services director can, by careful scheduling, lead a very happy, full, but not leisurely life. He can plan a satisfactory amount of time for personal use. When he needs to attend a special event of a recreational or social nature, he can leave the management and supervision of the school program to a qualified assistant. Much of his activity is such that members of his family can participate with him. He supervises activities in which his children can engage, and there are many programs of interest to his wife. (p. 159)

Embedded in that passage are standard principles of time management such as careful scheduling, responsible delegation of tasks, and care for one's personal life.

Whitt (1971) noted in a handbook for community school directors that "this position requires an uncommon number of hours per week. It has been estimated that many directors may spend as many as 60 hours a week, 48 weeks per year, often seven days a week to develop the program" (p. 42). In a recent publication describing the role of system-wide coordinators, time management was included in a list of specific training needs (System-Wide Coordinators, 1979).

Minzey and LeTarte (1979), in their well-known text on community education, listed several traits which should be sought in the...
selection of a director:

Good directors should be highly motivated persons who have a reputation for achieving established goals. They should be task-oriented so that achievement of goals takes precedence over time. They should work well with people and be able to establish good rapport in a short period of time. They should be good administrators, able to organize, execute, delegate, and plan. (p. 120)

This passage contains several references to someone who is able to manage time well.

Porter (1979) noted that time is the most important resource which can possibly be controlled by a community education director. He recommended that directors analyze how they allocate time to various types of tasks, assign priorities to tasks according to importance, learn to delegate responsibilities, organize the environment and desk space to facilitate working on high priority tasks, use the telephone selectively, and learn how to say no. Schmitt and Weaver (1979) listed meeting time deadlines as one of nine behaviors by which a community educator is judged to be an authentic professional person.

In spite of this concern for effective use of time by community education directors, however, there is little empirical documentation of how they allocate their time. Totten and Manley (1969) reported that they had had three directors keep time logs for seven days, but they did not report detailed results or analysis. Paddock (1980) compared estimates of how Texas community education coordinators allocated time to programming (36%), advisory council and personnel development (16%), supervision (10%), needs/resource assessment (10%),
funding (6%), interagency cooperation (6%), and personal professional development (6%) with perceived strengths and weaknesses in training in Texas and importance ratings of competencies in the Southwest. It seems reasonable to conduct such studies, given the concern for dealing effectively with the multi-faceted task of directing community education activities. Before studies can be conducted, however, appropriate instrumentation must be developed. The next section reviews some common approaches to analyzing time allocation practices, and points out some difficulties with them.

Two Perspectives on Analyzing Time Allocation Practices

There appear to be two perspectives among time management consultants regarding keeping detailed records of how time is allocated, which will be called an organization perspective and an individual perspective. Although a particular consultant's approach may have some characteristics of both perspectives, the different emphasis in each is useful in projecting the consequences of using that approach. Following the description of each perspective, comparisons and contrasts are summarized.

Organization Perspective

One perspective represented by consultants such as Drucker (1966b) or Mackenzie (1972), is that time should be audited regularly for the purpose of determining how time is being misallocated from the organization's point of view, so that corrective action can be taken to accomplish the organization's goals more effectively.
Someone consulting from this organization perspective is likely to advocate a systematic, precise, detailed, objective analysis of time allocation in terms of organization goals and objectives. Time wasters tend to be regarded as observable activities or events that are trivial from the organization's perspective; i.e., activities or events which do not directly contribute to organizational productivity.

Many time management consultants and writers (Anderson & Dobyns, 1973; Cooper, 1971; Coulter & Hayo, 1978; Danielson, 1963; Dayton, 1974; Drucker, 1966b; Gibbons, 1972; Heyel, 1960; Hibbard & Landrum, 1978; Jones, 1968; Mackenzie, 1972, 1975; McCullough, 1977; McGill, 1975; Morano, 1978; Scharf, 1975; Trickett, 1962; Wallack, 1977) recommend keeping a detailed record of how time is allocated as one of the initial steps in the process of improving time allocation practices. Carlson's (1951) case studies of the daily behavior of executives in nine Swedish industries and one large department store in France may be regarded as the forerunner of time management study. Time logs were kept for about four weeks in each case, with specific information obtained on the place, contact, communication technique, type of question asked, type of action taken and time used. After analyzing his data Carlson concluded that although there are types of periods especially difficult to assess (e.g., working lunches, travel time, work done at home), and it can be tedious to keep detailed records of all activities, documenting the obvious is important because showing the degree to which something occurs under certain conditions provides an objective basis for devising corrective action.
Drucker (1967) maintains, on the basis of his consulting experience, that executives have impressions of how they allocate time that don't match the results of empirical documentation. Until such impressions can be corrected by providing empirical evidence of how time is actually allocated, there is little chance for improvement. Cooper (1971) presented a variety of formats and described a variety of approaches to auditing time. An electronic signal device and data processing unit have been developed to help executives conduct a random work-sample self-study (Are Executives Efficient?, 1973). A study using such an approach has been reported by Hinrichs (1976), but Jackson and Hayen (1974) stated that the relatively large amount of preparation time required to create coding categories for the data processing unit and the inconvenience of being interrupted at random intervals make it not feasible for many high-level managers to use this approach.

Consultants have observed that, in addition to providing a basis for devising rational steps to improve time allocation, keeping a time log can be motivating. Engstrom and Mackenzie (1967), for example, suggested that motivation for managing one's own efforts more carefully only comes from a revelation that time is being wasted.

A third reason for keeping detailed records of how time is allocated is that there are no general norms for allocating executive time (Carlson, 1951). The effective executive diagnoses his situation in terms of what needs to be done to achieve the organization's goals, given the constraints and opportunities in the situation. Keeping detailed time logs is a rational way of obtaining information to
defend decisions regarding one's approach to his or her ambiguous task.

**Individual Perspective**

But how practical is it to audit in detail how one allocates his or her time? Bird and Yutzy (1965) noted that individuals who are required to keep time logs as a form of accountability may be tempted to fudge them in order to maintain a certain image for their performance. They recommended that a manager be relaxed about the mechanics of keeping track of every minute. Preston and Zimmerer (1976) and Turney and Cohen (1976) made similar recommendations.

Feldman (1968) and Gibbons (1972) also emphasized that self-determination and realistic long-term expectations regarding changes in one's behavior are fundamental ingredients to improving time allocation practices. Jackson and Steinmetz (1972), Jackson and Hayen (1974) and Roseman (1975) emphasized the point that awareness of the value of time is the key to time management, not adherence to a set of principles that have helped someone else. Bliss (1976), Radius (1976) and Zemke (1977) also presented simple exercises for increasing awareness of attitudes toward time allocation, as did the compilers of *Time Management for Community School Coordinators* (1974).

This individual perspective, represented by consultants such as Lakein (1973), McCay (1959) or Webber (1972), is that time should be audited for the purpose of clarifying one's life purposes and organizing one's activities better to fulfill them. Someone consulting from this perspective is likely to advocate a more introspective
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analysis of time allocation, cautioning against becoming so systematic, precise or detailed that one becomes psychologically hindered in functioning in a self-actualizing manner. Emphasis is placed on maintaining a balance between organizational productivity and accomplishment of more personal goals. Lakein, for example, cautions one to beware of the overorganizer, the overdoer, and the time nut.

Warhay (1978) emphasized developing patterns of interpersonal relations that help all concerned be more effective in their jobs. Lagana (1975) proposed that time management is actually a process of self-management that can be described within a systems theory format, where the primary output is personal and professional growth. Sexton and Switzer (1978) recommended that educational leaders harmonize professional and personal goals that are non-reversible, self-directed, self-imposed with far-reaching effects.

From this perspective time wasters, or time robbers (Gellerman's term in Heyel, 1960), tend to be regarded as psychological states or conditions that reduce one's level of functioning. Webber, for example, discussed four such conditions: inability to set limits which make it possible to cope with the variety, quantity or complexity of demands; tendency to pour effort into assigned tasks, whether or not it is necessary, at the expense of not developing more creative challenges; tendency to restrict access to information to obtain a sense of control over others; and a fear of ambiguity. If any of these conditions prevail, trivia (time wasters in the organization perspective) may be actually welcomed as a sort of protection against being overwhelmed or losing perceived status.
Dolan (1959) recommended that anyone interested in analyzing his or her time allocation practices examine personal attitudes toward becoming more effective, and what it will cost in terms of effort and personal stress that accompanies changes in personal behavior and ways of relating to other people. If one decides to proceed, Dolan recommended beginning slowly by thinking through one's objectives and keeping simple records. More detailed records can be kept as the value of doing so becomes apparent.

Bird and Yutzy (1965) also recommended that the format for keeping time logs, when keeping them is deemed desirable, be adapted to the nature of the individual's primary functions. This is especially helpful when an individual is expected to maintain flexible schedules to be effective.

Comparisons and Contrasts

Both perspectives recommend auditing allocation of time. In the organization perspective emphasis is placed on systematic, precise, detailed, objective analysis in terms of the organization's goals and objectives. In the individual perspective emphasis is placed on identifying personally satisfying and dissatisfying activities.

Both perspectives deal with time wasters. In the organization perspective time allocated to any activity which does not demonstrably contribute to the organization's productivity is time wasted. In the individual perspective time allocated to an activity which reduces self-actualizing behavior is time wasted.
In both perspectives the purpose of auditing time allocation is to stimulate more effective allocation. While in the organization perspective there may be a tendency to focus on obtaining a detailed picture of executive behavior in relation to norms, in the individual perspective there is more of a tendency to focus on giving an individual some information about his behavior to be used for clarifying one's self-perceptions.

The difference between the two perspectives is further illustrated by rationales given for delegating tasks or responsibilities to subordinates. Oncken and Wass (1974), in their humorous article about employees transferring monkeys from back to back, recommended that subordinates be trained to initiate and follow through activities so that the executive can have more discretionary time. This rationale is consistent with the organization perspective, for the emphasis is on accomplishment of the organization's goals more efficiently. Morano (1978) also recommended developing initiative in subordinates, but emphasized the value of doing so in terms of the subordinates' growth and satisfaction. This rationale is consistent with the individual perspective.

A consultant is not likely to operate solely out of either of these two perspectives. One who focuses on the organization perspective is apt to recognize the debilitating effects of being overwhelmed by the job, but will focus more on estimating the actual amount of time not devoted to accomplishing organization objectives than on assessing the psychological state of those working in the organization. On the other hand, one who focuses on the individual perspective is apt to
recognize the interference with goal accomplishment caused by frequent interruptions, but will focus more on analyzing the relationship between the interruptions and basic life purposes rather than the proportion of time allocated to dealing with them.

These considerations stimulated a more detailed analysis of "time waster" in the next section.

Analysis of Potential Time Wasters

"Time management" is an awkward phrase. The general usage of "manage" includes actions such as to conduct, control, train, handle, direct, or guide something or someone by careful or delicate treatment; or to contrive (Webster's New International Dictionary, 1934). One manages something or someone when one oversees the general situations that something or someone is related to, and manipulates conditions to keep that something or someone headed toward a result desired by the manager.

But can one manage time? One can manage people, including oneself, to achieve a desired result within a specified time period. But time passes at the same rate, regardless of manipulations or maneuvers. One can allocate time by assigning people to perform certain activities using certain resources within designated time periods, and then manipulate or maneuver these people and resources to accomplish the desired result within the time period.

Other statements including "time" are also awkward. "There is a limited amount of time available to accomplish our objectives today." What does this statement mean? Since there are twenty-four
hours in every day—never more, never less—the limit applies to the number of objectives that can be accomplished in the day. The number will vary according to the length of the time period required to accomplish each one.

These introductory comments illustrate the difficulty in defining terms associated with time. In the following section an operational definition for an activity which may be a "time waster" is discussed which provides a basis for less ambiguity in measuring time wasting. (In this study "time waster" will always refer to an activity. The term has also been used to refer to individuals who allocate time inefficiently [Feldman, 1968], or who interfere with someone else completing tasks effectively [Clutterbuck, 1977]).

Delay in Goal Accomplishment

Peter Drucker is acknowledged by many as a foremost management consultant. C. Northcote Parkinson, in his forward to Tarrant's (1976) study of Drucker, described him as "perhaps pre-eminent among management consultants and also among authors of books on management" (p. 13). The basic elements of Drucker's approach to time management are summarized in his article written for Harpers (1966b), and in Tarrant's (1976, chap. 5) synopsis from several of his works. The first step is to keep some sort of written record of how time is allocated. The second step is to analyze the record for activities which do not bring one closer to achieving desired goals, or unnecessary repetition of activities. The third step is to reduce the amount of time allocated to such activities by consolidating activities
into relatively large blocks of time, eliminating activities that do not produce desired results, exploiting strengths of others, respecting the value of associates' time, establishing routines to avert recurrent crises, and conducting meetings purposefully. Implicit in this approach is a definition of wasting time as participating in any activity which delays achieving desired goals or objectives.

Rutherford (1978, p. 68) listed five definitions suggested by secretaries for a time waster:

- Doing something without getting a return or payoff for doing it.
- Doing something that could better be done by someone else.
- Doing something that keeps me from a more appropriate and higher payoff activity.
- Anything that takes my time which I could, should and would do something about if I were to manage my time more effectively.
- Anything that uses time inappropriately.

The common theme throughout these definitions is that an activity is a time waster if it yields less payoff than some other activity could yield.

Although there is a tendency to regard an activity as a time waster or not a time waster, careful analysis of how the term is used shows that the context within which an activity is performed determines whether or not it is a time waster. Mackenzie (1972, p. 85) described time wasters as follows: "If something is wasting time, then something more important is not getting done." Implicitly
the time wasting activity could be getting something done that is important, but it is more important that something else be done. Lakein (1973, chap. 13) recommends frequently asking the question, "What is the best use of my time right now?" Implicitly any activity not consistent with the answer to the question is a time waster, even though in another context the same activity could be consistent with the answer to that question.

The Telephone—An Illustration

An activity can be classified as a time waster only in relation to another activity. If there are two activities, activity A is a time waster in relation to activity B if participation in A is less effective for accomplishing desired objectives within the given period than participation in activity B. Consider the following example given by Perry in his study of time management by community education center directors: "The telephone has been identified as a time interrupter (or waster) and you believe it to be very limiting to the daily performance of your job" (1978, p. 157, emphasis in original). What does this statement mean in terms of behavior likely to be observed?

When the telephone rings the director stops doing an activity, e.g., drafting a course brochure, picks up the receiver and talks with the calling party. When the conversation ends, the director replaces the receiver and resumes work on the brochure or begins some other activity.
If both working on the brochure and talking on the telephone were unrelated to accomplishing objectives for that day, then neither is a time waster in relation to the other. Both activities would be classified as nonproductive.

If working on the brochure was unrelated to accomplishing objectives for that day, but the phone conversation was related to accomplishing objectives for that day, then the phone call is an interruption that results in more effective use of time. Working on the brochure would be classified as a time waster in relation to talking on the phone.

If continuing to work on the brochure instead of talking on the telephone would have resulted in more objectives being accomplished at the end of the day, then the phone call was an activity that limited job performance; i.e., the phone call was a time waster for that day.

In Perry's study, impact on job performance was operationalized by using a five point scale ranging from 1 = not at all limiting, to 5 = extremely limiting. Presumably impact refers to whether or not the interruption delayed completing daily goals or objectives, but this was not clearly specified.

The five point scale does not provide an objective frame of reference for distinguishing degrees of limitation on job performance. Does "very limiting" mean more than 50% of all phone calls result in fewer objectives being accomplished; does it mean it strongly irritates the director when it happens; or does it mean there is a relatively long recovery period between completion of the call and
resumption of an activity that is directly related to accomplishing objectives? To provide an objective frame of reference, respondents could be asked to estimate the percent of time an interruption results in fewer objectives being accomplished, or additional desirable objectives not being attempted; or some other behavioral criteria could be provided for scale values.

**Operational Definition**

In this study the following definition of "time waster" will be used: A time waster is an activity which, in relation to another activity, is less effective in accomplishing desired goals, objectives or tasks within a specified time period.

A description of a time waster includes a list of desired goals or objectives, a specified time period, descriptions of two activities, and an estimate of effectiveness for each activity in accomplishing the listed goals or objectives. Detailed analysis of time wasters requires that desirable goals or objectives be assigned priorities.

Mackenzie (1975) listed 153 time wasters under seven functions of management (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling, communicating and decision making). Items in his list include people (e.g., poor secretary, drop-in visitors, inexperienced staff), personal characteristics (e.g., impatience, lethargy, poor physical condition, fear of mistakes), a host of "lacks" (e.g., lack purpose or mission, lack job description, lack orientation, lack delegation, lack of progress reports, lack of communication), poor work habits (e.g., putting second things first, cluttered desk, absenteeism,
long lunches, socializing, procrastination), poor judgment (e.g., unrealistic deadlines, duplication of effort, promoting above competence level, excessive delegation, overlooking poor performance, excessive communication, snap decisions), things (inadequate equipment, confused instructions, visual distractions, scheduled meetings), and other types of items, as well as activities (e.g., daydreaming, travel, waiting for others, reading, routine detail, doing it myself, fighting lost causes, postponing the unpleasant). Since other shorter lists of time wasters (Cooper, 1971; Douglass, 1977; Fitzwater, 1977; Hill, 1976; Job Analysis, 1957; McArthur, 1976; McCullough, 1977; Moore, 1968; Newman, 1977; People at Work, 1968; Rowan, 1978; Scharf, 1975; Sexton & Switzer, 1978; Toomey, 1977; Wallack, 1977) overlap Mackenzie's list, his list will be the basis for developing an inventory of time wasters consistent with the operational definition given above.

Mackenzie (1975, 1972) has had different groups of administrators rank different lists of time wasters. He had 75 school administrators rank ten time wasters, and 30 college presidents rank fifteen time wasters. Perry (1978) surveyed directors of university community education centers to estimate the relative importance of thirty-seven time wasters listed by Mackenzie (1972). Examination of both sets of data showed that wasting time is associated with activities which interrupt ongoing activities.

Mackenzie (1972, p. 85) specifically noted the importance of interruptions as time wasters: "While not all interruptions are
necessarily time wasters, by definition it would seem that time
wasters must often be interruptions." Perry (1978, p. 7) based his
definition of time wasters as "interruptions to the normal schedule
of operations" on this discussion by Mackenzie. It is presumed that
"normal operations" refers to operations related to accomplishing
desired goals and objectives.

Perry's instructions to respondents included the following
paragraph:

Authorities in the field of time management
recognize the limited amount of time available
to the Community Educator to complete the daily
goals and objectives of the profession. I would
like to determine the amount of impact certain
interruptions have on your job performance and
whether these interruptions can be traced to
your activities or the activities of others with
whom you may come in contact. (p. 157)

The limited amount of time available to the Community Educator
is the same limited amount available to anyone else: 24 hours per
day. However, the number of goals or objectives to be accomplished
in that amount of time is generally expected to be relatively large.
Interruptions in a tight schedule could result in a number of objec­
tives not being accomplished.

Webber (1972, chap. 8) cautioned against classifying every
interruption as a time waster regardless of the context within which
it occurs. For example, telephone conversations are often listed
as a major time waster (Mackenzie, 1972, 1975; Moore, 1968; Rowan,
1978), but telephone conversations may be essential for achieving
objectives. The fact that incoming calls cannot be precisely
scheduled may be an irritant, but such calls related to achieving objectives cannot be reasonably classified as time wasters. This point is consistent with the definition of a time waster as an activity in relation to another activity.

Boles and Davenport (1975) included pressure from time as an item in a list of constraints within which every educational leader must operate. They cited time wasters from Mackenzie's (1972) work which "many educational leaders doubtless are guilty of allowing" (p. 405). Because time wasters that are interruptions have received relatively much attention in the literature, items for the Time Allocation Inventory (TAI) are limited to interruptive activities.

Types of Time Wasters

Potential time wasters can be classified on two dimensions according to their frequency of occurrence and degree of interference with accomplishing goals or objectives. As will be shown in Chapter III, such a classification can be the basis for scoring TAI responses.

An activity can occur with low frequency and have little interference with accomplishing goals, or it can occur with high frequency and have high interference with accomplishing goals. The combinations of low frequency with high interference and high frequency with low interference are also possible, as shown in Table 1. Logical analysis of the four types of activity, which will be called minor interruptions, chronic time wasters, crises, and nuisances, suggests that each can be treated differently to allocate time more effectively.
Decisions regarding alterations of activities to reduce the effects of time wasters should be made by considering the effects of the alterations on time allocation for others in the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Types of Time Wasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with Goal Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interruption which occurs rarely and interferes little with goal accomplishment is a minor interruption, regardless of how the same interruption may be classified by others in a different situation. There is no point in allocating time to reducing or eliminating such interruptions.

An interruption which occurs frequently but interferes little with achieving objectives is a nuisance. If such an interruption interferes with someone else's goal accomplishment, then something should be done about it. Relieving the nuisance just for oneself, though, may result in considerable increase of time wasted by another person.

An interruption which occurs rarely but seriously interferes with goal accomplishment is a crisis. To minimize the disruptive consequences of crises, general procedures should be developed for handling crises, even though the details of the crisis may not be specifiable.
An interruption which occurs frequently and seriously impedes goal accomplishment is a **chronic time waster**. Corrective steps should be taken to eliminate or reduce such interruptions.

The Importance of Considering Priorities

"Basic to all time management is setting priorities" (Dayton, 1974, p. 127). One of Drucker's (1966a) five habits of effectivity is concentration on the few major areas where superior performance will produce outstanding results. Sticking to priorities, deciding what **not** to do in order to be able to allocate time to tasks related to high priority areas, is a major component in his model for effective managing. This component has been discussed from a variety of viewpoints by other consultants.

An **ABC Priority System** is the key component in Lakein's (1973) model for time management. Tasks are classified as high (A), medium (B), or low (C) in value, and time is to be allocated to A-items. "No list is complete until it shows priorities. Whenever you make a list, finish the list by setting priorities" (p. 28). A multitude of suggestions are given by Lakein for keeping effort focused on A-items. This approach is echoed in brief articles on time management by others (e.g., McArthur, 1976; McGill, 1975; Preston & Zimmerer, 1976; Reuter, 1977; Silverstein, 1973; Zemke, 1977).

Mackenzie (1972) recounted the well-known story of Charles Schwab, a former president of Bethlehem Steel, who paid Ivy Lee, a consultant, $25,000 for his suggestion to develop the habit in himself and his employees of working on priority tasks until they were...
completed. Mackenzie's focus on time-waster activities is designed to help the manager concentrate time on priority areas.

Albrecht (1977) proposed that the lack of objectives and priorities is a major cause of supervisors losing control over time by continually being in a crisis situation. Danielson (1963) urged personnel managers to concentrate on current organizational goals, and to combat misallocation of time to activities not directly related to those goals even though they are interesting, or demonstrate personal competence, or have short-term pay-off but don't contribute to achieving long-term goals, or that are fun to do. Bliss (1976) noted that bottlenecks in an organization, which can cause ineffective time allocation for a number of employees, are due to mistaken priorities or the absence of priorities.

Rutherford (1978) made a distinction between payoff and priority. "Payoff" refers to the relative contribution made by an activity toward accomplishing valued goals. "Priority" refers to the relative amount of effort expended for an activity, or the time period between becoming aware of an activity and completing it. A high payoff is an activity that makes a relatively great contribution toward accomplishing valued goals, regardless of how much effort is required. A high priority is an activity which receives immediate attention or much effort, regardless of the relative contribution toward accomplishing valued goals.

Choate (1960) noted that even if office managers cannot heed advice to eliminate, combine, reassign or simplify tasks, preparation of a detailed schedule for the day based on priorities assigned to
anticipated tasks increased accomplishment to a remarkable degree. Hibbard and Landrum (1978) suggested that daily objectives be ranked by priority, and that accomplishments related to long-term objectives be summarized weekly.

The meaning of a priority rating is not always obvious. Hogue (1970) described four different ways of allocating manhours to accomplish priority tasks, and suggested that managers clarify the meaning of "priority" in each situation. If several tasks have equal utility and are all high priority, Love (1978) recommended that each be worked on only until it could be assigned a lower priority, and then the time remaining could be allocated equally among them until they were completed.

Anderson and Dobyns (1973), Cooper (1971), Douglass (1977), Feldman (1968), Heyel (1960), Howe (1977) and Sexton and Switzer (1978) also discussed many tips for determining priorities and continually reminding oneself of them.

Priorities in Community Education

Because community educators value components of community education differently, they may assign different priority ratings to the same task. Some evidence for these differences is found by analyzing definitions of "community education." Armstrong (1977) presented a variety of definitions currently used in Britain, ranging from development of programs in leisure and recreation, through encouragement of broader use of all community facilities, to education of community residents in means of community development and
problem solving. A similar variety of definitions can be found in the American literature.

Minzey and LeTarte (1979, chap. 2) and Olsen and Clark (1977, chap. 4) have analyzed some common misconceptions of community education. The combined list of misconceptions is an overview of the variety of notions that have been, and in many cases still are, associated with "community education:"

The after-school and evening program offerings of school systems and/or community colleges;

Adult education;

A means to deliver various forms of compensatory education designed to meet specific needs of youth and adults;

The neighborhood school;

Community schools;

Academic learning;

A new concept, very recently developed and enunciated;

Social case work;

Community control.

Minzey (1974) observed that:

As the idea of Community Education continues to grow and expand to more and more school districts across the country, the arguments about its nebulous nature and the lack of a precise definition continue to be heard. Both supporters and opponents of Community Education point out that there is great disagreement regarding the defining and meaning of Community Education. (p. 7)
Although there appears to be consensus on the basic ingredients of community education listed by Minzey, the arguments continue at each succeeding convention of the National Community Education Association. Decker (1975) noted that although there appears to be a common evolutionary sequence of components (expanded use of school facilities, enrichment programs for all ages, interagency cooperation, citizen involvement, community development, and impact on the K-12 curriculum), there is still disagreement among community educators about the relative importance of these and other components.

Some direct evidence on differences in priority ratings is also available. Cook (1976) asked seven community education directors in one school district to rank six components of community education according to priority as part of a master's thesis. The results, shown in Table 2, indicate that disagreement existed among directors.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Priority Ratings Assigned to Community Education Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded use of school facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's supplemental programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community in the K-12 curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These data are from Cook, 1976.
even within the same district. Four or more of the seven directors assigned the same rating to only two components (community involvement and community services). The other four components received at least four different ratings.

This suggests that community education directors may assign different priority ratings to the same task. Since analysis of time wasters involves consideration of priorities, it is important to determine whether or not completion of an exercise which helps directors clarify current priority ratings affects ratings of activities as time wasters. The exercise to be used in this study is described in Chapter III.

The Importance of Perceptions of Time Competence

Berridge (1973) described the role of the full-time community education director as seeming "almost overwhelming and appearing to be too large for any one person . . . . He [the community education director] is just possibly the busiest person in the community" (pp. 65-66). Berridge goes on to emphasize that this very busy person, however, should use his time to initiate and encourage involvement of others in the process of community education, without being overly concerned for the time it takes to do it. "Perhaps the effective coordinator [director] is well aware of time-motion studies. However, to involve many people he turns all time-motion studies upside-down. The person who likes to 'get things done now' or who does not have the patience to 'let a committee do it' does not operate effectively as a coordinator [director]" (p. 66).
This perspective raises questions about the applicability of time wasting as usually defined by management consultants for managing community education processes and programs. Since concern for developing the processes of citizen involvement and coordination of services is a major aspect of community education, if directors believe that competent management in these process areas is not subject to time-waster analysis, it is not likely that they will perceive their own time allocation practices as having room for improvement. This suggests that it is important to determine how directors perceive that capable directors would respond to potential time waster activities.

A Rationale for Refined Measurement

Since community educators are expected to produce much by working with a wide variety of individuals and groups using limited resources, sound practices in allocating time seem to be an essential element of successfully managing a community education program. However, there is little empirical documentation of time allocation practices by community education directors. Furthermore, review of the time management literature discloses several ambiguities that can become obstacles to developing director guidelines for allocating time soundly.

The first ambiguity is that time allocation can be analyzed from two perspectives. From an organization perspective, a detailed audit of time allocation is necessary to obtain information for rationally determining corrective action to increase allocation of...
time to organizational goals, motivate individuals to change by objectively challenging self-talk about one's work habits, or to defend one's actions in ambiguous situations. From an individual perspective an audit is helpful in clarifying one's life purposes and organizing one's activities to fulfill them. The perspective which prevails at a given point in time will influence the type of time allocation audit and the consequent action.

The Time Allocation Inventory (TAI) in this study is designed primarily from the organization perspective, in that activities commonly regarded as time wasters are rated according to how much they interfere with accomplishing work objectives. Consideration of the individual perspective, however, led to the formulation of the two propositions to be investigated in this study; viz., that consideration of personal work priorities influences ratings of potential time wasters, and that perceptions of ideal time allocation practices influences ratings of activities as time wasters.

A second ambiguity is that activities commonly regarded as time wasters may be rated differently in different contexts. Measurement procedures which do not take this into account may yield results difficult to interpret. In this study four types of interruptions which may be time wasters will be identified in terms of how frequently they occur and how much they interfere with accomplishing goals or objectives.

A third ambiguity is that although time management consultants generally emphasize the need for determining priorities before analyzing allocation practices, procedures for identifying and ranking
time wasters have not accounted for priorities. In this study a priorities exercise will be used to determine whether ratings for potential time wasters are influenced by priorities.

The fourth and final ambiguity is that sound time management may or may not be socially acceptable among community education directors. A special set of instructions for the TAI will be used to determine whether there appears to be room for improving allocation practices.

In the next chapter the nature of the TAI is described in detail and the research procedures followed in this study are discussed.
CHAPTER III

THE INSTRUMENTS AND THE RESEARCH PLAN

The three purposes of this study were to develop a Time Allocation Inventory (TAI) that assists community education directors in identifying potentially chronic time wasters, to determine the effects that different conditions for administering the TAI have on responses, and to compare two scoring procedures for the TAI. Two propositions concerning conditions of administration affecting ratings assigned to activities often classified as time wasters were investigated.

The first proposition is that directors who are made aware of general work-related priorities will rate potential time wasters differently than directors who are not made aware of their priorities. On the one hand, directors with priorities in mind may indicate that they have more difficulty allocating time in accord with priorities. On the other hand, if directors with priorities in mind see little relationship between potential time wasters and achieving their priorities, then they may indicate that they have less difficulty allocating time well.

The second proposition is that directors as a group will indicate that a hypothetical, well-trained, experienced, competent director is hindered by potential time wasters less than directors indicate that they are hindered themselves. The rationale for this
The proposition is that sound time allocation is viewed as a characteristic of competent administrators.

The study was conducted in two phases. In Phase I the various instruments were drafted and pilot tested until specified criteria were met. In Phase II the instruments were administered to four groups of community education directors to obtain data for testing the two propositions.

In this chapter the dependent variable is defined and the TAI is described in detail. The independent variables are described, and the research hypotheses are stated. Factors related to interpreting self-report inventory responses are discussed, and the instruments are described for obtaining information to aid interpretation of TAI responses. The chapter concludes with a description of the procedures used in Phase I and Phase II.

Measures of the Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is estimated effectiveness of allocating time. One objective of this study is to develop an inventory of potential time wasters, called the TAI, that yields less ambiguous information than inventories that have been described in the time management literature. Scores from the TAI are measures of different aspects of the dependent variable.

Given an operational definition of time waster, guidelines for developing the TAI include a set of rules for determining what content is eligible, a description of the form in which the items appear, a representative sample of items, a facsimile of the directions to the
respondent, and a set of rules for assessing adequacy of responses to each item (Baker, 1974). These guidelines are developed for the TAI in the following sections.

Content Eligibility Matrix

An item content matrix for the TAI is defined by two dimensions. The first dimension is the type of interpersonal activity which interrupts ongoing activity. There are three basic types of activity discussed in the time management literature: meetings of three or more persons, two-party interactions (including telephone conversations) and individual or solitary activities.

The second dimension of the matrix is the undesirable condition in the interruption which is associated with less goal-related accomplishment. Twelve conditions have been sifted from the time management literature reviewed in Chapter II. The three types of interpersonal activity combined with the twelve interruption conditions yields the matrix of 36 cells in Table 3. The TAI contains one item from each cell of the matrix, except for the cell, Delayed Interaction/Solitary Work. This particular cell is a meaningless condition, since solitary work involves no interaction with others. The complete TAI is shown in Appendix B, while the items corresponding to each cell of the item content matrix are shown in Table 3.

To check the validity of the TAI item content matrix, three lists of time wasters were classified using the item content matrix. Sexton and Switzer (1978) discussed twelve of the most commonly recognized time wasters for educators in terms of achieving self-imposed,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Condition</th>
<th>Group Meetings</th>
<th>Two-Party Interactions</th>
<th>Solitary Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Inadequate preparation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Inadequate information</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Competing tasks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Nonproductive activity</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Unclear priorities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Delayed interaction</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(omit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Delayed decision</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Inadequate concentration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Unrealistic deadlines</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Information overload</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unanticipated events</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Uncoordinated responsibility</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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self-directed professional goals intended to have far-reaching effects, in contrast to maintaining the status quo of the present organization (see Table 4). Fitzwater (1977, chap. 11) listed 20 time wasters that he discusses in workshops with school superintendents and other executives (see Table 5). Perry (1978) used 37 time wasters in a survey of community education university center directors (see Table 6).

Because items in these lists are described briefly by their authors, some items could be classified into more than one cell of the item content matrix. Each item was placed into one and only one cell, with parenthetical comments added to show how the item was interpreted. In spite of the ambiguity present for some items, the exercise provides some evidence for the content validity of the matrix.

As shown in Table 7, all interruption conditions are represented in at least two of the lists except for Delayed Interaction. All three types of interpersonal interaction are represented. In all three lists the fewest items refer to group meetings, yet, because of the relatively high proportion of time spent in meetings by educational leaders, this is one of the areas having greatest potential for improving time allocation practices (Fitzwater, 1977; Pitner, 1979).

The order of the items in the TAI was determined as follows. The first twelve items contain an item from each of the interruption conditions in randomized order. Items 13–23 contain an item from each of eleven interruption conditions in a different randomized order;
Table 4

Twelve Commonly Recognized Time Wasters

1. Telephone interruptions for Maintenance Functions.
2. Telephone conversations that last longer than five minutes.
3. Visitors who drop in to deal with Maintenance functions.
4. Ineffective delegation.
5. Trying to do too many things.
6. Procrastination.
7. Meetings and assignments which for you are Maintenance Functions but are regarded by your superordinate as high priority tasks.
8. Meetings with people present that do not need to be there to deal with the agenda.
10. Meeting to take roll.
11. Encouraging give and take discussions with people having ideas relevant to Maintenance Functions, and not engaging in discussion with people who have ideas relevant to Professional Goal Functions.
12. Becoming more efficient doing what you should not be doing if you are to achieve your professional goals (self-directed, long-range, self-imposed).

Note: These items are from Sexton and Switzer, 1978.
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Wasters for Educational Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Employees socializing in boss's office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Too many visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Indecisiveness on part of managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Too many meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Poor meetings in terms of productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Lack of employee initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Little planning done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Unclear personal and organization priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Lack of commitment by employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Executives spread too thin. (Inadequate concentration given to important tasks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hasty action by executives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lack of deliberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inadequate delegation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Unavoidable waiting periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Reading backlog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Telephone. (Interrupts concentration on other tasks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lack of appreciation of time as a resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unclear lifetime goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These items are from Fitzwater, 1977, chap. 11.
Table 6

**Time Wasters for Community Education Center Directors**

| 01. Attempting to do too much at once. | 20. Leaving tasks unfinished. |
| 02. Having too many bosses.           | 21. Personal disorganization. |
| 03. Socializing.                     | 22. Untrained staff.         |
| 04. A staff with problems.           | 23. Delegating authority.    |
| 05. Trying to cope with change.      | 24. Over control.            |
| 06. Inability to say no.             | 25. Meetings.                |
| 08. Confused responsibility.         | 27. Routine details.         |
| 10. Lack of teamwork.                | 29. No objectives or daily plan. |
| 12. Failure to listen.               | 31. The telephone. (Interrupts concentration). |
| 15. Overstaffed.                     | 34. Not managing conflict.   |
| 16. Lack of motivation.              | 35. Committees.              |
| 17. Mistakes.                        | 36. Wanting all the facts.   |
| 19. Under communication              |                                |

**Note:** These items are from Perry, 1978.
Table 7

Classification of Time Waster Lists According to the TAI Item Content Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter. Cond.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Two-Party</th>
<th>Solitary</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>P22</td>
<td>F07</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>P18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>P28</td>
<td>P11</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>F04</td>
<td>F18</td>
<td>P14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>P16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>F25</td>
<td>F17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>F09</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>S03</td>
<td>F19</td>
<td>F20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>P08</td>
<td>F06</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P11</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>S02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F02</td>
<td>P05</td>
<td>P13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>P10</td>
<td>P13</td>
<td>P08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S08</td>
<td>P02</td>
<td>P21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>P30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F = Fitzwater item, P = Perry item, S = Sexton & Switzer item.
the Delayed Interaction condition is omitted to account for the empty cell in the item content matrix. Likewise, items 24-35 represent the twelve interruption conditions in a third randomized order. Assignment of the three interaction categories to an interruption condition was randomized. This procedure yielded a balanced distribution of interruption conditions and interaction categories throughout the Inventory without a discernable pattern to the content of the items.

**Item Format**

Each item is rated twice by each respondent. It is rated according to how frequently it is perceived that an interruption occurs and how much it is perceived that the interruption interferes with accomplishing goals or objectives.

**Frequency ratings.** Each item describes an activity that interrupts a goal-related activity. Respondents are asked to respond to each item stem with a five point scale that indicates the frequency with which the interruption usually occurs:

Usually an interruption like this occurs about

1 = once a week or less.
2 = more than once a week but less than once a day.
3 = once a day
4 = more than once a day but less than once an hour.
5 = once an hour or more.

**Goal interference.** Respondents are also asked to respond to each item stem with another five point scale that indicates the degree
to which the interruption usually inhibits accomplishment of objec-
tives in a typical work day:

When such an interruption occurs, the usual effect on
accomplishing my goals or objectives for that day is

1 = negligible.

2 = slight—a nonessential activity is eliminated
   from my schedule.

3 = moderate—an essential activity is rescheduled
   for the following day.

4 = serious—I have to work overtime.

5 = critical—an essential activity is eliminated,
   with undesirable consequences.

Instructions

Recall from Chapter II that a description of a time waster has
several components, including a list of desired goals or objectives,
a specified time period, descriptions of two activities, and a way of
comparing the effectiveness of the two activities for accomplishing
the goals or objectives in the specified time period. Prior to
rating the TAI items, respondents are asked to list major accomplish-
ments and unachieved objectives for the most recent three complete
work days. This activity is intended to provide some reference point
for responding to the time waster items. The TAI is given in Appendix
B for the self-instructions group, and in Appendix C for the ideal-
instructions group. The difference between these groups is discussed
fully below.
The TAI yields six scores. Two scores, IF and GI, are sums of ratings over 35 times on each of the scales. Four other scores, called diagnostic scores, represent the frequencies of certain combinations of interruption ratings and interference ratings. Each score is described in this section.

**Interruption frequency (IF).** Respondents rate the frequency of occurrence for each interruption described in the TAI. The sum of these ratings is called the Interruption Frequency, or IF, score. The larger the score, the more the respondent is indicating that he or she is interrupted during the work day; i.e., the more time is not being allocated effectively.

**Goal interference (GI).** Respondents rate the degree to which interruptions interfere with accomplishing goals or objectives. The sum of these ratings is called the Goal Interference, or GI, score. The larger the score, the more the respondent is indicating that the interruptions described in the TAI interfere with goal accomplishment; i.e., the more his or her time is not being allocated effectively.

Both the IF score and the GI score are summated ratings. In addition to these two summated scores, the classification of time wasters described in Chapter II provides a basis for four diagnostic scores.

Each item of the TAI receives a goal interference rating from 1 to 5, where 5 indicates a strong interference with accomplishing
goals, and a frequency rating from 1 to 5, where 5 indicates a constant interruption. The two ratings for each item can be used to sort each item into one of four types of time wasters.

Minor interruption (M). If the interference rating is 2 or less, and the interruption rating is 2 or less, the activity in the item is called a minor interruption for the respondent. The number of items in this category is the respondent's Minor, or M, score. If the TAI has 35 items, an individual can have 0-35 Minor items.

Nuisance interruption (N). If the interference rating is 2 or less, and the interruption rating is more than 2, the activity in the item is called a nuisance interruption. The number of items in this category is the Nuisance, or N, score.

Crisis interruption (C). If the interference rating is more than 2, and the interruption rating is 2 or less, the activity in the item is called a crisis interruption. The number of items in this category is the Crisis, or C, score.

Chronic time waster (K). If the interference rating is more than 2, and the interruption rating is more than 2, the activity is called a chronic time waster. The number of items in this category is the Chronic, or K, score.

The four diagnostic scores will sum to 35 for each individual.

Value of diagnostic scores. The TAI will be more useful as a consulting tool if it is sensitive enough to discriminate among individuals on the diagnostic scores. To illustrate, several hypothetical sets of scores are shown in Table 8 for a TAI with 35 items.
Individual A has large numbers of chronic time wasters and crisis items—there is a definite problem with time allocation. Individual D has mostly minor interruption items and a few nuisance items—there is no serious problem with time allocation. Individuals B and C have the same numbers of combined minor and nuisance items, with B having far more nuisance items. Individual C, however, has almost twice as many chronic items as B, which suggests C has a more serious problem with time allocation. These examples illustrate the value of analyzing the diagnostic scores.

The two summated scores are likely to be more statistically reliable, but data in Table 8 also illustrate potential problems with using the sum of the goal interference ratings or the sum of the interruption frequency ratings. Assume that the mean rating is assigned to each item in each particular type of scale. For a minor item, the interference ratings can be either 1 or 2, so the mean interference rating is 1.5. Likewise, since the interruption ratings for a minor item are 1 or 2, the mean interruption rating is 1.5. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Diagnostic Scores</th>
<th>Summated Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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mean ratings for each type of item are:

- minor item: interference = 1.5; interruption = 1.5;
- nuisance item: interference = 1.5; interruption = 4.0;
- crisis item: interference = 4.0; interruption = 1.5;
- chronic item: interference = 4.0; interruption = 4.0.

Using these mean values, a hypothetical total GI score for individual A in Table 8 is the sum of the mean interference values for each item:

- 0 minor items = 0 x 1.5 = 0;
- 5 nuisance items = 5 x 1.5 = 7.5;
- 11 crisis items = 11 x 4.0 = 44.0;
- 19 chronic items = 19 x 4.0 = 76.0.

Thus, the total GI score for A is 0 + 7.5 + 44.0 + 76.0 = 127.5.

In a similar manner the hypothetical total IF score for individual A is 112.5. Hypothetical GI and IF scores were computed for the other individuals in the same manner.

In Table 8 individual A has a slightly lower IF score than individual B, but A has more than three times as many chronic, or K, items as B. This leads to contradictory conclusions. Individuals B and C have the same GI scores, with C having a lower IF score. This suggests B has a greater time allocation problem, but C has almost twice as many K items as B.

These examples illustrate the potential value of the diagnostic scores.
Independent Variables

This study investigated the effects of two variables on responses to the TAI.

Awareness of Priorities

The first variable, awareness of priorities, is defined as personal awareness of importance assigned to typical tasks for the community school director. It was proposed that directors who are aware of work-related priorities will rate potential time wasters differently than directors who are not aware of their priorities. If evidence is obtained in support of this proposition, then it can be concluded that merely brainstorming time wasters or responding to lists of time wasters is not a valid method of studying time allocation practices. On the other hand, if the evidence does not support the proposition, then more confidence can be placed in the simpler procedures.

Although expressing goals and objectives with clarity and precision is a time consuming task, for purposes of this study it was assumed that a brief exercise which provides a rough set of priority ratings will provide an appropriate perspective for rating time wasters. Warden (1978) has published an exercise which was adapted for this study (see Appendix D). Directors are asked to classify twenty-four common tasks as high, medium or low priority in their situation. To minimize rating many tasks at a particular priority level, directors are instructed to assign each rating eight times.
To assist directors in using the exercise to clarify priorities for their particular situation, they are asked to list any high additional priority tasks not included in the exercise.

It was hypothesized that the six mean TAI scores for a group of directors that have completed the priorities exercise will differ from the six mean scores of directors that have not completed the priorities exercise. The direction of the differences was not specified.

**Perceptions of the Ideal Director**

The second variable, perceptions of the ideal director, is defined as the responses to the TAI made under instructions to respond as an ideal director would respond to it (see Appendix C). Respondents were given several images for an ideal director—one with more experience, or more extensive training, or more energy—someone who accomplishes much in spite of obstacles or difficulties.

It was proposed that directors will indicate that a hypothetical, well-trained, experienced, competent director is less hindered by potential time wasters than directors indicate that they themselves are hindered. It was hypothesized that the mean Goal Interference scores, mean Interruption Frequency scores, mean Crisis Interruption scores, and mean Chronic Time Waster scores for ratings of self will be greater than the mean scores for the respective ratings for hypothetical ideal directors. It was also hypothesized that mean Minor Interruption scores and mean Nuisance scores for ratings of self will
be less than the mean scores for ratings for hypothetical ideal directors.

Interpreting Self-Report Inventory Responses

Combs, Soper, and Courson (1963) discussed the social acceptability of the content of the items of a self-report as a factor that influences responses. For example, because someone who states that his or her performance is impeded by a variety of interruptions may be regarded as an ineffective administrator, an administrator may be reluctant to give an accurate estimate of the effect of interruptions on performance. On the other hand, if objective awareness of how one allocates time is valued within an organization, and the climate is not repressive for one who is willing to monitor his or her own performance, an administrator may not be so reluctant to give accurate estimates.

Items related to this factor are included in the Time Management Experience questionnaire (see Appendix E). This questionnaire also obtains information on previous exposure to principles of time management, and previous experience with auditing time allocation.

An individual must be willing to cooperate with an investigator to complete a self-report. The conditions within which the report is to be completed may threaten the individual, or cause him or her to feel inadequate to the task, or cause responding to the items from a perspective different than what he or she believes about the personal self. Instructions for the self-report need to allay potential threats, and emphasize the value of responding to describe oneself.
as accurately as possible. The self-report inventory in this study is called a Time Allocation Inventory, rather than a Time Waster Inventory, to appear less threatening. Reaction sheets were used to give respondents an opportunity to indicate the presence of threat (Appendix F).

Phase I--Development of Instruments and Procedures

The objectives for Phase I were to develop the Time Allocation Inventory (TAI), Priorities Exercise, instrument reaction sheets, and Time Management Experience questionnaire until each met criteria described below for field testing; develop the two sets of instructions for responding to the instruments until they met criteria for field testing; obtain information on the power of the statistical tests to be used in Phase II; and obtain estimates of the range of completion times for each instrument.

Respondents in Phase I were individuals who had worked full-time in educational leadership within the past year and were at least familiar with the concept of community education. Evidence that these criteria had been met was obtained on an eligibility form (see Appendix A).

Information was obtained to assess how well the instruments met the criteria shown in Table 9. Modifications were made as discussed in Chapter IV.

During Phase I of the study, two sets of procedures for using the IF and GI scales to rate the TAI items were investigated to
Table 9

General Criteria for All Instruments

The respondent indicates that the format of the instrument is satisfactory; i.e., it does not interfere with completing the task.

The respondent indicates that the instructions are clearly stated and complete.

The respondent indicates that the items are clearly stated.

The respondent indicates that the instrument is free of errors in use of language.

The respondent indicates that the instrument can be completed in a reasonable amount of time.

The respondent indicates that a director is likely to have enough information to complete the instrument.

The respondent indicates that a director is likely to be willing to complete the instrument.

The respondent indicates that a director is likely to respond to the instrument honestly without loss of self-respect.

determine which procedure is usually preferred. Some respondents were instructed to rate all items on the IF scale, and then to go through all of the items a second time using the GI scale. Other respondents were instructed to use both scales for an item before proceeding to the next item. Each respondent was asked to comment on the ease of completing the rating task.

Two additional criteria were used in Phase I of the study to develop the TAI to the point of readiness for field testing in Phase II. To increase the likelihood of participation in Phase II of the study it was decided to keep the entire procedure for any one respondent limited to 90 minutes. Therefore, the TAI was designed to be completed in 50 minutes or less. This allows approximately one minute
per item for 35 items, five minutes to read instructions, and 10 minutes to describe recent accomplishments.

During Phase I individuals were asked to cite personal illustrations for each activity in an item stem. Items were to have been revised until personal illustrations could be supplied for all items, in order to make the content of the TAI descriptive of typical work situations for community education directors.

The results for all of these studies are discussed in Chapter IV.

Phase II—The Effects of Priorities and Perceptions Of Ideal Allocation on Time Waster Ratings

The basic objectives of Phase II of the study were to test two propositions about ratings assigned to activities often classified as time wasters, and to compare two scoring procedures based on the ratings.

Subjects

Subjects were full-time school-based community education directors in Ohio or Michigan, or educational administrators whose primary responsibility was to direct community education activities. Coordinators whose primary responsibility was to supervise directors were not included in the study, since supervision differs from program management. Since the primary purpose of this study was to field test the viability of a new instrument rather than to obtain norms or to draw inferences regarding time allocation patterns in community education directors, directors in a variety of settings were sampled.
but no attempt was made to systematically stratify the sample by type of setting.

Design

Data were collected from four groups of directors. Presence or absence of the priorities exercise are the two levels of one of the independent variables, while self-oriented instructions or hypothetical ideal director instructions are the two levels of the second independent variable. Individuals were assigned at random to the four possible combinations of levels of independent variables. The six scores from the TAI are measures of the dependent variable, which is estimated effectiveness of time allocation.

In Group I ten directors completed the Priorities Exercise, the TAI, the TAI Reaction Sheet, and the Time Management Experience questionnaire in that order. They were instructed to respond to describe themselves as accurately as possible. In Group II ten directors completed the TAI, the Reaction Sheet, and the Experience questionnaire to describe themselves.

In Group III ten directors completed the Priorities Exercise and the TAI with instructions to respond as they believed a hypothetical, trained, experienced, competent director would respond. Ten directors in Group IV were instructed to respond to the TAI as the hypothetical directors would respond. Directors in Groups III and IV were instructed to respond to the Reaction Sheet and the Experience questionnaire to describe themselves.
Procedures

The instruments were administered to participants in three workshops scheduled within a three-month period. The first workshop included 14 eligible participants from Ohio who spent the morning considering goals for the Ohio Community Education Association and the afternoon in a time allocation workshop. The second workshop included 16 eligible participants from one Michigan district who were participating in an inservice activity. The third workshop included 10 eligible participants from several Michigan districts who were participating in a regional association activity.

In each setting there were administrators or staff whose primary responsibilities were not to manage community education activities. Those individuals were given alternate tasks to do which were related to other workshop activities. The frequencies of participants in the study by workshop and treatment group are shown in Table 10. The general format for all three workshops, which were scheduled for two hours and thirty minutes, began with an introduction to time management. Some basic approaches were reviewed, and the theme was developed that self-management is the key to allocating time effectively. The importance of allocating time effectively as a community education director was emphasized. From a list of principles of time management participants were asked to select those that they would like to have discussed later in the workshop.

The TAI and exercises were then introduced as an attempt to obtain empirical data on time management in community education. Participants
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Table 10

Frequency of Participants by Workshop and Treatment Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were asked to indicate whether or not they were full-time directors and primary responsibility were clarified for individuals. The exercise packets, which were arranged in blocks of four with the treatments in random order in each block, were then distributed to the eligible participants. It was pointed out that there were different sets of packets, and that any questions regarding instructions should be discussed privately with the investigator. Only two individuals asked a question, each related to the meaning of a high priority in the Priorities Exercise. Participants were asked to respond to the exercises in the packet from beginning to end without looking ahead.

As participants finished their packets they gave them to the investigator and browsed through books and materials on time management arranged on display tables, or took a stretch break. The workshop room was large enough in all three settings so that those who worked longest on the packet were not disturbed much by those who finished earlier. After all participants had completed their packets, the rationale for the TAI was described briefly and questions were
answered. The workshop concluded by discussing the four or five principles of time management that had been selected most frequently earlier.

**Statistical Model**

The rationale for having 10 participants per group is based on an analysis of power for the analysis of variance model (Cohen, 1977, chap. 8). Computation of power for a statistical test within the analysis of variance model depends on three factors: the anticipated size of the effect (e.g., the size of the difference between two population means), the significance level of the test (i.e., the probability of erroneously rejecting a null hypothesis), and the numbers of degrees of freedom in both the numerator and the denominator of the F-ratio. All other factors remaining constant, greater power is achieved (or the probability of erroneously failing to reject a null hypothesis is reduced) when the anticipated size of the effect is larger, the significance level is larger, the degrees of freedom in the numerator is smaller and degrees of freedom in the denominator (directly related to sample size) is larger.

Since there were no data available for the TAI, arbitrary values had to be used in the power analysis. Although this is an exercise that is somewhat artificial, it provides a rationale for making data-based modifications as data becomes available. At the very least it gives the reader an opportunity to objectively challenge decisions about the research design rather than to merely wonder why the investigator decided to do what is reported.
To test the main effects in a two-way analysis of variance, with a significance level of .10 and power of .75, the sample size required for each of the four groups is shown in Table 12 for three sizes of effects. With ten directors participating in each of the four groups of the design, the analysis of variance tests for large main effects can be made at the specified probabilities for decision errors. It is assumed that smaller effects will not justify the cost and inconvenience of using the priorities exercise or the special instructions for the hypothetical director. Data obtained during Phase I were used to check the reasonableness of the values in this analysis.

Table 11
Sample Sizes Required to Detect Various Sizes of Main Effects in a Two-Way Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Approximate Size Per Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (f = .10)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (f = .25)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (f = .40)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Entries obtained from Cohen, 1977, Table 8.3.23, pp. 333-334.

Differences in mean TAI scores which correspond to various sizes of main effects are shown in Table 12.

In summary, an inventory, called the TAI, of 35 items was developed which describes twelve common interruptions toward accomplishing a work objective in a situation involving only the self, one other person, or a group of persons. A respondent uses a five-point scale to rate how frequently an interruption occurs and another five-point
scale to rate how much that interruption interferes with goal accomplishment. The ratings are used to compute six scores.

Table 12
Differences in Mean TAI Scores Corresponding to Sizes of Main Effects in a Two-Way Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD) a</th>
<th>Effect Size (f)</th>
<th>Difference Between Means 2(SD)(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-175</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aEstimated to be one-sixth of the range, similar to a normal distribution.

The TAI was field tested in Phase I of the study and modified as described in Chapter IV. The TAI was completed by forty community education directors in Phase II, and their scores were used to assess the effects of completing a priorities exercise or responding as it is perceived that an ideal director would respond. Phase II results are described in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

PHASE I RESULTS

The purposes of Phase I of the study were to try out the various instruments to be used in Phase II until specified criteria were met, to develop the procedures to be used with the four groups of community education directors in Phase II, and to obtain data to be used in determining the sample size for Phase II. In this chapter the development of the Time Management Experience questionnaire and the Priorities Exercise are described; an experiment is reported regarding two methods for rating TAI items; the final forms for the two sets of instructions for responding to the TAI are discussed; information on the adequacy of the general format for the TAI is reported; reactions to the TAI in terms of self-esteem are discussed; and qualities of each of the six TAI scores are analyzed. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings and modifications.

Time Management Experience Questionnaire

Seventy-two public school administrators from Lorain County, Ohio, completed the Time Management Experience questionnaire during a summer workshop. Eighteen other individuals completed the questionnaire during a graduate workshop on community education administration at Kent State University. The questionnaire was completed in ten minutes or less by all respondents; the majority of the respondents completed it in three minutes or less.
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Only four persons said they did not keep a daily appointment calendar. Since this item does not appear to discriminate among respondents it was deleted from the questionnaire for Phase II. Only six persons said they had been criticized at work for wasting time; since this item deals with potentially sensitive information and does not appear to discriminate among respondents it also was deleted.

Priorities Exercise

Sixteen members of a graduate class in the principles of community education completed the Instrument Tryout form and the Priorities Exercise during a class period. One community educator in the field also completed the Tryout form and the Priorities Exercise.

Everyone responded to all five items on the form. Seven said that they had worked full-time in educational administration at some point in the past twelve months. Six of those seven said that they had worked as a community educator and had worked closely with a community education coordinator. Only the data for these six persons were analyzed, since the Exercise deals specifically with community education priorities.

Completion times for the exercise ranged from 9 to 16 minutes, with a mean of 14 minutes. It was concluded that 20 minutes should be ample time to complete the exercise.

Original frequencies for the three categories of low (L), medium (M) and high (H) priority were determined by reviewing the crossed out
responses on the questionnaires. The mean numbers of items originally in the three categories were 5, 8 and 10, respectively. These values are consistent with the expectation that individuals tend to regard their tasks as having high priority. Five of the six respondents adjusted their ratings until each category had eight items. It was concluded that the instructions for the Exercise did provoke the respondents to think through their priorities in some sort of discriminating manner.

Four respondents added at least one high priority item to the Exercise. It was decided to retain this activity in the Exercise in order to help respondents respond to the TAI as realistically as possible.

**TAI Rating Method**

The TAI was completed by 18 participants during a session of a graduate workshop in community education administration. Everyone completed the Instrument Tryout form, the Time Management Experience questionnaire, TAI Part I, TAI Part II, the Reaction Sheet and the Instrument Feedback form as directed by the investigator. Individuals were assigned to four groups at random. Two groups rated all of the TAI items with the IF scale, then rated all of the items with the GI scale. This method is called the **scale-by-scale** method of rating. The other groups rated each item with the two scales. This method is called the **item-by-item** methods of rating.

One of each of the rating methods groups was instructed to respond to the items as themselves. These two groups are called
self-instructions groups. The other two groups were instructed to respond to the items as they believed an ideal community education director would respond. These groups are called ideal-instructions groups.

In this section the rating methods effects on TAI scores are analyzed, and the degrees of confusion experienced by the four groups are discussed.

Effects on TAI Scores

Item-by-item rating yielded TAI scores that indicate greater difficulty with allocating time than scores obtained by scale-by-scale rating. Table 13 shows the mean scores and F-ratios for the two types of rating method. Rating method means were compared as a main effect in a two-way analysis of variance for five of the six scores. (Too few N responses were given to permit statistical analysis.) Comparison of the instructions means is discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

Item-by-item mean scores were greater than scale-by-scale means for IF, GI, C and K scores. The differences are statistically significant for the IF score, $F(1, 14) = 6.17, p < .05$, and the K score, $F(1, 14) = 4.81, p < .05$. The scale-by-scale mean score was greater for the M score, but the difference is not statistically significant. In every case the item-by-item group indicated greater difficulty in allocating time. It was concluded that the item-by-item method of rating yields TAI scores which can be interpreted as
Table 13

Mean TAI Scores and F-Ratios for Two Rating Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Item</th>
<th>Item-by-Item Method</th>
<th>Scale-by-Scale Method</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagnostic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item-by-Item Method</th>
<th>Scale-by-Scale Method</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. None of the interaction effects are significant. 
*P < .05.

indicating more difficulty with time allocation than the scale-by-scale method yields.

Effects on Confusion

Seventeen of the 18 respondents rated how much confusion they felt while using the two scales to rate TAI items. The rating ranged from 0 (no confusion) through 5 (moderate confusion) to 10 (total confusion). Two factors logically influence the sense of being confused while completing the TAI in this situation. First, those with prior experience or exposure to community education should experience less confusion than those without prior experience or exposure. Second, the methods of rating may cause different levels of confusion.
The eighteen individuals in the workshop were categorized into two groups on the basis of their responses to the Instrument Tryout form. Nine persons had been exposed to community education prior to the workshop by direct work experience, course work, or close association with a community education director. The other nine persons did not have such exposure, one of whom did not complete the Instrument Feedback form containing the confusion rating scale.

The mean confusion ratings for the four groups created by crossing the factors of rating method and exposure to community education are shown in Table 14. The pattern of means shows that respondents exposed to community education using both scales to rate item-by-item perceived the least amount of confusion. Respondents not exposed to community education who rated the items scale-by-scale perceived the greatest amount of confusion.

Those not exposed to community education gave a mean rating of 4.2; six of the eight respondents in this group gave "moderate" ratings (3 - 7). Those exposed to community education gave a mean rating of 2.2; seven of the nine respondents gave "no confusion" ratings (0 - 2).

The ten respondents who rated the items scale-by-scale gave a mean confusion rating of 3.6, while the seven who used both scales item-by-item gave a mean rating of 2.5. The respective sample variances were 9.16 and 3.08, which indicates greater dispersion of ratings around the mean for the scale-by-scale group. The three highest ratings were given by members of the scale-by-scale group.
Table 14

Mean Confusion Ratings for the TAI Rating Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comm. Educ. Exposure</th>
<th>Item-by-Item Method</th>
<th>Scale-by-Scale Method</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.3 (n = 3)</td>
<td>2.7 (n = 6)</td>
<td>2.2 (n = 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.4 (n = 4)</td>
<td>5.0 (n = 4)</td>
<td>4.2 (n = 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5 (n = 7)</td>
<td>3.6 (n = 10)</td>
<td>3.1 (n = 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. None of the effects are significant in a two-way analysis of variance.

Although the two-way analysis of variance showed no statistically significant differences, it was concluded that the scale-by-scale method of rating is perceived as more confusing to the respondent than the item-by-item method. The lack of statistical significance may be due to the small sample sizes and the disproportionate distribution of observations among the cells in the model.

Since the item-by-item method yields TAI scores which indicate more areas where there may be difficulty in allocating time effectively, and since the item-by-item method tends to create less confusion while completing the TAI, it was decided to use the item-by-item method in Phase II of the study.

TAI Instructions

Nine of the workshop participants completed the TAI with instructions to respond as an ideal director would respond, and nine completed the TAI to describe their own work situation. The items for both groups were written in the first person; e.g., "I am delayed ..."
Individuals were assigned to instructions groups at random. Mean scores and F-ratios for the two groups for the six types of scores are shown in Table 15.

The research hypothesis for instructions in this study predicts that the mean scores of the self-instructions groups will be greater for the IF, GI, C and K scores; and the mean scores of the self-instructions group will be less for the M and N scores. Visual inspection of the means shows results contrary to the predictions for all six scores. It was decided that this may have been due to the use of first person in the TAI items for the ideal-instructions group, and a vague description of a competent director.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Self-Instructions</th>
<th>Ideal-Instructions</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-way analyses of variance were conducted for five of the six scores. (Too few Nuisance responses were made to permit analysis). None of the F-ratios for the instructions factor are significant.
The same conclusion was reached after analyzing responses to each item. Each item for each respondent was classified as a Minor, Nuisance, Crisis or Chronic item according to the IF and GI ratings given. Using Fisher's exact test for 2x2 contingency tables (Bradley, 1968), the sum of the Minor and Nuisance responses and the sum of the Crisis and Chronic responses were compared for the two sets of instructions on each item. The research hypothesis is that a greater proportion of Crisis/Chronic responses will be given by the group responding as themselves. None of the comparisons for the 35 items are statistically significant at the .05 level. It was concluded that the two groups responded to each item with a similar pattern of ratings, or that the items did not discriminate between the two groups.

Thus the instructions did not affect the TAI ratings as predicted. One respondent noted that it was difficult to respond as an ideal director to items written as "I am delayed ..." That comment, the greater amount of confusion expressed by those responding as a perceived ideal director, and the lack of statistically significant differences on any of the scales between those responding as themselves and those responding as perceived ideal directors, led to the decision to revise the TAI instructions and the TAI items. The revised instructions explicitly define a competent director as one who accomplishes much in the face of obstacles or difficulties. The TAI items for those responding as a perceived ideal director were rewritten in the third person; e.g., "The ideal director is delayed ..."
All other content in each item is identical to the content in the TAI for those responding as themselves.

TAI Format

Twenty-seven educational administrators described incidents to illustrate five TAI items during a summer workshop on time allocation. From one to nine incidents were received for each of the 35 items, with a mean of four examples per item. It was concluded after reviewing the incidents that the TAI items can be illustrated in terms of educators' work experience, including the work experience of community education directors.

As described earlier in this chapter, the TAI was completed by 18 members of a graduate workshop in community education administration. Part I of the TAI is designed to help respondents clarify what happens and doesn't happen in a typical work day. None of the 18 workshop participants raised any questions about the instructions or format of Part I. All wrote lists of accomplishments, and all but two wrote lists of goals or objectives not accomplished. Not all respondents listed consecutive work days, which is interpreted to mean that they thought about which recent work days were typical. It was concluded that Part I of the Inventory was ready to be used in Phase II of the study.

Seventeen of the 18 respondents completed the Instrument Feedback form. Fifteen persons responded that the Inventory is organized so that it can be completed "without a lot of hassle." All 17
respondents said that the TAI is "reasonably attractive in appearance." It was concluded that the format for the TAI is satisfactory.

Fourteen persons responded that the TAI items were stated clearly. Eight items were reworded in minor ways to avoid having them appear repetitious. It was concluded that the items were stated clearly enough to use in Phase II.

Sixteen persons said that the TAI can be completed in a "reasonable amount of time." Everyone completed Part I in 15 minutes or less; the mean completion time was nine minutes; 55% of the respondents completed it in nine minutes or less. Everyone completed Part II in 20 minutes or less; the mean completion time was 12 minutes; 55% completed it in 13 minutes or less. It was concluded that 35 minutes is ample time to complete Parts I and II of the TAI, and that the majority of people can complete it in 22 minutes or less.

Fifteen persons said a community education director is likely to have enough information to respond meaningfully to the TAI.

Effects of Completing the TAI on Self-Esteem

The Reaction Sheet (Appendix F) contains four items related to how respondents feel about themselves after completing the TAI. Seventeen of the 18 workshop respondents completed it. Responses of four of the persons were interpreted to mean that they perceived no negative consequences of completing the TAI; i.e., no items caused them uneasiness, no strong feelings were aroused, they did not feel they wasted time, they did not believe a director would think less of
himself or herself after completing the TAI. Analysis of responses led to the conclusion that with minor modifications the TAI poses little threat to self-esteem.

Four respondents said they "wasted too much time." Three of these persons had been exposed to community education and completed the TAI under the ideal-instructions condition. It was concluded that community education directors responding as a perceived ideal director would respond may become more aware of difficulties they had themselves in allocating time. To reduce the possibility that participants in Phase II would experience any loss of self-esteem, the ideal-instructions were modified to emphasize that no inferences regarding ultimate individual worth or general competence should be made from responses made to the TAI.

Ten persons said that for at least one item they felt some discomfort or uneasiness, while six responded that zero items caused them to feel uneasy. Given the greater confusion expressed for the ideal-instructions with ratings made scale-by-scale, it is reasonable to expect more members of this group to experience uneasiness while completing the Inventory. Four of the ten respondents who said they felt uneasiness were in this group; two members of each of the other three groups said they felt uneasiness.

Nine persons said that completing the TAI did not arouse any strong feelings. Eight persons attempted to describe feelings that were aroused, but in fact described beliefs or resolves rather than emotions. Five of the descriptions focused on the need to improve
time allocation, yet on another item all five indicated that they allocate time as well as can be expected. None of the five had been exposed to community education prior to the workshop. It was concluded that although the Inventory may cause one to think about the general need to allocate time well, it does not cause self-condemnation.

On the Instrument Feedback form (Appendix G), sixteen persons responded that a community education director is likely to be willing to complete the TAI. Fifteen persons said that a director can respond to the TAI "honestly without losing any self-respect."

On the Reaction Sheet, however, five persons (four of whom responded under the self-instructions condition) did say that completion of the Inventory is "likely to cause someone to think less of themselves as a community education director." All five indicated that they themselves allocated time as well as can be expected. All five made comments to the effect that increased awareness of areas where time is not allocated as well as desired may produce a sense of being ill at ease or a sense that one was not accomplishing as much as one could. It is likely that this sensation would be momentary rather than an indication of loss of self-esteem. Nevertheless, the instructions for the TAI were modified to include a statement to the effect that responding honestly to the TAI items may cause one to become aware of situations at work where one could accomplish more, but that no conclusions should be drawn regarding the ultimate worth or general competence of the individual in such situations.
Analysis of TAI Scores

In this section the distributions of the six TAI scores are described and analyzed.

**Interruption Frequency Scale**

The community education workshop participants completed a version of the TAI in which the IF rating scale ranged from 0 to 20 in increments of 2. Zero was described as "seldom," 8 as "once an hour," and 20 as "constantly." Respondents were instructed to circle the number that represented an estimate of how often the interruption occurs in a typical work day.

After analyzing IF responses it was decided to re-define the IF scale for Phase II as follows:

1 = once a week or less.
2 = more than once a week but less than once a day.
3 = once or twice a day.
4 = more than twice a day but less than once an hour.
5 = once an hour or more.

This decision was based on the facts that the scores were clustered at the low frequency end of the scale used in Phase I, and logical interpretations of the responses are inconsistent with normal experiences.

**Low frequency cluster.** IF scores could have a range from 0 to 700 with the 0-20 scale. The 18 scores in this study ranged from 20 to 282, with a mean of 142. It is apparent that the scores are...
clustered toward the low frequency end of the scale. To analyze the
distribution of responses over categories the 11 categories were
grouped into five: 0-4, 5-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20. For each of the
four groups more than 50% of the ratings were in the first of the five
categories. Overall, 70% of the ratings were in these categories,
indicating low frequency of occurrence for the situations described
in the TAI.

**Logical flaws.** One person stated that the IF scale had too many
numbers in it, and suggested a five-point scale be used. A second
person noted that the IF scale was difficult to interpret—"hourly"
appeared closer to "constantly" than to "seldom" in this person's
thinking, yet on the scale "hourly" was located closer to "seldom."

Reflection on these comments that the 11-point scale is unwieldy
revealed a logical flaw in its design. The gap between 0 = seldom and
2 = twice a day is very large when one considers that events such as
meetings may be scheduled weekly or monthly. A monthly meeting and
a daily interruption by someone who enjoys socializing would be
assigned the same IF rating, yet the daily interruption has greater
potential for causing difficulty in allocating time effectively.

To check for inconsistencies in ratings due to this feature of
the 11-point scale, the mean IF ratings for each item were calculated
for the self-instructions group. (The ratings for the ideal-instruc-
tions group were excluded because of the greater confusion experienced
while completing the TAI.) The mean for the 12 meeting items, 2.92 is
lower than the mean for the 12 two-party interaction items, 3.29, and
the 11 solitary items, 4.40. This is consistent with the fact that meetings tend to occur less frequently than two-party interactions or self-interruptions. However, the mean rating for the meeting items, 2.92, is interpreted as being interrupted three times a day by meetings. This seems to be an excessive estimate.

Moreover, no item in the Inventory received a mean rating less than 2.00, which is interpreted as being interrupted twice a day. Seventeen items, or approximately one-half of the items, received a mean rating of 2.00 – 2.99. It was concluded that the lower end of the IF scale could not discriminate among the situations in the TAI in a meaningful manner.

The largest mean rating for the items was 7.33, which is interpreted as being interrupted a little less than once an hour. It seems that an hourly interruption is regarded as the most frequently occurring interruption. Therefore, the 11-point scale was redesigned as the five-point scale given above.

**Goal Interference Scale**

GI scores could range from 35 to 175. The 18 scores ranged from 36 to 121, with a mean of 73. All five response categories in the scale were used. The majority (72%) were in categories 1 (negligible) or 2 (slight); very few responses (9%) were made in categories 4 (serious) or 5 (critical). No one used the same category for all 35 items.
Diagnostic Scores

Ranges, means and variance estimates for the Minor, Nuisance, Crisis and Chronic scores are shown in Table 16. Each type of score could range from 0 to 35. The $M$ variance estimate for the total group is 23% of the maximum possible variance (computed by assuming nine individuals score 0 and nine individuals score 35), which is a relatively small proportion. The scores tend to be clustered toward the high frequency end of the range.

The $C$ variance estimate is only 12% of the maximum possible variance, with scores clustered toward the low frequency end of the range. The $N$ and $K$ scores show virtually no variation in responses, with 15 and 17 zero scores, respectively. None of the scores discriminate between the two instructions groups in the sense of having substantially smaller within-group variance estimates.

Summary of Findings and Modifications

The primary purpose of conducting Phase I of this study was to develop the instruments and procedures to be used in testing two research hypotheses in Phase II. This section is a summary of the major findings in Phase I, and the modifications that were made prior to data collection in Phase II.

According to the completion times recorded for the different instruments, the mean times required for the groups in Phase II were estimated to be 30 minutes for those not doing the Priorities exercise and 44 minutes for those doing it. Maximum completion times
Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for TAI Diagnostic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance (V)</th>
<th>Max. Var. (MV)</th>
<th>(V/MV) 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Instructions (n = 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9-35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal-Instructions (n = 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9-32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Groups (n = 18)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9-35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The mean is .40, which rounds off to 0.
were estimated to be 55 and 75 minutes, respectively. These values are within the 90 minutes regarded as the maximum allowable time in order to get directors to agree to participate in the study.

The final form of the Time Management Experience questionnaire was reduced from 14 to 12 items. It was concluded that there is enough variation in the responses to the items to be potentially useful in interpreting responses made to the TAI.

Responses to the Priorities Exercise indicated that it provoked thinking through priorities as a community education director. Since the exercise was used by community education personnel prior to being published by Warden (1978), it was deemed unnecessary to obtain specific data on readability and appropriateness. Suggestions from respondent were used to slightly modify the wording of the instructions and two items.

It was concluded that the general format of the TAI is satisfactory; i.e., it can be completed "without a lot of hassle." The content is understood by persons who have at least been exposed to community education. Illustrations of each item can be provided by educational administrators. According to the respondents, a community education director is likely to have enough information to respond to the TAI meaningfully, and is likely to be willing to do so.

Even though completing the TAI may cause one to become aware of time allocation practices that could be improved, it does not provoke loss of self-respect. It was decided, however, to process each administration of the TAI in order to help respondents clarify their
experience and the significance of that experience for them. The Reaction Sheet was used to guide this processing discussion. It was also decided in the instructions to emphasize the point that no inferences regarding one's ultimate worth or general competence should be made from one's responses to the TAI.

It was concluded that the item-by-item method of rating the TAI items is less confusing to respondents and yields ratings which indicate greater difficulty with allocating time. Since the TAI is intended to be used to identify potential problems with allocating time, it was decided to use the item-by-item method in Phase II.

The TAI results for the two sets of instructions were not consistent with the research hypothesis which predicts that perceived ideal directors will be rated as having less difficulty with allocating time. For five of the six scores the mean ratings indicated that perceived ideal directors had more difficulty with allocating time than individuals described themselves as having. Although the differences are not statistically significant, the consistent pattern suggests that either the research hypothesis is false or the Inventory is faulty. There is some evidence that contradicts the research hypothesis—thirteen of seventeen respondents said they allocated time "as well as can be expected" or that "there is little room for improvement." If members of a group perceive themselves as not needing to improve in some area, then members of that group may not perceive the ideal group members as being able to do any better in that area.
On the other hand, three of the four respondents who said they "waste too much time" had completed the TAI with the ideal instructions. This suggests that the perceived ideal director may be regarded as being able to allocate time better. It was decided to rewrite the TAI items in the third person (ideal director) for those responding as perceived ideal directors, and to emphasize that competence means accomplishing much in the face of obstacles and difficulties.

The Goal Interference and Interruption Frequency scores showed potential for discriminating between the two groups who have different instructions for completing the TAI. The four diagnostic scores did not show such potential.

The 11-category Interruption Frequency scale, which ranged from 0 to 20 interruptions per day, was modified to a five-point scale ranging from 1 = "once a week or less" to 5 = "once an hour or more." This was done to provide greater discrimination among situations which occur less than daily and to make the upper end of the scale coincide with actual high frequency estimates, which may make the diagnostic scores more discriminating.

Finally, it was decided that the four group design for Phase II, with ten directors per group, is adequate to test the two research hypotheses for large main effects.
CHAPTER V

PHASE II RESULTS

The purposes of Phase II of the study were to test two propositions concerning the administration of the TAI, to analyze two methods of scoring responses to the TAI, to assess how experience with time management affects responses to the TAI, and to analyze reactions to the TAI. A brief overview of the major findings is presented here before describing the analyses and findings in detail.

Data provide some support for the first proposition that directors who complete a task priorities exercise will respond differently to the TAI than directors who do not complete such an exercise. Data do not support the second proposition that directors will rate potential time wasters as occurring more frequently and interfering more with achieving their goals than directors rate potential time wasters as they believe that hypothetical effective directors would rate them.

Corrected split-halves coefficients of .82 to .92 for the six scores provide evidence of satisfactory reliability estimates for the TAI. There is some evidence that the different scores yield different types of information.

Although individuals varied in experience with time management, the four treatment groups did not differ in average amounts of experience with time management. Across treatment groups TAI scores for directors with less time management experience showed that they had
less difficulty allocating time than directors with more time management experience.

In general the reactions to the TAI were not unfavorable. Several concerns are reported and discussed.

All of the results are discussed in detail in the following sections of this chapter.

Effects of Completing the Priorities Exercise

It is hypothesized that those who complete the Priorities Exercise will have different mean scores on each of the two TAI summated scores than those who do not complete it. A two-way fixed effects analysis of variance was computed for the Interruption Frequency (IF) and Goal Interference (GI) scores (Table 17). To have reasonable power for significance testing, a significance level of .10 was used to interpret the results.

There was a significant main effect for the Priorities Exercise on the IF scores, $F(1,36) = 4.41, p < .05$. The mean IF score for those completing the Exercise was 77.35, while the mean for those not completing it was 65.90 (Table 18). Those who completed the Exercise estimated that they were interrupted more frequently than those who did not complete it. The mean GI scores were not significantly different for the Priorities groups.

It is hypothesized also that those who complete the Priorities Exercise will have different mean frequencies for the four TAI diagnostic scores, but the frequencies are dependent upon the IF and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Priorities (A)</td>
<td>1,311.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,311.02</td>
<td>4.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions (B)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>10,696.90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>297.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,500.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21,236.70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>589.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>No Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>77.35</td>
<td>65.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>94.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GI scores. If two groups have equal GI mean scores, but one group has a higher IF mean score than the other group, then it is predicted that that group will have a greater mean K frequency and lower mean C frequency if the GI scores are relatively high, or that that group will have a greater mean N frequency and lower mean M frequency if the GI scores are relatively low.

An analysis of variance was computed for each of the four diagnostic scores (Table 19). Based upon the mean difference which exists on the IF scores, there was a significant main effect in the logically predicted direction for the Priorities Exercise in the Crisis score, $F(1, 36) = 2.95, p < .10$. The mean C score for those who completed the Exercise was 8.55, while the mean score for those who did not complete it was 12.65 (Table 20). Those who completed the Exercise had fewer crisis responses on the TAI.

There was a significant main effect, also, in the logically predicted direction given the difference in mean IF scores which exists; for the Priorities Exercise on the Chronic score, $F(1, 36) = 2.95, p < .10$. The mean K score for those who completed the Exercise was 10.50; for those who did not complete it the mean score was 6.65 (Table 20). Those who completed the Exercise had more responses...
# Table 19

Two-Way Analyses of Variance for TAI Diagnostic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Priorities (A)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions (B)</td>
<td>133.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,568.30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>140.60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>168.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>168.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2,051.80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>148.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>42.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1,092.50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .10
** P < .05
on the TAI indicating chronic interruptions. Both of these significant differences for the diagnostic scales are consistent with the IF results.

To sum up, those who completed the Priorities Exercise indicated that they were interrupted more frequently. They had fewer crisis items and more chronic items on the TAI. Thus, three of the six research hypotheses on priorities are supported by the results of this study, and three hypotheses are not supported. An hypothesis suggested by these findings, which should be tested in another study, is that completion of the Priorities Exercise causes one to estimate that one has more difficulty with allocating time.

Responses to the Priorities Exercise

It is concluded that participants completed the Exercise as intended. All but one of twenty participants completed the Exercise in accord with instructions; that one participant had 9 low ratings, 7 medium ratings and 8 high ratings instead of 8 ratings for each level. Participants changed ratings on two to fifteen items, with
a mean of six items changed; thirteen persons added items; and every­
one identified a single item as highest priority. This is interpreted
to mean that participants considered their ratings carefully.

In the next section the effects of the instructions variable
are described.

Effects of Ideal vs. Self-Instruction

It is hypothesized that those in the self-instructions group will
have greater mean scores on the IF, GI, C and R than those in the
ideal-instructions group; while those in the ideal-instructions
group will have greater mean scores on the M and N scores than those
in the self-instructions group.

The only significant main effect for the Instructions variable
is for the Crisis Interruption score (refer back to Table 19),
\( F(1, 36) = 2.95, p < .10 \). The mean C score for those who described
themselves on the TAI was 8.55, while the mean C score for those
describing the ideal director was 12.65 (Table 21). Those who
described themselves had fewer crisis responses, which is contrary
to the research hypothesis.

The lack of significant differences on five of the TAI scores
between those describing themselves and those describing an ideal
director comes as a surprise, even though there was evidence in Phase
I of this study that suggested that the research hypothesis might
not be supported. (Recall that no significant difference was found
for any of the six scores.) It seems reasonable to propose that an
Table 21

Mean TAI Scores for Instruction Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Self-Instructions</th>
<th>Ideal-Instructions</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td>Diagnostic Scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>71.55</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>88.75</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M 16.40 12.75 .87
N 1.15 1.15 .00
C 8.55 12.65 2.95*
K 8.85 8.30 .10

*p < .10.

Ideal director would be perceived as one who would organize activities so as to be interrupted less frequently, and to be less severely hindered in accomplishing goals when interrupted. The results of this study do not support these propositions; in fact, comparison of the mean scores for the two groups suggests that directors believe that the ideal director will be interrupted more frequently and will experience greater interference with goal accomplishment (Table 21).

The proposition that directors will perceive ideal directors as having different time allocation practices can be investigated from another perspective. If there is consensus about how an ideal director would allocate time, then the TAI score variances for those in the self-instructions groups should be greater than the variances for those in the ideal-instructions groups. Standard deviations are shown in Table 22 for the two sets of instructions. Since there are significant
differences in mean TAI scores for the Priorities groups, the standard
deviations are shown separately for those who completed the Priorities
Exercise and those who did not complete it.

Comparison of standard deviations for those who did not complete
the Exercise yields little support for the proposition about consensus.
The standard deviations are greater in the self-instructions group
for only the GI and the N scores; the difference is statistically
significant only on the N scale, \( F(9, 9) = 4.60, p < .05 \).

Comparison of standard deviations for the two sets of instructions
for those who completed the Priorities Exercise shows results consis­
tent with the proposition for the IF, M and K scores, but none of the
differences are statistically significant.

It is concluded from these data that there is not consensus
among directors on how ideal directors will respond to interruptions
in terms of estimating frequency of occurrence or estimating how much
they will interfere with accomplishing goals. If similar results are
found in a replication study, it is worth further investigation.

**Interpretation**

Perhaps respondents in this study confused "ideal program" with
"ideal director." If one perceives an ideal program as one filled
with many different kinds of activities involving many people, then
the director of such a program is apt to be interrupted often,
particularly to attend meetings and interact with others. This does
not account for self-initiated interruptions, however.
Table 22

Standard Deviations for TAI Scores for Four Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Priorities Exercise</th>
<th>No Priorities Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Instruct. I</td>
<td>Ideal-Instruct. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>18.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>25.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>24.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|         | Self-Instruct. II   | Ideal-Instruct. IV     |
|         | Diagnostic Scores   |                        |
| M       | 7.96                | 7.91                   |
|         | 7.56                | 10.11                  |
| N       | 1.08                | 2.92                   |
|         | 2.21*               | 1.03                   |
| C       | 5.12                | 8.42                   |
|         | 7.28                | 8.82                   |
| K       | 7.16                | 5.05                   |
|         | 3.93                | 5.40                   |

*F (9, 9) = 4.60, p < .05.

If one perceives an ideal program as one filled with important activities, then any interruption can be interpreted as interfering more with goal accomplishment than if a program has a mixture of important and unimportant activities. The TAI does not appear to be interpreted by respondents in the sense that an ideal director has things under control so that interruptions have less severe impact on goal accomplishment.

Summated vs. Diagnostic Scores

One of the purposes of this study is to compare the use of summated scales on the TAI with diagnostic scores. Recall that the summated IF and GI scores are the sums of ratings over 35 items, while...
the diagnostic M, N, C and K scores are the frequencies of items having specific combinations of IF and GI ratings. This section discusses split-halves estimates of internal consistency for the scores, distributions of responses over the ranges of the scores and various characteristics of the TAI item.

**TAI Internal Consistency**

Four of the TAI scales have satisfactory split-halves coefficients. A common way of estimating internal consistency for an instrument is to compute the correlation coefficient between even numbered and odd numbered items, and to apply the Spearman-Brown formula to obtain a coefficient for an instrument with the original number of items. This is not a satisfactory procedure for the TAI, however, because there are three group items, six two-party items, and nine solitary items in the odd numbered items. The two halves of the instrument used to estimate internal consistency should be balanced in terms of the item content matrix. Therefore, half of the group items, two-party items, and solitary items were selected at random for each half of the instrument. Six of the twelve conditions in the item content matrix were selected at random to have two items in one half of the instrument. One half of the instrument used to estimate internal consistency included eighteen items: #01, 02, 04, 05, 07, 08, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 29, 32, 33, 35. The other half of the instrument contained the remaining seventeen items. The correlation coefficients for the two halves of the TAI for each of the six scores are shown in Table 23. The Spearman-Brown...
coefficient for the IF scale is .90 and for the GI it is .92. These coefficients are satisfactory. One would expect the diagnostic score coefficients to be lower, since they are based on nonpredetermined subsets of items in the TAI. However, the Minor (.88) and Crisis (.91) Interruption scales have Spearman-Brown coefficients similar to the IF and GI scales. Both the Nuisance and Chronic scales have a coefficient of .82, which is lower as expected.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAI Spearman-Brown Coefficients</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Spearman-Brown r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Between IF and GI Scores

Correlation coefficients were computed between IF and GI scores within each treatment group (Table 24). Only the correlation coefficient of .88 for the group that completed the Priorities Exercise under self-instructions differs significantly from zero ($p < .01$).
Perhaps completion of the Priorities Exercise causes a respondent to associate impact on goal accomplishment directly with frequency of interruption. This proposition could be tested in another study.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructions Group</th>
<th>Priorities Exercise</th>
<th>No Priorities Exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01.

Score Ranges

The observed ranges for the six TAI scores are shown in Table 25. The N scale had a very short range of scores in all four treatment groups, which limits its potential for being a discriminating measure.

Ratings Used on Summated Scales

Total IF and GI scores can be interpreted by computing the scores which would be obtained if all items were rated at the same point on the scale. If the average IF rating for an individual over the 35 items was 1.00-1.49, it could be interpreted as meaning that on the average interruptions described by the TAI items occurred once a week or less. The corresponding range of IF total scores is 35-52. Score ranges for the other four IF ratings and for the five GI ratings can be computed in a similar manner. The frequencies of scores at the different levels of both scales are shown in Table 26.
Table 25

Observed Ranges for the TAI Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>I&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>II&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>III&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>IV&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summated Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>55-118</td>
<td>53-85</td>
<td>57-115</td>
<td>36-92</td>
<td>36-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57-126</td>
<td>48-124</td>
<td>70-146</td>
<td>52-123</td>
<td>48-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5-28</td>
<td>5-29</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>2-29</td>
<td>0-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>3-31</td>
<td>0-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5-28</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>0-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Possible range is 35-175.
<sup>b</sup>Possible range is 0-35.
<sup>c</sup>Self-Instructions, Priorities.
<sup>d</sup>Self-Instructions, No Priorities.
<sup>e</sup>Ideal-Instructions, Priorities.
<sup>f</sup>Ideal-Instructions, No Priorities.
Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>IF Scale</th>
<th>GI Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-52</td>
<td>Once a week or less.</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-87</td>
<td>More than once a week; less than once a day.</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-122</td>
<td>Once a day.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-157</td>
<td>More than once a day; Less than once an hour.</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158-175</td>
<td>Once an hour or more.</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No respondents had IF scores at the two upper levels of the scale. In each treatment group the majority of respondents had IF scores that can be interpreted as meaning that on the average they estimated that they were interrupted more than once a week but less than once a day. Perhaps this level of the scale is too broad; a rating of twice a week could be inserted, and the hourly rating eliminated.

No respondents had GI scores at the "critical" level. In the self-instructions groups the majority of respondents had scores at the "slight" level, while in the ideal-instructions groups the majority had scores at the "moderate" level.

Potential Time Wasters

Since a basic purpose of the TAI is to identify situations which may include serious time wasters, the IF, GI and K scores were compared in terms of items they identified as potential serious or chronic time wasters. The three scores tend to identify the same items, but each score identified some unique items as potential time wasters.

Item means were computed on the IF and GI scales for the Prior­ities groups and the No Priorities groups (Table 27). Items with a mean IF score of 2.6 or more were classified as potential time wasters. Items with such scores are interpreted as describing situations which respondents estimate occur at least once a day. Items with a mean GI score greater than 3.0 were classified as potential time wasters. Items with such scores are interpreted as describing situations which respondents estimate have at least a moderate effect on goal accompl­ishment. (The mean value of 3.0 was selected in order to yield
Table 27

IF and GI Item Means and K % for Priorities and No Priorities Groups

| Item | Priorities Groups | | | No Priorities Groups | | |
|------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|      | IF Mean | GI Mean | K % | IF Mean | GI Mean | K % | |
| 01   | 2.20   | 3.00    | 30  | 2.05   | 2.70    | 25  | |
| 02   | 2.55   | 3.00    | 30  | 1.95   | 2.65    | 30  | |
| 03   | 2.60*  | 3.00    | 40* | 2.10   | 2.65    | 25  | |
| 04   | 2.35   | 3.00    | 25  | 1.90   | 3.05*   | 15  | |
| 05   | 2.80*  | 2.90    | 40* | 2.20   | 2.65    | 30  | |
| 06   | 1.75   | 1.95    | 15  | 1.45   | 2.30    | 05  | |
| 07   | 1.95   | 2.80    | 20  | 1.80   | 2.85    | 20  | |
| 08   | 2.00   | 2.70    | 30  | 1.80   | 2.95    | 20  | |
| 09   | 1.95   | 2.90    | 20  | 1.40   | 2.25    | 00  | |
| 10   | 2.75*  | 3.25*   | 50* | 2.65*  | 3.40*   | 50* | |
| 11   | 2.20   | 2.65    | 30  | 1.95   | 2.75    | 20  | |
| 12   | 2.05   | 2.60    | 20  | 1.40   | 2.65    | 05  | |
| 13   | 3.50*  | 3.70*   | 75* | 3.10*  | 3.25*   | 50* | |
| 14   | 2.10   | 2.35    | 25  | 1.60   | 2.20    | 20  | |
| 15   | 2.00   | 2.40    | 25  | 1.45   | 2.15    | 05  | |
| 16   | 3.00*  | 2.80    | 45* | 2.30   | 2.85    | 30  | |
| 17   | 1.95   | 2.35    | 25  | 2.85*  | 2.55    | 15  | |
| 18   | 1.90   | 2.45    | 20  | 1.50   | 2.60    | 05  | |
| 19   | 1.90   | 2.30    | 25  | 1.65   | 2.35    | 10  | |
| 20   | 1.90   | 2.70    | 15  | 2.00   | 3.10*   | 15  | |
| 21   | 2.35   | 2.60    | 40* | 2.35   | 2.60    | 25  | |
| 22   | 1.70   | 2.55    | 10  | 1.30   | 2.40    | 00  | |
| 23   | 1.65   | 1.95    | 10  | 1.40   | 2.40    | 00  | |
| 24   | 2.05   | 2.90    | 30  | 1.80   | 2.90    | 20  | |
| 25   | 2.70*  | 3.25*   | 50* | 2.35   | 3.05*   | 40* | |
| 26   | 1.75   | 2.10    | 15  | 1.40   | 2.50    | 00  | |
| 27   | 3.15*  | 3.50*   | 60* | 2.15   | 3.20*   | 70* | |
| 28   | 2.55   | 2.55    | 55* | 2.45   | 2.95    | 45* | |
| 29   | 1.70   | 2.25    | 15  | 1.50   | 2.50    | 00  | |
| 30   | 1.60   | 2.40    | 10  | 1.40   | 2.50    | 05  | |
| 31   | 1.80   | 2.35    | 40* | 1.55   | 2.35    | 10  | |
| 32   | 2.25   | 2.95    | 40* | 2.10   | 3.05*   | 20  | |
| 33   | 2.25   | 3.10*   | 30  | 1.60   | 2.45    | 10  | |
| 34   | 1.90   | 2.30    | 15  | 1.60   | 2.25    | 10  | |
| 35   | 2.35   | 3.05*   | 45* | 1.85   | 2.65    | 15  | |

*Potential time waster item.
a number of items comparable to the number of items selected by the IF scale.)

Items where eight or more persons in the Priorities groups or No Priorities groups responded to them as \( K \) items were classified as potential time wasters. This represents at least 40% of the groups. These three decision rules yielded eight potential time wasters for the IF scale, nine for the GI scale, and twelve for the K score. Some items were classified as potential time wasters by more than one score.

Sixteen items were classified as potential time wasters on at least one of the three scores by either the Priorities groups or the No Priorities groups. Those items are plotted on the TAI Item Content Matrix in Table 28. Fourteen of the items were two-party items or solitary items; only two meeting items were identified as potential time wasters. All twelve of the interruption conditions are represented.

Four items were identified on all three scores as potential time wasters in the Priorities Groups; two of these were also identified on all three scores in the No Priorities Groups. One was a two-party item and three were solitary items. The items referred to unclear priorities, delayed interaction, unanticipated events, and uncoordinated responsibility.

The GI scale identified four items not identified by the other two scores. The K score identified two solitary items uniquely. The IF scale identified one item uniquely. Thus, nine of the sixteen potential time wasters were identified by more than one score.
Table 28
Potential Time Waster Item Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Condition</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Two-Party</th>
<th>Solitary</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Inadequate preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Inadequate information</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Competing tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Nonproductive activity</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Unclear priorities</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Delayed interaction</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>(omit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Delayed decision</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Inadequate concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Unrealistic deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Information overload</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unanticipated events</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Uncoordinated responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency 2 6 8 16

*Identified as a potential time waster by three scores in the Priorities Group.
Interpretation

It appears that both the summated scales and the diagnostic scales have potential for identifying time wasters, although the diagnostic scales may be less reliable. Validity studies should be conducted to determine the correlation between IF scores and logged frequencies of interruptions, and the correlation between GI scores and observations of goal interference such as actual postponements, delays, complaints from others, or overtime. The stability of TAI scores should also be investigated, particularly during both hectic (e.g., registration and the first week of classes) and calm (e.g., midsemester or breaks between semesters) periods of activity.

The next section discusses the relationship between previous experience with time management and scores on the TAI.

Time Management Experience

Responses to the Time Management Experience questionnaire indicate which allocation practices are in use and how much instruction in time management has been completed. The responses were analyzed from three perspectives. First, the amounts of experience with time management were compared for the four treatment groups. Overall, the groups were found to be similar. Second, the relationships between amount of experience and TAI scores were analyzed. Those with more experience indicated that they had more difficulty in allocating time effectively. Third, results from Phase I and Phase II were compared to ascertain whether community educators show more or less concern for
time allocation than other administrators. Some evidence was found to suggest that they do show more concern.

Treatment Group Similarities

The four treatment groups were similar in experience with time management. The frequencies of "yes" responses for each of the four treatment groups are shown in Table 29. More than 50% of the respondents responded "yes" to three items which indicate experience in time management.

31 had deliberately tried to change how they plan or schedule time;

30 usually write a list of activities to do each day;

22 had some instruction in time management before the past twelve months.

The majority of respondents had not kept daily time logs, nor had recent instruction in time management, nor studied materials on time management. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that their supervisor or organization had tried to assist them with time management. Thirty-two respondents said that supervisors are entitled to know how the people they supervise allocate time, but only 24 said that they would submit time logs voluntarily to a supervisor.

Chi-square values for each item were computed for the four treatment groups (see Table 29). Chi-square (3) = 9.20, \( p < .05 \), is significant for the item: having kept a daily log sometime prior to the past twelve months. More individuals in the ideal-instructions groups had kept logs than in the self-instructions groups. For all other
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily activities list.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent daily log.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past daily log.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent change in time allocation.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent instruction.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past instruction.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific books read.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other materials studied.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor assistance.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization assistance.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of log to supervisor.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
items the chi-square values were not significant. It is concluded that the groups did not differ significantly on time management experience, which means time management experience can be discounted as a rival hypothesis in this study.

There were no statistically significant differences in time management experience among the participants in the three workshops.

**Correlation Between TAI Scores and Experience**

To investigate the relationship between experience with time management and scores on the TAI, respondents were dichotomously classified as experienced or inexperienced in each treatment group by the following rules. The total number of "yes" responses to items #1-8 on the Time Management Experience questionnaire was computed for each individual. Within each treatment group the lower totals were coded as inexperienced and the higher totals were coded as experienced. Individuals who had the same total in the middle range were excluded, except in Group I.

Six respondents had the same middle range total of "yes" responses in Group I. The eight items were divided into five categories—daily activities list (#1), daily logs (#2, 3), change in time allocation practices (#4), instruction (#5, 6) and materials studied (#7, 8). The number of categories where at least one "yes" was given was computed for each individual. Those with more categories were coded as experienced; those with less categories were coded as inexperienced.
Seven respondents were coded on experience in each treatment group which yielded 28 respondents to be analyzed. The mean scores for the less and more experienced groups are shown for each of the six TAI scores in Table 30. Two-tailed $t$-tests were significant for both the $IF$ and $GI$ summated scores and for the $M$ and $K$ diagnostic scores:

$t (13) = 2.12, p < .05$; $t (13) = 2.15, p < .05$; $t (13) = 2.62, p < .05$; $t (13) = 2.12, p < .05$; respectively. Individuals with more experience in time management said that they themselves or an ideal director would be interrupted more and that there would be more interference with accomplishing objectives. This resulted in those with more experience having more chronic interruption items and fewer minor interruption items. Perhaps exposure to time management causes one to be more sensitive to how interruptions can affect accomplishing goals or objectives, thereby yielding higher TAI scores. On the other hand, being more sensitive to the impact of interruptions may cause one to seek out exposure to principles of time management. A different type of study would have to be conducted to refine interpretation of this finding.

**Concern for Time Allocation**

Analysis of responses to the Time Management Experience questionnaire by school administrator groups having different degrees of involvement with community education suggests that those with more involvement may have more concern for effective time management. 

In Table 31 responses to the Time Management Experience questionnaire in Phase II are compared with responses made by three groups in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Less (n = 14)</th>
<th>More (n = 14)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summated Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>64.21</td>
<td>79.57</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>83.36</td>
<td>101.07</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05.
Table 31

Percent of Groups Responding "Yes" to Time Management Experience Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>SA+</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Chi-Square&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily activities list.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent daily log.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past daily log.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent change in time allocation.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent instruction.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past instruction.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials studied.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization assistance.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's right to know.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of log.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Chi-square computed for three groups: Phase II, SA+ and SA. Phase I workshop participants were excluded from the analysis because it included both exposed and non-exposed administrators.

*P < .05.

**P < .01.
Phase I. One group was composed of eighteen individuals in a graduate workshop on community education administration. The other two groups were public school administrators (mostly principals, some superintendents, a few other central office administrators) in a summer workshop that included different administrative topics. Each administrator was asked if he or she had worked as a community educator at any time, if he or she had ever taken a course in community education or a course which included discussion of the concept of community education, and if he or she had ever worked closely with a community education director. Each of the 39 persons who responded "yes" to at least one of these three questions was put into the group called public school administrators exposed to community education. The other 30 persons are called school administrators not exposed to community education.

In Table 31 the item, "materials studied," represents a "yes" response to either item #7 or #8 in the questionnaire used in Phase II (Appendix E). Item #9 on that questionnaire is not shown in Table 31 since many Phase I participants did not respond to it because they were not community education directors.

In this study, those more related to directing community education programs tended to show more concern for allocating time than other groups of administrators. Proportionally more members of the three groups of persons practicing or exposed to community education (67-75%) prepared a daily activities list than school administrators not exposed to community education (43%); proportions among the
Phase II directors and the two groups of school administrators were significantly different, chi-square (2) = 8.76, p < .05. More Phase II directors (78%) had made recent changes in allocation practices than the other three groups (43-51%); the proportions are significantly different for Phase II directors and the two groups of administrators, chi-square (2) = 9.64, p < .10. More Phase II directors (28%) indicated that their organizations provided assistance with allocating time than the other three groups (3-15%); the proportions are significantly different, chi-square (2) = 7.32, p < .05.

Those exposed to community education in this study had had more instruction in time management. More Phase II directors (55%) said that they had had past instruction in time management than the other three groups (22-27%): the proportions differ significantly, chi-square (2) = 9.12, p < .05.

These data suggest that community educators may have relatively more concern for consciously allocating time more effectively. There may be more willingness among them, then, for participating in time allocation research which could then be extended to other educational administration positions.

The association of higher TAI scores with those more experienced in time management is a bit surprising. One could expect those with more experience to feel that they are more in control of time allocation, which should be reflected in lower TAI scores. It would be interesting to explore this relationship in greater detail in another study.
Reactions to the TAI

Respondents completed a Reaction Sheet (Appendix F) related to the influence of the TAI on perceptions of current capability of allocating time, self-concept, feelings aroused by the TAI, and particular sources of discomfort experienced while responding to the TAI items. This section organizes the responses to that Reaction Sheet according to self-perceptions of allocation and influence of self-concept.

Self-Perceptions of Allocation

The four treatment groups did not differ significantly in the pattern of responses to the item concerning perceptions of one's own allocation practices. The data suggest that the degree of difficulty in allocating time, as indicated by the TAI, is independent of respondents' perceptions of how well they allocate time. There was no significant association between these responses to this item and high or low ranking according to the GI scale or the IF scale.

This result is a bit surprising. One would expect those who indicated that they wasted too much time to have proportionally more higher TAI scores. Perhaps the general impression a director has of how well he or she allocates time is based on a small number of situations. It would be interesting to ask directors to indicate their general impression before and after completing the TAI, to see if completing it changes that general impression. It also would be
interesting to ask respondents what they became aware of as they completed it, and whether or not they were at all surprised by it.

**Influence on Self-Concept**

Almost all directors indicated that completion of the TAI would not cause one to lose self-esteem. Only three of the respondents said that completion of the TAI was likely to cause someone to think much less of himself or herself as a community education director. One person said that it caused one to be more aware of wasting time, another said that it pointed to weak areas in one's allocation practices, and the third said that one might see shortcomings instead of possibilities for growth. These comments do not appear to describe a strong challenge to one's self-concept as a consequence of completing the TAI.

There was no significant association between indicating strong feelings were aroused or not aroused by completing the TAI and high or low ranking on the GI scale or the IF scale. Thus, it is concluded that the degree of difficulty in allocating time, as indicated by the TAI, is independent of whether or not strong feelings are aroused by completing the TAI.

Since a third (13) of the respondents indicated that the TAI aroused strong feelings, it is concluded that some caution should be exercised in using the TAI. More specifically, ten respondents in the two groups who completed the Priorities Exercise said completing the TAI aroused strong feelings. Only three respondents in the other two groups said that it did. It is concluded that completion of the
Priorities Exercise may sensitize individuals to possible dissatisfaction with their time allocation behavior, which arouses strong feelings while completing the TAI.

There is no significant association between respondents' degree of difficulty with allocating time, as indicated by the TAI, and whether or not TAI items caused discomfort or uneasiness.

Thirteen individuals (32%) indicated some items caused them discomfort or uneasiness. It is concluded that completion of the TAI may cause some discomfort for some individuals.

Two items were listed by five respondents as causing discomfort:

32. A director loses interest in an objective and interrupts work on it to do something else.

33. As a director is working on an objective he or she decides to do something unrelated to accomplishing the objective.

One item was listed by four respondents:

21. A director interrupts work toward accomplishing an objective to do something nonproductive.

All three items are related to loss of self-discipline in working toward an objective.

One would expect to find a direct association between whether or not completion of the TAI aroused strong feelings and whether or not items were listed as causing discomfort. The Yates chi-square value of 6.46 for these two items is significant (p < .02). Those who did not say completion of the TAI aroused strong feelings tended not to list items as causing discomfort or uneasiness; those who said strong feelings were aroused tended to list items as causing discomfort.
In summary, TAI scores are not related to whether or not discomfort or other feelings are experienced while completing it. This allows one to have more confidence in interpreting the scores in terms of item content. If scores had been related to experiencing feelings, interpretation of TAI scores would be more ambiguous.

Completion of the Priorities Exercise does seem to stimulate awareness of feelings in more respondents, perhaps because they are sensitized to how the situations described in the TAI are related to their own priorities as a community educator. On the other hand, persons who did not complete the Priorities Exercise experienced discomfort on more items, perhaps because they could not see clearly how the situations described in the items affected their actual priorities. It would be interesting to see if processing responses to the Priorities Exercise in a group before completing the TAI would reduce the amount of feelings experienced. Perhaps expressing and sharing feelings about job-related priorities would reduce the emotion experienced while completing the TAI.

Summary of Results

There is evidence to support the proposition that completion of the Priorities Exercise affects responses made to the TAI. Those who completed the Exercise indicated that they were interrupted more frequently; they had fewer crisis items and more chronic items.

No evidence was found to support the proposition that directors will describe themselves as having more difficulty in allocating time.
than perceived ideal directors would have. Directors responding to the TAI as ideal directors tended to show more difficulty with allocating time. An interpretation of these results based on confusing "ideal director" with "ideal program" was discussed.

The summated scales have slightly more internal consistency than the diagnostic scores, although the M and C scores have comparable degrees of internal consistency. The N score appears to be the least satisfactory score from a statistical point of view, primarily because few respondents make any N responses. The IF, GI and K scores tend to identify the same items as potentially chronic time wasters, although each score identifies items uniquely. There is evidence that the IF rating scale should be modified to improve its capacity to discriminate among individuals.

The treatment groups were similar in the amount of experience that they had had with time management. Those with more experience indicated that they had more difficulty in allocating time; no information was obtained in this study to determine the nature of causality in this relationship. Some evidence was found to suggest that community educators tend to show more concern for allocating time effectively than other educational administrators.

Almost all directors indicated that completion of the TAI would not cause one to lose self-esteem. More of those who completed the Priorities Exercise has strong feelings while completing the TAI, perhaps because they were sensitized to deficiencies in their allocation practices. Items describing self-initiated interruptions tended
to cause more discomfort while completing the TAI; persons who completed the TAI to describe themselves without completing the Priorities Exercise experienced discomfort on more items.

Implications of these findings are discussed in the final chapter.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter begins with a summary of the study and discussion of limits to generalizing its findings. Suggestions for refining the Time Allocation Inventory are given, followed by discussion of several types of implications this study has for community education directors. Some implications for the superintendency are then considered, and an illustration is given of how time allocation research could advance theory development in educational administration. The chapter concludes with a summary of the various implications discussed.

Summary of This Study

This study was designed for three purposes. First, an instrument was developed for community education directors to use in estimating the effects of allocating time to activities often classified as time wasters. Second, two methods of scoring the responses to the instrument were compared. Third, the effects of two different sets of conditions on responses to the instrument were investigated. One condition involved considering job-related priorities before completing the instrument, while the other condition involved instructions to complete the instrument so as to describe one's own situation or to stimulate an ideal director's responses.

A time waster was defined as an activity which, in relation to another activity, is less effective in accomplishing desired goals or
objectives within a specified time period. In Phase I of this study an instrument called the Time Allocation Inventory (TAI) was developed, field tested and modified which described 35 types of interruptions which could be time wasters. Respondents estimated how often each interruption occurred in a typical work situation, and rated how much each interruption interfered with accomplishing goals. Each item was then coded as a minor interruption, nuisance, crisis or chronic time waster.

In Phase II of the study four groups of community education directors completed the TAI under different conditions. Two groups completed a Priorities Exercise prior to completing the TAI; the other groups did not complete the Exercise. Two groups completed the TAI under instructions to describe their own situation; two groups were instructed to complete the TAI as they believed a hypothetical ideal director would complete it. All groups completed a questionnaire on experience that they had had with time allocation, and a brief questionnaire on their reactions to the TAI.

Results

The TAI had satisfactory measures of internal consistency. Although strong feelings and discomfort were aroused in some who completed the TAI, almost all directors indicated that completion of the TAI would not cause one to lose self-esteem.

Completion of the Priorities Exercise did affect responses to the TAI. Those who completed it said that they were interrupted more frequently, and they had fewer crisis items and more chronic items.
It was hypothesized that directors would describe themselves as having more difficulty in allocating time than perceived ideal directors would have. In fact, the data tended to show the opposite. Those with more experience in time management indicated that they had more difficulty in allocating time. There was some evidence to suggest that community educators may show more concern for allocating time effectively than other educational administrators.

Several kinds of implications of these findings are discussed later in this chapter. But first some limits on the generalizability of the findings need to be mentioned.

**Limits on Generalizability**

Recently Shaver and Norton (1980) demonstrated that educational researchers do not tend to select samples at random from defined or described accessible populations, nor do they describe target populations with much detail. Limitations on generalizability are not usually discussed, and replication is not used as a research strategy. A brief analysis of generalizability for this study is appropriate here.

In this study the target population was full-time community education directors, or other full-time educational administrators, having primary responsibility for programming community education activities or events. Participants were not selected at random from a specified geographical area. All participants were members of the target population. Participants came from a variety of urban, suburban and rural settings.
The accessible population in the study was the subset of directors in the target population who voluntarily chose to participate in a workshop on time allocation. The results of the study are only generalizable to community education directors who have an interest in learning more about time allocation, and who are located in states where the predominant approach to community education is through community schools.

More confidence in the effects of the Priorities Exercise on responses to the TAI will be acquired if the results are replicated in another study. More exploration of the actual vs. ideal instructions condition is necessary before attempting to replicate that portion of this study.

Refinement of the TAI

Data were obtained in Phase I of the study that showed that the content of the TAI is understood by community educators and that it can be completed without undue confusion. Several suggestions were made in Chapter V, however, for refining the TAI for use in future studies.

First, the IF scale should be revised until it discriminates more among individuals. Perhaps a rating of twice a week should be inserted, and the hourly rating eliminated.

Second, validity studies should be conducted to determine the correlation between IF scores and logged frequencies of interruptions. Troy and Maggon (1979) compared estimates of time given by university...
counseling center staff for major job functions with actual times logged, and found that estimates were inflated for ten of eleven goals. Overall, nearly half of the job functions were overestimated by 50% or more of the staff.

On the other hand, the rank correlation coefficient between logged hours and estimated hours per goal in that study is .96. Even though overestimates were given for functions, the rank order of estimated hours correlated very highly with the rank order of logged hours.

Magana and Niebel (1976) compared self-estimates of time allocated to nineteen categories by sixteen university engineering department administrators with estimates based on 150 random observations of work activities for each administrator over a five-week period. A number of significant differences between the two types of estimates were reported. Lewis and Dahl (1976) conducted a similar study for eight university department chairpersons and four deans. There were significant differences between self-estimates and estimates based on a random sample of work activities for each administrator. These studies suggest that the validity of time estimation procedures should be investigated more thoroughly.

Validity studies should also be conducted to determine the correlation between GI scores and observations of goal impediments such as actual postponements, delays, overtime, etc.

Third, the stability of the TAI scores needs to be studied over various periods of time.
Fourth, the correlation between responses to the TAI and responses to typical checklists of time wasters should be determined.

Implications for Community Education Directors

Four sets of implications of this study for community educators are discussed in this section. First, potential uses of the TAI for assisting the director to be more accountable to the appropriate organization are discussed. Second, methods for identifying and reducing the effects of time wasters are considered. Third, possible studies are suggested for exploring the perceptions of time allocation in an ideal situation. Finally, some possibilities for using time allocation as a topic for instruction in a community education curriculum are discussed.

Accountability to the Organization

Recall that the organization perspective to auditing time allocation practices is based on determining how time is misallocated from the organization's point of view. The TAI provides a means for a director to clarify personal impressions of how interruptions affect his or her work, which can then be checked empirically by logging interruptions and their effects. This information can be used to improve time allocation from the organization's perspective.

In a provocative essay, Jones (1968) outlined an approach for quantifying the benefits of time allocation, beginning with three basic assumptions which are consistent with most executive situations.
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These assumptions also appear to be consistent with the concerns expressed by community educators regarding demands on their time.

1. Executive time is scarce. Although each individual has the same amount of time as anyone else, the number of executives is small. Therefore, the total number of hours available for executive tasks is limited.

2. There is a continuous backlog of unsatisfied demands that are directed to most executives. Regardless of how rapidly demands are satisfied, the number of demands remaining to be satisfied does not appear to dwindle.

3. There is a more meaningful relationship between returns on time invested and the amount of time invested in a decision, than between returns on money invested and the amount of money invested in a decision.

Jones recommended that managers analyze their decision making to determine which types of decisions required the greatest amounts of time, and to break those down into components where time management principles can be applied to improve effectiveness. Time coefficients could be developed for major activities, and experimentation with different allocation patterns conducted. Once decision areas requiring greater amounts of time are identified, then the TAI could be used to identify activities which may be time wasters in those areas.

Accountability can be analyzed from the perspective of priorities. Suppose a director's advisory council, Board of Education and superintendent (or other appropriate superordinate) completed the
Priorities Exercise used in this study. The results would show which tasks are considered higher priority by those to whom the director is accountable. Then the director could estimate or log the amounts of time allocated to each task priority, and see if there are discrepancies to be resolved between time allocated and priority assigned by superordinates.

The TAI could be used to identify interruptions which create the most difficulty for tasks which are allocated the most time. These interruptions, which are time wasters, can then be analyzed to develop changes in the situation or director's behavior which will yield more effective time allocation.

Reducing Effects of Time Wasters

Rutherford (1978, chap. 8) listed eight steps for pinpointing and controlling time wasters. Those steps are discussed here in terms of this study.

The first step is to describe in specific terms and as clearly as possible the nature of the time waster. To define a time waster, it has been recommended in this study that alternative activities be listed for accomplishing a specific goal or objective, that the times required for each alternative be compared, and that the effectiveness of each be compared. Completion of the TAI provides information on types of situations that are potential time wasters. Those items which are scored as "critical" or "chronic" should be explored by the respondent in these more specific terms.
Rutherford's second step is to discern the messages being received from a potential time waster by answering such questions as: What behaviors are involved? What are the positive and negative consequences associated with those behaviors? In this study, evidence was found that consideration of priorities influences estimates of how often interruptions occur and how much impact they have on goal interference. Reflection on potential time wasters in relation to priorities is one way of analyzing positive and negative consequences.

Third, analyze the implicit and explicit agreements that one has with others regarding one's time allocation, especially in terms of the purpose served by each agreement. In this study, two-party interactions and individual behaviors were more likely to be classified as chronic time wasters. This result underscores the importance of analyzing these types of agreements.

Fourth, analyze the positive and negative payoffs associated with the potential time waster by answering such questions as: Assuming that every activity has some payoff associated with it, what behavioral and attitudinal goals or objectives are achieved by engaging in the activity? How do they complement or impede accomplishing goals or objectives for which one is accountable? In this study, it was found that consideration of priorities assigned to job-related tasks influenced responses to potential time wasters. This is one way of analyzing positive and negative payoffs.

The fifth step is to ascertain whether the activity is controlled by oneself or someone else, or under what circumstances it is controlled by oneself or others. In this study, two-party interactions
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and solitary activities were more likely to be coded as chronic time wasters; analysis of the solitary activities is probably the place to begin planning changes in time allocation practices.

Sixth, analyze one's own attitudes toward a particular time waster. In this study about half of the respondents said that they allocated time as well as can be expected, while 30% said that they wasted too much time. All of these people were voluntarily participating in a workshop on time allocation, which suggests that attention should be given to clarification of relevant attitudes before deciding where to concentrate on improving time allocation. In another study, Cookingham (1980) obtained some evidence that not all time allocation workshop participants are ready to consider personal behavioral change as a way of improving time allocation.

The seventh step is to think through implications of dealing with the time wasters for one's life. Recall that the items for the TAI were developed from various lists of time wasters. It is of interest that the TAI items were rated in ways that reflected different degrees of potential for wasting time. Under the self-instructions condition there were 14 minor items, 14 crisis items and 7 chronic items. The seven chronic items were:

- dealing with a crisis;
- dealing with routine details;
- being interrupted by an unanticipated event;
- doing something nonproductive;
- being unable to consult with a necessary person;
- dealing with some other responsibility;
- socializing.

Suppose one decided to reduce the amount of time allocated to socializing. It is possible that belongingness needs might go
unfulfilled, possibly to the extent that productivity decreased rather than increased. Or suppose one decided to reduce doing non-productive tasks. Before proceeding it is advisable to determine what needs are met by doing those nonproductive tasks, and to project what could happen if those needs are not satisfied in some other fashion.

The final step is to create a plan of action for dealing with an identified time waster. In terms of the rationale for this study two approaches can be taken; reduce the frequency of interruptions, or reduce interference with goal accomplishment.

**Perceptions of Allocation for Ideal Directors**

Recall that the observed mean scale scores for the TAI do not support, and for one score contradict, the proposition that hypothetical ideal directors will be perceived as having less difficulty with time allocation than actual directors have. (The mean Crisis score for the ideal-instructions group was significantly greater than the mean for the self-instructions group.)

Also recall that the variance of the TAI scores was significantly greater for the self-instructions group only on the N score for those who did not complete the Priorities Exercise. The observed score variances do not support, and in some cases contradict, the proposition that there is consensus among directors on how ideal directors would respond to the TAI. For those who completed the Priorities Exercise, the variance of the ideal-instructions group was significantly greater for both the N and C scales; $F (9, 9) = 7.31, p < .10$;
\( F(9, 9) = 2.70, \ p < .10, \) respectively. (Refer back to Table 22.)

Also, it is inconsistent with other studies which showed that variances were smaller on the Time Competence scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory under instructions to describe the ideal self than under instructions to describe the actual self (Braun & Asta, 1969; Foulds & Warehime, 1971).

Several types of studies could be conducted to search for an explanation for these puzzling findings. Directors could be asked to describe qualities of an ideal director, and then to describe how such a director would deal with interruptions and goal interference. Probing interviews could yield clues to how time allocation is viewed in ideal situations.

It might be interesting to specify in the instructions to the TAI that the ideal director is known for allocating time effectively and efficiently, and then compare TAI responses under this condition to the responses observed in this study. Debriefing respondents, asking them to explain responses to certain items, could yield valuable insights.

It would be interesting to have an appropriate panel select a group of ideal directors, directors who have demonstrated that they are both effective and efficient, and have them respond to the TAI.

Finally, the same individuals could complete the TAI, or random halves of it, under both ideal-instructions and self-instructions. The predicted results may appear when individuals are their own control group, provided that variables such as completion order are counterbalanced.
Meeting Community Needs Through Time Allocation Instruction

The study of time allocation practices may have implications for curriculum development in community education. Briod (1978) presented a case for including "synchronization learning" in schooling, which is acquisition of skills and habits for arranging activities that involve others according to the clock and calendar. As social relations become more complex at work and outside work, individuals who do not allocate time wisely, either because they don't know how or because they haven't the will to do so, become increasingly handicapped in functioning effectively. Educators have not decided to do much with synchronization learning in the K-12 curriculum, perhaps because the value of the machine called the clock is not recognized for personal planning (it's viewed more as a necessary evil than as an essential aid). Perhaps it is overlooked because time consciousness is associated with work-life efficiency or anti-work attitudes in popular culture. Most likely, according to Briod, it claims little attention because educators know relatively little about teaching skills such as judging when the time is appropriate for taking a major action at work or at home, or developing favorable attitudes toward time allocation in terms of immediate and long-range consequences to the self and others.

If the pressures associated with being a community education director cause directors to seek more skill in time allocation, and if seeking more skill leads to more in-depth analyses of what is involved in dealing with time, that in turn may stimulate more
definitive curriculum development in this area for both children and adults. This could be an important step toward helping individuals and groups meet their perceived needs in the community, which is a major aim of community education.

From another perspective, Becker (1965) has discussed an economic theory of time allocation based on the assumption that allocation of non-work time may be more important to economic welfare than work time. Since leisure time represents foregone productivity in the usual concept of the marketplace, there are costs to be computed in an economic analysis. As the leisure industry grows, however, benefits also become an important element of the analysis. Moreover, since volunteer time is an important element of social problem solving, which is related to productivity, the development of skill in time allocation throughout the populace may have economic impact beyond what can be projected at the present time. Community educators who have skill in time allocation may appreciate its value more, and may see broader applications consistent with the aims of community education.

Time Allocation for Other Educational Administrators

There are articles and materials for educational leaders that emphasize the value of time management without support data (Brieve, 1977; Fitzwater, 1977; Halverson, 1974; Hendrickson, 1979; Howes, 1974; Josephs, 1961; Lagana, 1975; Sexton & Switzer, 1978; Time Management, 1974; Weldy, 1974), but there are few empirical studies. As discussed earlier, Lewis and Dahl (1976) did a work sampling study.
of eight university department chairpersons and four deans, and Magana and Niebel (1976) did a work sampling study of sixteen engineering education administrators. Dorwin (1978) compared management activities of elementary school principals and middle managers in industry. In this section some implications of this study using the TAI are discussed for the superintendency.

Wilson (1960, chap. 2) discussed a study of estimates of time allocation conducted by the American Association of School Administrators in 1950 in a dramatic portrayal of the nonpredictable nature of a superintendent's typical day. In that study city superintendents estimated that they allocated more time to financial administration and school-plant management than they would prefer, and less time to instructional leadership than they would prefer. Wilson noted three obstacles to more effective time allocation in the superintendency—exceptional situations to which an immediate response must be made continually occur but cannot be scheduled; the public regards the superintendent as a servant to them on call (Cohen and March, 1974, noted similar expectations for a college president); and many individuals believe in taking their concern directly to the chief executive, regardless of whether it could be handled more effectively by a subordinate.

Pitner (1979) documented time allocation patterns for one week for three suburban school superintendents, and Duignan (1979) observed eight Canadian superintendents, for two to five days each. In both studies it was observed that the superintendent's day was characterized
by numerous brief episodes, with the primary activity being giving
or receiving information. Much time was allocated to reacting to
situations involving relatively mundane matters. They did not allo­
cate time on predetermined priorities or potential achievements,
perhaps because there was much unclarity about long-term goals.
These findings are consistent with Wilson's earlier observations.

In general, the superintendents had no definite procedures for
allocating time. Duignan summed up the time allocation challenges
facing the superintendent:

- Balance the pace and quality of work.
- Deal actively with current issues while planning
  how to deal with longer range issues.
- Allocate time efficiently while leading a
  humanistic organization.
- Apportion time between managing daily operations
  and providing educational leadership.

An instrument like the TAI could be used to identify areas where such
challenges could be met. To be effective it should be used in con­
junction with a priorities exercise. Kimbrough and Nunnery (1976,
chap. 6) have presented categories of educational administration tasks
which could be used in developing or assessing the appropriateness of
such an exercise.

Theory Development in Educational Administration

There appears to be growing concern for effective time allocation
in different aspects of education. Bloom (1980) has described new
directions in educational research in terms of "alterable variables."
Learner time-on-task is an alterable variable that is being studied more, for studies show that the percentage of time on task is highly related to achievement and attitudes toward learning. Time on task can be altered by instructional procedures, which means that patterns of teacher time allocation affect patterns of learner time allocation which in turn affects learner achievement and willingness to learn.

For example, Arlin (1979) described research on transitions in elementary and junior high classrooms ("Stop doing that, and begin doing this.") as a major mechanism for influencing classroom time flow. Structuring transitions to minimize off-task student behavior (which can be called disruptions) may be a key to more effective learning in the classroom. Another way to describe this aspect of teaching is to say that determining what teacher behaviors result in more effective allocation of student time will provide guidelines for teachers in allocating their own time more effectively. Observation of transitions may provide reliable clues to a teacher's general effectiveness in allocating instructional time.

Arlin noted, however, that teachers tend to view time as something to use up or kill rather than as a scarce resource to allocate with care. He suggested that teacher perceptions of time management may be analyzed better by using some approach other than the economic analogy of scarce resource allocation. The results of this study of the TAI for community educators suggest that the study of transitions initiated by teachers may profit from including clarification of instructional task priorities and classification of different types
of disruptions in terms of frequency of occurrence and amount of interference with completion of the high priority instructional tasks.

Glaser (1979) suggested that a macrotheory of teaching and instruction may be developed around large practical variables including allocation and efficient use of time. Erickson (1979) deplored the lack of attention given to research on student time allocation in research on educational administration, noting that organizing schooling in accord with such findings would have far-reaching consequences for school administration and society. It is worth considering how time allocation research might contribute to theory development in educational administration.

Needs Satisfaction

To illustrate such potential, consider the areas of needs satisfaction and job satisfaction. Much of the time management literature is based on a common-sense approach to managing one's activities to satisfy one's needs. Examples from well-known consultants include Lakein's (1973) emphasis on using an ABC priority system along with maxims such as:

- Work smarter, not harder;
- Control your time—and your life;
- Decide what you really want from life;
- Block out A-time—work on high priority tasks;
- Continually ask Lakein's question: "What is the best use of my time right now?"
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Webber (1972) included the following items in a list of practical tactics for allocating time effectively:

Be specific on what is delegated, and do not interfere with subordinates to whom tasks are delegated. This will require self-control and courage.

Every manager must drift from some time while responding to others. Managers must discipline themselves to be open, patient, and truly responsive.

Formulate wishes about the future, even though it is difficult and threatening.

Love (1978) described the basic objective of time allocation as accomplishing more that is important to the individual while maintaining satisfactory quality at reasonable cost. A basic principle is to concentrate effort on the life purposes that are most important to the individual.

This type of advice makes good sense; it is rational, reasonable, understandable. Why don't all administrators allocate time well? There appears to be some felt need among managers in various fields to acquire more skill in allocating time effectively, and there is some evidence in this study that in educational administration the need may be stronger among community educators. Are there other competing needs within administrators which lead to the development of attitudes and behaviors associated with misallocation of time?

For example, to delegate tasks to others effectively requires the capacity to trust others and to accept outcomes which differ to some degree from expected outcomes. One who has a strong need for security may have difficulty delegating tasks. Boles and Davenport
(1978) challenged educational leaders to determine whether they were able and willing to meet personal needs and help others meet theirs. To help others feel satisfied in terms of growth, responsibility, achievement, and recognition, they suggest that leaders must allow delegation; involve others in goal-setting, problem-solving, and work design; give access to information; encourage action in an atmosphere of freedom and approval. Not everyone is capable of such behavior, which may help explain why everyone is not capable of allocating time effectively.

This area could be studied by analyzing correlations between need levels and TAI responses. Trusty & Sergiovanni (1966) developed a process for measuring perceived deficiencies at the various levels of the Maslow need hierarchy (Maslow, 1943) in teachers and administrators which could be used or adapted for such a study. Studies by Porter (1962) and Schneider and Alderfer (1973), which developed operational ways of identifying prepotent need levels of modified versions of the Maslow hierarchy, would also provide clues for designing an appropriate study.

As educational enrollments decline teachers will tend to stay in a school system longer; as the art of negotiating becomes more developed it will require more supervisory skill and ingenuity to create conditions within which teachers will "give their all." As revenues decrease, due to declining enrollments, community educators will be pressed to justify their positions more and more. Again, supervisory ingenuity will be required to encourage high quality performance in somewhat precarious situations.
Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) provides another approach to satisfaction of needs related to professional performance. Given the importance of time-on-task for educational effectiveness, studies of relationships between motivators, hygienes, and TAI scores could yield important findings for educational administration in general, and for community educators in particular.

Using Herzberg's theory Sheppard (1979) identified achievement as the most frequent source of job satisfaction for community education coordinators in the Mid-Atlantic region. Since time allocation practices directly affect achievement, job satisfaction may be increased by improving time allocation practices. (Discussing a rationale for time management for community college faculty, Tesar, 1977, suggested that a major reason is to help increase job satisfaction by increasing one's sense of control over time.) The results of this study suggest that review of priorities should be part of any assessment process used to identify potential time wasters, and that beliefs regarding time allocation in ideal situations need to be clarified. Perhaps such beliefs could be clarified by investigating relationships between TAI scores and motivators/hygienes.

Studies by Sergiovanni (1967) and Schmidt (1976), which apply Herzberg's theory to teacher and administrator job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, could provide clues to designing an appropriate study. It is important to take note of the methodological controversy that has been generated by studies based on the two-factor theory;
articles by Ewen (1966), Grigaliunas and Herzberg (1971), House and Wigdor (1967), King (1970), Soliman (1970), Whitsett and Winslow (1967), and Wolfe (1970) should be reviewed carefully. Hoy and Miskel (1978) described a three-factor reformulation of Herzberg's theory, based on a research instrument developed by Miskel and Heller (1973) and studies conducted by Miskel (1973, 1974), which could also be helpful.

Sense of Personal Competence

Another perspective is provided for this area by considering the relationship between a leader's sense of personal competence or importance and time allocation patterns. Cohen and March (1974, chap. 7) described time allocation patterns for a national sample of college presidents, who are usually described by themselves and others as overworked and misworked (unable to concentrate on important matters because of claims placed on them by others). Cohen and March attempted to explain why presidents and their contacts view the situation in this manner but do little or nothing to change it.

A key factor is the ambiguous nature of goals for higher education. Given the diversity of goals, with no generally accepted way of assigning relatively long-lasting priorities to them, it is not possible to compare the relative effectiveness of executive time allocation patterns in terms of desired outcomes. A president can't defend a change in allocation practices with hard data. There may be less ambiguity about goals for community education in a particular
situation; if so, more data could be collected to help ascertain which allocation patterns are more effective. Such data can be interpreted meaningfully only if priorities are analyzed.

Another key factor is the belief shared among the president's contacts that his or her time is a scarce resource which must be obtained, regardless of how much actual influence an appointment or meeting has on eventual outcomes important to the individual seeking the president's time. In the absence of hard data on the relationship between goal accomplishment and time allocation, these social expectations become the norms which govern allocation practices for the president. He or she can't say "no" to demands to meet with a large variety of people regarding a broad array of concerns, because the expectations of others strongly contradict the exercise of executive judgment in that manner. Because the community education director works with many community leaders and groups, similar social expectations may influence time allocation practices. Classification of interruptions, as was done to develop the TAI, is an important step in understanding this area.

Finally, given the ambiguous nature of goals for higher education, given the strong expectations of others that the president respond affirmatively to requests for appointments and presence at meetings and various social functions, college presidents may choose to work long hours doing things of less importance because it enhances their sense of personal competence and importance. Organizing time around people rather than problems, putting forth effort in a way that is perceived as conscientious and equitable by the various individuals
and groups related to the presidency, is what presidents appear to enjoy doing. In some sense, according to Cohen and March, working long hours as the head of an institution is a reward with various emotional perquisites for past accomplishments. Time allocation is judged effective more in terms of the relationship between satisfaction expressed by a variety of groups and personal effort than in terms of organizational goal accomplishment. Sheppard's (1979) finding that achievement was a more frequent source of job satisfaction for community educators than recognition suggests that this factor may not be as important in community education as it is in the college presidency, but it seems worth exploring more systematically. (Incidentally, this factor may have valuable explanatory power for the superintendency in public schools.)

This sketch of possible studies and factors to be investigated illustrates the potential usefulness of the TAI in other areas of research in educational administration.

Summary of Implications

The TAI could be used to develop time coefficients for important decision-making areas in community education to assist directors in being more accountable. Analysis of priorities among referent groups could pinpoint areas where a director should use the TAI to identify time wasters in order to be perceived as more accountable to those groups.
The categories of time wasters developed for this study could be used to focus efforts to improve time allocation. This was illustrated for one practical approach described by Rutherford (1978).

Several types of studies were suggested to explore perceptions of time allocation in an ideal situation. This is an interesting area for future research.

The value of instruction about time allocation in a community was explored from a couple of perspectives.

Extension of research with the TAI to other areas of educational administration was discussed, and an illustration of how that could be done for the superintendency was presented. Possible contributions of time allocation studies in developing theory in educational administration were considered, particularly in relation to the growing body of research about instructional time on task. An illustration of how time allocation research could be done within the context of theories about need satisfaction and job satisfaction was presented, drawing on studies done with public school teachers and administrators and college presidents.

This study has attempted to demonstrate the potential value of more systematic investigation of time allocation practices in community education and educational administration. In spite of the taint of hucksterism associated with time management consulting, developing skill in allocating time effectively is essential for educational leaders in this era of change. It is hoped that this study is a contribution to that end.
APPENDIX A

Time Allocation Instrument Tryout Form

Phase I
TIME ALLOCATION INSTRUMENT TRYOUT

PHASE I

Please check your answer to each of the following questions.

1. Are you currently enrolled as a graduate student in educational administration?
   
   ___ NO
   ___ YES

2. Have you worked full-time in educational administration any time in the past twelve months?
   
   ___ NO
   ___ YES

3. Have you worked as a community educator at any time?
   
   ___ NO
   ___ YES

4. Have you ever taken a course in community education, or a course which included some discussion of the concept of community education?
   
   ___ NO
   ___ YES

5. Have you ever worked closely with a community education director?
   
   ___ NO
   ___ YES

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING TIME TO THIS TASK.
APPENDIX B

Time Allocation Inventory

Self-Instructions
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY

This is an exercise in clarifying how you perceive the effects that interruptions have on your performance as a Community Education Director. The information you provide will be used to develop procedures that Directors can use on the job to accomplish desired goals and objectives effectively.

Many of us have not thought about how we manage time. Your honest response to each item, however, even if you believe it is a tentative response, is more valuable than no response. Your responses will be regarded as confidential.

Some of the items may cause you to think about work situations where you desire to perform more effectively. Managing time always involves choosing to do something while choosing not to do something else. Reacting to interruptions in a humane way also involves such choices. Thus no inferences from your responses will be made about your worth as an individual or your competence as a Community Education Director. The intent of the exercise is simply to clarify how Directors perceive the effects that interruptions have on their performance.

There are two Parts to the Inventory. In Part I you will be asked to recall accomplishments and unaccomplished objectives for recent workdays. Since you will need this information to complete Part II of the Inventory, take whatever time you need to complete Part I to your satisfaction.

After you have completed Part I you will be given an Inventory of 35 items. Each item describes an activity which interrupts another activity related to accomplishing your goals or objectives. Your task will be to assign two types of ratings to each of the items. Complete instructions for Part II will be given to you after you have completed Part I.
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY
PART I

For this part of the Inventory your task is to recall work accomplishments for recent work days and to record them on the Recent Work Accomplishments Chart. Please follow the steps given below carefully.

In the space labeled "Day 1" on the Chart, write down the name of the most recent completed work day. For example, if today is Monday and you worked a full day last Friday, write "Friday" in the Day 1 space.

Day 1 __________ Day 2 __________ Day 3 __________

In some respects every work day is unique. On the other hand, most people differentiate between a usual day and an unusual one, even when usual days contain something new or interesting. Was there anything extremely unusual about what you did at work on the day you wrote down? For example, did you spend most of your time on something that happens only once a year, or did some crisis occur that has never occurred before and is unlikely to occur again? If so, cross out the day you entered for Day 1 and write the name of the next most recent work day that was not extremely unusual.

Now enter the next most recent two complete work days in the spaces labeled "Day 2" and "Day 3," which were not extremely unusual.

List your work related accomplishments for each of the three days. Then list things you wanted to accomplish on each of those days, but didn't.
RECENT WORK ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Start time: _______  Complete time: _______

Day 1____________________

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

Day 2____________________

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

Day 3____________________

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

Thank you for allocating time to this task.

Ask for Part II of the Inventory.
There are 35 items in Part II of the Inventory. Each item describes an activity which interrupts another activity related to accomplishing goals or objectives in a work day. Your task is to assign two types of ratings to each of the items.

Read the first item carefully. Rate it according to how frequently you believe the situation described in the item occurs in a typical work situation for you. Refer to your Recent Work Accomplishments Chart to help you decide your ratings as realistically as you can for your situation. Whether or not the situation can be controlled by you, indicate how frequently it typically occurs.

A rating can range from 1 to 5. Use the following scale:

Usually an interruption like this occurs about

1 = once a week or less.

2 = more than once a week but less than once a day.

3 = once a day.

4 = more than once a day but less than once an hour.

5 = once an hour or more.
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Now re-read the item. Rate it according to the degree to which the total number of interruptions similar to the one described in the item interferes with accomplishing goals or objectives in a typical work day for you. Refer to your Recent Work Accomplishments Chart to help you decide your ratings as realistically as you can for your situation.

A rating can range from 1 to 5. Use the following scale:

When such interruptions occur in a work day, the usual effect on accomplishing goals or objectives for the day is

1 = negligible.

2 = slight—a nonessential activity is eliminated from the schedule.

3 = moderate—an essential activity is rescheduled for another day.

4 = serious—it is necessary to work overtime.

5 = critical—an essential activity is eliminated, which has undesirable consequences.

Make your responses on the two scales independent from each other. Any combination of ratings is possible. An item can have a 1 on one scale and a 5 on the other, or vice-versa, or the item can have the same value on both scales, etc.

Please respond to both scales on each item. Your best estimate, no matter how tentative, provides more information than no response.
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY
PART II

Date: ________________  No. ______________

Circle the two appropriate responses for each of the 35 items by following the instructions given on a separate sheet.

01. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because I postpone making a necessary decision related to it.

**Interruption Frequency**

1  2  3  4  5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1  2  3  4  5
negligible moderate critical

02. As I work with someone on a task our progress is delayed because one or both of us is unable to concentrate on it.

**Interruption Frequency**

1  2  3  4  5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1  2  3  4  5
negligible moderate critical

03. I am delayed in accomplishing an objective because I continually seek more information before acting.

**Interruption Frequency**

1  2  3  4  5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1  2  3  4  5
negligible moderate critical

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
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04. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because I am interrupted to attend a meeting not directly related to accomplishing the objective.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05. As I work with someone else we are interrupted in completing our task to resolve a difference in priorities.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

06. I am unable to accomplish my objectives in attending a meeting because the participants do not have adequate information.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
07. My work toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted by attending a meeting where the outcomes of the meeting could have been accomplished just as effectively without me.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

08. I am delayed in accomplishing an objective while waiting for a group or committee to do something related to accomplishing it.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

09. My progress toward accomplishing an objective is delayed because I am not adequately prepared to do some task required to accomplish it.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical
10. My work toward accomplishing an objective is delayed while I deal with a crisis that interrupts that work.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. As I work with someone else, my work toward accomplishing our goal together is delayed because I was unable to say no to doing an irrelevant task initiated by the other person.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. As I work with someone to accomplish a goal, we set unrealistic deadlines which result in a delay in achieving the goal.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. My work on an important objective is interrupted to deal with routine details.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. My progress toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted as someone sends me a stream of detailed memos on the activities required to accomplish it.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. As I work with someone we are delayed in accomplishing our goal because we duplicate each other's effort.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. As I work with someone on a task our progress is interrupted by an unanticipated event.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed while I talk with someone who is not prepared to use whatever contribution I may have.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I am unable to accomplish my objectives in a meeting because other participants are trying to resolve conflicts in interest.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
19. I am unable to accomplish my objectives in a meeting because I am unable to concentrate my attention on them.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

20. My progress toward achieving a goal is interrupted while I wait for a decision from a committee or group of people.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

21. I interrupt my work toward accomplishing an objective to do something nonproductive.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical
22. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed while I attend a meeting that has more items on the agenda than can be dealt with satisfactorily.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

23. My progress toward accomplishing an objective is delayed because I make a snap decision and do something which later has to be re-done.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

24. My work on an objective is interrupted because a supervisor has failed to make a necessary decision.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical
25. I am delayed in accomplishing an objective because someone I need to consult with is not available.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. My work toward accomplishing an objective is delayed by participating in a meeting where the priorities of the agenda items were not clarified.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. My progress toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted because I have to deal with some other responsibility.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
28. As I work with another individual our progress toward accomplishing a goal is delayed as we socialize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal Interference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. My objectives for a meeting are not accomplished because there is too much information for the group to process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal Interference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. My work toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted by attending a meeting where participants are inadequately prepared to deal with the agenda items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal Interference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
31. I set unrealistic deadlines for myself which cause delays in accomplishing my goals.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. I lose interest in an objective and interrupt my work on it to do something else.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because I did not communicate enough information to someone related to the task.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
34. I am unable to accomplish my objectives in a meeting because an unanticipated event interrupts it.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

35. As I am working on an objective I decide to do something unrelated to accomplishing the objective.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING TIME TO THIS TASK

IF ___________  M ___________  TA ___________
GI ___________  N ___________  
C ___________  K ___________
APPENDIX C

Time Allocation Inventory

Ideal-Instructions
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY

This is an exercise in clarifying how you perceive the effects that interruptions have on your performance as a Community Education Director. The information you provide will be used to develop procedures that Directors can use on the job to accomplish desired goals and objectives effectively.

Many of us have not thought about how we manage time. Your honest response to each item, however, even if you believe it is a tentative response, is more valuable than no response. Your responses will be regarded as confidential.

Some of the items may cause you to think about work situations where you desire to perform more effectively. Managing time always involves choosing to do something while choosing not to do something else. Reacting to interruptions in a humane way also involves such choices. Thus, no inferences from your responses will be made about your worth as an individual or your competence as a Community Education Director. The intent of the exercise is simply to clarify how Directors perceive the effects that interruptions have on their performance.

There are two Parts to the Inventory. In part I you will be asked to recall accomplishments and unaccomplished objectives for recent workdays. Since you will need this information to complete Part II of the Inventory, take whatever time you need to complete Part I to your satisfaction.

After you have completed Part I you will be given an Inventory of 35 items. Each item describes an activity which interrupts another activity related to accomplishing your goals or objectives. Your task will be to assign two types of ratings to each of the items. Complete instructions for Part II will be given to you after you have completed Part I.
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY  
PART I

For this part of the Inventory your task is to recall work accomplishments for recent work days and to record them on the Recent Work Accomplishments Chart. Please follow the steps given below carefully.

In the space labeled "Day 1" on the Chart, write down the name of the most recent completed work day. For example, if today is Monday and you worked a full day last Friday, write "Friday" in the Day 1 space.

Day 1 __________ Day 2 __________ Day 3 __________

In some respects every work day is unique. On the other hand, most people differentiate between a usual day and an unusual one, even when usual days contain something new or interesting. Was there anything extremely unusual about what you did at work on the day you wrote down? For example, did you spend most of your time on something that happens only once a year, or did some crisis occur that has never occurred before and is unlikely to occur again? If so, cross out the day you entered for Day 1 and write the name of the next most recent work day that was not extremely unusual.

Now enter the next most recent two complete work days in the spaces labeled "Day 2" and "Day 3," which were not extremely unusual.

List your work related accomplishments for each of the three days. Then list things you wanted to accomplish on each of those days, but didn't.
## RECENT WORK ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Start time: ___________  
Complete time: ________

### Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
<th>GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
<th>GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
<th>GOALS OR OBJECTIVES NOT ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for allocating time to this task.

Ask for Part II of the Inventory.
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY
PART II

Although we try to do the best job we can under the circumstances, we tend to have an image in mind of someone who could do it better. Perhaps this ideal someone has had more experience, or more extensive training, or has more energy. Each one of us can think of some person, real or imagined, who can perform competently as a Community Education Director in every way desirable. This does not mean that we are incompetent in our present situation. It simply means we can imagine someone accomplishing much in spite of obstacles or difficulties.

For this part of the Inventory, respond to the items as you think an ideal Director would respond. You may believe an ideal Director would respond much differently than you would respond for yourself, or you may believe he or she would make the same response you would make for yourself. In either case, mark the response you believe an ideal Director would mark.

There are 35 items in Part II of the Inventory. Each item describes an activity which interrupts another activity related to accomplishing goals or objectives in a work day. Your task is to assign two types of ratings to each of the items.

Read the first item carefully. Rate it according to how frequently you believe the situation described in the item occurs in a typical work situation for the ideal Director you have in mind. Refer to your Recent Work Accomplishments Chart to help you decide your ratings as realistically as you can for the ideal Director. Whether or not the situation can be controlled by the Director, indicate how frequently it typically occurs.

A rating can range from 1 to 5. Use the following scale:

Usually an interruption like this occurs about

1 = once a week or less.

2 = more than once a week but less than once a day.

3 = once a day.

4 = more than once a day but less than once an hour.

5 = once an hour or more.
Now re-read the item. Rate it according to the degree to which the
total number of interruptions similar to the one described in the
item interferes with accomplishing goals or objectives in a typical
work day for the ideal Director you have in mind. Refer to your
Recent Work Accomplishments Chart to help you decide your ratings as
realistically as you can for the ideal Director.

A rating can range from 1 to 5. Use the following scale:

When such interruptions occur in a work day, the usual
effect on accomplishing goals or objectives for the day is

1 = negligible.

2 = slight—a nonessential activity is eliminated from the
schedule.

3 = moderate—an essential activity is rescheduled for
another day.

4 = serious—it is necessary to work overtime.

5 = critical—an essential activity is eliminated, which
has undesirable consequences.

Make your responses on the two scales independent from each other.
Any combination of ratings is possible. An item can have a
1 on one scale and a 5 on the other, or vice-versa, or the item
can have the same value on both scales, etc.

Please respond to both scales on each item. Your best estimate, no
matter how tentative, provides more information than no response.
Circle the two appropriate responses for each of the 35 items by following the instructions given on a separate sheet.

01. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because an ideal director postpones making a necessary decision related to it.

Interruption Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

Goal Interference

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

02. As an ideal director works with someone on a task their progress is delayed because one or both of them is unable to concentrate on it.

Interruption Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

Goal Interference

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

03. An ideal director is delayed in accomplishing an objective because he or she continually seeks more information before acting.

Interruption Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

Goal Interference

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical
04. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because an ideal director is interrupted to attend a meeting not directly related to accomplishing the objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05. As an ideal director works with someone else they are interrupted in completing their task to resolve a difference in priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

06. An ideal director is unable to accomplish his or her objectives in attending a meeting because the participants do not have adequate information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruption Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
07. An ideal director's work toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted by attending a meeting where the outcomes of the meeting could have been accomplished just as effectively without him or her.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

08. An ideal director is delayed in accomplishing an objective while waiting for a group or committee to do something related to accomplishing it.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

09. An ideal director's progress toward accomplishing an objective is delayed because he or she is not adequately prepared to do some task required to accomplish it.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. An ideal director's work toward accomplishing an objective is delayed while he or she deals with a crisis that interrupts that work.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. As an ideal director works with someone else, his or her work toward accomplishing their goal together is delayed because he or she was unable to say no to doing an irrelevant task initiated by the other person.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. As an ideal director works with someone to accomplish a goal, they set unrealistic deadlines which result in a delay in achieving the goal.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. An ideal director's work on an important objective is interrupted to deal with routine details.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. An ideal director's progress toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted as someone sends him or her a stream of detailed memos on the activities required to accomplish it.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. As an ideal director works with someone they are delayed in accomplishing their goal because they duplicate each other's effort.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
16. As an ideal director works with someone on a task their progress is interrupted by an unanticipated event.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed while an ideal director talks with someone who is not prepared to use whatever contribution he or she may have.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. An ideal director is unable to accomplish his or her objectives in a meeting because other participants are trying to resolve conflicts in interest.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
19. An ideal director is unable to accomplish his or her objectives in a meeting because he or she is unable to concentrate attention on them.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

20. An ideal director's progress toward achieving a goal is interrupted while he or she waits for a decision from a committee or group of people.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical

21. An ideal director interrupts work toward accomplishing an objective to do something nonproductive.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5
negligible moderate critical
22. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed while an ideal director attends a meeting that has more items on the agenda than can be dealt with satisfactorily.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. An ideal director's progress toward accomplishing an objective is delayed because he or she makes a snap decision and does something which later has to be re-done.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. An ideal director's work on an objective is interrupted because a supervisor has failed to make a necessary decision.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. An ideal director is delayed in accomplishing an objective because someone he or she needs to consult with it not available.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. An ideal director's work toward accomplishing an objective is delayed by participating in a meeting where the priorities of the agenda items were not clarified.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. An ideal director's progress toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted because he or she has to deal with some other responsibility.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or less</th>
<th>Once/twice daily</th>
<th>Hourly or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. As an ideal director works with another individual their progress toward accomplishing a goal is delayed as they socialize.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

29. An ideal director’s objectives for a meeting are not accomplished because there is too much information for the group to process.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical

30. An ideal director’s work toward accomplishing an objective is interrupted by attending a meeting where participants are inadequately prepared to deal with the agenda items.

**Interruption Frequency**

1 2 3 4 5  
weekly or less once/twice daily hourly or more

**Goal Interference**

1 2 3 4 5  
negligible moderate critical
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31. An ideal director sets unrealistic deadlines which cause delays in accomplishing his or her goals.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or Less</th>
<th>Once/Twice Daily</th>
<th>Hourly or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. An ideal director loses interest in an objective and interrupts work on it to do something else.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or Less</th>
<th>Once/Twice Daily</th>
<th>Hourly or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Accomplishment of an objective is delayed because an ideal director did not communicate enough information to someone related to the task.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly or Less</th>
<th>Once/Twice Daily</th>
<th>Hourly or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. An ideal director is unable to accomplish his or her objectives in a meeting because an unanticipated event interrupts it.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. As an ideal director is working on an objective he or she decides to do something unrelated to accomplishing the objective.

**Interruption Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekly or less</td>
<td>once/twice daily</td>
<td>hourly or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Interference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negligible</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING TIME TO THIS TASK
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APPENDIX D

Priorities for the Community Education Director

An Exercise
PRIORITIES FOR THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION DIRECTOR*

This is an exercise in clarifying the priorities you have at the present time as a Community Education Director. Your task is to determine the relative importance of various tasks that you are now performing. Listed on a separate sheet are some tasks which the Director may be asked to perform.

First, place a letter in the blank to indicate your priority at the present time for each of the listed tasks.

H = high priority task  
M = medium priority task  
L = low priority task

Second, review your ratings and adjust them until there are eight (8) tasks with rating H, eight with rating M and eight with rating L. This may be difficult, but please adjust ratings until there are eight high, medium and low ratings.

Third, on the Supplement Task Sheet, add any tasks that you do currently which have high priority for you as a Community Education Director.

Fourth, mark the single most important high priority task with a star (*). Even though there may be several tasks that you consider most important, choose only one to mark with a star. You may mark a task that you have added on the Supplement Task Sheet.

This task will take you 20 minutes or less to complete.

Rate each task according to your priority at the present time:

H = high priority task, M = medium priority task, L = low priority task

_____ 01. Become familiar with the social and economic structure of the community.

_____ 02. Assist the school faculty in the development and operation of programs which have the capability to enrich the required portion of the school curriculum.

_____ 03. Assist the Advisory Council in the conduct of periodic assessments of the community needs and interests.

_____ 04. Implement an evaluation plan for the purpose of upgrading existing programs and incorporating new ideas.

_____ 05. Represent the school district in all matters related to the overall conduct of the Community School program.

_____ 06. Maintain accurate records of all Community School activities.

_____ 07. Maintain communications with all those organizations and agencies who sponsor or conduct activities within the framework of the Community School program.

_____ 08. Prepare an annual budget request for the Community School program.

_____ 09. Develop and publicize a schedule or calendar of Community School programs and events.

_____ 10. Arrange for periodic inservice training opportunities for the faculty, classified staff, and volunteers in the Community School.

_____ 11. Monitor all Community School program activities and conduct evaluations of individual programs and personnel.

_____ 12. Interpret the goals and objectives of the Community School program to the community at every opportunity.
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Rate each task according to your priority at the present time:

H = high priority task, M = medium priority task, L = low priority task

13. Assist in the enforcement of the rules and regulations of the school district during the conduct of Community School activities.

14. Facilitate the activities of a Community Advisory Council.

15. Be present on the school premises when Community School activities are in progress unless some other authorized person has assumed this responsibility.

16. Develop and operate a year-round program which includes involvement opportunities for children, youth and adults.

17. Encourage the development of inter-agency cooperative efforts within the designated service area.

18. Identify and develop new Community School activities which have the potential to benefit local constituents.

19. Promote and interpret existing and planned Community School activities to the school staff and community-at-large.

20. Establish rapport with local citizens in the designated service area.

21. Accept the responsibility for all activities normally designated as community-related.

22. Seek or develop additional funding sources to support an expanded program of Community Education and service.

23. Identify existing community resources which can help meet community needs.

24. Develop or revise a Community Education Director's handbook or manual.

Adjust your ratings for items 1-24 until there are 8 H's, 8 M's, and 8 L's.

Go on to the next page.
SUPPLEMENT TASK SHEET

Add any tasks that are not included in the previous list of 24 tasks which currently have high priority for you as a Community Education Director.

A. 

B. 

C. 

D. 

E. 

REVIEW ALL HIGH PRIORITY TASKS AND MARK ONE WITH A STAR (*).

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING TIME TO THIS TASK.
APPENDIX E

Time Management Experience Questionnaire
TIME MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

The following items ask for information about experience you have had with time management. Please respond to each item.

1. Do you usually write a list of the activities you need to do each day?
   __________ NO
   __________ YES

2. Have you kept a daily log of the amount of time spent on work activities sometime in the past twelve months?
   __________ NO
   __________ YES Please indicate how many days you have kept the log: _____.

3. Have you kept a daily log of time spent on work activities anytime before the past twelve months?
   __________ NO
   __________ YES

4. Have you deliberately tried to change how you plan or schedule your time in the past twelve months?
   __________ NO
   __________ YES Please explain what you did to change how you manage your time:

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
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TIME MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE--2

5. Have you had any instruction in time management in a class or a workshop in the past twelve months?

_______ NO

_______ YES Please indicate the number of actual hours of instruction: ________.

6. Have you had any instruction in time management in a class or workshop before the past twelve months?

_______ NO

_______ YES

7. Place an X beside each of the following resources in time management that you have read in the past twelve months.

_______ The Time Trap, by R. Alec Mackenzie.

_______ How to Get Control of Your Time and Your Life, by Alan Lakein

_______ Time and Management, by Ross Webber

_______ How to Get Things Done, by Edward Bliss

_______ Tools for Time Management, by Edward R. Dayton

8. Have you studied any other materials on time management in the past twelve months?

_______ NO

_______ YES Please indicate the number of books _______ that you recall.

articles____

films____
TIME MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE--3

9. Since you've been working as a Community Education Director has a supervisor ever discussed time management with you, or given you materials to read about time management?

_________ NO

_________ YES

10. Does your organization make a conscious effort to assist you in managing your time?

_________ NO

_________ YES

11. Your response to the Time Allocation Inventory and to this questionnaire are confidential; they will not be reported to anyone in a way that will associate them with you. Understanding that your responses will remain confidential, do you believe that supervisors are entitled to know how the people they supervise allocate their time?

_________ NO, because...

_________ YES, because...

12. Would you voluntarily submit weekly time logs to your supervisor?

_________ NO

_________ YES

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING YOUR TIME TO THIS TASK.
APPENDIX F

Time Allocation Inventory

Reaction Sheet
TIME ALLOCATION INVENTORY

REACTION SHEET

While completing the Time Allocation Inventory did you feel discomfort or uneasiness as you rated certain items?

_______ NO

_______ YES Please review the Inventory and write the item numbers here which caused you to feel discomfort or uneasiness:

Please check one of the following according to your beliefs about how you allocate time on your job:

_______ I allocate time very well; there is little room for improvement by changing either my own behavior or my situation.

_______ I allocate time as well as can be expected; I can do better only if my situation changes.

_______ I waste too much time; I can do better if I change my behavior.

Did completing the Inventory arouse any strong feelings? If so, please describe them as accurately as you can.

_______ NO

_______ YES I FELT, OR AM FEELING, ...

In your opinion, is completion of the Inventory likely to cause someone to think much less of himself or herself as a Community Education Director? If so, please explain.

_______ NO

_______ YES A DIRECTOR IS LIKELY TO THINK MUCH LESS OF SELF BECAUSE
APPENDIX G

Time Allocation Inventory

Phase I Instrument Feedback Form
Please assess the quality of the Inventory you've just completed. Check your response for each item, and comment where appropriate. Your suggestions will be greatly appreciated.

1. The Inventory is organized so that I can complete it without a lot of hassle.
   
   ____ YES.
   ____ NO. Suggestions: ________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

2. The Inventory is reasonably attractive in appearance.
   
   ____ YES.
   ____ NO. Suggestions: ________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

3. The instructions for the Inventory are stated clearly.
   
   ____ YES.
   ____ NO. Suggestions: ________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

4. The instructions for the Inventory are complete.
   
   ____ YES.
   ____ NO. Suggestions: ________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
5. The items in the Inventory are stated clearly.
   _____ YES.
   _____ NO. Suggestions: ______________________________

6. The Inventory has no errors in use of language.
   _____ YES.
   _____ NO. Errors: ________________________________

7. The Inventory can be completed in a reasonable amount of time.
   _____ YES.
   _____ NO. Suggestions: ______________________________

8. In my opinion, a Community Education Director is likely to have enough information to respond meaningfully to the Inventory.
   _____ YES.
   _____ NO. Suggestions: ______________________________

9. Circle the number that indicates how much confusion you felt while using the two scales to rate the Inventory items.
   
   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   no confusion moderate confusion total confusion
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10. In my opinion, a Community Education Director is likely to be willing to complete the Inventory.

_____ YES.

_____ NO. Suggestions: __________________________________________

                                                            

11. In my opinion, a Community Education Director can respond to the Inventory honestly without losing any self-respect.

_____ YES.

_____ NO. Suggestions: __________________________________________

                                                            

THANK YOU FOR ALLOCATING TIME TO THIS TASK
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