

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 518

CS 012 601

AUTHOR Bridge, Connie A.; And Others
TITLE Implementing Large Scale Change in Literacy Instruction: A Second Look.
PUB DATE 29 Nov 95
NOTE 6p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (New Orleans, LA, November 29-December 2, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; *Educational Change; Integrated Activities; *Language Arts; Primary Education; *Reading Instruction; Student Needs; *Whole Language Approach; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS Authentic Assessment; *Kentucky; Kentucky Education Reform Act 1990; Process Approach (Writing)

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether Kentucky primary teachers were adopting the changes in literacy instruction recommended in the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA/1990) which, in part, encouraged the use of whole language and integrated reading/language arts approaches and the teaching of writing as a process. The study employed direct classroom observations and teacher interviews with 96 subjects, selected by random sample from 24 schools in Kentucky's 8 regional service center areas. Results indicated that approximately 70% of teachers were using recommended practices in reading and writing instruction and 60% were using authentic methods of literacy assessment. Half or more of the teachers were having difficulty implementing continuous progress, using flexible grouping, and varying their instruction to meet individual needs. Teachers were also having difficulty sharing control with students. It appears that statewide mandates in literacy instruction and assessment can bring about changes in teachers' instructional practices. (CR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

***IMPLEMENTING LARGE SCALE CHANGE
IN LITERACY INSTRUCTION:
A SECOND LOOK***

by
**Connie A. Bridge
Margaret Compton-Hall
Susan Gooden**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Bridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**A Paper Presented to the
National Reading Conference
New Orleans, LA
November 29, 1995**

IMPLEMENTING LARGE SCALE CHANGE IN LITERACY INSTRUCTION: A SECOND LOOK

Purpose of the Study

In June, 1990, Kentucky passed the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), which mandated a complete restructuring of the Kentucky educational system in the areas of finance, governance, and curriculum. One of the mandates which has had far reaching implications has been the requirement for all of Kentucky's elementary schools to implement multi-age, multi-ability primary classrooms by the 1993-1994 school year. As part of the primary program, the Kentucky Department of Education encouraged teachers to adopt developmentally appropriate practices, including "whole language" and "integrated reading/language arts approaches" and to teach "writing as a process."

During the springs of 1993, 1994, and 1995, statewide studies have been conducted to determine the status of implementation of the primary program in Kentucky (Bridge, 1994; 1995). As part of those studies, we have taken an in-depth look at the reading and language arts instruction in Kentucky's primary classrooms.

Methodology

In order to determine whether or not teachers were adopting the recommended changes in literacy instruction, a combination of direct observations in classrooms and teacher interviews were conducted. The teachers in the study included teachers from a geographically stratified random sample of 24 schools chosen from the eight regional service center areas in Kentucky. Within each school, four teachers were randomly selected from the list of primary teachers in that building, resulting in the identification of 96 teachers. Due to scheduling problems, 86 of the 96 teachers were observed in 1994 and 92 in 1995. A different sample of schools and teachers were selected each year.

Trained observers spent one day observing in each classroom and followed the observations with a teacher interview. The observers used a structured observation guide that included various components of the primary program. For the purposes of this study, only the components related to literacy instruction and assessment will be reported. These include aspects of the physical environment, the social environment, teacher/student interaction patterns, and literacy instructional and assessment practices. The percentages of teachers in 1994 and 1995 who were observed to be implementing these aspects of the primary program with high fidelity to recommended practices are presented in Table 1.

Results of the Study

Results revealed that approximately 70% of the teachers are creating a warm social emotional climate, arranging a print rich environment, and using recommended practices in reading and writing instruction; and 60% are using a variety of authentic methods of literacy assessment. Teachers are still having difficulty sharing control with students in that only slightly more than a third of them allow students much opportunity to initiate activities, to evaluate their own work, or to display student work in the classroom. Half or more of the teachers are having difficulty implementing continuous progress, using flexible grouping, and varying their instruction to meet individual needs.

The percentages of teachers judged to be successfully implementing the program dropped in several areas, two of which were statistically significant: the arrangement of a flexible physical environment and the management of continuous progress to meet each student's individual needs. Implementation in several other areas was lower but not significantly so. It appears, however, that the teachers have reached a plateau in their level of implementation and in some cases are reverting back to more traditional practices.

An in-depth follow-up study conducted in the spring of 1995 of eight of the teachers who had been judged as high implementors of the primary program in 1994 revealed that even these teachers reported that they were returning to traditional practices in some areas of reading instruction because they were afraid students were not learning the basic skills (Gooden, 1995).

In the interviews in the statewide study, teachers reported that they had made the greatest changes in their instruction in the areas of reading and writing in response to the education reform mandates. Specifically, they said that they were having the students do a great deal more writing, write more different types of compositions, and do more writing across the curriculum. They also reported that they were relying less on basal reading textbooks and using more children's literature and trade books.

Implications

It appears that statewide mandates in literacy instruction and assessment can bring about changes in teachers' instructional practices. However, if teachers do not have adequate staff development and ongoing support, they may not maintain changes over time, especially if these new practices are not consistent with their beliefs or if they feel that students are not achieving as well as they did in the past.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

- Bridge, C.A. (1994) The implementation of Kentucky's primary program. A report of research conducted by the Institute on Education Reform at the University of Kentucky for the Kentucky Institute for Education Research, Frankfort, KY.
- Bridge, C.A. (1995) The implementation of Kentucky's primary program 1995: A progress report. A Report of Research conducted by the Institute on Education Reform at the University of Kentucky for the Kentucky Institute for Education Research, Frankfort, KY.
- Gooden, S. (1995) Teacher characteristics and school conditions affecting the implementation of the primary program in Kentucky: Case studies of teachers and schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

Percentage of Teachers Implementing with High Fidelity

| | 1994 | 1995 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|
| Physical Environment | | |
| Flexible layout | 90 | 78 |
| Print rich environment | 70 | 75 |
| Student work displayed | 35 | 37 |
| Social and Emotional Environment | | |
| Active engagement | 63 | 62 |
| Student talk | 73 | 75 |
| Student/teacher interaction | 77 | 83 |
| Integrated Instruction | | |
| Flexible scheduling | 55 | 52 |
| Broad based themes/units | 45 | 43 |
| Meaning centered reading | 74 | 67 |
| Meaning centered writing | 67 | 63 |
| Varied Instructional Strategies | | |
| Varied instruction | 48 | 47 |
| Student/Teacher initiation | 35 | 29 |
| Flexible grouping | 66 | 52 |
| Continuous progress | 55 | 39 |
| Continuity and frequency | 62 | 60 |
| Authenticity | 62 | 57 |
| Variety of methods | 62 | 60 |
| Student self-evaluation | 39 | 37 |



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|--|---|
| Title: Paper presented at the Annual National Reading Conference (New Orleans) <i>"Amplifying Large Scale Change in Literacy Instruction: A Second Look."</i> | |
| Author(s): <i>Connie A. Bridge, Margaret Compton-Hall, Susan Gooden</i> | |
| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: Nov. 29-Dec. 2, 1995 |

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.



Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document



Check here

Permitting
microfiche
(4"x 6" film),
paper copy,
electronic,
and optical media
reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER
COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here

Permitting
reproduction
in other than
paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

| | |
|--|---|
| "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries." | |
| Signature: <i>Connie A. Bridge</i> | Position: <i>Associate Dean, Professor</i> |
| Printed Name: <i>Connie A. Bridge</i> | Organization: <i>University of KY</i> |
| Address: <i>101 Taylor Education Bldg. Lexington, KY 40506-0001</i> | Telephone Number: <i>(606) 257-6734</i> |
| | Date: <i>10-8-96</i> |

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Publisher/Distributor: | |
| Address: | |
| Price Per Copy: | Quantity Price: |

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder: |
| Name: |
| Address: |

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

| | |
|---|--|
| Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: | <i>Acquisitions</i> ERIC/REC 2805 E. Tenth Street Smith Research Center, 150 Indiana University Bloomington, IN 47408 |
|---|--|

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Facility~~
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500