Why Phone Bans Miss the Point About Student Distraction

Published by **John Dolman** on 8/9/25

Recent headlines about mobile phone bans in schools have been grabbing attention across the globe, but they're telling us a story that's far more complex than the soundbites suggest. The Economist recently published findings from a double-blind study showing that phone bans can improve performance, while Conservative politicians have jumped on the bandwagon with promises of statutory rights to withdraw digital device consent in schools. Both responses, whilst containing grains of truth, fundamentally miss the point about what's really happening in our classrooms.

The Problem Isn't the Device—It's What's On It

Let's be clear about what we're actually dealing with. The issue isn't that students are carrying small rectangular objects in their pockets. The problem is that these objects contain applications literally designed to create addiction. TikTok, YouTube, mobile games—these platforms use sophisticated psychological techniques to trigger dopamine responses, creating the same biological reward cycles that underpin all forms of addictive behaviour.

This isn't accidental. These applications are engineered with short-term dopamine hits, tiny rewards that keep users coming back for more. It's the same basic biological function that drives us to eat calorie-dense foods or binge-watch television programmes. Our brains are programmed this way, and technology companies have become exceptionally skilled at exploiting these natural responses.

When we focus solely on banning the device, we're treating a symptom rather than addressing the underlying cause. It's like trying to solve obesity by banning plates instead of examining what we're putting on them.

Why Blanket Bans Aren't the Answer

The research supporting phone bans tells a more nuanced story than the headlines suggest. Yes, some studies show marginal improvements, particularly for lower-achieving students who benefit from reduced distraction (that was the much vaunted study trumpeted by the Economist today). But other research, including attempts to replicate key studies, has found no benefit whatsoever from phone restrictions.

More tellingly, the OECD found that whilst one in three students reported being distracted by phones in almost every lesson, researchers at King's College London discovered something counterintuitive: countries with stricter phone restrictions actually showed lower PISA benchmark scores, though the reasons for this correlation remain unclear.

From my own experience working in schools with "on-site, out-of-sight" policies, phone-reaching behaviour during lessons simply wasn't a massive problem. When teaching in Malaysia the only student I regularly encountered with this habit was, tellingly, an expat child struggling with cultural adjustment. In Southeast Asia, where I've taught, students who were culturally compliant with educational expectations didn't exhibit these behaviours during lessons at all. Out of lessons was another matter, but in lessons – not a problem.

This points to something crucial: engagement matters more than enforcement and cultural factors also play into this. Where students are culturally more compliant or the system allows for greater engagement and variety of teaching style and topic, the phone is less of an issue.

Better Engagement, Not Better Bans

Here's what we actually need to address: learning culture and curriculum relevance. It's difficult to be distracted when you're genuinely engaged with what's happening in front of you. It's easy to be distracted when the content doesn't speak to you or when the teaching methods fail to capture attention.

Rather than playing into easy-win, god whistle politics with no basis in robust science, we need to acknowledge the complex combination of factors at play. Yes, there's overuse of screens in inappropriate contexts. Yes, students are distracted by genuinely addictive applications. But the solution isn't to point fingers at convenient scapegoats—it's to do better.

We need curricula that are aligned, interesting, and personally relevant. We need teaching methods that recognise the digital world our students inhabit whilst providing meaningful alternatives to passive consumption. Most importantly, we need to stop looking for quick fixes to complex educational challenges.

The Right Tool for the Right Task

This doesn't mean abandoning technology—quite the opposite. In my own practice, I use a mixture of approaches depending on the learning objective. Sometimes it's all pen and paper, utilising that crucial brain-body connection for memory consolidation. Sometimes it's creative work with glue, scissors, and colour. We create mind maps, arrange papers on the floor, move around the room for decision-making exercises, and yes, we work on screens when that's the most effective tool for the job.

The key principle is: right tool for the right time. For learning and memory consolidation, writing by hand offers distinct cognitive advantages. For assessment and demonstration of learning, recent studies suggest electronic devices may actually provide benefits—students taking exams using keyboards perform better than those using pen and paper for the same tasks.

This makes intuitive sense: we're not learning when we're being assessed, we're demonstrating our learning. And it appears that electronic devices can be more effective tools for that demonstration.

Moving Beyond Binary Thinking

The Conservative promise of statutory rights to withdraw digital device consent in schools represents exactly the kind of knee-jerk political response that hinders rather than helps educational progress. Imagine what technologies will exist by 2029—banning screens at that point would be not just redundant but actively harmful to students' preparation for their future world.

This isn't about being pro-technology or anti-technology. It's about being thoughtful about how we integrate the tools our students will need whilst addressing the genuine challenges that poorly implemented technology creates.

We need to teach better digital habits rather than digital avoidance. We need curricula that compete successfully with TikTok for student attention, not by mimicking its addictive qualities but by offering something genuinely meaningful and engaging in return.

Complexity Requires Complex Solutions

The phone ban debate reveals something uncomfortable about our approach to educational challenges and politics in general: we're drawn to simple solutions for complex problems. But student distraction, digital addiction, and declining engagement aren't problems we can solve with magnetic pouches and statutory regulations.

They're symptoms of broader issues with curriculum relevance, teaching methods, and our collective failure to create learning environments that genuinely compete with the sophisticated attention-capture mechanisms students encounter outside school.

Rather than fighting yesterday's battles with tomorrow's technologies, we need to focus on what we've always known works: engaging students with meaningful content, delivered through appropriate methods, in supportive environments that recognise both their current reality and their future needs.

The solution isn't to ban the digital world our students inhabit—it's to help them navigate it thoughtfully whilst creating educational experiences compelling enough to compete for their attention.