How Scripted is Too Scripted?

A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Literacy Teachers’ Guides

Jessica Mejía, Dr. Yasmin Sitabkhan and Dr. Benjamin Piper
Teachers’ Guide Study Background

Mixed methods analysis of RTI’s teachers’ guides for projects from 2009 to 2017
Reviewed: 1) Teachers’ Guides, 2) Classroom Observations & 3) Teacher Interviews
The teachers’ guide analysis looked at:
  13 countries
  19 projects
  34 teachers’ guides
The classroom observation and interview analysis looked at:
  4 countries
  27 lessons
  27 teacher interviews
RQ1: How does the level of scripting across projects differ?
RQ2: Does the level of scripting have a relationship with teachers choosing to implement?
RQ3: Does the level of scripting have a relationship with the length of time teachers take to do the routines correctly in limited time?
RQ4: Relationship between level of scripting and program outcomes?
Program Impact on Oral Reading Fluency by Grade Data

Grade 1 data
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Grade 3 data
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Scripting and ORF impact

IMPACT ON ORAL READING FLUENCY (CWPM)

"SCRIPTING" LEVEL

$R^2 = 0.2362$
Classroom Observations
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification Types</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Additions</td>
<td>Adding content to an activity or lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Teacher adds an extra word for blending, teacher adds extra questions in comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Omissions</td>
<td>Omitting content from an activity or lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Teacher skips a word during blending exercise, teacher omits a new vocabulary word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Changes</td>
<td>A change to the structure or delivery of the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Students are not asked to do paired work but instead conduct the activity as a whole class, teacher leaves out the “you do” section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Activity Skipped</td>
<td>Skipping an entire activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Teacher does not do pre-reading activity, story reading, or comprehension questions with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Activity Skipped</td>
<td>Skipping a sub-component or part of an activity; not conducting part of an activity using the content as outlined in the guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: The teacher skips the “prediction/pre-reading” step, but does not omit the main content/story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Fidelity and Lesson Quality

- **Uganda Average**: Low quality, low fidelity
- **Malawi Average**: Medium quality, medium fidelity
- **Ethiopia Average**: Medium Quality, medium fidelity
- **Kenya Average**: High quality, High fidelity

The graph shows the correlation between the number of modifications per 30 min block and the percentage of negative modifications, indicating differences in program fidelity and lesson quality across different regions.
Types of Changes by Country

Ethiopia
- Content Addition: 24.1%
- Content Omission: 2.4%
- Structural: 53%
- Partial Activity Skipped: 6%
- Full Activity Skipped: 14.5%

Malawi
- Content Addition: 46.7%
- Content Omission: 4.8%
- Structural: 38.1%
- Partial Activity Skipped: 1%
- Full Activity Skipped: 9.5%

Kenya
- Content Addition: 20.8%
- Content Omission: 9.7%
- Structural: 63.9%
- Partial Activity Skipped: 4.2%
- Full Activity Skipped: 1%

Uganda
- Content Addition: 19.7%
- Content Omission: 4.3%
- Structural: 35.6%
- Partial Activity Skipped: 37.8%
- Full Activity Skipped: 2.7%
What are two things you would change about the teachers’ guide?

- **Other**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 1
  - Uganda: 1

- **Simplify Content**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 1
  - Uganda: 8

- **Simplify Activities**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 2
  - Uganda: 2

- **Scripting Language**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 2
  - Uganda: 2

- **Formatting**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 1
  - Uganda: 3

- **Add Content**:
  - Ethiopia: 2
  - Kenya: 1
  - Malawi: 1
  - Uganda: 1
Reflections on Teachers’ Guide Usage

- **Wide variation** in the design of RTI teachers’ guides
- The **trend** is towards shorter guides with fewer words
- Front and back matter is little used – **dramatically reduce**
- Some of our teachers’ guide formats are much more popular with teachers than other formats – **consider changing**
- Our newer TGs are improved – make time for **revisions**
- Moderate negative relationship between “scripting level” and program outcomes – **surprised to find this**
- Structured teachers’ guides do work – **let’s improve them**
- Consider how TGs you work on **can be improved**
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