The effects of environmental and classroom noise on the academic attainments of primary school children

Bridget M Shield

Faculty of Engineering, Science and Built Environment

London South Bank University

Borough Road

London SE1 0AA

United Kingdom

email: shieldbm@lsbu.ac.uk

Julie E Dockrell

School of Psychology and Human Development

Institute of Education

25 Woburn Square

London WC1A 0HH

United Kingdom

email: j.dockrell@ioe.ac.uk

Running title: Effects of noise on children

Date of submission: 8th November 2007

ABSTRACT

While at school children are exposed to various types of noise including external, environmental noise and noise generated within the classroom. Previous research has shown that noise has detrimental effects upon children's performance at school, including reduced memory, motivation and reading ability. In England and Wales children's academic performance is assessed using standardised national tests of literacy, mathematics and science. A study has been conducted to examine the impact, if any, of chronic exposure to external and classroom noise on the test results of children aged 7 and 11 years. External noise was found to have a significant negative impact upon performance, the effect being greater for the older than the younger children. The analysis suggested that children are particularly affected by the noise of individual external events. Test scores were also affected by internal classroom noise, background noise levels being significantly related to test results. The negative relationships between performance and noise levels were maintained when the data were corrected for socio-economic factors relating to social deprivation, language and special educational needs. These results provide further evidence of the detrimental impact of noise upon schoolchildren and of the need for appropriate acoustic design of schools to minimise these effects.

PACS number: 43.50Qp

I. INTRODUCTION

Children are exposed to many different types of noise while at school. Previous studies have shown that schools may be exposed to high levels of environmental noise, particularly in urban areas[1,2] . Sources include road traffic, trains, aircraft and construction noise. Inside schools a wide range of noise levels have been measured[3-7], the levels varying significantly between different types of space and different classroom activities[1]. For much of the day in a primary school classroom, young children are exposed to the noise of other children producing 'classroom babble' at levels typically of around 65 dB(A) L_{Aeq}[1], while the typical overall exposure level of a child at primary school has been estimated at around 72 dB(A)[1].

The effects of noise on children and their teachers have been investigated in many studies in the past 40 years. It is generally accepted that noise has a detrimental effect upon the cognitive development of primary school children, and that older children in this age group are more affected than the younger children[8,9]. Two major reviews of previous work in this area, published in the early 1990s, concluded that chronic noise exposure of young children has an adverse effect, particularly upon their reading ability[10,11].

Most of the previous work has concerned the effects of environmental noise, notably aircraft noise, upon children. Exposure to high levels of aircraft noise has been found to affect long term memory and reading ability, and to reduce motivation in school children[11-15]. These effects appear to be long term; noise reduction inside a school has been found to have little immediate effect upon children's performance[16] while another study found that when an airport was closed it took several years for the

detrimental effects of noise exposure to cease[13]. These results suggest that noise reduces the learning trajectories of the pupils involved so that extended periods of teaching and learning are required for children to reach typical levels of performance.

In addition to aircraft noise other types of environmental noise, including that from railways[17, 18] and road traffic[19], have been found to affect reading. Road traffic noise outside schools, at levels of around 70 dB(A), has also been found to reduce children's attention[20,21].

While there is a large body of work concerning the effects of external environmental noise upon children at school, there have been far fewer investigations into the effects of typical classroom noise upon children's performance. However in recent years evidence has been found to suggest that noise inside the classroom affects letter, number and word recognition[10,22-25].

It is thus now generally accepted that all types of noise exposure at school affect children's learning and academic performance. The majority of the previous studies have compared the performance of children exposed long term to significant levels of environmental noise with that of children with low noise exposure, or have examined the effects of noise reduction on children's performance. There have been few studies which have demonstrated a dose/response relationship between noise and effects on children's performance, thereby making it difficult to determine threshold levels at which adverse effects occur, which in turn makes it difficult to establish specific guideline values to prevent such effects[26]. In addition there is minimal data available

to establish the effects of classroom noise upon children's performance, and to suggest suitable criteria for classroom noise levels.

In the study described here noise levels measured outside 142 primary schools in central London (UK), and inside a range of spaces inside 16 schools have been compared with assessment scores of the schools in national standardised tests. The approach taken enables the effects on children at school of different levels and types of noise to be investigated. It is also possible to compare the impact of various types of noise upon different aged children across a variety of academic tasks. In addition, this approach allows the most important property of the noise (for example its background, maximum or ambient level) in relation to academic performance to be determined, an issue that has not been considered in previous studies.

A simultaneous study by the authors[27] used experimental testing to investigate the effects of environmental and classroom noise on children's performance on a range of tasks in the classroom. It will be seen that the results of the two investigations are complementary and advance the understanding of the different ways in which children's academic performance and development are affected by noise.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Procedure

The study investigated the effects of chronic noise exposure upon children's academic attainments by comparing measured noise levels with recognised standardised measures of children's attainments in primary school. The relationships between

attainment scores for individual schools and both external (environmental) and internal noise were examined. The effects of acute exposure to environmental and classroom noise were also investigated in the complementary experimental study mentioned above[27].

B. Measures of children's attainments: Standardised Assessment Tests (SATs)

In the 1990s a standard national curriculum was introduced for all schools in England and Wales. To complement this curriculum standardised assessment tests (SATs) in various subjects including English, Mathematics and Science were introduced across the age range at both primary and secondary school level. The majority of children at state schools take these tests at the ages of seven ('Key Stage 1'), eleven ('Key Stage 2') and fourteen ('Key Stage 3') years. Average results for all schools in all subjects are published by the Department for Education and Skills. The published school data consist of the percentages of children in each school who reach a recognised criterion level in each subject at each stage. Average school scores for each stage are also published.

The study described here concerned children of primary school age. The relevant test data were therefore Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 SATs results. At Key Stage 1 (KS1) the assessment includes both teacher assessments and national standardised tests, which are combined to give a single score for each subject for each child. At Key Stage 2 (KS2) children sit standard nationwide examinations. Between two and four examinations are taken in each subject, the examination results being averaged to give a single mark for each subject.

The subjects assessed at the two stages at the time of this study were as follows:

Key Stage 1 (Year 2 of primary school, seven years of age on average): reading; writing; spelling; and mathematics

Key Stage 2 (Year 6 of primary school, eleven years of age on average): English; mathematics; and science

The schools' attainments scores in each subject, plus average scores at Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 were compared with noise levels measured inside and outside the schools.

C. Selection of study areas and schools

The areas chosen for the study were based upon the local government boroughs of London, of which there are 33. It was important for the study that the boroughs chosen should be representative of London as a whole in terms of noise exposure, academic achievements and demographic characteristics in order to reduce the number of potentially confounding variables.

It was decided that boroughs in which aircraft were the dominant environmental noise source should be excluded from the survey, as there was already a considerable body of research on the effects of aircraft noise on children. There was also a concurrent study of the effects of aircraft noise on children in schools to the west of London, around Heathrow airport[14]. Furthermore there were fewer detailed studies of the impact of general environmental noise than of aircraft noise. Therefore in selecting

boroughs for the purpose of this study those to the west of London, which are affected by flights to and from Heathrow, were excluded.

Remaining boroughs were examined to ensure that their primary school academic attainments and demographic characteristics (see section D following) were typical of London as a whole. The distributions of SATs results in boroughs were studied in order to select boroughs for which a) test scores displayed an acceptable range, as indicated by the standard deviations of the SATs results in all subjects b) the mean scores for reading, writing and mathematics were not above the mean score of all London boroughs. Of the boroughs selected in this way agreement was obtained from the Directors of Education of three boroughs to participate in the project. Borough A is an 'outer' London borough, with all schools within approximately six miles of central London, while boroughs B and C are 'inner' London boroughs, with all schools within a distance of approximately three miles from central London.

Means and standard deviations of the subject scores for the three boroughs are shown in Table I. Analysis of variance showed that there was no significant difference between the subject scores for the three boroughs.

It can be seen from Table 1 that there was in general close agreement between mean subject scores in the three boroughs, while borough C displayed slightly higher standard deviations in most subjects indicating a wider spread of scores in this borough.

D. Demographic characteristics

The socio-economic characteristics of schools in the boroughs were also examined. The data considered were the percentages of children in each school receiving free school meals (FSM); the percentages of children for whom English is an additional language (EAL); and the percentages of children with special educational needs (SEN). The percentage of children receiving free school meals is commonly accepted as a reliable indicator of social disadvantage in an area[28,29].

The means and standard deviations of these data for the three chosen boroughs are also given in Table I. Analysis of variance showed that there were some differences between the boroughs, particularly in the distributions of children with special educational needs. There were considerably fewer children with special needs in borough A while the percentages for the inner boroughs were similar and around 2.5 times the percentage in borough A.

E. Noise surveys

Noise levels were measured outside all the state-funded primary schools in boroughs A (N = 53) and B (N = 50) and outside a majority of the 61 schools in borough C (N=39). Of these, eight schools in boroughs A and B were also selected for internal surveys. The eight schools were chosen to reflect the full range of external noise levels measured, the external L_{Aeq} levels of the 16 schools ranging from 49 to 75 dB(A). The measurement methods, noise levels and noise sources present have been described elsewhere[1]. The external and internal levels that have been used in examining the impact of noise upon test results are summarised below.

1. External levels

Table I also shows the means and standard deviations of various environmental noise parameters measured in the three boroughs. These levels were measured at, or have been normalised to, a distance of four metres from the school façade during the school day[1].

It can be seen that the levels were reasonably consistent across the three boroughs, with borough C having slightly higher levels than the other two boroughs. This was to be expected as this borough is the one nearest central London. The mean levels in borough B were slightly lower than might be expected given that this is also an inner London borough. However many of the schools in this area are situated in the middle of housing estates or on side streets, and are thus sheltered to some extent from the noise of road traffic, the main noise source in the areas surveyed[1]. This is illustrated by the larger standard deviations of noise levels in borough B.

2. Internal levels

In the internal school noise survey levels were measured in classrooms and other areas around a school. Most spaces were measured in both occupied and unoccupied conditions. The averaged ambient (L_{Aeq}) and background (L_{A90}) levels for the types of spaces considered in each school are shown in Table II.

The survey found that external noise affected internal noise only when children were engaged in quiet activities in the classroom[1]. For the remainder of the time the classroom noise level was dominated by the particular classroom activity being

undertaken by the children and teacher. Six distinct classroom activities were identified as follows:

Activity 1 Children sitting at tables doing silent reading or tests

Activity 2 Children sitting at tables or on the floor, with one person (teacher or child) speaking at any one time

Activity 3 Children sitting at tables working individually, with some talking

Activity 4 Children working individually, moving around the classroom, with some talking

Activity 5 Children working in groups, sitting at tables, with some talking

Activity 6 Children working in groups, moving around the classroom, with some talking

The average L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels measured for each activity are also shown in Table II.

Internal levels were also categorised according to the age of the class. The average L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels for different age groups in each school are again shown in Table II. For the purposes of analysing the effects, if any, of noise on SATs results noise levels for Year 2 and Year 6 are the only ones considered in the subsequent discussion.

F. Analyses

In order to study the impact, if any, of noise on children's attainments the noise levels measured inside and outside the schools were correlated with the SATs scores for the academic year in which the noise survey was carried out.

Correlation analysis was carried out for the noise and test data. The noise levels were correlated with SATs scores for all subjects at each level, and with average school scores. Obviously any relationships found between noise and SATs scores in this way could be due to social or other factors rather than representing a direct effect of noise on academic performance. In order to eliminate the effects of socio-economic factors partial correlations were carried out, in which the schools' data on children with free school meals (FSM), English as an additional language (EAL) and special educational needs (SEN) were controlled for.

Current guidance on choosing a site for new school buildings in England and Wales recommends an upper limit of 60 dB $L_{Aeq,30min}$ at the boundary of school premises[30]. For this reason, in addition to considering all schools measured in each borough, those schools where the measured external L_{Aeq} levels are greater than or equal to 60 dB(A) have been considered separately.

III. RESULTS - RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EXTERNAL NOISE AND TEST RESULTS

The values of the noise parameters L_{Aeq}, L_{Amax}, L_{Amin}, L_{A99}, L_{A90}, and L_{A10} measured outside each school were compared with average and subject SATs scores for the younger (aged 7 years) and older (aged 11 years) children.

The Pearson correlation coefficients between average and subject scores and noise levels were calculated for all schools in boroughs A, B and C. Table III shows the coefficients for borough A. It can be seen that there were negative relationships between noise and SATs for all scores, that is, the greater the noise level the lower the school test performance score. Furthermore all except one of the relationships were significant at the 1% or 5% levels. However, for both boroughs B and C the correlation coefficients were very small, varying from -.15 to .28. There were no significant relationships and the coefficients were very similar for the two boroughs. This may reflect the difference between the inner and outer boroughs reflected in the SEN data shown in Table I. For this reason the two inner boroughs are considered together and separately from the outer borough in the following discussion.

A Outer London borough A

1. All schools

Table III shows that when all schools in borough A are considered there were significant negative relationships between all SATs scores and all noise parameters, except for KS1 Mathematics and L_{Amax}. The relationships were stronger for Key Stage 2 subjects, suggesting that noise has more of an impact upon the performance of the older children. A possible explanation for this is that the older children have been exposed to the noise for a longer period of time. This is consistent with the results of previous research demonstrating the effects of long term noise exposure[13-16]. However

it is also possible that the nature and demands of the tasks for older children differ from those of the younger children and are more vulnerable to the effects of noise.

At Key Stage 1 and for KS2 English the stronger correlations tended to be with the 'background' or 'underlying' noise levels, as measured by L_{A90} and L_{A99}. For other subjects at Key Stage 2 however, L_{Amax} was the parameter which had the strongest association with test scores. This suggests that the younger children were affected by general external background noise, while the older children were more affected by individual external noise events such as motorbikes or lorries passing the school. This is consistent with the findings of previous research[12-18] which has found that reading is affected by noise caused by individual external sources such as trains or planes. It is also consistent with a questionnaire survey of children carried out by the authors which found that older, Key Stage 2 age, children were more aware of external noise than the younger children at Key Stage 1. The subject showing the strongest negative effect of noise (with background levels at Key Stage 1 and with maximum levels at Key Stage 2) was Mathematics. The mathematics assessment at Key Stage 2 is complex involving orally presented mental arithmetic, written arithmetic and word problems. Thus performance at these tasks is vulnerable to the effects of noise on both reading and speeded responses, two areas which have been found to be affected by noise in previous studies[10-18,27].

Table IV shows the partial correlation coefficients obtained when the data for borough A were controlled for the FSM, EAL and SEN data. It can be seen that when social deprivation (as measured by FSM data) was taken into account there was still a negative relationship between noise and test scores, but there were fewer significant

relationships than with the uncorrected data. However, L_{Amax} was still significantly correlated with two subject scores (Mathematics and Science) and the average score at Key Stage 2. The strongest relationship was again with the Mathematics scores. When potential language problems (as indicated by EAL data) were accounted for there were still strong associations between L_{Amax} and all subjects at Key Stage 2, with Mathematics again being the subject most strongly related to noise. As with the uncorrected data, KS1 Mathematics scores were most strongly, and significantly, related to background and underlying levels. When controlling for SEN, it can be seen that the pattern was very similar to that for the uncorrected data, with KS2 Mathematics and Science again being the subjects most affected by noise, and L_{Amax} having the strongest negative relationship with test scores at Key Stage 2.

2. Schools with external L_{Aeq} levels of 60 dB(A) or greater

When considering only those schools with L_{Aeq} levels of 60 dB(A) or more in borough A (N=22) KS1 Mathematics was the only subject significantly related to noise, being significantly related at the 5% level to L_{Amin}, L_{A90} and L_{A99}. These significant relationships were maintained when the data were corrected for socio-economic factors, becoming significant at the 1% level when correcting for SEN.

B Inner London boroughs B and C

1. All schools

As mentioned previously, there were no significant relationships between test scores and noise for the inner London boroughs when all schools in the two boroughs were considered. The reason for the difference between these schools and those in borough

A is unclear but may be related to the discrepancies in the percentages of children with special needs in the inner and outer boroughs.

2. Schools with external L_{Aeq} levels of 60 dB(A) or greater

However, if only those schools where the external level exceeds 60 dB L_{Aeq} in the two boroughs were considered (N = 35) then there were stronger negative relationships between SATs scores and noise, as shown in Table V. For most noise parameters, as with borough A schools, the relationships were stronger for Key Stage 2 results, and in general L_{Amax} was the parameter most closely related to test results. In these boroughs however, English was the subject showing the greatest effect of noise. Both KS1 Reading and KS2 English scores were significantly related to L_{Aeq}, L_{Amax} and L_{A10}, while KS2 English was also significantly related to the background L_{A90} level. Unlike the outer borough, mathematics scores were not significantly related to any noise parameter.

Table VI shows the correlations when the data were corrected for socio-economic factors. In all cases the results were very similar to those for the uncorrected data. KS1 Reading and KS2 English were the subjects most affected by noise, KS2 English being significantly correlated with L_{Amax} at the 1% level and L_{Amax} again being the noise parameter with the strongest correlations with test scores. When correcting for EAL and SEN, all subjects at KS2 were significantly related to L_{Amax}. Relationships between KS2 English and L_{Amax} were significant at the 1% level, and stronger than for the uncorrected data.

IV. RESULTS - RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INTERNAL NOISE AND TEST RESULTS

In investigating relationships between internal noise and SATs scores average and subject Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 SATs scores were correlated with relevant internal noise data. For this analysis correlations were carried out for the complete set of 16 schools (eight in borough A and eight in borough B) for which internal noise data was available. The internal noise data that were used consisted of the L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels for Year 2 and Year 6 (as these are the years in which children sit SATs); for the six classroom activities; and in the various school locations which were measured.

A Correlation with year group levels

Table VII shows the correlations between KS1 test scores and Year 2 noise levels, and between KS2 scores and Year 6 levels. It can be seen that there were negative relationships between all scores and noise levels, except for Key Stage 1 Reading; however none of the correlations were significant, possibly because of the small sample size. The subject showing the strongest effect of noise was KS2 English which was related to both L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels. This is consistent with the results of the parallel experimental testing[27] which showed that classroom babble affected all tasks both verbal and non-verbal.

When the data were corrected for socio-economic factors KS2 English was still the subject most strongly affected by noise; when correcting for FSM there was a significant negative relationship between background noise (L_{A90}) in Year 6 classrooms and test scores for this subject.

B Correlation with activity levels

Table VIII shows the correlation coefficients between activity L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels and test scores. Although there were few significant negative relationships (in part due to the small sample sizes) it can be seen that the strongest correlations were between SATs results and noise levels for Activities 1 and 5, in particular L_{Aeq} levels for Activity 1 and L_{A90} levels for Activity 5. Activity 1 is when children are sitting at their tables working in silence so the L_{Aeq} level represents the ambient noise level in the occupied classroom without any additional children's babble. It can be seen that KS1 Mathematics was the subject most closely related to this noise level, and also to the L_{A90} level for Activity 1. For Activity 5 children are working and talking in groups and L_{A90} is a measure of the background noise level in that situation; Table VIII shows that KS1 Reading and Mathematics were significantly related to this level.

Another point of interest is that L_{Aeq} levels for Activity 2 were positively correlated with all subject scores. In Activity 2 just one person is speaking, thus the L_{Aeq} level is likely to be dominated by the teacher's voice. This might suggest that the higher the teacher's voice level, the better the performance in SATs; however, no data is available on the teachers' voice levels in these classrooms to enable further investigation.

When the data were controlled for socio-economic factors A similar pattern emerged as for the uncontrolled data. When the data were controlled for EAL, Activity 2 L_{Aeq} levels were significantly positively correlated with all subjects except KS2 Science, suggesting as before a possible effect of the teacher's voice on test scores.

C Correlation with location levels

Table IX shows the correlation coefficients between L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels for different school locations and subject test scores. There were negative correlations between all subject scores and all noise levels measured in occupied classrooms, unoccupied classrooms and corridors and foyers. In general the relationships were strongest for occupied classrooms, with the background (L_{A90}) level being significantly related to test scores for most subjects. The subject most strongly affected by noise was again KS2 English which was significantly correlated at the 1% level with L_{A90}. KS1 Mathematics was significantly related to L_{A90} in both occupied and unoccupied classrooms.

It is interesting to note that there were consistently negative correlations between test scores and all noise levels in corridors and foyers, being significant again for KS2 English. While carrying out internal noise surveys it was subjectively apparent that the noise in such spaces gave a good indication of the general 'noise climate' in a school.

It can be seen that there was no relationship between noise levels in school halls, occupied or unoccupied, and test scores. This is as would be expected and validates the fact that there are strong negative relationships between noise in classrooms and test results.

Tables X and XI show the correlation coefficients between test scores and L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} respectively in classrooms and circulation areas when the data were corrected for

socio-economic factors. In general relationships were slightly less strong when correcting for FSM and EAL but when correcting for SEN correlations coefficients were similar to those for the uncorrected data. KS2 English was still significantly correlated with L_{Aeq} in occupied classrooms and in corridors/foyers. When correcting for all factors there were significant correlations between KS2 English and L_{A90} in occupied classrooms and corridors/foyers.

V. DISCUSSION

The study described here has shown that chronic exposure to noise at school has a detrimental effect upon children's academic performance, as measured by standard assessment testing in schools in England and Wales. These are consistent with the findings of previous studies and with the results of experimental testing of children carried out by the authors, as will be discussed below. Both external environmental noise heard inside a school, and noise generated within a school have an impact upon children's test scores, but affect children in different ways. In addition to different subjects being affected by external and by school noise, the particular characteristics of the noise which impact upon children's performance differ between the two types of noise.

A External nose

It was seen that different results were obtained for the outer and inner boroughs. For the outer borough there were strong relationships between all noise parameters and all test scores when all schools were considered, but for the inner boroughs significant relationships were found when only the schools on the noisier sites were considered. The reasons for the discrepancies are not fully understood but may relate to

differences in demographic and/or noise characteristics between the boroughs. There may be 'floor' effects for the inner boroughs in that, however low the noise levels, the test scores would not improve above a certain level.

A further difference between boroughs is that in the outer borough the subject most affected by noise was KS2 Mathematics whereas in the noisier inner boroughs it was KS2 English. Furthermore in the outer borough background (L_{A90}) and underlying (L_{A99}) external noise levels were also significantly related to test scores. KS1 Reading was also significantly related to noise levels in all boroughs.

In general, for the outer borough and for the noisier schools in the inner boroughs correlations between noise and test scores were stronger for Key Stage 2 scores than for those at Key Stage 1 suggesting that external noise has more of an effect on the older children. It has previously been found that the negative effects of environmental noise are long term[13,16]. The greater effect upon the older children may therefore reflect the fact that these children have been exposed to noise at school for a longer period than the younger children.

It was found that the noise parameter with the highest and most significant correlations with test scores was L_{Amax}, implying that noise of individual events may be the most important in affecting children's performance.

Significant relationships between tests scores and noise were maintained when the data were corrected for factors relating to social deprivation, non-native speaking and additional educational needs. In particular in all boroughs (considering just the

noisier schools in the inner boroughs) all KS2 subjects remained significantly related to L_{Amax} while KS1 English was also significantly related to some noise parameters.

The dominant external noise source in the schools considered was road traffic[1]. These findings are thus consistent with the findings of other studies which have found that road traffic noise has an impact upon children's performance at school[19-21]. Furthermore, although schools exposed to aircraft noise were not included in the study, the close relationships between L_{Amax} and test scores suggest that the noise of individual events has an impact upon children's performance. This is thus consistent with the results of other studies which have found that both aircraft[12-16] and railway[17] noise affects children's performance.

The results also complement the findings of a questionnaire survey of children carried out by the authors which found that the older (Year 6) children were more aware of external noise than the younger children[31]. This is consistent with the finding that the test results of these children were more affected by noise than those of the younger children. Furthermore annoyance caused by external noise among children was significantly related to external maximum noise levels, the levels that are found to have the most effect upon test scores.

B Internal noise

There were consistent negative relationships between test scores and L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} levels measured in occupied and unoccupied classrooms and corridors and foyers. The internal noise levels which had the strongest relationships with test scores were the background (L_{A90}) levels in occupied classrooms. All subjects except KS1 Spelling

and KS2 Mathematics were significantly correlated with these levels. KS1 mathematics was also significantly correlated with L_{A90} measured in unoccupied classrooms and KS2 English with L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} measured in corridor and foyer areas. Many of the relationships, particularly those for KS2 English, were maintained when the data are corrected for socio-economic factors.

These results complement the results of the controlled experimental testing of children carried out by the authors in which children performed various tasks in different classroom noise conditions[27]. Classroom babble was found to decrease performance on both verbal and non-verbal tasks, with verbal tasks of reading and spelling being particularly affected. This is consistent with the finding that KS2 English test scores are strongly and significantly related to the ambient and background noise levels in classrooms.

VI CONCLUSION

This study has shown that chronic exposure to both external and internal noise has a detrimental impact upon the academic performance and attainments of primary school children. For external noise it appears to be the noise levels of individual events which have the most impact while background noise in the classroom also has a significant negative effect. Older primary school children, around 11 years of age, appear to be more affected by noise than the younger children.

In order to minimise the impact of noise upon children at school it is therefore necessary to consider two factors. The siting and the internal layout of a school should be such that classrooms are not exposed to high levels of noise from external sources

such as road traffic. In addition it is essential to keep background noise levels in the classroom as low as possible to ensure that optimum conditions for teaching and learning are achieved.

VII ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Department of Health and Department for Environment, Food and Regional Affairs (DEFRA). The authors would like to thank research assistants Rebecca Asker and Ioannis Tachmatzidis for collecting the data in this study.

VII REFERENCES

[1]B. Shield and J. E. Dockrell, "External and internal noise surveys of London primary schools," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 115(2), 730-738 (2004).

[2]E. Celik and Z. Karabiber, "A pilot study on the ratio of schools and students affected from noise", Proc. International symposium on Noise Control and Acoustics for Educational Buildings, Proc. Turkish Acoustical Society, Istanbul, May 2000, 119-128 (2000).

[3]M. Hodgson, R. Rempel and S. Kennedy, "Measurement and prediction of typical speech and background noise levels in university classrooms during lectures", J. Acoust. Soc. Am.105(1), 226-233 (1999).

[4] M. Picard and J. S. Bradley, "Revisiting speech interference in classrooms", Audiology 40, 221-224 (2001).

[5]A. Moodley, "Acoustic conditions in mainstream classrooms", J. British Association of Teachers of the Deaf, 13(2), 48-54 (1989).

[6]B. Hay, “A pilot study of classroom noise levels and teachers’ reactions”, Voice, 4, 127-134 (1995)

[7]D. MacKenzie, “Noise sources and levels in UK schools”, Proc. International symposium on Noise Control and Acoustics for Educational Buildings, Proc Turkish Acoustical Society, Istanbul, May 2000, 97-106 (2000).

[8]B. Berglund and T. Lindvall. “Community Noise”, Archives of the Center for Sensory Research, 2(1), 1-195 (1995)

[9]Institute for Environment and Health, “The non-auditory effects of noise”, Report R10. le.ac.uk/ieh/pdf/ExsumR10.pdf (1997)

[10]R. Hetu, C. Truchon-Gagnon and S. A. Bilodeau, “Problems of noise in school settings: a review of literature and the results of an exploratory study”, J. Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, 14(3), 31-38 (1990).

[11]G. W. Evans and S. J. Lepore, “Nonauditory effects of noise on children: a critical review”, Children's Environments, 10(1), 31-51 (1993)

[12] S. Cohen, G. W. Evans, D. S. Krantz. and D. Stokols, "Physiological, motivational, and cognitive effects of aircraft noise on children. Moving from the laboratory to the field”, American Psychologist, 35(3), 231-243 (1980).

[13] S. Hygge, G. W. Evans and M. Bullinger, “The Munich Airport noise study: Cognitive effects on children from before to after the change over of airports”, Proc. Inter-Noise’96, 2189 – 2192 (1996)

[14]M. M. Haines, S. A. Stansfeld, J. Head and R.F.S Job. “Multi-level modelling of aircraft noise on performance tests in schools around Heathrow Airport London”, J. Epidemiology and Community Health, 56, 139-144 (2002).

[15] C. Clark, R. Martin, E. van Kempen, T. Alfred, J. Head, H. W. Davies, M. M. Haines, B. Lopez, M. Matheson and S. Stansfeld, “Exposure-effect relations between

aircraft and road traffic noise exposure at school and reading comprehension: the RANCH project", Am J Epidemiol 163(1), 27-37 (2006)

[16] S. Cohen, G. W. Evans, D. S. Krantz, D. Stokols, and S. Kelly, "Aircraft noise and children: longitudinal and cross-sectional evidence on adaptation to noise and the effectiveness of noise abatement", J. Personality and Social Psychology, 40(2), 331-345 (1981).

[17] A. L. Bronzaft and D. P. McCarthy, "The effect of elevated train noise on reading ability", Environment and Behaviour, 7(4), 517-527 (1975).

[18] A. L. Bronzaft, "The Effect of a Noise Abatement Program on Reading Ability", J. Environmental Psychology, 1, 215-222 (1981).

[19] J. S. Lukas, R. B. DuPree and J. W. Swing, "Report of a study on the effects of freeway noise on academic achievement of elementary school children, and a recommendation for a criterion level for a school noise abatement program", Learning, Memory and Cognition, 20(6), 1396-1408 (1981).

[20]S. Sanz, A. M. Garcia and A. Garcia, "Road traffic noise around schools: a risk for pupils' performance?", International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 65, 205-207 (1993).

[21]J. Romero and D. Lliso, "Perception and acoustic conditions in secondary Spanish schools", Proc. 15th International Congress on Acoustics, Trondheim, Norway, 271-274 (1995).

[22]F. Berg, J Blair and P Benson, "Classroom acoustics: the problem, impact and solution", Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools 27, 16-20 (1996)

[23]S. Airey and D. Mackenzie, "Speech intelligibility in classrooms", Proc. Institute of Acoustics 21(5), 75-79 (1999).

[24]L. Maxwell, L and G. Evans, "The effects of noise on pre-school children's pre-reading skills", J. Environmental Psychology, 20, 91-97 (2000).

[25] P. Lundquist, K Holmberg and U Landstrom, "Annoyance and effects on work from environmental noise at school", Noise and Health, 2(8), 39-46 (2000)

[26]World Health Organisation, Guidelines for Community Noise. www.who.int/peh/, (1999)

[27]J. E. Dockrell and B. M. Shield, "Acoustical barriers in classrooms: the impact of noise on performance in the classroom", British Educational Research Journal 32(3), 509-525 (2006)

[28]W. Williamson and D. D. Byrne, "Educational disadvantage in an urban setting". In D.T. Herbert and D.M. Smith (Eds) Social Problems and the City. Oxford: Oxford University Press (1977)

[29]P. Sammons, A. West and A. Hind, "Accounting for variations in pupil attainment at the end of Key Stage 1", British Educational Research Journal 23, 489-511 (1997)

[30]Department for Education and Skills, Building Bulletin 93: Acoustic Design of Schools, The Stationery Office, London, www.teachernet.gov/acoustics (2003)

[31]J. E. Dockrell and B. M. Shield, "Children's perceptions of their acoustic environment at school and at home", J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 115(6), 2964-2973 (2004).

TABLE I

SATs results, demographic factors and external noise levels for the three boroughs

Stage	Subject	Borough A		Borough B		Borough C	
		Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd
Key Stage 1 test results	Reading	76.1	14.1	74.7	13.2	78.4	16.9
	Writing	76.8	14.9	74.8	13.9	78.2	16.9
	Spelling	63.8	17.1	59.3	17.2	64.7	18.4
	Maths	86.4	8.9	83.5	12.0	86.4	13.2
Key Stage 2 test results	English	68.5	18.5	69.8	15.7	69.5	16.6
	Maths	66.1	16.2	67.0	15.7	68.2	19.1
	Science	77.9	15.9	81.0	12.6	78.9	17.3
Demographic factors	% FSM	38.8	19.3	41.5	14.2	33.6	10.7
	% EAL	43.9	19.2	35.3	16.8	39.6	17.7
	%SEN	10.3	2.9	28.3	10.0	26.2	7.8
External noise levels	$L_{Aeq,5min}$	57.4	8.8	56.2	9.4	58.9	7.4
	$L_{A10,5min}$	59.4	9.0	58.4	9.9	61.2	7.7
	$L_{A90,5min}$	49.2	7.7	46.5	9.3	50.2	8.2
	$L_{A99,5min}$	47.0	7.4	44.3	9.2	47.8	8.2
	$L_{Amax,5min}$	70.5	10.5	68.3	17.0	72.0	9.0
	$L_{Amin,5min}$	46.0	7.5	41.3	12.4	47.0	8.3

TABLE II

Internal noise levels

	School location					Classroom activity						Class (age group)							
	Occ teach space	Unocc teach space	Corr/ foyer /stair	Occ hall	Unocc hall	Act 1	Act 2	Act 3	Act 4	Act 5	Act 6	Nurs (3-4)	Rec (4-5)	Yr 1 (5-6)	Yr 2 (6-7)	Yr 3 (7-8)	Yr 4 (8-9)	Yr 5 (9-10)	Yr 6 (10-11)
L_{Aeq}	72.1	47.0	58.1	73.4	53.2	56.3	61.2	64.7	72.2	72.9	76.8	71.9	73.9	74.3	66.3	68.9	69.6	73.2	71.2
L_{A90}	54.1	36.9	44.6	55.1	44.3	42.4	45.8	52.1	59.6	58.6	63.9	57.3	62.3	61.0	51.3	52.5	49.8	53.8	52.9

TABLE III

Borough A: correlation coefficients between test scores and noise levels

	L_{Aeq}	L_{Amax}	L_{Amin}	L_{A99}	L_{A90}	L_{A10}
KS1 Reading	-.34[b]	-.31[b]	-.36[a]	-.36[a]	-.37[a]	-.33[b]
KS1 Writing	-.32[b]	-.29[b]	-.32[b]	-.34[b]	-.34[b]	-.31[b]
KS1 Spelling	-.34[b]	-.31[b]	-.37[a]	-.38[a]	-.38[a]	-.35[b]
KS1 Maths	-.34[b]	-.27	-.43[a]	-.43[a]	-.43[a]	-.34[b]
KS2 English	-.37[a]	-.39[b]	-.40[a]	-.41[a]	-.40[a]	-.33[b]
KS2 Maths	-.40[a]	-.46[b]	-.41[a]	-.41[a]	-.40[a]	-.36[a]
KS2 Science	-.40[a]	-.45[b]	-.41[a]	-.41[a]	-.42[a]	-.37[a]
KS1 average	-.36[b]	-.32[b]	-.39[a]	-.40[a]	-.40[a]	-.36[b]
KS2 average	-.41[a]	-.45[a]	-.43[a]	-.43[a]	-.43[a]	-.37[a]

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE IV

Borough A: correlation coefficients between test scores and noise levels corrected for data on FSM, EAL and SEN

	L_{Aeq}			L_{Amax}			L_{Amin}			L_{A99}			L_{A90}			L_{A10}		
	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN
KS1 Reading	-.17	-.26	-.32[b]	-.15	-.26	-.29[b]	-.09	-.21	-.33[b]	-.09	-.22	-.34[b]	-.11	-.24	-.35[b]	-.16	-.25	-.31[b]
KS1 Writing	-.15	-.24	-.29 [b]	-.14	-.24	-.27	-.07	-.20	-.30[b]	-.09	-.21	-.31[b]	-.11	-.23	-.33[b]	-.16	-.24	-.30[b]
KS1 Spelling	-.19	-.27	-.34 [b]	-.17	-.26	-.30[b]	-.14	-.24	-.36[b]	-.15	-.25	-.37[a]	-.16	-.26	-.37[a]	-.21	-.27	-.34[b]
KS1 Maths	-.23	-.28	-.32 [b]	-.15	-.22	-.24	-.28	-.34[b]	-.40[a]	-.29	-.35[b]	-.41[a]	-.29	-.35[b]	-.41[a]	-.24	-.28	-.33[b]
KS2 English	-.17	-.27[b]	-.34 [b]	-.25	-.38[a]	-.37[a]	-.05	-.19	-.37[a]	-.05	-.20	-.38[a]	-.08	-.23	-.39[a]	-.12	-.22	-.31[b]
KS2 Maths	-.23	-.32[b]	-.38[a]	-.36[a]	-.44[a]	-.44[a]	-.10	-.23	-.38[a]	-.09	-.23	-.38[a]	-.10	-.25	-.38[a]	-.19	-.27	-.35[a]
KS2 Science	-.25	-.32[b]	-.39[a]	-.34[b]	-.42[a]	-.44[a]	-.16	-.26	-.39[a]	-.16	-.26	-.39[a]	-.19	-.30[b]	-.41[a]	-.23	-.29[b]	-.36[a]
KS1 average	-.20	-.29	-.34[b]	-.17	-.27	-.30[b]	-.15	-.26	-.37[a]	-.16	-.27	-.38[a]	-.18	-.29	-.39[a]	-.21	-.28	-.35[b]
KS2 average	-.25	-.33[b]	-.39[a]	-.36[a]	-.45[a]	-.44[a]	-.12	-.25	-.40[a]	-.12	-.25	-.41[a]	-.14	-.28[b]	-.41[a]	-.20	-.28[b]	-.36[a]

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE V

Schools in boroughs B and C with external $L_{Aeq} \geq$ 60 dB(A): correlation coefficients between test scores and noise levels

	L_{Aeq}	L_{Amax}	L_{Amin}	L_{A99}	L_{A90}	L_{A10}
KS1 Reading	-.40[b]	-.40[b]	-.12	-.13	-.22	-.36[b]
KS1 Writing	-.29	-.26	.00	-.01	-.12	-.24
KS1 Spelling	-.31	-.33	-.03	.03	-.07	-.24
KS1 Maths	-.10	-.09	.08	.05	-.03	-.20
KS2 English	-.39[b]	-.43[a]	-.31	-.32	-.37[b]	-.38[b]
KS2 Maths	-.21	-.31	-.16	-.16	-.15	-.27
KS2 Science	-.25	-.36[b]	-.15	-.15	-.15	-.24
KS1 average	-.31	-.31	-.01	-.02	-.12	-.28
KS2 average	-.30	-.39[b]	-.23	-.23	-.24	-.32

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE VI

Schools in boroughs B and C with external $L_{Aeq} \geq$ 60 dB(A): correlation coefficients between test scores and noise levels corrected for data on FSM, EAL and SEN

	L_{Aeq}			L_{Amax}			L_{Amin}			L_{A99}			L_{A90}			L_{A10}		
	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN
KS1 Reading	-.35[b]	-.40[b]	-.35[b]	-.40[b]	-.41[b]	-.43[a]	-.04	-.10	-.07	-.04	-.12	-.07	-.13	-.22	-.16	-.23	-.36[b]	-.29
KS1 Writing	-.22	-.29	-.23	-.23	-.26	-.27	.10	.01	.06	-.10	-.00	.05	-.02	-.12	-.05	-.09	-.24	-.16
KS1 Spelling	-.26	-.32	-.27	-.31	-.33	-.35	.10	.02	.07	.11	.03	.09	.02	-.08	-.00	-.13	-.25	-.18
KS1 Maths	-.00	-.08	-.02	-.04	-.10	-.10	.18	.15	.14	.16	.12	.13	.09	.05	.07	-.04	-.15	-.10
KS2 English	-.34[b]	-.37[b]	-.32	-.46[a]	-.46[a]	-.48[a]	-.28	-.23	-.27	-.26	-.24	-.26	-.30	-.28	-.29	-.23	-.32	-.29
KS2 Maths	-.09	-.18	-.11	-.30	-.32[b]	-.34[b]	-.07	-.08	-.10	-.04	-.08	-.08	-.01	-.06	-.05	-.06	-.21	-.16
KS2 Science	-.16	-.23	-.20	-.35[b]	-.37[b]	-.37[b]	-.07	-.09	-.11	-.05	-.09	-.10	-.03	-.08	-.09	-.06	-.19	-.17
KS1 average	-.25	-.31	-.25	-.29	-.31	-.33	.09	.02	.05	.09	.00	.05	-.02	-.11	-.04	-.14	-.28	-.21
KS2 average	-.22	-.28	-.23	-.41[b]	-.41[b]	-.43[a]	-.16	-.15	-.18	-.14	-.15	-.16	-.13	-.16	-.16	-.13	-.26	-.22

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE VII

Internal noise: correlation coefficients between test scores and Year 2 and Year 6 noise levels

	Year 2 N = 11		Year 6 N = 13	
	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}
KS1 Reading	.01	-.12		
KS1 Writing	-.12	-.25		
KS1 Spelling	-.21	-.33		
KS1 Maths	-.17	-.33		
KS2 English			-.45	-.48
KS2 Maths			-.04	-.00
KS2 Science			-.36	-.11
KS1 average	-.15	-.29		
KS2 average			-.33	-.25

TABLE VIII

Internal noise: correlation coefficients between test scores and classroom activity noise levels

	Activity 1 N=6		Activity 2 N=11		Activity 3 N=14		Activity 4 N=9		Activity 5 N=8		Activity 6 N=13	
	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}
KS1 Reading	-.46	-.38	.44	.05	.14	.07	-.11	.10	-.30	-.73[b]	.33	.20
KS1 Writing	-.44	-.04	.38	.13	.09	.07	-.21	.11	-.44	-.63	.27	.10
KS1 Spelling	.70	-.37	.70[b]	.42	.13	-.04	-.12	.34	-.40	-.29	.26	.21
KS1 Maths	-.60	-.54	.30	-.08	.01	.13	-.14	.25	-.42	-.73[b]	.33	.25
KS2 English	-.29	-.31	.40	.16	-.22	-.42	-.33	-.44	-.69	-.55	-.27	-.19
KS2 Maths	.20	-.39	.58	-.08	.19	-.02	-.20	-.34	-.17	-.53	-.03	.07
KS2 Science	-.57	-.22	.26	.03	.19	.03	-.33	-.18	-.13	-.29	-.22	.12
KS1 average	-.23	-.42	.52	.17	.11	.05	-.15	.22	-.43	-.61	.32	.20
KS2 average	-.22	-.38	.48	.05	.06	-.15	-.29	-.30	-.42	-.54	-.20	-.02

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE IX

Internal noise: correlation coefficients between test scores and school location noise levels

	Occ class N=16		Unocc class N=14		Corridor/foyer N=14		Occ hall N=8		Unocc hall N=7	
	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}	L_{Aeq}	L_{A90}
KS1 Reading	-.11	-.60[b]	-.33	-.46	-.38	-.39	.32	.06	.14	.18
KS1 Writing	-.19	-.60[b]	-.39	-.51	-.39	-.35	.27	.03	.29	.35
KS1 Spelling	-.15	-.44	-.35	-.42	-.38	-.39	.04	-.33	-.13	.12
KS1 Maths	-.12	-.57[b]	-.52	-.55[b]	-.38	-.40	.36	.21	.43	.34
KS2 English	-.55[b]	-.77[a]	-.08	-.20	-.53[b]	-.62[b]	-.12	-.28	.47	.49
KS2 Maths	-.22	-.46	-.06	-.21	-.47	-.49	.18	.03	.28	.36
KS2 Science	-.41	-.50[b]	-.14	-.32	-.38	-.39	-.09	-.31	-.19	-.04
KS1 average	-.16	-.58[b]	-.41	-.51	-.41	-.39	.24	.06	.15	.18
KS2 average	-.43	-.64[a]	-.10	-.46	-.49	-.35	-.00	.03	.15	.35

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE X

Internal noise: correlation coefficients between test scores and school location L_{Aeq} levels corrected for FSM, EAL and SEN

	Occupied classroom N=16			Unoccupied classroom N=14			Corridor/foyer N=14		
	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN
KS1 Reading	.11	.13	-.09	-.05	-.19	-.34	-.25	-.33	-.49
KS1 Writing	.06	.07	-.20	-.07	-.25	-.39	-.24	-.33	-.44
KS1 Spelling	.04	-.02	-.14	-.12	-.27	-.36	-.26	-.34	-.47
KS1 Maths	.15	.18	-.14	-.28	-.42	-.52	-.23	-.33	-.42
KS2 English	-.45	-.44	-.53[b]	.32	.11	-.10	-.43	-.50	-.71[a]
KS2 Maths	-.07	-.09	-.24	.23	.07	-.05	-.38	-.43	-.51
KS2 Science	-.33	-.32	-.38	.04	-.03	-.15	-.31	-.34	-.53
KS1 average	.09	.08	-.15	-.12	-.29	-.41	-.27	-.36	-.49
KS2 average	-.32	-.31	-.42	.21	.05	-.12	-.39	-.45	-.62[b]

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level

TABLE XI

Internal noise: correlation coefficients between test scores and school location L_{A90} levels corrected for FSM, EAL and SEN

	Occupied classroom N=16			Unoccupied classroom N=14			Corrifor/foyer N=14		
	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN	FSM	EAL	SEN
KS1 Reading	-.44	-.47	-.60[b]	-.21	-.30	-.45	-.26	-.30	-.40
KS1 Writing	-.40	-.45	-.62[b]	-.22	-.34	-.52	-.17	-.23	-.35
KS1 Spelling	-.24	-.34	-.44	-.20	-.33	-.42	-.27	-.33	-.39
KS1 Maths	-.36	-.40	-.60[b]	-.30	-.40	-.57[b]	-.25	-.29	-.40
KS2 English	-.66[a]	-.69[a]	-.76[a]	.19	.03	-.17	-.55[b]	-.58[b]	-.64[b]
KS2 Maths	-.30	-.36	-.49	.06	-.07	-.22	-.40	-.43	-.48
KS2 Science	-.42	-.42	-.48	-.18	-.21	-.29	-.31	-.33	-.40
KS1 average	-.38	-.44	-.59[b]	-.24	-.36	-.51	-.26	-.31	-.41
KS2 average	-.51[b]	-.54[b]	-.63[a]	.01	-.10	-.26	-.44	-.47	-.54

[a] significant at 1% level [b] significant at 5% level