

THE EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED READING
PROGRAM INVOLVING 3 GRADE 4 STUDENTS
EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTIES IN READING

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

RANDY PITTMAN NOSEWORTHY, B.A., M.P.H.



THE EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED READING PROGRAM
INVOLVING 3 GRADE 4 STUDENTS
EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTIES IN READING

by

Randy Pittman Noseworthy, B.A., M.P.H.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Memorial University of Newfoundland

August 1990

St. John's

Newfoundland



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-61781-0

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the effects of an individualized reading program involving 3 Grade 4 boys who were experiencing significant difficulties in reading. The program, which was developed within a holistic perspective, used trade books selected by the students and included scheduled conferences between each student and the resource teacher (the investigator) to initiate and to conclude activities related to each book. Incorporated within these conferences were instructional activities which specifically focused on the student's reading awareness and strategy development through techniques such as discussion, investigator modelling, and reinforcing and correcting verbal feedback. The program provided ample opportunities for each student to experience and respond to his books, both independently and within various social contexts. Continuing communication between the investigator and the classroom teacher helped ensure consistency of instructional experiences and enabled the 3 students to maintain active involvement in the whole-class Grade 4 language program during the 15-week period of the individualized reading program. Additionally, on-going communication with parents played an important role in ensuring their support and in encouraging and enabling the parents to actively participate in their children's activities at home. The anticipated outcomes of the program were that each student would develop those attitudes and strategies that foster independence in

reading and increased proficiency in word identification and comprehension.

A number of formal and informal assessment procedures were administered before, during, and after the program. Pretest group mean results on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests revealed that the students were considerably below grade level in comprehension and vocabulary. Posttest results showed group mean gains in comprehension and vocabulary; one student's score (in vocabulary) exceeded anticipated gains for students making average progress. The results of informal, process-oriented assessments administered before and after the program revealed distinct gains for all students in comprehension, sight word recognition, reading awareness and the selection and use of reading strategies and showed continued favorable self-perceptions about reading. Additional informal measures during conference sessions revealed increased proficiency in the selection and use of reading strategies and indicated a favorable student response to the use of feedback following oral reading.

Based on the results of this study it was concluded that Grade 4 students who are experiencing significant reading difficulties respond with interest and enthusiasm to a holistic approach and that an individualized reading program can be an effective means for providing independent and instructional experiences that benefit their reading development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation for the guidance and advice provided by Dr. Joan Matchim, supervisor of this thesis.

Additionally, I wish to thank the Avalon North Integrated School Board, whose interest and cooperation enabled this study to be conducted.

I would also like to thank the 3 students who participated in the study, as well as their parents and their classroom teacher.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contribution made by my family--my parents, Gordon and Cavell; my sister, Beverley; and my daughter, Janis. Each has profoundly influenced my awareness of how children respond to experiences with books. For this, and for their encouragement and support during the development of this thesis, I am most grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	page
I. NATURE OF THE STUDY.	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Need for the Study	5
Limitations	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Literacy in the 1990s	10
Recent Insights into Literacy Learning	13
Reading Begins at Home	16
Implications for the Early Grades	19
Whole Language	20
Readers with Difficulties	23
Windows on the Reading Process	30
Miscue Characteristics and Reader Proficiency	32
Miscues and Reader Focus on Meaning	34
Using Miscues to Guide Instruction	35
III. METHODOLOGY	40
Introduction	40
Subjects	40
Basis of Selection	41
Instruments and Measurement Procedures	42

	page
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests	42
Cloze Task	43
Awareness About Reading	45
Reading Interview	45
Ideas About Reading	46
Self-Perceptions About Reading	47
Miscue Analysis Procedures	49
RMI Procedure II	49
RMI Procedure III	51
Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback	52
Involvement and Reaction	54
Collection of Data	56
Treatment of Data	56
Procedure	56
Overview	56
Scheduling of Sessions	57
Support from Classroom Teacher	58
Encouraging Parent Involvement	59
Assembling the Collection.	61
Student Selection of Trade Books . . .	62
Preparation of the Text	66
Start-Up Session	68
On My Own Activities	79
In the Classroom	80
At Home	81
Wrap-Up Session	81

	page
IV. EVALUATION	86
Introduction	86
Reading Achievement	87
Cloze Task	91
Awareness About Reading	95
Reading Interview	95
Ideas About Reading	102
Self-Perceptions About Reading	105
Miscue Analysis	107
RMI Procedure II	108
RMI Procedure III	115
Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback	125
Involvement and Reaction	134
Student Interviews	134
Basic Sight Words	138
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . .	141
Summary	141
Conclusions	159
Implications	163
REFERENCES	169
APPENDIX A	177
APPENDIX B	187
APPENDIX C	189
APPENDIX D	194
APPENDIX E	197

	page
APPENDIX F	199
APPENDIX G	200
APPENDIX H	201
APPENDIX I	222
APPENDIX J	224
APPENDIX K	226
APPENDIX L	229
APPENDIX M	233
APPENDIX N	249
APPENDIX O	302
APPENDIX P	354
APPENDIX Q	411
APPENDIX R	418
APPENDIX S	425
APPENDIX T	432

LIST OF TABLES

Table	page
1. Outline of Steps in Start-Up Sessions	70
2. Schedule for Including Feedback by Investigator in Start-Up Sessions	71
3. Gain in Reading Achievement on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Level B, Forms 1 and 2	88
4. Gain in Cloze Task Scores Using Same Passages in Pretest and Posttest	93
5. Gain in Cloze Task Scores Using Alternate Passages in Pretest and Posttest	94
6. Gain in Awareness About Reading as Measured by a Procedure Adapted from Paris and Colleagues (Jacobs & Paris, 1987)	103
7. Gain in Self-Perceptions About Reading as Measured by a Procedure Developed by Paris and Oka (1986)	106
8. Results of Pretest and Posttests (Including Gains) Using Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure II (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)	109
9. Group Mean Results of Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)	117
10. Mean Results of John's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)	119
11. Mean Results of Max's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)	121
12. Mean Results of Sam's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)	123
13. Mean Results of the Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback	126

	page
14. Semantic Acceptability Scores for Student Oral Reading of Excerpts from Trade Books	132
15. Gains in Recognition Scores on the Dolch List of 220 Basic Sight Words	139

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In a society which values literacy, learning to read is almost universally considered to be an essential educational objective for children (Becher, 1985; Stewart, 1985).

At an early age children growing up in a print-rich society begin to acquire some basic understandings about literacy (Strickland & Morrow, 1988). In varying manners and to varying degrees, largely depending upon the home, this process continues throughout the preschool years (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985). By the time these children enter school, where they will encounter their first formal instruction in reading and writing, they will have already mastered many complex understandings about language; in fact, some will already be able to read (Doake, 1979; Anderson et al., 1985; Stewart, 1985; Doake, 1986).

In kindergarten the children will likely be introduced to reading instruction through an individualized approach (Stewart, 1985). Through the primary and elementary grades they will likely experience a curriculum of which a sizeable proportion (28% in primary and 24% in elementary in this province) is devoted specifically to language arts (Department of Education, 1989). This, coupled with the prominent role written language plays in the rest of the curriculum, indicates that experiences with reading will comprise a significant, if not dominant, feature of the school life of

the children.

Clearly, a tremendous amount of individual, family, school, and community resources has been mobilized so that children will "learn to read." Indeed, most children will learn how to read (Anderson et al., 1985); although it should be noted that many of them avoid reading or choose to apply their abilities only in narrow or superficial ways (Carbo, 1987; Cullinan, 1987).

Statement of the Problem

Despite the high value with which reading is regarded and the considerable resources directly and indirectly allocated to its attainment, Snow (1983) has contended that "a significant number of children, even those whose intelligence is in the normal or above-average range, fail at or have great difficulty in learning to read" (p. 182). According to Poplin (1988b), programs intended to help such students have tended to follow a deficit model, based on a reductionistic view of learning. Rhodes and Dudley-Marling (1988) have observed that, within this model, instruction relies heavily on a "skills and drills" approach that focuses on specific weaknesses or deficits identified in the student.

This model, along with its associated programs, is now being widely challenged, largely as a result of insights gained from research over the past few years regarding the nature and function of language and the learning processes of young children (Park, 1986; Teale, 1987; Poplin, 1988a; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988). These insights reflect a

growing recognition of the holistic/constructivist and developmental characteristics of language learning and the benefits of incorporating these characteristics within formal instructional settings, including programs for students experiencing difficulties in reading (Clay, 1979; Buchanan, 1980; Holdaway, 1980, 1982; Church & Newman, 1985; Newman, 1985a; K.S. Goodman, 1986; Boehnlein, 1987; Phinney, 1988; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988).

Holdaway (1979, 1980, 1982) has examined some possible applications of the developmental model within literacy programs in schools. His findings clearly indicate the validity of this approach and have contributed to the refinement of an induction model of language teaching, organized around the framework of the individualized reading program. In view of the flexibility inherent in the individualized reading program, Holdaway's work appears to offer an especially promising basis for developing holistic programs to help students experiencing difficulties in reading. Could such an approach benefit the programs offered in a Newfoundland school by a resource teacher (special education teacher) working with elementary students experiencing reading difficulties?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of an individualized reading program involving 3 Grade 4 boys, who were experiencing significant difficulties in reading. The program, using trade books selected by the student,

included scheduled conferences between the student and the resource teacher (the investigator) and opportunities for the student to experience and respond to the books independently and with his parent(s). Two complementary aims of the program were to foster interest and enjoyment in reading and to help the student to develop those understandings and strategies used in proficient reading.

The major questions investigated were:

1. Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading development in the following areas:
 - (a) reading comprehension, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, by Cloze tasks, and by retelling following oral reading?
 - (b) reading vocabulary, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests?
 - (c) reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured by Cloze tasks and by Reading Miscue Inventory Procedures II and III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?
 - (d) reading awareness, as measured by the Reading Interview (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987) and by a procedure adapted from Jacobs and Paris (1987)?
 - (e) self-perceptions about reading, as measured by a procedure adapted from Paris and Oka (1986)?
2. Within the context of an individualized reading program as implemented in this study, will the use of a planned

approach to providing verbal feedback following the student's oral reading of an excerpt from his self-selected trade book improve his use of reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured by a procedure entitled Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback and by an adaptation of Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?

Need for the Study

Perspectives on learning based on holistic principles are having increasing influence on school curricula and teacher practices. In Newfoundland and Labrador, holistic approaches now form integral components of the language arts and total curriculum from kindergarten through elementary grades (Department of Education, 1989). Holistic approaches can benefit all students. Moreover, for those experiencing special needs in reading and writing, the results of research and practice are demonstrating that holistic principles and practices offer the most appropriate and effective means for fostering literacy growth. Thus, in Newfoundland and Labrador, those responsible for planning and providing programs for students experiencing special needs in reading and/or writing have an available context which offers high potential for achieving the curricular congruence Allington and Shake (1986) have strongly advocated. This study explores one way to build on this potential for curriculum congruence in the school's total program and tests its

effectiveness. Additionally, the implementation of the Department of Education's Special Education Policy Manual (1987) has created the need and/or the opportunity to be more flexible in the delivery of programs and services within schools. The results of this study provide information indicating the extent to which one approach, in whole or in part, could be used to improve the reading ability of students experiencing reading difficulties.

Research and teaching practice have shown that the student experiencing reading difficulties should be helped early, with methods consistent with current understandings of the reading process, and focused on restoring those attitudes, strategies, and behaviors associated with healthy, independent reading. In itself, this global statement underscores the need for helping any students identified as having difficulties. Furthermore, research evidence points to a number of risk factors which may affect the reading development of students around third and fourth grades and may have a bearing on the need for the study.

Longitudinal studies of reading achievement indicate that the period around Grade 3 may be especially significant in the academic development of many students (Butler, Marsh, Sheppard, & Sheppard, 1985; Badian, 1988). One of the most significant findings emerging from those studies is that, in general, for the student experiencing reading difficulties around this period, the prospects for adequate improvement are poor.

Evidence from other sources also suggests the significance of this general period. Larrick (1982) has asserted that the third grade or early fourth is a crucial time in children's reading development. She said it is a time they usually find their stride as readers. Landsberg (1985), referring to the 7-to-9 year old, has expressed the opinion that unless reading is well established as a prime source of pleasure for the child, ". . . it is more than likely that, at this age, boys especially will fall by the wayside as readers of books" (p. 36). Lamme (1987) has concluded that the child who is an avid reader by the end of Grade 3 will continue to develop competence in the upper elementary grades and will be a reader for life.

Various research studies support these views and offer some insight into the dynamics involved. In a large-scale study of Grade 3 and Grade 5 students, Paris and Oka (1986) found that among the Grade 3 students and low-achieving Grade 5 students, comprehension skills were the best predictor of reading achievement. More specifically, they found that inefficient comprehension monitoring and poor use of reading strategies were the primary determinants of reading skill. They observed that with age and skill, motivational variables became more predictive of reading and the number of significant predictor variables increased. They concluded that the variables important for reading became more diffuse and less strictly cognitive in nature.

This is consistent with the perspective of Stanovich (1986) who noted especially the interaction of volume of reading experience, vocabulary, and overall reading development. Nagy and Anderson (1984) concluded that beginning about the third grade the major determinant of vocabulary growth is the amount of free reading. Fielding, Wilson, and Anderson (1986) reported that the time spent in voluntary independent reading of trade books was the best predictor of size of vocabulary, performance on standardized tests, and reading achievement gains between second and fifth grades. As Lamme (1987) succinctly put it: "Enthusiastic readers become talented readers" (p. 52).

Research and practice provide substantial evidence of the need to appropriately and effectively help students who are experiencing reading difficulties as they enter Grade 4. Furthermore, research and practice also provide substantial evidence that this help should be developed within a holistic, natural-language perspective. However, there remains much to be learned about the task of linking the emerging understanding of natural language learning and the practice of helping children in their literacy development. Holdaway (1980) made the following observation:

We face a challenge to develop styles of teaching and procedures of evaluation which will encourage optimum development of self-monitoring strategies at every stage and over the whole spectrum of reading, and which will allow teachers to intervene more positively in the learning adventures of children who are struggling to master the skills of literacy. (p. 33)

The present study is directed towards the need to define more clearly how the resource teacher, using a holistic perspective, can intervene positively in the reading development of Grade 4 students experiencing significant difficulties.

Limitations

The study was conducted in a medium-sized elementary school serving two rural communities on the Avalon Peninsula of Newfoundland. Only 3 Grade 4 students, all males, participated in the study. These students had been previously identified (through the school's administrative process) as having the greatest difficulties in reading in their class of 26 students. Therefore, random selection was not involved in subject selection for the study. No control subjects were used. No cause/effect relations are demonstrated.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The ability to read with understanding is vital in modern society; so from an early age children are provided with a wide range of experiences intended to ensure they successfully learn to read. While most children will indeed learn to read, some will experience significant difficulties. Efforts to help these children have often proved to be ineffective. However, scholarship and research in recent years have suggested that such efforts should be guided by insights into how successful readers learn to read. Therefore, the literature review for this study focuses on research and discussions which indicate how holistic and naturalistic perspectives might inform the efforts of a resource teacher working with Grade 4 students experiencing significant difficulties in reading. For the purposes of this study, particular attention will be placed on (a) literacy and learning in the 1990s; (b) naturalistic ways to encourage reading development; (c) holistic approaches to helping readers experiencing difficulties; (d) miscue analysis and the reading process; and (e) using miscues to promote reader proficiency and independence.

Literacy in the 1990s

The ability to read with understanding is essential in a modern society (Spiro, Bruce, & Brewer, 1980). Without the

ability to read well, opportunities for personal fulfillment and job success will inevitably be lost (Anderson et al., 1985). But reading is not just a personal matter. Whether the perspective is individual, provincial, national or international, the importance of reading, and of literacy in general, is evident (e.g., Church & Newman, 1985; Fagan, 1988; Reading Today, 1989; Meaney, 1989). Holdaway (1984) noted that predictions about the imminent decline in the use of literacy were ". . . made false by the unprecedented explosion of print in the world of the seventies and eighties" (p. 1). Indeed, he concluded that "power resides more than ever in the ability to write" and that "reading . . . is essential to participation" (p. 2).

Furthermore, the role of literacy can be expected to continue growing in importance. A clear indication is the action of the General Assembly of the United Nations in designating 1990 as International Literacy Year, thus highlighting the global significance of literacy issues (Reading Today, 1988). In the opinion of Anderson et al. (1985), "the world is moving into a technical-information age in which full participation in education, science, business, industry, and the professions requires increasing levels of literacy" (p. 3).

However, some contemporary writers warn that modern society needs to redress an imbalance in its view of literacy and education. Huck (1982) claimed that society is focusing

on literacy that is oriented more towards technology than towards human feelings and quality of life. "Almost everything a child learns in school today is concerned with facts" (p. 315), she observed. Huck advocated having a strong literature component within the curriculum. She maintained that "besides humanizing us, literature can help children to develop their imagination, that quality so essential in all we do, as necessary for the salesman as the architect, the plumber as the writer, the doctor as the artist" (p. 316).

Landsberg (1986) expressed the opinion that there is nothing in the world more beautifully and powerfully designed to awaken a child's imagination than excellent books. Furthermore, she asserted that "we need these books now, in the age of electronic overkill, more than ever" (p. 55).

The tendency towards the more "efferent" (utilitarian), as opposed to "aesthetic," applications of literacy has been noted by Rosenblatt (1982). She maintained that both types of reading should be taught; however, she contended that aesthetic reading tends to be neglected. She warned that even when literature is presented to young readers, the efferent emphasis of society and school tends to negate the potential interest and benefits of the reading. Rosenblatt recommended that in addition to teaching efferent reading, elementary teachers should also help children to develop the habit of reading from an aesthetic stance.

Recent Insights into Literacy Learning

From the perspective of literacy development, achieving full and satisfying participation in society will obviously present challenges at all levels, from individual to global, yet there is reason to be optimistic that much progress can be made. This optimism is engendered in large part by the explosion of research and scholarship during the past two decades in the areas of literacy (Paris & Wixson, 1986), reading (K.S. Goodman, 1985), and young children's oral and written language development (Newman, 1985a). This work has resulted in a remarkable number of insights into how people read, write, and communicate (Paris & Wixson, 1986).

Holdaway (1984) concluded that modern linguistic studies have affirmed the potency of natural language learning and the value of common sense and have pointed ". . . with remarkable specificity to the need for radical changes in pedagogical procedures" (p. 2). He suggested that the insights derived from these studies include: (a) the urgent need for a massive increase in quantity of print transacted in learning to read and write; (b) the urgent need for radical change in the teaching and reinforcement of self-direction from the earliest stages of literacy learning; (c) the urgent need for radical changes in attitude towards approximation and correction in early language learning; and, (d) the recognition that the criteria of instructional level (viz., 96% accuracy and 75% comprehension) should be applied from the beginning of formal instruction.

Based on their review of current research, Paris and Wixson (1986) concluded that researchers have begun to forge a clearer notion of what constitutes effective instruction for literacy. Paris and Wixson have identified from the new approaches four implications which, they suggest, differ substantially from traditional practice:

1. Comprehension should be taught as a functional, goal-directed activity that occurs naturally in the life of a child.
2. Instruction should emphasize the development of concepts of reading that will enable the children to successfully comprehend written material under a variety of conditions.
3. Instruction should operate at a level slightly beyond a child's current independent ability and include opportunities for appropriate interactions between the learner and a more-proficient other.
4. Instruction should utilize informed, self-control training procedures.

Paris and Wixson asserted that these principles are all important for the development of literacy and that they can be incorporated into instructional curricula and settings.

Anderson et al. (1985) concluded that over the last decade substantial progress has been made in understanding the process of reading. In their opinion, the majority of scholars in the field now agree on the nature of reading: "Reading is the process of constructing meaning from written

texts. It is a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information" (p. 7).

From the reading research of the past decade, Anderson et al. have gleaned five generalizations which, stated from the presumed goal of reading development, are:

1. Skilled reading is constructive.
2. Skilled reading is fluent.
3. Skilled reading is strategic.
4. Skilled reading is motivated.
5. Skilled reading is a lifelong pursuit.

Newman (1985a) concluded that the growth in the theoretical understanding about young children's oral and written language development has thrown into question much of what traditionally has been considered important in terms of language instruction. In regard to reading, she emphasized the contributions made by Kenneth S. Goodman and colleagues, and by Frank Smith. Their work has shaped a perspective which depicts readers as being ". . . engaged in constructing meaning by coordinating information received from the print with the graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic knowledge they were supplying" (p. 21). This perspective, supported largely by research into reader miscues during oral reading, ". . . has important implications for reading instruction" (p. 23). Among these are a recognition of the importance of the reader's prior knowledge, particularly their knowledge about language; the value of reading to students, and of students having opportunity for uninterrupted reading; and the need

for the teacher to develop effective skills in determining what students are trying to do with language and then helping them do it. She asserted that from the research in reading and language development a common set of beliefs may be discerned; namely:

1. The most fundamental concern of language users is making sense.
2. The vehicle for language development is language itself.
3. Language development requires other language users to interact with; however, the interaction must encourage risk-taking and variety and not demand exact, correct language.

Newman claimed that classrooms typically have not been good at providing environments compatible with these beliefs. However, she expressed the opinion that classrooms can become good environments for language development, perhaps with characteristics influenced by the language learning model of the home. Indeed, Holdaway (1984) expressed the belief that "the most efficient learning environments we know are those centered on the conditions of the healthy home" (p. 9), and that an important goal of those involved in education should be to determine ways in which these conditions can be met, and possibly exceeded, in schools.

Reading Begins at Home

While for some preschoolers the home conditions have contributed to obvious and remarkable development in literacy

(e.g., Krippner, 1963; Lass, 1982; Baghban, 1984; Grant & Brown, 1986), Doake (1979) asserted that by the time they enter school, most children have mastered many complex understandings about written language. Stewart (1985) expressed the view that reading is not a single ability but a collection of abilities that develop over time. As Chapman (1986) pointed out, "learning to read is a gradual process that begins early in a child's life, not a sudden happening that comes about when the child enters school" (p. 11).

Though some supportive evidence for such a claim has long been available (e.g., Iredell, 1898; Huey, 1908), this appears to have been overshadowed by the prevailing view of reading development which, until recently, regarded reading as a secondary or derived language learning task. Within this view, stated Doake (1986), parents were actively encouraged to facilitate the oral language development of their children in naturalistic ways, yet were actively discouraged, by teachers in particular, from promoting the reading development of their children. He maintained that apart from encouraging parents to read to their children to foster interest in books and reading, teachers have traditionally guarded the domain of providing reading instruction for children upon their entry to school. In the light of growing evidence that ". . . this view of learning to read is in serious error" (p. 2), Doake exhorted teachers to examine the characteristics of homes which produce children who read before school entry or whose learning proceeds with ease

after school entry, regardless of the nature of the instruction provided.

In fact, Strickland and Morrow (1989) reported that studies carried out in homes have become a major catalyst for the new strategies in early literacy. These studies showed that, in general, parents of early readers not only read to their children, but they were responsive to their children's attempts to read and write, and they were readers themselves.

Grant and Brown (1986) concluded that the caregivers of the early readers in their study taught children not how to read, but how to learn. They created an environment which provided models for literacy, encouraged questions for self-clarification, established guided learning, provided direct and indirect instruction, at the request of their children, and encouraged fearless practice and self-monitoring of comprehension.

Chapman (1986) made naturalistic observations of parents sharing books with their preschool children. She found that most of the parents seemed to function in ways related to the age and developmental level of their children. Further, she noticed a number of parental behaviors seemed to characterize the parent-child interactions:

During book sharing, parents frequently related events in books to the child's life, used books to expand the child's world, provided the child with information about books and about reading, helped the child get meaning from pictures, helped the child get meaning from text, and encouraged the child to behave like a reader.

(p. 13)

Chapman noted that the adults appeared to structure the interactions so that the child could participate successfully from the beginning; further, they enabled the child's role to expand to match the growing competence of the child.

Implications for the Early Grades

Although, as Stewart (1985) indicated, "we still do not completely understand how preschoolers go about learning to read" (p. 356), Teale (1987) concluded that the research of the past decade has provided ". . . unprecedented insights into developmentally appropriate ways to foster literacy growth" in preschool through primary-level children (p. 14). Teale viewed the emergent literacy classroom as a community of readers and writers which provides for young children's participation by allowing them to experiment with reading and writing on their own; to interact in reading and writing activities with a variety of literate others; to see literate others engaged in reading and writing; and to interact with each other as they attempt to solve the written language puzzle.

Grant and Brown (1986) asserted that some of the strategies employed by the caregivers of early readers can be successfully adopted within structured learning settings. In addition to endorsing the principle of reading to and listening to children, they suggested that the teacher model using reading for leisure and for information purposes. They also suggested that the teacher use discussion to make explicit

the strategies and procedures being used. The authors recommended that the classroom be a child-centered learning environment, with opportunities for self-initiated and self-directed learning from highly interesting materials. Grant and Brown noted that learning and practice activities occurred in an atmosphere that encouraged risk-taking and offered non-threatening "testing," supported by caregivers who held positive expectations of the children's future success with reading and learning generally.

Strickland and Morrow (1989) concluded that teachers can learn from the way children learn in natural settings outside of school. They envisioned the classroom as a family or community which not only values the home experiences, but incorporates them within the language and literacy development of the students. Such a classroom would also have an atmosphere which encouraged risk-taking and approached literacy for pleasure and meaning.

Doake (1986) clearly stated his conclusion about the lessons available from literacy learning before school. In his view, "schools must abandon teacher-oriented and teacher-dominated methods of reading instruction and incorporate the naturalistic methods and memorable books used so successfully by parents who read regularly to their children" (p. 7).

Whole Language

While various labels are used to describe school programs developed from this perspective (McTeague, 1987), a term often used is "whole language" (K.S. Goodman, 1987).

There is considerable evidence that this perspective has been adopted by many individuals and organizations and that it is steadily gaining momentum (Grundin, 1985; Rich, 1985; K.S. Goodman, 1986; Altwerger, Edelsky, & Flores, 1987). Yet it apparently eludes efforts to formulate a satisfactory concise definition (Newman, 1985b; Rich, 1985). Gunderson (1989) suggested that whole language teachers themselves have many different definitions and viewpoints. He concluded that there are as many different forms of whole language instruction as there are whole language teachers. K.S. Goodman (1986) acknowledged that whole language is a lot of things to a lot of people. Moreover, he emphasized that it is not a dogma to be practiced narrowly.

This is not to say that "anything goes." Indeed, Altwerger et al. (1987) have strongly argued against certain alleged misuses and misrepresentations of the term "whole language" and have, along with other proponents of whole language, indicated that there clearly are appropriate and inappropriate ways to approach language learning and instruction in schools. For Altwerger et al., "whole language is not practice. It is a set of beliefs, a perspective" (p. 145). Rich (1985) characterized it as "an attitude of mind which provides a shape for the classroom" (p. 719). Newman (1985b) regarded whole language as "a set of beliefs about curriculum, not just language arts curriculum, but about everything that goes on in classrooms" (p. 1). As Clarke (1987) viewed it, whole language is "a philosophy rather than

a methodology" and does not prescribe activities so much as recommend them (p. 386). In the opinion of Rich (1985):

No two whole language teachers are likely to have identical programs although there will be a common thread running through every program. The classrooms will be comprehension-centered and child-centered, but the methodologies will be as varied as the teachers and the children.
(p. 720)

K.S. Goodman (1986) identified those characteristics which he feels are common to whole language programs. Regarding "what's whole in whole language," he maintained that:

- Whole language learning builds around whole learners learning whole language in whole situations.
- Whole language learning assumes respect for language, for the learner, and for the teacher.
- The focus is on meaning and not language itself, in authentic speech and literary events.
- Learners are encouraged to take risks and invited to use language, in all its variety, for their own purposes.
- In a whole language classroom, all the varied functions of oral and written language are appropriate and encouraged. (p. 40)

In his opinion, all children are whole language learners; but there are no whole language classrooms without whole language teachers. K.S. Goodman and Y.M. Goodman (1981) asserted that "most crucial in the holistic method is the new role of an enlightened teacher who serves as a guide, facilitator, and kid-watcher" (p. 5). Much of K.S. Goodman's work reflected his desire to encourage and support teachers in their efforts to adopt this new role and to develop,

individually or in groups, their own version of whole language (K.S. Goodman, 1986).

Readers with Difficulties

It has been claimed that teachers and principals can often generate within minutes a list of the students in their school who are having trouble reading and writing (Department of Education, 1988). Peetoom (1986) suggested that in most average classrooms there are 5 or 6 less able readers; moreover, they likely have been behind their classmates from the beginning of school, an assertion supported by a number of longitudinal studies.

Butler, Marsh, Sheppard, and Sheppard (1985) tracked the reading achievement of students from kindergarten through to Grade 6. They found that students who were the poorest readers in the early years of primary school remained the poorest readers during all of the first 6 school years. Badian (1988) tracked the reading achievement of students from pre-kindergarten to late eighth grade. She found that by third grade individual performance in reading appears to have been largely determined. Furthermore, after Grade 3 the 10% who were defined in the study as poor readers made only one-quarter of the yearly gain of the group as a whole. Badian claimed that these results are consistent with those of many follow-up studies, indicating that the reading prognosis for children who are poor readers at or about Grade 3 is bleak.

It is, of course, important to keep in mind that in any given grade there will be a range of reading abilities. Clay (1985) suggested that by the fourth year at school one should expect a spread of 5 or 6 years in reading achievement. It is her observation that "the less able children will read like children in the first or second year class and [the] more able children will read like young high school pupils" (p. 9). In Clay's opinion, all children will not be able to read in the same way, and if all children at every point in the range of normal variation are increasing their skill, then the school is doing its job well. However, she made the important proviso: "Teachers and the educational system should make every effort to reduce the number of children falling below their class level in reading" (p. 9).

Stanovich (1986) indicated some of the complexities faced in trying to understand and influence this variation in reading ability. He suggested that individual differences in levels of acquired reading skill, which can be massive, may best be understood within the perspective of "rich-get-richer and poor-get-poorer" processes, or "Matthew effects." He reasoned that some factors have the potential to be reciprocally facilitating (and others, reciprocally inhibiting) in relation to the individual's reading development. Stanovich concluded that effective prevention or remediation of reading difficulties may lie in a better understanding of "the cycle of escalating achievement deficits" and of the most effective ways to "short-circuit the cascade of negative spinoffs"

(p. 393). Unfortunately, Stanovich's review did not extend to instruction, though he referred to that area's inherent potential for contributing to Matthew effects, both negative and positive.

The search for effective and appropriate ways to help children who are experiencing difficulties in reading has had a long and varied history (Leinhardt & Bickel, 1987; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988). While there have been exceptions, usually attributable to excellent qualities of the teacher or of the relationship between teacher and child or parent and child, the results of remedial programs have generally not been encouraging (Clay, 1985; Haynes & Jenkins, 1986; Milligan, 1986; Allington, 1987). Clay (1985) asserted that major weaknesses in previous programs have been their lack of early intervention and their failure to help the child learn to read in the way that successful readers learn. More recently, programs taking these features into account have been demonstrating positive results with beginning readers (Clay, 1985; Boehnlein, 1987; Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989). Allington (1987) argued that, in the United States at least, bureaucratic obstacles are hindering the development and implementation of programs incorporating proven instructional techniques. He expressed the belief that, to be effective, remedial programs must have open communication between remedial and classroom teachers and instruction which is congruent with that in the core curriculum (Allington & Shake, 1986). He advocated drastically revising the

philosophy and the delivery of that country's programs so that students having problems with reading receive larger amounts of higher quality instruction, including ample experiences with real reading.

Poplin (1988a, 1988b) asserted that fundamental reforms are needed in the ways schools attempt to help students with learning problems. She urged the adoption of a holistic/constructivist perspective, replacing the existing approaches developed on what she considers "the reductionistic fallacy." Similarly, arguments against the reductionistic perspective in reading programs in the United States have been put forth by Winograd and Greenlee (1986). They advocated an alternate approach, termed the strategic view of reading, which emphasizes the factors of reader purpose, self-monitoring, and motivation.

Growing support for a shift towards a more holistic/constructivist approach can be observed in many areas of education. Rhodes and Dudley-Marling (1988) claimed that this is a reflection of the emergence of holism as a dominant philosophy of society. They expressed the opinion that although its effects on institutions, especially schools, have been relatively slow, the holistic philosophy is evident, as in the "whole child" approach and in holistic views of reading and writing. Rhodes and Dudley-Marling said they favor holistic approaches to reading and writing instruction for all children. Moreover, they asserted that holistic approaches may be especially valuable for children

experiencing difficulties.

This view is reflected in the work of a growing number of researchers and practitioners (Buchanan, 1980; DeFord, 1981; Church & Newman, 1985; Newman, 1985a; Phinney, 1988). Kenneth S. Goodman, one of the most prominent advocates of a holistic approach to literacy development for all learners, clearly identified the implications of what he terms a "whole language" approach for the student experiencing difficulties (K.S. Goodman, 1986). He maintained that "if young humans aren't succeeding in becoming literate in schools, something must be wrong with the program: it needs remediation, not they" (p. 55). He expressed the opinion that if students are in a whole language program with whole language teachers right from the beginning, there will be a lot fewer readers and writers experiencing difficulties. Meanwhile, recognizing that there currently are many ineffective and troubled readers and writers in schools, K.S. Goodman advocated an approach called "revaluing." He stated that there are only two objectives to a revaluing program:

1. To support pupils in revaluing themselves as language learners, and to get them to believe they are capable of becoming fully literate.
2. To support pupils in revaluing reading and writing as functional, meaningful whole language processes rather than as sequences of sub-skills to be memorized. (p. 56)

In K.S. Goodman's view, revaluing is essential. Students must find the strength and confidence to take necessary risks, make literacy choices, and enter into functional literacy events. He expressed the belief that experiences

with whole, relevant, meaningful language can help students build productive meaning-seeking strategies. "Eventually they will come to realize that making sense is all that reading and writing are about" (p. 56), K.S. Goodman concluded.

An essential aim of those responsible for developing and providing a revaluing program is to offer experiences which will effectively and appropriately facilitate such learner growth. Some of the important factors to be considered include the nature of the learner's strengths and needs and the gap that has developed in relation to the learner's potential or the learner's peers. McNaughton, Glynn, and Robinson (1981) asserted that 8-to-12-year-old children who have not made adequate progress in reading need to improve faster than their peers so that they can catch up. This may be a difficult task, especially if they have been left too long without help (Clay, 1985). As Stanovich (1986) observed, "perhaps just as important as the cognitive consequences of reading failure are the motivational side effects" (p. 389). Recognizing this, K.S. Goodman (1986) emphasized that patience is a key ingredient in helping students to turn around and start believing in themselves.

These considerations indicate that effective and appropriate learning experiences would be ones which would enable the learner to, as Clay (1979) expressed it, "pull himself up by his bootstraps" (p. 252) and, as Stanovich (1986) indicated, create a flow of positive "Matthew effects." The

potential for achieving this is inherent in the nature of how children learn to read.

Smith (1973) claimed that "children learn to read only by reading" (p. 195). Further, he contended that their learning to read is achieved as a consequence of their striving to make sense of print (Smith, 1985). Clay (1985) claimed that, as they strive to make sense of print, successful readers learn a system of behaviors which continue to accumulate skills merely because they operate. They function as self-improving systems, learning more about reading every time they read, independent of instruction. Clay asserted that the role of the teacher is to help the low-progress reader establish such behaviors, so that the more they read, the better they get, and the more unnecessary the teacher becomes in this process.

Smith (1973) provided some clear guidance on the way the teacher (or other person) can help the child. He maintained that the only way to facilitate the child's learning to read is to make reading easy for the child and to respond to what the child is trying to do. In Smith's view, "making learning to read easy means ensuring cues at the time a child needs them, ensuring feedback of the kind he requires at the time he requires it, providing encouragement when it is sought" (p. 195). Responding to what the child is trying to do requires an understanding of the reading process and sensitive observation of the child.

Windows on the Reading Process

Although the observation and analysis of oral reading errors has been around for many years, prior to 1968 the practice lacked a clearly articulated framework to direct investigations (Leu, 1982). However, in the late 1960s a number of investigators, most notably Kenneth S. Goodman and his colleagues, began to view errors in relation to the linguistic sources of information available to the reader. K.S. Goodman and Y.M. Goodman (1977) claimed that studying oral reading errors (termed "miscues") made by readers as they read whole, natural, meaningful texts enables the investigator to gain insights into the development of reading competence and the control of the underlying psycholinguistic processes. In effect, miscues are "windows on the reading process at work" (p. 332).

Based on this research, K.S. Goodman (1973) concluded that during the act of reading readers move through text in cycles of sampling, predicting, testing and confirming as they strive to construct meaning. During this process, they make use of cues available from the three language systems (graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic), as well as their context (the pragmatic system), all four of which must be present and intact for comprehension to occur (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). Readers select the most significant graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic cues and predict what they believe subsequent graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic structures are going to be (Y.M. Goodman & Burke, 1980). In

doing so, readers of all ages and all materials use the same overall reading strategies: initiating and sampling, predicting, and confirming (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). The interaction of these cueing factors within the reading process occurs so rapidly as to appear simultaneous (Y.M. Goodman & Burke, 1980). Readers do not use all cues available, since to do so would not only be slow and inefficient, but would actually lead the readers away from their primary goal, comprehension (K.S. Goodman, 1973). Neither are cues selected in any consistent order or sequencing. The weighting or significance readers give to individual cues varies with the experiences and language information they bring to the text and depends on the readers' purposes (Y.M. Goodman & Burke, 1980), as well as the nature of the reading tasks (K.S. Goodman, 1973). Readers pick and choose from the available information only enough to select and predict a language structure which is decodable. Proficient readers are those who are so efficient in sampling and predicting that they use the least (not the most) available information necessary (K.S. Goodman, 1973). K.S. Goodman and Y.M. Goodman (1977) claimed that these processes are essentially the same in silent reading as well and that the miscues found in oral reading also occur in silent reading. "In our view, a single process underlies all reading" (p. 160), they concluded.

K.S. Goodman and colleagues use two measures of readers' proficiency: comprehending, which shows the readers' concern

for meaning as expressed through miscues; and retelling, which shows the readers' retention of meaning. Proficient readers can usually tell a great deal about the selection, and they produce miscues which do not interfere with gaining meaning. In contrast, many nonproficient readers produce miscues that interfere with gaining meaning from the selection (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977). K.S. Goodman and colleagues claimed that these differences are attributable to the way in which the readers handle the basic reading strategies of sampling, predicting, and confirming. However, they cautioned that since proficiency is also influenced by reader interest, purpose, and background knowledge, no single measure should be used exclusively to evaluate readers (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). They asserted that beginners use the same information as proficient readers to make sense of print. Development is a matter of getting the process together: learning to use, in the context of real language, just enough print, language structure, and meaning, and keeping it all in proper perspective (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1981). They concluded that a goal of reading instruction is not to eliminate miscues, but to help readers produce the kind of miscues that characterize proficient reading (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977).

Miscue Characteristics and Reader Proficiency

Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) asserted that readers' patterns of miscues and retellings can be used to indicate the proficiency with which they use the systems of

language and the reading strategies. To facilitate discussion within the whole range of proficiency, they used three terms to describe readers at various levels: proficient, moderately proficient, and nonproficient.

K.S. Goodman described proficient readers as those who make both effective and efficient use of the language cueing systems and reading strategies (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). Readers are effective when they succeed in constructing meaning and efficient when they use the minimal effort necessary (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977). Proficient readers produce syntactically and semantically acceptable structures most of the time, either by predicting appropriate structures or by correcting unacceptable ones using graphophonic information selectively (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). The more proficient a reader is, the greater the proportion of semantically acceptable miscues produced (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977).

Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) described moderately proficient readers as those who make effective use of reading strategies but are not very efficient. These readers produce syntactically and semantically acceptable structures most of the time, but tend to rely a great deal on graphophonic information. They have a tendency to correct miscues that are semantically and syntactically acceptable. Their reading may be slow and they may regress often; though they are constructing meaning, they are not efficient in their selection of cues. Moderately proficient readers may be able

to retell a great deal of the selection, although they may not understand subtlety.

Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) described non-proficient readers as those who produce unacceptable and uncorrected structures. They often rely too heavily on graphophonic information and do not relate the text to their lives and their background knowledge. They are easily distracted and often resist reading.

Miscues and Reader Focus on Meaning

During reading, the basic responsibility of the reader is to make sense of text, to construct meaning (Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988). The purpose in reading is to construct a message that will match to a high degree the one the author intended to convey; this is not a matter of attaining exact agreement with the author (K.S. Goodman, 1982). Newman (1985a) contended that reading cannot be an exact process because in the interplay between the various sources of information a reader is co-ordinating some misjudgments are bound to occur. All readers make miscues (K.S. Goodman, 1982). Readers self-correct when what they have read does not fit into the meanings they are trying to construct (Clay, 1979; Newman, 1985a). Effective and efficient reading requires the readers to closely monitor their reading through the confirmation strategies associated with semantic and syntactic contexts. Additionally, these readers use correction strategies to reprocess information when they need to, in order to recover from miscues that have resulted in

meaning loss (K.S. Goodman, 1982).

Using Miscues to Guide Instruction

Miscues reflect the degree to which readers are understanding and are seeking meaning (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977). Miscues of low order give way to miscues of higher order as children become more proficient readers (Y.M. Goodman, 1970). K.S. Goodman (1982) concluded that the most important indicator of the children's basic reading competence is the extent to which they retain meaning even when they produce miscues. Therefore, he recommended that teachers focus attention on the effects of reader miscues rather than their quantity. In K.S. Goodman's view, if the miscues do not disrupt the meaning, then the reader is being effective. If the reader corrects when the miscues do disrupt meaning, the reader is indicating a pervading concern for meaning.

Teachers can help developing readers to build the strategies they need for effective and efficient reading (K.S. Goodman, 1982). This may be provided through indirect or direct instruction (Slaughter, 1988). In whole language programs, direct instruction in reading occurs through reading strategy lessons, provided on a class, group, or individual basis (depending on learner needs and interests) and accounting for 20 to 30% of time allocated to the reading program (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). These lessons build upon the prior knowledge and language strengths of the learners and help them integrate and become more flexible in

their use of effective and efficient reading strategies (Slaughter, 1988). An important aspect of these lessons involves the teacher's engaging the learners in thinking and talking about their reading and the reading process generally (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987).

A fundamental aim of strategy lessons for moderately proficient and nonproficient readers is to help them develop the understandings and behaviors shown by proficient readers. Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) asserted that proficient readers are constantly asking and answering the questions: "Does this make sense?" "What will happen next?" "Does this sound like language?" (p. 162). Strategy lessons, as well as many of the less formalized teacher-student interactions, can be used as occasions to help establish or strengthen these within all readers (e.g., Y.M. Goodman, 1970; Taylor, 1977; Maring, 1978; Clay, 1979; Holdaway, 1980; Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987).

Rhodes and Dudley-Marling (1988) claimed that one particularly important line of reading research into helping students make sense of words during reading has to do with teacher feedback following student's oral reading. Rhodes and Dudley-Marling concluded that this research sets forth the following recommendations: (a) the teacher should accept those miscues that do not greatly change the author's meaning; (b) the teacher may comment positively about a miscue that reveals attention to meaning; and (c) when a miscue disrupts meaning, the teacher should wait to intervene until

the end of the sentence or paragraph or until the student has finished reading.

It is extremely important that the teacher's response be one that is supportive of independence by enabling the readers to make use of their own resources to build their own strategies (Holdaway, 1980; K.S. Goodman, 1982). All too often, the nonfluent or nonproficient reader is experiencing difficulties that can be directly traced to instruction (Holdaway, 1980; Clay, 1985; Newman, 1985a), frequently involving experiences in which the teacher, or others, "short-circuit" the student's self-monitoring and self-regulation as they direct student attention to precise oral reading (Allen, 1976). Low-progress readers tend to be rigid in what they know and can do; they have given up on searching or restrict themselves to narrow, trivial, and less-productive sources of information in text (Clay, 1979). However, with a focus on meaning, students will be able to move towards integrated and flexible use of all cueing systems. Within the context of the recommendations presented above and sensitive teacher judgment, verbal prompts can be an effective way to alert the student to check his monitoring strategies. Using a short verbal prompt relating to meaning (e.g., Did that make sense?) and, if appropriate, to grammar (e.g., Did that sound right?) is a frequently recommended method for encouraging the student to attend to an apparent loss of meaning (e.g., Holdaway, 1980; K.S. Goodman, 1982; Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling,

1988).

Proficient readers also employ effective and efficient strategies that help them recover meaning when it is disrupted or when they encounter a difficult word (Y.M. Goodman, 1976). Newman (1985a) asserted that the most important thing readers must learn is what to do when what they are reading does not make sense. She noted that fluent readers make informed choices as to how to recover meaning. Newman claimed that their proficiency in dealing with loss of meaning has been developed through dealing with mistakes and difficulties encountered during extensive uninterrupted reading. She cautioned against indiscriminate intervention: "Every time we correct children's miscues for them, we take away the control they need to develop these strategies for themselves" (p. 24). However, the teacher can help non-proficient and moderately proficient readers develop correction strategies (K.S. Goodman, 1982). Various authors (e.g., Holdaway, 1980; K.S. Goodman, 1982; Clay, 1985; Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988) have made suggestions for helping these readers develop correction strategies in ways that promote student self-control of their reading development.

Holdaway (1980) summarized the fundamental aim behind all these teacher interventions: "Children can never become independent unless they accept full responsibility for confirming their own perceptions, and for achieving an accurate and satisfying understanding of what they read" (p. 66).

Doake (1988) concluded that the time has come for allowing the task of learning to read and write to be based on natural language-learning needs that lie within the children themselves. Integral to this is the responsibility of the teacher to use holistically based strategies where control of what is being learned stays with the learner. In addition, the teacher should work to develop open channels of communication with parents so that home and school can form a true partnership in the child's literary development.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the subjects, the basis of selection, and the instruments and measurement procedures used in the collection and treatment of the data. This chapter also describes the procedure used in the development and implementation of the individualized reading programs according to the following characteristics:

(a) overview; (b) scheduling of sessions; (c) support from classroom teacher; (d) encouraging parent involvement; (e) assembling the collection; (f) student selection of trade books; (g) preparation of the text; (h) Start-Up Session; (i) On My Own activities, in the classroom and at home; and (j) Wrap-Up Session.

Subjects

The study was implemented in a combination of locations (primarily a resource room, a Grade 4 classroom, and students' homes) in a rural Newfoundland setting. The study involved 3 Grade 4 boys (assigned the pseudonyms John, Max and Sam) who had been identified as making unsatisfactory progress in language arts, particularly reading. The process of identifying the students as having special needs had occurred during the latter part of their year in Grade 3 and had followed the administrative procedures provided in the province's Special Education Policy Manual (1987), also

summarized in the Department of Education publication, Reading and Writing Difficulties: An Educator's Handbook (1988), pp. 3-10. At the start of the study, the students were of approximate ages (years:months): John (9:6), Max (9:6), and Sam (9:10). The investigator, who was also the school's resource teacher for Kindergarten to Grade 4, interacted with and observed these students during the study. Additionally, he enlisted the support and cooperation of the Grade 4 classroom teacher and established and maintained contact with the parents, who were encouraged to play an active role in the study.

Basis of Selection

This class and its language arts program were probably typical of circumstances found in many elementary schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly as schools move towards full implementation of the policies and procedures contained in the province's Special Education Policy Manual (1987). The 3 students were members of a class of 26 students. All students participated in a language arts program as a heterogeneous class for approximately twelve 40-minute periods per 6-day administrative cycle. The classroom program was based on the Nelson Language Development Reading program, LDR NETWORKS, for Grade 4, which provided a good deal of flexibility in content and method. The overall program, using individual, small-group, and whole-class approaches, was developed and taught cooperatively by the classroom teacher and the resource teacher to address the

full range of student needs. The overall Grade 4 language program was conducted in a combination of locations, principally the Grade 4 classroom and the resource room.

Additionally, the parents of the 3 students were invited to participate in the study by providing specific support to their children at home. This support was designed as a natural extension of the interest and assistance typically provided by parents. Information about their child's reading program and suggestions for parental involvement were offered through both formal and informal contacts between the investigator and each student's parent(s).

Instruments and Measurement Procedures

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (1980) are group-administered, normatively referenced tests designed to determine the general level of reading achievement of individual students. Two subtests are available at all levels: vocabulary and comprehension. The tests claim to be able to contribute information which can be used to complement teachers' evaluations. More specifically, they can aid in determining the appropriate instructional levels for individual children, in identifying children who need additional or special instruction, in evaluating programs, in reporting to parents, and in measuring growth in reading achievement.

Test Level B was used in the study. It was chosen because, in the judgement of the investigator, this was the

highest level at which the 3 students could be expected to perform within test criteria. Both subtests, vocabulary and comprehension, were used. Alternate forms of each of the subtests were administered to the 3 students. Test Level B, Form 1, was given as a pretest on December 18, 1989, and test Level B, Form 2, as a posttest on May 17, 1990.

Cloze Task

The Cloze task is a procedure in which words have been deleted from a passage according to some specified rule. Readers must infer and supply the missing words by making use of the syntactic relations within the sentences and the semantic relations within the passage. The Cloze task provides a means of assessing literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, understanding the main ideas, and structural awareness (Paris & Jacobs, 1984). Cloze provides a measure of how well the student predicts and monitors while reading (Limbrick, McNaughton, & Glynn, 1981; Diagnostic Reading Program, 1986).

The Cloze Strategy assessment procedures contained in the Alberta Education Diagnostic Reading Program (1986) were adapted for use in the study. The Diagnostic Reading Program contains suitably prepared passages at a range of reading levels, each with four equivalent forms. Passages are constructed with the first and last sentences complete; all other sentences have every fifth word deleted.

To determine an appropriate level at which to select passages for the pretest and posttest assessments, a passage

at the Grade 2 level was selected and administered to the students on December 15, 1989. Based on the performance of each student, the investigator decided that passages at a lower level would be required to facilitate readability by the students, a consideration noted by Paris and Jacobs (1984). Passages at the Grade 1 (middle) and Grade 1 (end) were selected. Passages 1A-Mid and 1A-2 (see Appendix A) were administered as pretests on December 18, 1989; and alternate forms at these levels, passages 1B-Mid and 1B-2 (see Appendix A), were administered as posttests on May 15, 1990. Also, passages 1A-Mid and 1A-2 were readministered on May 16, 1990, as posttests. All Cloze task assessments were administered to the 3 students as an intact group.

Shortly after each session, the investigator met with each student to review his completed Cloze task. This procedure ensured that spelling and handwriting did not interfere with the investigator's interpretation of the responses. Additionally, it enabled the investigator to obtain information regarding the student's reasoning behind each of the responses that was not an exact-word response.

All Cloze tasks were scored by the traditional method, whereby original words are scored as correct while all other responses are scored as incorrect. The traditional method of scoring is compatible with the method used by the Diagnostic Reading Program (Alberta Education, 1986) to determine passage difficulty relative to the reader. The Diagnostic

Reading Program applies the following criteria in relation to exact-word responses: (a) Scores of 56-100% indicate independent level, (b) scores of 35-55% indicate instructional level, and (c) scores of 0-34% indicate frustration level. Each student's scores (as determined by the traditional method) on the pretest and posttest passages were compared with the Diagnostic Reading Program criteria to ensure that no student's Cloze task was at the frustration level.

Awareness About Reading

Students' awareness about reading was assessed using two approaches: the Reading Interview (see Appendix B), an open-ended interview technique administered individually, and Ideas About Reading (see Appendix C), a multiple-choice technique administered to the students as an intact group following completion of the three interviews.

Reading Interview

The Reading Interview, originally developed by Carolyn L. Burke, is an open-ended individual interview form designed to reveal information about a person's metalinguistic knowledge about reading (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). Buchanan (1980) concluded that the approach can reveal not only what students think they do when they read, but also what they think teachers (or others) expect them to do.

The investigator conducted Reading Interview sessions with each of the 3 students on December 14, 1989, and on May 15, 1990. These were scheduled so that on each occasion

they preceded the sessions involving the Ideas About Reading assessments. Each interview session was recorded on audio tape so that the investigator could have a complete, permanent record to which he could refer, as appropriate.

Ideas About Reading

Students' awareness about reading was also assessed using an approach developed by Scott G. Paris and colleagues (Jacobs & Paris, 1987). The approach is designed to assess students' knowledge about reading and their abilities to evaluate tasks, goals, and personal skills; to plan ahead for specific purposes; to monitor progress while reading; and to recruit fix-up strategies as needed.

Ideas About Reading, the instrument which was used in this study, consists of 20 questions adapted from the work of Paris and colleagues. Each question is followed by three randomly ordered alternatives with possible point values of 0, 1 or 2, depending on its strategic value for reading. Each student's score is obtained by combining the point scores on the 20 questions to obtain a total score, which will be on a range from 0 to 40. Subscores are available for four characteristics, each of which is represented by five items: (a) evaluation of the reading task and one's own abilities, represented by Items 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9; (b) planning to reach a specified reading goal, represented by Items 8, 11, 12, 14 and 16; (c) regulation of reading through the use of monitoring strategies, represented by Items 7, 15, 17, 18 and 19; and conditional knowledge, or an understanding

of when and why particular strategies should be applied, represented by Items 3, 6, 10, 13 and 20. Following the procedures of Paris and Oka (1986), students are told that it is not a test; they are instructed to choose the response that best describes what they think about reading. The items and alternatives are read aloud to the students as they read silently. Enough time is provided to enable students to indicate their choice on each item.

The assessment was administered to the 3 students, as an intact group, on December 18, 1989, as a pretest and re-administered on May 16, 1990, as a posttest.

Self-Perceptions About Reading

Students' self-perceptions, including their beliefs and feelings, specifically about reading, were assessed using a procedure developed by Paris and Oka (1986). The procedure consists of statements concerning conceptions and beliefs about reading, as well as affective evaluations of reading expressed as likes or dislikes. Students evaluate the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (adapted for this study to include a written label at each numerical point, ranging from 1, "totally disagree", to 5, "totally agree"). The seven items included in the procedure are indicated below. Except for Item 5, in which the present investigator has pluralized the subject and associated verb, the items used in the study are the same as those in the original Paris and Oka (1986) instrument.

- (1) I think reading is very difficult for me.
- (2) If you are a good reader it helps you learn lots of other things.
- (3) Reading does not take much effort for me.
- (4) I am one of the best readers in my class.
- (5) My teachers do not help me to learn how to read better.
- (6) I really enjoy reading.
- (7) I think that I won't be a very good reader in high school.

A composite score is computed, based on the mean of the seven items (scores on Items 1, 5 and 7 are subtracted from 6 points). A high score on this task represents positive self-perceptions of reading.

The assessment was administered to the 3 students as an intact group on December 19, 1989, as a pretest and on May 16, 1990, as a posttest. Prior to administering the seven-item assessment, the investigator administered a practice activity to familiarize the students with the use of the 5-point scale (see Appendix D). This activity, which the investigator developed specifically for this study, used three items, none of which was directly related to reading. Following completion of each practice item, the investigator and the students discussed the responses. When the investigator was confident that all students were adequately familiar with the use of the 5-point scale, he administered the seven-item assessment (see Appendix D). As in the practice activity, he read each item aloud as the students

followed along silently; and he allowed the students enough time to enter their responses after each item. However, unlike the practice activity, no discussion of the students' responses occurred.

Miscue Analysis Procedures

Miscue analysis of a student's oral reading, including subsequent retelling, provides a means of assessing the student's use of language cues and reading strategies in the process of constructing meaning while reading text (K.S. Goodman & Y.M. Goodman, 1977). The study employed two procedures developed by Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987). These were selected because of their suitability in relation to the purposes and circumstances of the study.

RMI Procedure II

Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure II is constructed so that its major focus is on the sentence within the context of the entire text. This procedure examines the sentences as produced by the reader in terms of their syntactic acceptability, semantic acceptability, and degree of meaning change; also assessed, regarding each word-for-word substitution, is the degree of graphic similarity and sound similarity between the miscue and the text item.

Language Sense, as used in Procedure II, provides a rating of the reader's concern for constructing meaning during reading as indicated by the reader's producing sentences that make sense and sound like language. As such,

Language Sense indicates the proficiency with which the reader uses strategies involving sampling, predicting, confirming and constructing meaning. The term Language Sense (S/PS) was used in this study to identify the composite rating for Strength and Partial Strength patterns revealed on the coding forms in response to Questions 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix E).

Word Substitution in Context, as used in Procedure II, helps to identify the graphic and sound cues that influence the reader. Only substitution word-for-word miscues are evaluated to see the degree to which they are graphically or phonologically related to the text item. The terms Graphic Relations (H/S) and Sound Relations (H/S) were used in this study to identify the composite rating for High degree and Some degree of similarity revealed on the coding forms in response to Questions 4 and 5, respectively (see Appendix E).

Miscue analysis using Procedure II was used with each of the 3 students in individual sessions immediately preceding and immediately following the intervention component of the study. For use in these sessions, the investigator chose two selections (see Appendix F) from the Nelson LDR NETWORKS program for Grade 2, a revised program introduced subsequent to the students' year in Grade 2. In selecting, preparing, and using these materials, the investigator followed the criteria and procedures recommended by Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987).

The Helpful Giant was used in a pretest session with each student on December 14, 1989, and again in a posttest session with each student on May 16, 1990. The Balancing Girl was used in a second posttest session with each student on May 17, 1990.

Subsequent to each session, the investigator reviewed the audio tape of the student's oral reading and marked and coded the miscues on a typescript of the selection read. This information, as well as other pertinent information noted (including reading time), was then transferred to the Miscue Analysis Procedure II Coding Forms and Reader Profile form (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). The investigator also reviewed the section of the audio tape containing the student's retelling of the selection read. The retelling was scored against a retelling guide prepared in advance by the investigator. This information was also noted on the Reader Profile form.

RMI Procedure III

According to Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987), RMI Procedure III provides the same kind of information as does Procedure II, but it is less time-consuming. Procedure III was used to examine a sample of each student's oral reading during individual conference sessions held during the study. On those occasions the materials read were excerpts from the trade books self-selected by the students, therefore varying among students. Each excerpt was read by the student twice,

during two separate conference sessions relating to the same trade book. In the first conference, the excerpt was unfamiliar (i.e., not previously read or heard by the student). In the second conference, the excerpt had been read at least once (i.e., in the first conference); however, no reliable data were kept regarding additional readings by the student. By random choice, readings using the odd-numbered books (1, 3, 5, 7 and 9) in each student's sequence of nine trade books were selected for analysis using Procedure III. In the sample, the group mean number of days between the first and second conference on each book was 9.7.

Using the audio tape of each selection chosen for this procedure, the investigator reviewed the student's oral reading and marked each miscue, along with other pertinent information (including reading time), on a typescript of the passage read. Each sentence was then numbered consecutively. Afterwards, the investigator read each sentence as the reader had left it and coded it in relation to Questions 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix E). The investigator then examined each word-for-word substitution miscue regarding graphic similarity and coded it in relation to Question 4 (see Appendix E). All information was entered directly on the typescript.

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

Student response to correcting feedback provided by the investigator following student oral reading was assessed using a procedure specifically developed for this study. The procedure involved reviewing the audio tapes of selected

conferences in order to examine student response to the investigator's request to read a particular sentence judged by the investigator as having contained an uncorrected miscue which seriously interfered with the meaning of the text. (These rereadings had been cued by the investigator's asking the student, "Would you read this sentence again, starting here?" The conference protocol had allowed for a range of involvement by the investigator to the degree considered appropriate to support the reader's efforts.) Based on a review of the audio tape of each conference selected for this procedure, the investigator rated the degree of independence shown by the student in regard to noticing and resolving the miscue during rereading. Point values of 2, 1, or 0 were assigned, according to the degree of independence shown by the student. (Higher scores corresponded to higher independence, as judged by the investigator.) Because the number of sentences reviewed in each conference varied, total point values in each category were converted to percentages to permit comparisons with other conference results. The resulting scores provided measures of student monitoring and correcting behaviors (separately and combined) in response to correcting feedback provided by the investigator (see Appendix G).

This procedure was applied to sessions drawn from those sessions selected for Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III. All odd-numbered conference sessions containing feedback by the investigator as a feature were chosen for the procedure.

Those sessions were, by student and trade book selection number: John (5, 7 and 9), Max (5 and 7), and Sam (3, 5 and 7). The information derived from this procedure was reviewed in relation to the RMI Procedure III results for the same oral reading performances. This provided the investigator with an indication of student proficiency during independent reading of the selection immediately before the feedback activity. Only Semantic Acceptability and composite No and Partial Meaning Change scores are reported in relation to the review of student response to correcting feedback.

In order to gauge the influence of the feedback procedure on student use of reading strategies in subsequent oral reading activities, the investigator reviewed the results of RMI Procedure III assessments of each student's Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9. Only the semantic acceptability scores were examined in relation to the scheduling of feedback in these sessions.

Involvement and Reaction

In addition to the instruments and measurement procedures described previously, several other important sources of information were used in the study. Anecdotal information was recorded by the investigator throughout the study, including information about the extensive informal contacts with parents, the Grade 4 classroom teacher, and the students. Written records were kept on the more structured or routine activities; these included records such as schedules of conferences, lists of books selected by students, and

information entered in the students' reading folders during conferences. Additionally, audio tape recordings were made of each individual conference or assessment session with students. Extensive written records were produced from these audio tapes; notably, marked and coded typescripts of students' oral readings and transcripts of students' retellings and interviews. In addition to records kept by the investigator, students were encouraged to maintain a reading folder showing a variety of information about their reading materials, opinions and response activities, conferencing records, and other facts and feelings associated with their individualized reading program. Students were also encouraged to invite their parents to enter information in selected areas of their reading folders. Parents' thoughts and opinions were also elicited by means of two questionnaires sent home by the investigator. At the conclusion of the study, the investigator also met with the students individually and then as a group to obtain their ideas and opinions about their individualized reading programs and the study generally; these sessions were recorded on audio tape and later transcribed. Additionally, the investigator met with the Grade 4 classroom teacher at the conclusion of the study to obtain her views on the individualized reading programs; these were noted anecdotally in writing. Supplementary evidence of student language development was also obtained by the investigator through concurrent activities within the

Grade 4 program although not defined as a component of the individualized reading program.

Collection of Data

Data were collected through the use of the instruments and measurement procedures as described in the previous section.

Treatment of Data

The data from the instruments and measurement procedures are presented and discussed. One aspect of this treatment is to examine the data in relation to reading comprehension, reading vocabulary, reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), reading awareness, and self-perception about reading. Another aspect of this treatment is to explore the influence of teacher verbal feedback following oral reading in relation to student reading strategies. The primary focus is on the contribution of the data toward describing and interpreting the reading development of the 3 students and to explore the relative contribution made by the individualized reading program.

Procedure

Overview

During a period of approximately 15 weeks, from January 24 to May 10, 1990, the investigator implemented an individualized reading program for the 3 students experiencing difficulties in reading. The goal of the program was

to provide both instructional and independent experiences conducive to developing attitudes and strategies that foster independence in reading and improved skill in word identification and comprehension. These experiences were developed around trade books self-selected by the students. The investigator met with each student on a one-to-one basis one day per administrative cycle to initiate experiences with the book and again after about a week to conclude activities on that book. The first meeting, termed a Start-Up Session, and the second meeting, termed a Wrap-Up Session, each lasted about 35 minutes. Between sessions, the student was responsible for a number of activities entitled On Your Own, which were done in the classroom and at home. This procedure was repeated, using a different trade book, for each administrative cycle over the period of the study's intervention phase, approximately 15 weeks.

Scheduling of Sessions

Each student was assigned one day of the school's administrative cycle as his day for a Start-Up Session. That student's Wrap-Up Session was scheduled on the day immediately preceding his next Start-Up Session. For example, if his Start-Up Session was scheduled for Day 1, his Wrap-Up Session was scheduled for Day 6, which was the school day immediately preceding his next Start-Up Session. Thus, in regard to his individualized reading program, each student was working with only one book at a time over a period of 5 school days, or approximately 8 calendar days. During the course of the

study, a degree of flexibility was included in the scheduling as required.

Support from Classroom Teacher

On December 13, 1989, the investigator met with the Grade 4 classroom teacher to outline the study and enlist her support and involvement. (Prior to this, the investigator had, through informal conversations, kept the teacher generally apprised of the proposed study and preparations for its implementation.) It was agreed that class-wide Sustained Silent Reading would be provided daily during the period of the study and that the classroom teacher would generally monitor the 3 students to ensure that they adhered to the procedures established for that aspect of the study. The classroom teacher agreed to help ensure that students attended their sessions in the resource room according to schedule and that they remembered to take home their trade books and other items at the end of the school day. To facilitate this, the investigator agreed to provide the teacher with a schedule of sessions in the resource room, as well as a small sign to be posted near the homework assignment area as a reminder to the 3 students to take home the necessary materials for that night's activities in their individualized reading programs.

Subsequent to the meeting, the investigator and the classroom teacher maintained frequent contact regarding the study and the students' individualized reading programs. Following the completion of the study, the investigator met

with the classroom teacher to formally obtain her observations and opinions about the students' progress and the contribution made by the individualized reading programs, as well as her views about the use of this type of program for students experiencing reading difficulties in the elementary grades.

Encouraging Parent Involvement

During the school week of November 20-24, 1989, the investigator telephoned the parents of the 3 students and invited them to meet with him. These meetings, each involving the investigator and the parent(s) of one of the 3 students, were held on November 27, November 28, and December 6, 1989. At the meetings the investigator outlined the proposed study and invited the parents to consider having their children participate. Furthermore, he suggested how they could take an active role in their children's individualized reading programs. In this regard, he indicated how, through regular interaction with their children at home, they may be able to make a valuable contribution to their children's reading development. In concluding the meetings, the investigator provided the parents with copies of a consent form (see Appendix H) to take home and read before formally expressing their decision about their children's participation in the study.

All three consent forms were signed and returned to the investigator before December 12, 1989. These were then signed by the investigator, who photocopied the documents,

retained the originals, and sent the copies to the appropriate parents to confirm the agreement. Enclosed with the copy to each student's parent(s) was a letter (see Appendix H). This letter, dated December 13, 1989, informed the parent(s) about the commencement of the study and introduced the Parent's Questionnaire (see Appendix H) which was also enclosed. All parents returned their completed Parent's Questionnaire forms by December 22, 1989.

A second letter (see Appendix H), dated January 22, 1990, was sent to the parents to inform them about the commencement of the individualized reading programs and to outline the activities in which their children would be engaged. Also included was a three-page enclosure entitled "Working with Your Child at Home" (see Appendix H). The information and suggestions contained in these materials were provided as part of the overall aim of encouraging and enabling the parents to actively participate in the home component of the children's individualized reading programs.

Throughout the remainder of the study period, the investigator and the parents maintained informal contact by phone, notes, and chance encounters at school. Additionally, on February 8, 1990, the investigator met with each student's parent(s) in separate meetings to review each student's progress during the first term in Grade 4 in general and to discuss the student's individualized reading program in particular.

Following completion of the individualized reading programs, a third letter (see Appendix H), dated May 17, 1990, was sent to the parents to inform them about the forthcoming student assessment activities. Shortly after, a fourth letter (see Appendix H), dated May 22, 1990, was sent to the parents to introduce Parent's Questionnaire #2 (see Appendix H), which was intended to obtain the parents' views about the individualized reading programs just completed. All questionnaires were completed and returned as requested.

As part of the school's program planning process for students with special needs (Department of Education, 1987, 1988), on June 14, 1990, program planning team meetings were held to review each of the three students' programs in Grade 4. As members of the program planning team, each student's parent(s) attended the relevant meeting; the investigator, who was also the resource teacher, attended all three meetings. These were opportunities for an examination and discussion of the students' progress in all aspects of their Grade 4 programs, including the individualized reading programs included in this study.

Assembling the Collection

The investigator assembled a collection of trade books from which the students made their personal selections for use in their individualized reading programs. In assembling the collection, the investigator kept in mind a number of professional selection criteria, both general and specific to the study. The interests and experiences of the students

were considered, as well as the need for offering materials which were relatively unfamiliar to the students. The text in the books included in the collection reflected natural language and had good predictability. Illustrations, where present, supported, but did not dominate, the text. Although precise preselection on the basis of difficulty was not required, the investigator did attempt to provide a range of difficulty suitable to the anticipated abilities of the students and the requirements of the procedures established for the study. The length of the book had to lend itself to use according to the study's design, including completion within 5 or 6 days. The collection included a variety of genres, emphasizing narratives but also including some information books. The size of the collection, 60 books, was large enough to permit a reasonable degree of choice for each student. The collection was attractively and conveniently displayed in the resource room during the selection sessions.

Student Selection of Trade Books

The investigator convened three sessions, involving all 3 students, for the purpose of selecting those books the students wished to use during the individualized reading programs. The first session was held on January 15, 1990, which was about 10 days in advance of the beginning of the individualized reading program component of the study. This session was part of an orientation session for the students regarding the individualized reading program component. The second

session was held on February 12, 1990; the third, and final, session was held on March 27, 1990.

The investigator emphasized that in selecting the books for this special series of individualized reading programs, it was important that each student select only books which he had not already read or heard. Also, the investigator explained that they should not begin reading the text except for a sample page or two, to be selected around the middle of the book. The purpose of the sample was to help the student determine if a book he was interested in selecting was at an appropriate level of difficulty for him to use in the context of this component of the study. To determine this, the student used a procedure which had been developed for this study by the investigator and was an adaptation of a technique called "Rule of Thumb" (Veatch, 1968). In accordance with the procedure developed for this study, the student counted off a section of 100 words, which he then read quietly. As he read, he took note of the words which he felt he did not know or was having difficulty with. As he encountered each one, he noted this by extending or holding one finger or thumb. At the end of the section, he counted how many fingers and thumbs he had used. If fewer than 5, the book was probably too easy for him to use (in the context of the study). If he had run out of digits (i.e., more than 10), it was probably too hard. If he had used any number from 5 to 10, inclusive, the book was probably at an appropriate level of difficulty for him to use in the

individualized reading program component of the study. This procedure had been introduced by the investigator in a special session with the 3 boys on January 11, 1990, so that they would be familiar with it before the first selection session for the study.

Each student was expected to find, and list in order of personal preference, three or four books that he wished to use, that he had found to be at an appropriate level of difficulty, and that had been selected in accordance with all other selection procedures and criteria. The list was shown to the investigator, who briefly reviewed it with the student. When all three lists had been reviewed with the students, the investigator developed individual schedules showing the books to be used by the students over the subsequent several administrative cycles. During the study there were no instances where the investigator had to alter a student's written order of preference. (The investigator did notice several instances where the students informally worked out scheduling conflicts among themselves before finalizing their written lists.) In fact, there were several contingencies provided for in the selection process but not actually experienced. To the extent possible, each student was to be assigned books according to his indicated order of preference. He would have, in the next selection session, been given preference for obtaining any book requested but not available during the current period. Furthermore, for any book a student may have been interested in but found did not

meet the selection criteria established for the study, the investigator would have determined if it was appropriate for the student to borrow the book during the study or if the student should wait until the completion of the study.

From the collection of 60 trade books offered during the selection sessions, 21 different titles were chosen by the students (see Appendix I). In the three sessions each student selected a total of nine books, which were used, one at a time, as the focus of his individualized reading program during the study (see Appendix J).

One of the most significant features noted throughout the selection process and the subsequent use of the materials was that the students tended to choose books which were considerably more difficult than the levels the investigator had anticipated would result from the selection procedure. The procedure had been designed to elicit for each student selections which were beyond his independent level yet were not extremely difficult; they would be somewhere around the upper range of his instructional level or even a little beyond. In the opinion of the investigator, the modified Rule of Thumb would, if used, have tended to produce such results. However, the students seemed to let other personal-choice criteria override the use or results of the Rule of Thumb. The investigator noticed this early in the study but chose not to intervene directly; he felt that if the materials were too difficult the students' experiences would tend to encourage more appropriate selections in subsequent

selection sessions (or in severe cases, cause the students to request that their current selections be exchanged for easier ones). However, the investigator did intervene indirectly by including, in subsequent selection sessions, additional titles at what he judged were appropriate levels.

One indication of the primary considerations influencing selection was the student's reported reason for choosing the trade book. This was elicited by the investigator during individual conference sessions relating to each trade book selected by the student. A sample of each student's reported reasons for choosing his trade books is contained in Appendix K.

Preparation of the Text

Before each trade book selected by a student could be introduced into his individualized reading program, a number of preparatory activities had to be undertaken by the investigator:

1. The investigator made an audio cassette tape recording of the complete book. He read the text with expression appropriate to the selection, at a normal rate, but ensuring that there was time for the listener to look briefly at any illustrations and to turn the pages. The investigator exaggerated the sound while turning the pages to serve as cues during read-along situations.

2. The investigator made a duplicate of the tape. He retained the original; the duplicate was used by the student.

This ensured a ready solution in case the tape was lost or damaged.

3. The investigator reviewed the text to determine (a) an appropriate segment to use as an introduction to the selection and where to divide it between teacher-reading and student-reading responsibilities; and, (b) two appropriate places to use as dividing points in the remainder of the text so that it is divided into three segments of approximately equal length. The investigator marked each of these points in the text with small peel-off coding stickers.

4. The investigator prepared a typescript of the part to be read by the student in the introductory segment (cf. 3(a), above) and made two copies for use as miscue recording sheets during the Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions.

5. The investigator considered the forthcoming use of this trade book by the student and made any advance preparations needed (e.g., having on hand in the Start-Up Session some item considered useful in introducing or explaining some aspect of the selection).

The investigator's preparation of the text and related items served several connected outcomes. It provided the student with units of text which took into account his independent capabilities, access to support, time factors, and consideration of natural divisions within the text. It provided the student with access to support through an audio cassette tape rendition of the text. It provided the administrative materials which the investigator needed to record

the student's oral reading miscues during conferencing sessions. Finally, it prepared the investigator, having himself read and worked with the whole book, for more effective interactions with the student during all phases of the student's involvement with the book.

Start-Up Session

Location: Resource Room

Participants: Investigator (Resource Teacher) and one student.

Length: 35 minutes (approx.).

Preparations: The investigator ensured that he had on hand the trade book previously selected by the student, any instructional media (e.g., objects, photos) chosen by the investigator to help introduce the book, and all necessary administrative items (e.g., typescript of the text segment for recording miscues, forms, audio cassette recorder, blank audio cassettes.)

Seating: The session was generally conducted with both the investigator and the student sitting at a work table. They were close enough to permit easily moving into a side-by-side arrangement when appropriate (e.g., when looking at the same book or other item).

Procedure: The entire session was recorded on audio cassette tape as a permanent record to which the investigator could

refer as needed in the study.

The investigator assumed responsibility for leading the session. He aimed at conveying a friendly, optimistic, and interested attitude so that the student would feel secure and actively participate in the session.

The session was organized according to a sequence of steps. Within each step, the investigator aimed at having a degree of flexibility and spontaneity in the interaction. He also attempted to provide for good continuity between steps so that there would be a natural flow throughout the session.

The full range of steps available is shown in Table 1. Each session used one of two patterns of steps, according to the location of the session in the study's design. These patterns of steps have been labelled with reference to the presence or absence of the component labelled "Feedback by Investigator," which is step C.1(a). Table 2 shows the schedule used for incorporating the component "Feedback by Investigator" into the students' individualized reading programs.

A description of each step follows:

A. Pre-Reading Activities. These activities were designed to help establish an appropriate psychological "set" (expectations, predictions, questions, etc.) for experiencing the selection.

1. Informal Discussion. The investigator engaged the student in a brief dialogue about the trade book, its theme or topic, relevant student experiences, and/or

Table 1

Outline of Steps in Start-Up Sessions

<u>Steps</u>	<u>Feedback by Investigator</u>	
	<u>Not Included</u>	<u>Included</u>
A. Pre-Reading Activities	x	x
1. Informal Discussion	x	x
2. Questioning/Predicting (Part 1)	x	x
B. Reading (Part 1)	x	x
1. Oral Reading by Investigator	x	x
2. Questioning/Predicting (Part 2)	x	x
C. Reading (Part 2)	x	x
1. Oral Reading by Student	x	x
(a) Feedback by Investigator	-	x
2. Retelling	x	x
3. Questioning/Predicting (Part 3)	x	x
D. Conclusion	x	x

Table 2

Schedule for Including Feedback by Investigator in Start-Up Sessions

	Administrative Cycles during Intervention Phase								
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Sam			F	F	F	F	F		
Max				F	F	F	F	F	
John					F	F	F	F	F

- Note. 1. F = Feedback by Investigator, included in Start-Up Session as step C.1(a)
2. Students were randomly assigned to the individual schedules.

similar matters that appeared to have potential for helping establish an appropriate "set" within the student. The investigator allowed student responses to indicate some of the directions the discussion followed. The investigator chose one or more of the following techniques:

- ask why the student chose this book;
- preview and discuss some aspects of the book (e.g., title, cover illustration, chapter titles);
- discuss the topic or theme contained in the book;
- use an item (e.g., photo, object) previously selected by the investigator to help introduce the book.

Within this context, the investigator and student entered bibliographic information about the book in the student's Reading Record (see Appendix L) and Reading Log (see Appendix L).

2. Questioning/Predicting (Part 1). The investigator encouraged the student to formulate and express any salient questions about what he currently knew about the selection and any related possible explanations, answers, and predictions about what might unfold in the selection. The investigator recorded these on the chart "I Wonder/I Think" (see Appendix L), a term adopted from the Nelson Networks program (McInnes, 1983).

B. Reading (Part 1). This component was designed to build upon the appropriate "set" established in Part A. The investigator's oral reading enabled the student to begin to construct meaning about the developing story by relying mainly on his oral language strengths (and provided a solid base from which to continue when he assumed responsibility for reading, in step C.1).

1. Oral Reading by Investigator. Sitting side-by-side with the student, the investigator read aloud the title, author, and introductory segment of the book (ending at a previously determined appropriate place in the story). The investigator read at a normal oral rate, using expression appropriate to the text and sweeping a finger or small pointer under the text as he read.
2. Questioning/Predicting (Part 2). Making appropriate reference to the chart "I Wonder/I Think," the investigator encouraged the student to reflect on the questions and predictions previously developed and discuss anything that the unfolding text may have prompted (e.g., confirmations, revisions, doubts, etc.). Further, he encouraged the student to express additional questions and/or predictions arising from the text read so far. The investigator recorded the appropriate notations in the "I Wonder/I Think" chart.

C. Reading (Part 2). This component was designed to enable the student to continue constructing the meaning of the story using his available resources independently. Because the student was reading orally, the investigator could make use of miscue assessment procedures as one source of information about the student's reading.

1. Oral Reading by Student. The investigator asked the student to read aloud the next segment of the text (previously determined by the investigator, who had also made a typescript of that section). The investigator passed the book over to the student, indicating where he was to begin and end (marked with small peel-off coding stickers). If the student happened to encounter difficulties which led him to request help, he was reminded to do his best and if unsuccessful, continue past them.

As the student read orally, the investigator recorded his miscues and any other pertinent observations (e.g., laughing, spontaneous comments, fluency, expression) on the typescript.

On completion, the investigator made a positive comment about some aspect of the student's oral reading of the segment. (Note: This action was omitted if the session incorporated step C.1(a), Feedback by Investigator, since that step dealt with positive feedback in a more structured manner.)

- (a) Feedback by Investigator. (Note: In the whole sequence of steps, this was the only one which was subject to manipulation. It was included or omitted in any given Start-Up Session, depending on the location of that session in the overall design of the study.)

The investigator provided two types of verbal feedback to the student following completion of the oral reading: reinforcing feedback and correcting feedback.

Reinforcing feedback focused on some of the positive aspects of the student's oral reading, both generally (e.g., good expression shown) and/or specifically in regard to those strategies being emphasized by the investigator and the study (e.g., correcting a miscue which seriously interfered with meaning). The investigator engaged the student in a brief discussion about these items, highlighting the strengths shown and giving ample praise.

Correcting feedback focused on uncorrected miscues which seriously interfered with the meaning of the text. The investigator selected one such miscue which appeared to be highly amenable to correction by the student. Pointing to the text, the investigator said, "Would you read this sentence again, starting here?" After the

student had read the sentence, the investigator said, "Does that make sense?" or "Does that sound right?" (depending on the nature of the miscue). (If the student had corrected the miscue in the reading, the investigator gave reinforcing feedback and, using a second miscue noted during the oral reading, repeated the procedure.) The investigator observed the student as he attempted to locate and resolve the miscue. If he appeared to be having difficulty, the investigator asked him to "think aloud" or explain what he has noticed, what he has tried to do, etc. If the student did not seem to be making use of some basic word-solving strategies encouraged by his language arts program and the study, the investigator reminded him about them. If he experienced continued difficulty, the investigator assumed a more direct role and modeled part or all of the task, using "think aloud" or other techniques to help the student understand the nature of the task and the approach being used by the investigator. Thus, the amount and depth of involvement by the investigator varied in accordance with the student's need for assistance in noting and correcting miscues that seriously interfered with meaning. Depending on the time available, the

investigator selected one or more additional miscues and followed the same procedure. Throughout all the interaction based on correcting feedback, the investigator always attempted to focus on the positive dimensions of the student and his reading development.

2. Retelling. The investigator asked the student to give a retelling of the story (so far) by saying, "I'd like you, in your own words, to tell me about the story (or book) so far." The retelling was done without the aid of the book. When the student stopped, the investigator asked, "Is there anything else you remember that you'd like to add?" When the student had finished, the investigator thanked him and made a positive comment about the student's retelling; for example, "You certainly remembered a lot about what's happened so far" or "Your retelling showed you really understood how (the character) felt in the beginning of the story."
3. Questioning/Predicting (Part 3). Making appropriate reference to the chart "I Wonder/I Think," the investigator encouraged the student to reflect on the questions and predictions previously developed and discuss anything that the unfolding text may have prompted (e.g., confirmations, revisions, doubts, etc.). Further, he encouraged the student to express additional questions and/or predictions arising from

the text read so far. The investigator recorded the appropriate notations in the "I Wonder/I Think" chart.

- D. Conclusion. The conclusion was intended to prepare the student for continuing involvement with the selection during the next 5 or 6 days with the aim of developing and expressing a personal understanding of the selection, along with a high degree of control over the print.

The investigator made a note in the student's Reading Log about the work done in the Start-Up Session and indicated the section of the trade book for which the student was responsible as his first On My Own activity. He also inserted the "I Wonder/I Think" chart developed during the present session.

The investigator set the date and time for the Wrap-Up Session regarding the current trade book and recorded it in the student's Reading Log. He reminded the student to continue working on the trade book, especially during Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) in the Grade 4 classroom and at home with his parent(s). He also reminded the student to choose a My Turn personal response activity during the next few days and be prepared to report on it in the Wrap-Up Session. He gave the student the trade book, along with the corresponding audio cassette tape (prepared in advance of the session).

The investigator asked the student if he had any questions or concerns about what he was responsible for during the time before the Wrap-Up Session. When he was

assured that these had been dealt with, the investigator concluded the session with a positive comment, which he jotted down in the student's Reading Log, about some aspect of the session or anticipated experiences during the week.

On My Own Activities

Each student was encouraged to continue to work on his selection according to the procedure established for the study. The procedure provided opportunities, information, and other resources supportive of the student's purpose--the construction of meaning through interaction with his chosen trade book. Because a major instructional goal of the study was the development of independence and self-regulation of the reading process, the procedure was designed to encourage and enable the student to assume a high degree of control over his activities.

Each student's On My Own activities were scheduled for 5 days per administrative cycle, equivalent to about five times every 8 calendar days. The student was permitted to increase the amount or the frequency of activity if he so desired.

The first day of On My Own activities coincided with the day of the Start-Up Session. On that day and for 3 subsequent school days the student was responsible for continuing to construct meaning of the complete text and to develop a high level of control over the print through silent and oral reading, read-along, and other language activities. The

activities during these 4 school days mainly occurred in the Grade 4 classroom and at home.

The student was also responsible for selecting and carrying out an activity called My Turn, a term adapted from the Scholastic 3I's Program (Lynch & Peetoom, 1987). My Turn represented an overt and tangible personal response to the selection (see Appendix L). This was to be completed on or before the fifth school day in the On My Own sequence.

In the Classroom

Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) was a daily activity of the whole Grade 4 class. The study capitalized on this feature by incorporating some aspects of the On My Own activities into the SSR sessions. On each of the first 4 days of the On My Own activities, the student was asked to use the trade book introduced in the recent Start-Up Session, working with one section per day (as previously selected by the investigator and marked by coding stickers). The student had the option of reading the section independently and/or listening to the audio-cassette recording of the section, using his personal-type tape player and headphones (on loan from the investigator for the period of the study). The student was encouraged to maintain a written record of his activities by making appropriate notations on his Reading Log sheet. On the fifth day, having completed the trade book, the student was free to select any reading material compatible with the guidelines of SSR used in the classroom.

At Home

On each of the 5 days in the On My Own procedure, the student was responsible for a home assignment. On the first 4, the assignment related to the section of the trade book the student had worked on in the classroom during SSR. Each night, the student was to read orally with his parent(s) for 10 minutes, starting at the beginning of the section for that day. The parent(s) were encouraged to interact with the student according to the principles and guidelines developed in consultation with the investigator. Following the oral reading, the student was asked to give, in his own words, a retelling of the story (to date, from the beginning of the story to the end of the current day's section). The student and parent(s) were asked to maintain a written record of the activities by making appropriate notations on the Reading Log sheet.

On the fifth day (or night), the student was to ensure that, if he had not done so already, he selected and completed a My Turn activity as a personal response to the selection.

Wrap-Up Session

Location: Resource Room.

Participants: Investigator (Resource Teacher) and one student.

Length: 35 minutes (approx.).

Preparation: The investigator ensured that he had on hand all necessary administrative items (e.g., student file, type-script of the text segment for recording oral reading mis-cues, audio cassette recorder, blank audio cassettes.)

Seating: The session was generally conducted with both the investigator and the student sitting at a work table. They were close enough to permit easily moving into a side-by-side arrangement when appropriate (e.g., when looking at the same book or other item).

Procedure: The entire session was recorded on audio cassette tape as a permanent record to which the investigator could refer as needed in the study.

The investigator assumed responsibility for leading the session. He aimed at conveying a friendly, optimistic, and interested attitude so that the student would feel secure and actively participate in the session.

The session was organized according to a sequence of steps. Within each step, the investigator aimed at having a degree of flexibility and spontaneity in the interaction. He also attempted to provide for good continuity between steps so that there would be a natural flow throughout the session.

A description of each step follows:

- (1) Retelling. The investigator asked the student to give a retelling of the whole selection by saying, "I'd like for you, in your own words, to tell me about the story (or book), (give the title)." The retelling was done

without the aid of the book. When the student stopped, the investigator asked, "Is there anything else you remember that you'd like to add?" When the student had finished, if there had been significant aspects not included or apparently not understood according to the author's apparent meaning, the investigator may have chosen to elicit further information by probing. If so, he avoided giving any information not contained in the student's retelling so far.

(2) Oral Reading by Student: Investigator-selected Segment.

The investigator asked the student to read aloud the segment of text the student had read in the Start-Up Session. He reminded the student where to begin and end (previously marked with the peel-off coding stickers). If the student happened to encounter difficulties which led him to request help, the investigator reminded him to do his best and, if unsuccessful, continue past them.

As the student read orally, the investigator recorded his miscues and any other pertinent information (e.g., laughing, spontaneous comments, good expression) on the typescript of the text.

The investigator made a positive comment about some aspect(s) of the student's oral reading when he finished the segment.

- (3) Student Response to Selection. The investigator engaged the student in a discussion of the selection by asking about his overall reaction and probing for details about

the student's comment. Further, he asked the student what personal response activity (My Turn) he had selected and engaged him in an open-ended discussion or sharing of the product (e.g., poem, drawing).

- (4) Oral Reading: Self-Selected Segments. The investigator engaged the student in a brief discussion of favorite parts of the selection. He told the student a part he really enjoyed and would like to read an excerpt from. The investigator read it aloud to the student, afterwards briefly commenting on the material. He asked the student if he would read aloud a part of the segment he, the student, enjoyed. Following the student's oral reading, the investigator made a positive comment and engaged the student in a brief discussion.
- (5) Evaluation by the Student. The investigator asked the student to comment on his experiences involving the individualized reading program over the past week or so. He approached the topic by asking questions such as: "Thinking back on your activities using this book, what did you like best? What didn't you like? What could have been done to make the activities better for you?" The investigator made notes about the student's comments to help improve the student's experiences during the remainder of the study. He and the student then briefly reviewed the Reading Log sheet for the work on the selection just completed and made appropriate entries,

including the student signature indicating his approval of the Reading Log.

- (6) Conclusion. The investigator asked the student if he had any other comments or questions about the individualized reading program or his reading activities in general. Having dealt with these, the investigator made a positive comment(s) about some aspect of the session or the experiences over the past week or so.

Before concluding, he informed the student that he would retain the student's project folder briefly so that he could obtain a photocopy of the most recent entries.

Finally, he reminded the student that a Start-Up Session was scheduled for the next school day.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION

Introduction

The evaluation of the study is based on data obtained on the reading behaviors, as well as related knowledge and perceptions of 3 Grade 4 students who were experiencing significant reading difficulties. Both qualitative and quantitative data were obtained through a variety of observational and measurement procedures administered before, during, and after their participation in individualized reading programs over a period of approximately 15 weeks.

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests in order to assess the students' growth in reading achievement. The chapter then presents and discusses the students' results on Cloze task procedures designed to assess the students' growth in comprehension and strategy use while reading whole text. Next, the chapter presents and discusses the results of three procedures which assess the students' metacognitive development in regard to reading awareness, beliefs, and feelings: (a) the Reading Interview, an open-ended interview form administered individually; (b) Ideas About Reading, a multiple-choice format administered to the students as a group; and (c) Self-Perceptions About Reading, a self-rating scale in response to statements about reading administered to the students as a group. The chapter then presents and

discusses the results of two miscue analysis procedures which assess the students' proficiency in the selection and use of language cues and reading strategies in constructing meaning while engaged in oral reading of extended text: (a) RMI Procedure II, used to examine students' reading of selections prior to and following the individualized reading programs; and (b) RMI Procedure III, used to examine students' reading of excerpts from their self-selected trade books during their individualized reading programs. The chapter then presents and discusses the results of a procedure which assessed the students' response to feedback following oral reading of excerpts from their trade books. The chapter concludes by presenting and discussing some of the most salient features of the students' involvement and reaction regarding their individualized reading programs.

Reading Achievement

Alternate forms of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests were administered to the 3 students as an intact group. Test Level B, Form 1, was given as a pretest on December 18, 1989. Test Level B, Form 2, was given as a posttest on May 17, 1990. Grade equivalent scores for each student were calculated according to the procedures recommended in the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests: Teacher's Manual (1980).

The results of the pretest (see Table 3) revealed that the students' mean scores in both vocabulary and comprehension were below grade level. Overall, the pretest mean score for the students' comprehension was greater than their mean

Table 3

Gain in Reading Achievement on the Gates-MacGinitie
Reading Tests, Level B, Forms 1 and 2

Student	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
John			
Vocabulary	1.5 ^a	2.3	0.8
Comprehension	2.1	2.1	0.0
Max			
Vocabulary	2.1	2.1	0.0
Comprehension	2.2	2.5	0.3
Sam			
Vocabulary	1.5 ^b	1.7	0.2
Comprehension	1.7	2.1	0.4
Mean Value			
Vocabulary	1.7	2.0	0.3
Comprehension	2.0	2.2	0.2

^{a, b} Because of extremely low raw scores, these were assigned the lowest score given in table of norms.

score in vocabulary. Indeed, this relationship between scores was found in each student's pretest scores. Two of the students (John and Sam) had extremely low raw scores in vocabulary, which may have been below the 1.5 grade level indicated in Table 3.

The results of the posttest (see Table 3) revealed that the 3 students' mean scores in both vocabulary and comprehension were still below grade level. Overall, their mean score in comprehension was greater than their mean score in vocabulary. However, the comprehension score for one student (John) was less than his vocabulary score.

According to test norms, during the period between the pretest and the posttest, the average progress students made in vocabulary and in comprehension was approximately 5 months (0.5). The results of the posttest revealed that the 3 students showed a mean gain in vocabulary of 3 months (0.3) and in comprehension of 2 months (0.2). One student (John), on one test (vocabulary), showed a gain exceeding 0.5; all other gains were less than 0.5. The gains made by each student were: John, 0.8 (vocabulary) and 0.0 (comprehension); Max, 0.0 (vocabulary) and 0.3 (comprehension); and Sam, 0.2 (vocabulary) and 0.4 (comprehension).

One might speculate about possible explanations for these results. In view of the low level of the students' performances prior to the study (as indicated in the pretest scores), a study of 5 months' duration may not be long enough to produce more substantial gains in test scores.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the scoring adjustment required to accommodate the two extremely low raw scores in the vocabulary pretest (John's and Sam's) may have masked a certain additional amount of gain in vocabulary scores. Although only one student (John), on one test, met or exceeded the average progress expected for students during this 5-month period, it would be unrealistic to judge the results solely according to average performances. The level of students' performances in December, 1989, clearly showed that these 3 students were considerably below grade level in reading achievement prior to the study. In a longitudinal study of students from pre-kindergarten to late eighth grade, Badian (1988) found that from Grade 3 the poor readers ". . . followed a progressively downward course, gaining a mean 0.34 grades per year . . ." (p. 102) on a standardized, norm-referenced test of reading achievement. She noted that this downward trend occurred in spite of early identification and help from age 5 or 6 for the majority of these poor readers. Badian maintained that these findings are consistent with those of most follow-up studies of students experiencing serious reading difficulties. Viewed in this context, the gain scores of the 3 students in the present study were encouraging.

Although the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests are a popular choice by researchers and educators, Paris and Oka (1986) report that their search of the literature did not reveal one instructional program that significantly enhanced

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test scores. Indeed, the use of these and similar standardized, norm-referenced tests of reading comprehension is being increasingly called into question as a means of assessing instructional interventions in the classroom (e.g., Johnston, 1984; Paris, Cross, & Lipson, 1984; Anderson et al., 1985; Farr & Carey, 1986; Paris & Oka, 1986). In the opinion of Johnston (1984), researchers and educators need to shift their focus to ". . . the assessment of process in the individual and . . . the process of assessment in context" (p. 175).

Cloze Task

Cloze tasks using passages selected at the Grade 1 level in the Diagnostic Reading Program (Alberta Education, 1986) were administered to the 3 students to measure comprehension. Passages 1A-Mid and 1A-2 (see Appendix A) were administered as a pretest on December 18, 1989. Passages 1B-Mid and 1B-2 (see Appendix A) were administered as a posttest on May 15, 1990. Additionally, passages 1A-Mid and 1A-2 were readministered as a posttest on May 16, 1990.

All Cloze tasks were scored according to the traditional method. The score for each Cloze task was compared with criteria contained in the Diagnostic Reading Program to ensure that no Cloze task was at a frustration reading level for the student. It was determined that all Cloze tasks except two were at the independent reading level; the two exceptions were at the instructional reading level.

The composite score of each pair of passages in the pretest and in each posttest was used to determine the difficulty level of the passages for each student. This revealed that, with one exception, the combined passages in the pretest and in each posttest were at the independent level; the exception scored at the instructional level. The scores derived by means of this procedure are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

The main results of these tests showed a mean gain in posttest scores over pretest scores whether the passages used were the same forms or alternate forms. With one exception (John's same-forms tests), all students demonstrated gains in comprehension over the 5-month period. Overall, the combined mean gain score on both forms of the posttest was 9.0%. The highest gain in comprehension when combining the two measures was made by Sam, who also demonstrated the most improvement in comprehension as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. The students' mean gain was slightly greater when the posttest used the same forms rather than alternate forms (mean gains of 10.6% and 7.3%, respectively). The possibility exists that even with approximately 5 months between testing the students' prior experience with the passages may have contributed to the mean gain. However, Holdaway (1980) has stated that, at least for oral reading assessment, "after six months we may use the pre-test material as post-test material" (p. 70). This suggests that other factors such as individual differences in relating to the passages may have

Table 4

Gain in Cloze Task Scores Using Same Passages in
Pretest and Posttest

Student	Pretest (%)	Posttest (%)	Difference (%)
John	71	71	0
Max	63	73	10
Sam	54	76	22
Mean Value	62.7	73.3	10.6

Note. Based on criteria contained in the Diagnostic Reading Program (1986), all scores except one are at the independent level. The exception is Sam's pretest score (54), which is at the instructional level.

Table 5

Gain in Cloze Task Scores Using Alternate Passages in
Pretest and Posttest

Student	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
John	71	85	14
Max	63	65	2
Sam	54	60	6
Mean Value	62.7	70.0	7.3

Note. Based on criteria contained in the Diagnostic Reading Program (1986), all scores except one are at the independent level. The exception is Sam's pretest score (54), which is at the instructional level.

contributed to the differences shown in the gain scores. Indeed, the results showed noticeable variation among the students regarding the difference between same-forms and alternate-forms posttest scores. While Max, and especially Sam, showed noticeably greater gains on posttests using the same forms, John, who showed no gain using the same forms, made substantial gain on the alternate-forms posttest.

Awareness About Reading

Two approaches were used to assess students' awareness about reading, including their understanding of effective reading strategies: The Reading Interview, an individually administered procedure; and Ideas About Reading, a group-administered procedure.

Reading Interview

The Reading Interview (see Appendix B) is an open-ended individual interview form designed to reveal information about a person's metalinguistic knowledge about reading (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). The investigator conducted individual interview sessions with each of the 3 students on December 14, 1989, which was prior to the intervention phase, and again on May 15, 1990, which was immediately after the intervention phase of the study. Each session was recorded on audio tape, which was subsequently transcribed. These complementary formats provided the investigator with a complete, permanent record of each interview session. The transcripts of each student's December and May interview

sessions are contained in Appendix M.

John's responses in both interviews indicated an awareness that the primary responsibility during reading is to make sense. His December responses indicated he had several strategies available to deal with the difficulties he encountered; in his May responses he elaborated on these and added several others. In both interviews, he mentioned strategies of recognized efficacy in proficient reading (e.g., "Go on ahead and see what makes sense" and "I skips it and puts in something that makes sense"). Moreover, the responses in the May session included more of these high-quality strategies, which indicated that John had a greater awareness and appreciation of their value. However, in both sessions he included one strategy of doubtful efficacy, especially if used as the initial or sole strategy; specifically, it was the strategy of "breaking down" the unknown words encountered in the text. In fact, John seemed to have a high degree of surface-feature beliefs and actions incorporated into his overall awareness and reported reading behaviors. This may be hampering the development or utilization of more efficient and effective strategies, many of which he already has in his repertoire.

John also indicated a recognition of circumstances under which the reader can assume the maximum level of independence and self-control while receiving help from a more-able reader. In suggesting how he would help a person having trouble reading, he prefaced his response with "Well, I

wouldn't read it for him." His references to using oral Cloze, masking and reading parts of a word, and giving other cues or prompts which the reader could apply to work out the problem all suggested an appreciation of what experiences promote reader growth and independence.

John's responses also indicated a positive view of what reading might offer him (e.g., the satisfaction of reading harder books, of reading to others, and of helping others learn to read) and that he could achieve this (e.g., through shared reading experiences with his family and practice with the same books or with new books). Furthermore, his comments in the May interview, especially those in response to Questions 10 and 11, showed a distinctly more positive and confident self-perception about his current and future levels of development as a reader.

Max's responses during both interviews tended to reflect a high degree of surface-feature beliefs and reported actions. Frequent references to spelling (e.g., "I knows how to spell better"), reading accuracy (e.g., "I never knew a couple, only about three words, and I knew the rest"), practising words (e.g., ". . . practising words," in response to Question 3 in December), and hard words (e.g., "there's hard words in it") seemed to dominate his responses.

The strategies which he reported using largely reflect a surface-feature orientation as well. Of these, one frequently mentioned by Max was the strategy of "breaking it down" (or "breaking it up") when he comes to something he does not

know. It is noteworthy that this was the first strategy mentioned in answer to Question 1 in December, while in May it was the second one mentioned. The first strategy mentioned in May was one generally acknowledged (at least from a holistic perspective) as a more powerful one for proficient reading; in Max's words, ". . . I just goes on and skips it sometimes."

In the opinion of the investigator, Max's lack of explicit references to "making sense" did not reflect the extent to which he seemed to actually utilize this fundamental principle during reading. However, it does seem significant that few of the responses reflected even implicit reference to "making sense" as an underlying principle during reading. One possible explanation is that it reflected Max's understanding of what he thought he should be doing, perhaps based on what others were (or he thought were) encouraging him to do.

Max's responses reflected a positive self-perception about reading. In both interview sessions he fondly referred to his earliest experiences of reading. His comments indicated he enjoys reading with his parents and he recognizes the value of being read to, especially in relation to subsequent reading of the material for himself. Perhaps the most significant commentary on the affective dimension of Max's reading awareness was the story he related about dreaming of being a writer.

Sam's response to Question 1 in both sessions indicated that he has an awareness of the fundamental role of "making sense" in the reading process. His response in December indicated several high-quality strategies. However, the second one he mentioned, "sounding it out," is generally considered as having doubtful efficacy. Sam's comment suggested that he is beginning to form a similar conclusion: "It don't work with me all that good. . . ." His response in May involved some of the same strategies, although their order of mention was considerably different. "Sounding it out" was still included, but mentioned last: "Sometimes I'll try to sound it out or something. But I'm not good at that, so that don't work that good for me." He referred to this strategy on several occasions. Sam apparently believed that it was a strategy he should be using, yet having found it unproductive, had concluded the problem must be his inability to use it appropriately.

Other responses also indicated that Sam has a high surface-feature orientation to reading. He made frequent reference to spelling (e.g., "I know something else that makes him a good reader--spelling"), recognizing more words (e.g., "before I never knew some words and now I knows those words"), and harder words (e.g., "I have lots of words that cause me trouble"). Sam's responses revealed that his perceptions about surface-feature beliefs and strategies have been greatly influenced by his experiences at home. His ample commentary on his early reading experiences suggest

that from the start the surface features of text were made a focus of parent-child interactions. Additionally, Sam indicated that his father encourages him to "sound out" the words he has trouble with and that a primary strategy at home is for Sam to ask what the problem word is and to be told. Sam's experiences at home have also supported his awareness of the value of literacy and the satisfactions available through books (e.g., reading with his family) and having experiences in independent reading (e.g., "I read at the same time and I listened and read like Mom").

Sam's responses indicated a recognition of what reading might offer in the future (e.g., reading harder books, especially novels; and doing math story problems) and a recognition that learning to read more proficiently is available to him. His responses in the May interview indicated that Sam had altered his view of effective ways to help a reader experiencing difficulties; his suggestion could be classified as more holistic, less centered on surface features, and more interactive on the part of the participants.

Sam's remarks about himself as a reader reflected a noticeable degree of ambivalence. He recognized that he has competence in some aspects of reading, yet he indicated a lack of confidence in other aspects: "I'm not really all that great . . . I'm kinda good and kinda a bit bad. Like, some books I can read; and some I can't." The extent of Sam's prior involvement with the text seems to be an especially important factor. He maintained that with previous exposure,

no matter how hard the book, he can read it (" . . . at least a little"); however, he said that "books I'm not used to, I can't read that much." This quite likely indicates that Sam needs to have opportunities to develop and apply strategies which enable him to connect his past experience and knowledge of language with the unfamiliar text he encounters. Such strategies would help Sam lessen his primary attention on the surface features of text and establish a better balance amongst all the language cues available to him as he reads.

The interviews revealed that, to varying degrees, beliefs and strategies associated with a subskills orientation to reading were held by the students. Moreover, some instances of distinct changes in these beliefs and strategies were noticed, in apparent response to the students' independent and instructional experiences. Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) have observed that many students, even moderately proficient readers, reflect a subskills view of reading in their interviews. However, these authors are of the opinion that when a gap exists between what the students think they should do and what they actually do when reading, the students are prone to experiencing reading difficulties, especially when encountering difficult or unpredictable text. Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987) believe that through appropriate instructional and independent experiences, these students can come to understand that " . . . the goal of reading is not to read accurately but to read for meaning" (p. 163).

Ideas About Reading

Students' awareness about reading was assessed using an approach developed by Scott G. Paris and colleagues (Jacobs & Paris, 1987). Ideas About Reading, the instrument used in this study (see Appendix C), was administered to the 3 students as an intact group on December 18, 1989, as a pretest and on May 16, 1990, as a posttest.

The results of the pretest (see Table 6) revealed a mean total score of 25.6. The mean subscores for each of the four characteristics were fairly evenly distributed within a range of 6.3 to 6.7. Individual scores in the pretest ranged from 23 to 28; the third student's score (26) was approximately at the mean. These results appear to be strongly positioned in relation to the findings of a large-scale study of third- and fourth-grade students reported by Jacobs and Paris (1987). In that study, pretest scores ranged from 12 to 39, with mean scores of 23.0 in Grade 3 and 26.9 in Grade 5.

The results of the posttest (see Table 6) revealed a mean total score of 30.4, which was an overall gain of 4.8 points. While each of the four mean subscores showed an increase, the largest changes occurred in two characteristics: (a) evaluation, which increased by 1.7; and (b) planning, which increased by 2.4. Individual total scores on the posttest ranged from 28 to 33; the third student's score (30) was approximately at the mean. Each student's total score showed an increase over the pretest results. The greatest gain in Ideas About Reading during the time period

Table 6

Gain in Awareness About Reading as Measured by a ProcedureAdapted from Paris and Colleagues (Jacobs & Paris, 1987)

Characteristics	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
John			
Evaluation	5	8	3
Planning	9	9	0
Regulation	7	6	-1
Conditional Knowledge	7	10	3
Total	28	33	5
Max			
Evaluation	8	7	-1
Planning	4	9	5
Regulation	7	7	0
Conditional Knowledge	7	5	-2
Total	26	28	2
Sam			
Evaluation	6	9	3
Planning	6	8	2
Regulation	5	7	2
Conditional Knowledge	6	6	0
Total	23	30	7
Group Mean			
Evaluation	6.3	8.0	1.7
Planning	6.3	8.7	2.4
Regulation	6.3	6.7	0.4
Conditional Knowledge	6.7	7.0	0.3
Total	25.6	30.4	4.8

Note. For each student, the maximum possible score for each characteristic was 10 and the maximum possible total score was 40.

of the study was made by Sam. The individual total-score gains were on a range from 2 to 7; the third student's gain (5) was approximately at the mean.

The mean total score and the students' total scores found in the posttest appear to be strongly positioned in relation to the findings reported by Mulcahy, Andrews, and Peat (1987). They found significant differences in the reading awareness of Grade 4 students in three diagnostic categories. Mulcahy et al. (1987) reported means of 27.0, 29.5, and 33.4 for learning disabled, average, and gifted categories, respectively.

There is substantial evidence that the procedure developed by Paris and colleagues can help differentiate between students who know a lot about evaluating, planning, and regulating their own reading and those who are less aware (Jacobs & Paris, 1987; Mulcahy et al., 1987). Pretest results in the present study indicated that all students had attained a relatively good level of reading awareness for Grade 4. Moreover, posttest results revealed they had made substantial gains during the 5-month period of the study. It is known that while all students tend to show an increase in reading awareness during the year, instructional experiences can significantly enhance this process (Jacobs & Paris, 1987). In this study it was not possible to specify the contribution the individualized reading programs made in the increased reading awareness observed. However, it seems reasonable to conclude that they at least complemented those

other instructional and independent experiences which contributed to the growth in reading awareness revealed by the assessment procedure.

Self-Perceptions About Reading

Students' self-perceptions, including beliefs and feelings specifically about reading, were assessed using a procedure developed by Paris and Oka (1986) and adapted for this study (see Appendix D). The assessment was administered to the 3 students as an intact group on December 19, 1989 as a pretest, and on May 16, 1990 as a posttest.

The results of the pretest and the posttest are shown in Table 7. The mean total scores in both the pretest (28.4) and the posttest (25.7) were strongly positioned on the instrument's scoring range (0 to 35). A notable feature of the results was the level of stability shown. The decline of 2.7 points in the group mean total was derived from changes spread across the mean gain scores of 4 items, while no change was observed in the mean gain scores on 3 items. Furthermore, of the students' item gain scores, more than half, 11, showed no change; 6 showed -1; 2 showed -2; and 2 showed 1. This relatively high degree of stability in scores is consistent with the findings of Paris and Oka (1986). In their opinion, students' self-perceptions about reading likely are enduring characteristics and, as such, should not be expected to be altered as a result of relatively brief interventions.

Table 7

Gain in Self-Perceptions About Reading as Measured by a
Procedure Developed by Paris and Oka (1986)

Comparison	Items							Total	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
John									
Pretest	3	4	3	2	5	5	5	27	3.86
Posttest	3	5	3	1	4	3	5	24	3.43
Gain	0	1	0	-1	-1	-2	0	-3	-0.43
Max									
Pretest	3	5	3	2	5	3	5	26	3.71
Posttest	4	5	3	2	4	3	5	26	3.71
Gain	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0.00
Sam									
Pretest	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	32	4.57
Posttest	4	4	3	3	5	3	5	27	3.86
Gain	-1	-1	-2	0	0	-1	0	-5	-0.71
Group Mean									
Pretest	3.7	4.7	3.7	2.3	5.0	4.0	5.0	28.4	4.06
Posttest	3.7	4.7	3.0	2.0	4.3	3.0	5.0	25.7	3.67
Gain	0.0	0.0	-0.7	-0.3	-0.7	-1.0	0.0	-2.7	-0.39

Note. Maximum possible score on each item is 5.
Maximum possible score is 35.

Another notable feature of the results was the level of similarity shown. The range of the students' total scores in the pretest, 6 points, narrowed even further in the posttest, to 3 points. Additionally, even if the pretest and posttest results were combined, the range in scores for each item never exceeded 2 points.

Item 4 ("I am one of the best readers in my class") consistently scored lowest amongst both the individual and the group results. Conversely, 3 items (2, 5, and 7) scored consistently high. Item 7 ("I think that I won't be a very good reader in high school") was perhaps the most remarkable amongst all the scores; on both the pretest and the posttest, all 3 students rated it at the highest value (5), which indicated that they totally disagreed with the statement.

The pretest total scores indicated that, overall, the students had a relatively positive view of themselves in relation to reading. The posttest results revealed that despite a slight decline in the mean total score, the individual total scores remained strongly positioned on the scale, indicating positive self-perceptions about reading.

Miscue Analysis

The students' selection and use of language cues and strategies during reading were examined by means of two miscue analysis procedures developed by Y.M. Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1987). Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure II was used in pretest and posttest sessions. Reading Miscue

Inventory Procedure III was used in conferencing sessions during the individualized reading programs.

RMI Procedure II

Miscue analysis (including retelling) was conducted with each of the students in individual sessions using Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure II (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). The selection The Helpful Giant (see Appendix F) was used in a pretest session with each student on December 14, 1989, and again in a posttest session with each student on May 16, 1990. The selection The Balancing Girl (see Appendix F) was used as a second posttest with each student on May 17, 1990. The principal findings derived from Procedure II are presented in Table 8.

The mean score for Language Sense (S/PS) in the pretest revealed that only 38.5% of the sentences as read by the students were syntactically and semantically acceptable within the context of the entire selection. This indicated a relatively low level of proficiency in the use of the language cueing systems and the reading strategies (initiating and sampling, predicting, and confirming). The Graphic Relations (H/S) mean score (90.4%) indicated a heavy reliance on graphic cues; although the Sound Relations (H/S) mean score seemed to be within acceptable limits for proficient reading. The mean retelling score (65.3%) indicated that a moderate level of understanding was achieved. The mean reading rate (40.4 words per minute) is slow for Grade 4 students on a task such as this.

Table 8

Results of Pretest and Posttests (Including Gains) Using Reading Miscue InventoryProcedure II (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)

Characteristics	Pretest (%)	Posttests (%)	
	The Helpful Giant	The Helpful Giant	The Balancing Girl
John			
Language Sense (S/PS)	27.3	46.8 (+19.5)	29.4 (+ 2.1)
Graphic Relations (H/S)	87.6	88.6 (+ 1.0)	92.8 (+ 5.2)
Sound Relations (H/S)	76.2	71.4 (- 4.8)	78.2 (+ 2.0)
Retelling	64.0	72.0 (+ 8.0)	76.0 (+12.0)
Reading Rate	28.4 wpm	47.1 (+18.7) wpm	42.2 (+13.8) wpm
Max			
Language Sense (S/PS)	62.3	74.0 (+11.7)	52.0 (-10.3)
Graphic Relations (H/S)	89.4	89.6 (+ 0.2)	93.5 (+ 4.1)
Sound Relations (H/S)	72.9	61.2 (-11.7)	72.7 (- 0.2)
Retelling	69.0	82.0 (+13.0)	79.0 (+10.0)
Reading Rate	34.0 wpm	44.1 (+10.1) wpm	41.6 (+ 7.6) wpm
Sam			
Language Sense (S/PS)	26.0	40.3 (+14.3)	28.0 (+ 2.0)
Graphic Relations (H/S)	94.3	95.6 (+ 1.3)	96.2 (+ 1.9)
Sound Relations (H/S)	76.6	70.2 (- 6.4)	67.6 (- 9.0)
Retelling	63.0	80.0 (+17.0)	81.0 (+18.0)
Reading Rate	58.8 wpm	54.3 (- 4.5) wpm	53.7 (- 5.1) wpm
Group Mean			
Language Sense (S/PS)	38.5	53.7 (+15.2)	36.5 (- 2.0)
Graphic Relations (H/S)	90.4	91.3 (+ 0.9)	94.2 (+ 3.8)
Sound Relations (H/S)	75.2	67.6 (- 7.6)	72.8 (- 2.4)
Retelling	65.3	78.0 (+12.7)	78.7 (+13.4)
Reading Rate	40.4 wpm	48.5 (+ 8.1) wpm	45.8 (+ 5.4) wpm

Note. 1. Language Sense (S/PS) combines scores in Strength (YYN) and Partial Strength (YYP and YYY) categories based on the pattern representing responses to Questions 1, 2 and 3 (see Appendix E).

2. Graphic Relations (H/S) and Sound Relations (H/S) each combines High and Some scores in response to Questions 4 and 5, respectively (see Appendix E).

The mean scores on the posttests revealed several noteworthy changes from the pretest results. The mean gain of 15.2% on the same-form posttest score for Language Sense (S/PS) indicated students' increased proficiency in the use of language cues and reading strategies. A similar gain did not occur with the alternate-form posttest, which showed a slight decrease in proficiency. However, the same-form and alternate-form posttests showed similar changes in two areas: (a) retelling, which had mean gains of 12.7% and 13.4%, respectively, and (b) reading rate, which had mean gains of 8.1 wpm and 5.4 wpm, respectively. Overall, the combined results for Language Sense (S/PS) on the two posttests showed mean gains of 10.8% (John), 8.2% (Sam), and 0.7% (Max).

The variability among gains shown by the same-form and alternate-form posttests compared with the pretest suggests that any influences of prior experience with the pretest (practice effects) are likely minimal. Indeed, the 5-month period between testing approaches the criterion mentioned by Holdaway (1980), who contended that after 6 months the pretest material can be used as the posttest material. One possible explanation for some of the gain-score variations between the two posttests is that despite the investigator's efforts to select passages having comparable characteristics (e.g., length, vocabulary, pictorial support, interest and relevance to the students, conceptual load, etc.), The Balancing Girl was in some way(s) more difficult than The Helpful Giant for these students.

John's Language Sense (S/PS) score of 27.3% in the pretest indicated a low level of proficiency in selecting and using the language cues available in the selection. He tended to rely heavily on graphic cues and read at a very slow rate. Despite this, he showed by his retelling that he was able to draw on his language strengths, including knowledge of story grammar and of genres and themes similar to the selection, to construct a moderate degree of understanding of the selection, indicated by his retelling score of 64.0%.

John's posttest results revealed a number of noteworthy features. His Language Sense (S/PS) score for the same-form posttest showed an increase of 19.5%, suggesting a relatively sizeable increase in reading proficiency. This increased control of the reading process is also indicated by a decrease in word-for-word substitutions from 105 to 70 (although he still showed a heavy reliance on graphophonic cues) and by an increase in his reading rate. At the same time, John showed an increased understanding, or comprehension, of the selection in his retelling, which was scored at 72.0% (a gain of 8.0%).

In contrast with the results on the same-form posttest, John's Language Sense (S/PS) score on the alternate-form posttest showed only a slight increase over the pretest. Furthermore, the results suggested a slightly greater increase in reliance on graphophonic cues. However, compared with the pretest, the number of word-for-word substitutions decreased (from 105 to 69), while the reading rate increased.

Additionally, John's retelling score increased by 12%, indicating a growing ability to construct and communicate his understanding of selections read independently. (John's reader profiles, coding forms, retelling guides and marked typescripts are contained in Appendix N).

Max's Language Sense (S/PS) score of 62.3% in the pretest indicated a moderate level of proficiency in selecting and using the language cues available in the selection. However, he tended to rely heavily on graphophonic cues and read at a slow rate. Max's retelling score (69.0%) reflected a moderate level of understanding of the selection.

Max's posttest results revealed a number of noteworthy features. On the same-form posttest, the increase of 11.7% in his Language Sense (S/PS) score indicated an increased proficiency in using the language cues and reading strategies to construct meaning as he read. Max's Graphic Relations (H/S) score indicated a continued high reliance on graphic cues; however, the number of word-for-word substitutions declined from 85 in the pretest to 67. Max's reading rate of 44.1 wpm, while still slow, had increased by 10.1 wpm over the pretest rate. Max's retelling showed that he understood a great deal about the selection; his retelling score of 82.0% was 13% higher than his pretest score.

The Language Sense (S/PS) score of 52.0% on the alternate-form posttest contrasted sharply with the score on the same-form posttest. This indicated that Max had more difficulty in selecting and using appropriate cues and

strategies in constructing meaning as he read. This difficulty was also reflected in his greater reliance on grapho-
phonic cues. Max's alternate-form reading rate and retelling score were both slightly less than on the same-form posttest, yet they were still noticeably higher than they were on the pretest. His retelling showed that he was able to achieve a fairly good understanding of the selection, which suggested that he drew on a variety of language strengths, including inferencing and experience with genres and themes similar to the selection. (Max's reader profiles, coding forms, retelling guides, and marked transcripts are contained in Appendix O).

Sam's Language Sense (S/PS) score of 26.0% on the pretest indicated a low level of proficiency in selecting and using the language cues available in the text. He relied heavily on graphophonic cues. Sam's reading rate of 58.8 wpm on the pretest (which was the highest observed in all nine readings by the 3 students) approached a moderate rate for a Grade 4 student on this task; yet this was achieved in large part by a high level of omissions and substitutions that were quickly inspected. Sam's retelling revealed a moderate level of understanding of the selection, suggesting that he was able to use a range of language strengths, such as inferencing and experience with similar genres and themes in constructing his retelling.

Sam's posttest results revealed a number of noteworthy features. His Language Sense (S/PS) score for the same-form

posttest showed a distinct increase, although the score (40.3%) indicated that he was still reading at a relatively low level of proficiency. Sam showed a decrease in the number of word-for-word substitution miscues produced, from 124 on the pretest to 114; but he continued to reveal a very heavy reliance on graphophonic cues. However, Sam's same-form posttest results showed an increase of almost 9% for composite No and Partial meaning change, as indicated by coding results for Question 3. (This was the largest improvement by any student relative to either form of the posttest.) Sam's reading rate decreased by 4.5 wpm, suggesting that, compared with the pretest, he may have been attending more to some of the text elements which he had previously tended to omit or substitute with only quick consideration. Evidence for Sam's increased attention to meaning and comprehension is also supported by the increase of 17.0% in his retelling score. As indicated by a retelling score of 80.0%, Sam showed he understood a great deal about the selection, which indicates he made use of a range of language strengths in constructing his retelling of this selection.

Sam's Language Sense (S/PS) score of 28.0% on the alternate-form posttest, while showing a slight gain over the pretest, was noticeably lower than the score on the same-form posttest. This score (28.0%) indicated a low level of proficiency in selecting and using the language cues available in the text. Although his reading revealed a decrease in the number of word-for-word substitutions from 124 on the pretest

to 105, Sam continued to rely very heavily on graphophonic cues during his reading. However, his alternate-form posttest results showed an increase of 6% for composite Nc and Partial meaning change, as indicated by coding results for Question 3. As in the same-form posttest results, Sam's reading rate on the alternate-form posttest showed a decrease, relative to his pretest level. (This pattern of lower reading rates on each of the posttest forms compared with the pretest was present only in Sam's results. John and Max each showed increases of at least 10 wpm in posttest results.) Sam's retelling, as reflected in his score of 81.0%, showed that he was able to draw upon his language strengths to construct a good level of understanding about the selection. (Sam's reader profiles, coding forms, retelling guides and marked typescripts are contained in Appendix P.)

RMI Procedure III

Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III was used to assess a sample of each student's oral reading of excerpts from his self-selected trade books during conferences with the investigator. The student read each excerpt twice. The first time, during the Start-Up Session for the book, the excerpt was unfamiliar. The second time, during the Wrap-Up session for the book, the excerpt had been read at least once (i.e., during the Start-Up Session); however, no reliable data were maintained regarding additional readings by the student. The group mean number of days between the Start-Up

and Wrap-Up Sessions for each book was 9.7. The findings of the Procedure III assessment of student oral readings in the five Start-Up and five Wrap-Up Sessions included in the sample (i.e., Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9) are presented according to group mean and individual mean results.

The group mean results are presented in Table 9. In the Start-Up Sessions, the scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability (48.7% and 34.0%, respectively) revealed a fairly low level of success in constructing sentences that made sense within the context of the selection. However, where semantic acceptability was achieved, the students' oral reading tended to maintain the meaning intended by the author; this was indicated by the combined "No" and "Partial" scores relating to meaning change (86.3%). The students' oral reading revealed a heavy reliance on graphophonic cues, as indicated by the combined "High" and "Some" graphic similarity scores (93.4%) on a relatively high number of coded substitution miscues (23.0). The reading rate (40.4 wpm) was relatively slow for Grade 4 students.

The group mean results in the Wrap-Up Sessions revealed several noteworthy features. The group mean scores for syntactic acceptability and semantic acceptability, although still relatively low, showed substantial gains over the levels in the Start-Up Sessions. The group mean score for syntactic acceptability was 66.3%, a gain of 17.6%; and the score for semantic acceptability was 58.3%, a gain of 24.3%.

Table 9

Group Mean Results of Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III(Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)

Start-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 48.7%	N 51.3%		No. Sentences Coded	18.7
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 34.0%	N 66.0%		No. Sentences Coded	18.7
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 74.3%	P 12.0%	Y 13.7%	No. Sentences Coded	6.3
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 60.7%	S 32.7%	N 6.6%	No. Miscues Coded	23.0
No. Words Read		171.1	Time		4:14	Rate 40.4 wpm

Wrap-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 66.3%	N 33.7%		No. Sentences Coded	18.7
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 58.3%	N 41.7%		No. Sentences Coded	18.7
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 70.3%	P 20.0%	Y 9.7%	No. Sentences Coded	10.7
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 62.7%	S 30.0%	N 7.3%	No. Miscues Coded	20.7
No. Words Read		171.1	Time		4:02	Rate 42.5 wpm

Difference

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y +17.6%	N -17.6%		No. Sentences Coded	0.0
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y +24.3%	N -24.3%		No. Sentences Coded	0.0
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N - 4.0%	P + 8.0%	Y -4.0%	No. Sentences Coded	+4.4
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H + 2.0%	S - 2.7%	N +0.7%	No. Miscues Coded	-2.3
No. Words Read		0.0	Time		-0:12	Rate +2.1 wpm

Note. Mean number of days between Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions = 9.7.

The meaning change composite score for "No" and "Partial" responses remained high (90.3%, which was a gain of 4%). These results suggest a considerable improvement in the students' use of language cues and reading strategies to construct meaning during their oral reading of the excerpts. The students' mean scores for graphic similarity, though still indicating a heavy reliance on graphophonic cues, showed a slight decrease; while the reading rate showed a slight increase.

In the Start-Up Sessions, John's scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability (46% and 27%, respectively) indicated a low level of success in constructing sentences that made sense in the context of the selection (see Table 10). When he did achieve semantic acceptability, he tended to retain a reasonably high degree of the original meaning, indicated by a composite score of 80% in "No" and "Partial" meaning change. John's mean results revealed a high reliance on graphophonic cues, indicated by a composite score of 91% in "High" and "Some" graphic similarity, derived from a relatively high number of coded substitution miscues (22). His reading rate of 30.8 wpm was quite slow for a Grade 4 student.

John's mean scores in the Wrap-Up Sessions (see Table 10) revealed several noteworthy features. His scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability showed substantial gains. John's score for syntactic acceptability was 60%, a gain of 14%; and his score for semantic acceptability was

Table 10

Mean Results of John's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III(Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)

Start-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 46%	N 54%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 27%	N 73%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 78%	P 2%	Y 20%	No. Sentences Coded	6
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 59%	S 32%	N 9%	No. Miscues Coded	22
No. Words Read		165.2	Time 5:22		Rate 30.8 wpm	

Wrap-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 60%	N 40%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 50%	N 50%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 71%	P 11%	Y 18%	No. Sentences Coded	10
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 64%	S 32%	N 4%	No. Miscues Coded	19
No. Words Read		165.2	Time 4:50		Rate 34.2 wpm	

Difference

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y +14%	N -14%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y +23%	N -23%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N - 7%	P + 9%	Y -2%	No. Sentences Coded	+4
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H + 5%	S 0%	N -5%	No. Miscues Coded	-3
No. Words Read		0.0	Time -0:32		Rate +3.4 wpm	

Note. Mean number of days between Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions = 10.2.

50%, a gain of 23%. The meaning change score remained relatively high (82%, a gain of 2% over the Start-Up Session level). These results revealed that although John was still functioning at a relatively low level of proficiency in the selection and use of language cues and reading strategies, he had made substantial gains over his performance in the Start-Up Sessions. Although there was a slight reduction in the number of word-for-word substitutions coded (19%, a reduction of 3%), they revealed that John continued to rely heavily on graphophonic cues, as indicated by his composite score of 96% for "High" and "Some" graphic similarity. His reading rate, although still quite slow, did show an increase (3.4 wpm).

In the Start-Up Sessions, Max's scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability (74% and 62%, respectively) indicated a moderate level of success in constructing sentences that made sense in the context of the selection (see Table 11). When he did achieve semantic acceptability, he was highly successful in retaining the author's meaning; this was indicated by his composite score for "No" and "Partial" meaning change (100%). The number of coded word-for-word substitution miscues (12) shown in Max's results was distinctly lower than the group mean (23.0); however, their level of graphic similarity (93%, for combined "High" and "Some" scores) revealed that Max relied heavily on graphophonic cues during his reading of the excerpts. Max's reading rate (40.3 wpm) was relatively slow for a Grade 4 student.

Table 11

Mean Results of Max's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III

(Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)

Start-Up Sessions						
Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 74%	N 26%		No. Sentences Coded	16
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 62%	N 38%		No. Sentences Coded	16
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 76%	P 24%	Y 0%	No. Sentences Coded	10
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 64%	S 29%	N 7%	No. Miscues Coded	12
No. Words Read		151.8	Time 3:46		Rate	40.3 wpm
<hr/>						
Wrap-Up Sessions						
Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 88%	N 12%		No. Sentences Coded	16
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 86%	N 14%		No. Sentences Coded	16
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 78%	P 20%	Y 2%	No. Sentences Coded	14
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 65%	S 22%	N 13%	No. Miscues Coded	11
No. Words Read		151.8	Time 3:07		Rate	48.7 wpm
<hr/>						
Difference						
Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y +14%	N -14%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y +24%	N -24%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N + 2%	P - 4%	Y +2%	No. Sentences Coded	+4
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H + 1%	S - 7%	N +6%	No. Miscues Coded	-1
No. Words Read		0.0	Time -0:39		Rate	+8.4 wpm

Note. Mean number of days between Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions = 9.4.

Max's mean scores in the Wrap-Up Sessions (see Table 11) revealed several noteworthy features. His scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability showed substantial gains. Max's score for syntactic acceptability was 88%, a gain of 14%; and his score for semantic acceptability was 86%, a gain of 24%. Furthermore, Max's combined score for "No" and "Partial" meaning change (98%) showed that he was quite successful in maintaining the author's intended meaning. Max's combined scores for "High" and "Some" graphic similarity (87%) revealed a decrease in relation to the Start-Up Sessions; although the combined score was still relatively high, it indicated some reduction in Max's reliance on graphophonic cues during his oral reading of the excerpts. In addition, Max's reading rate increased to 48.7 wpm, a gain of 8.4 wpm. Together, these results indicated a distinct increase in Max's proficiency in selecting and using language cues and reading strategies during his oral reading of the excerpts from his trade books.

In the Start-Up Sessions, Sam's scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability (26% and 13%, respectively) indicated a very low level of success in constructing sentences that made sense in the context of the selection (see Table 12). When his efforts did achieve semantic acceptability in the sentence, he was moderately successful in retaining the author's meaning; this is indicated by a composite score of 79% in "No" and "Partial" meaning change. Sam's mean results revealed a very high reliance on graphophonic cues, indicated

Table 12

Mean Results of Sam's Oral Reading Assessments Using RMI Procedure III(Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)

Start-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 26%	N 74%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 13%	N 87%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 69%	P 10%	Y 21%	No. Sentences Coded	3
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 59%	S 37%	N 4%	No. Miscues Coded	35

No. Words Read 196.2

Time 3:35

Rate 54.8 wpm

Wrap-Up Sessions

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y 51%	N 49%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y 39%	N 61%		No. Sentences Coded	20
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N 62%	P 29%	Y 9%	No. Sentences Coded	8
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 59%	S 36%	N 5%	No. Miscues Coded	32

No. Words Read 196.2

Time 4:07

Rate 47.6 wpm

Difference

Q.1	Syn. Accept.	Y +25%	N -25%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.2	Sem. Accept.	Y +26%	N -26%		No. Sentences Coded	0
Q.3	Mean. Chng.	N - 7%	P +19%	Y -12%	No. Sentences Coded	+5
Q.4	Graphic Sim.	H 0%	S - 1%	N + 1%	No. Miscues Coded	-3

No. Words Read 0.0

Time +0:32

Rate -7.2 wpm

Note. Mean number of days between Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions = 9.4.

by a composite score of 96% in "High" and "Some" graphic similarity, derived from a very high number of coded substitution miscues (35). His reading rate (54.8 wpm) was relatively slow; although compared with the group mean score (40.4 wpm) it was noticeably higher. (Indeed, it was the highest individual mean score for reading rate amongst all students' results for Procedure III.) Together, these results indicate a very low level of proficiency in Sam's selection and use of language cues and reading strategies as he read the excerpts in the Start-Up Sessions.

Sam's mean scores in the Wrap-Up Sessions (see Table 12) revealed several noteworthy features. His scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability showed substantial gains. Sam's score for syntactic acceptability was 51%, a gain of 25%; and his score for semantic acceptability was 39%, a gain of 26%. Moreover, Sam's combined score of 91% for "No" and "Partial" meaning change indicated that when he did construct semantically acceptable sentences, he was quite successful in retaining the author's meaning. Sam's results revealed a very high number of coded word-for-word substitution miscues (32, although this was a decline of 3 from the previous results). Additionally, the composite score for "High" and "Some" graphic similarity exhibited by these miscues (95%) revealed that Sam relied heavily on graphophonic cues during his oral reading of the excerpts. His reading rate decreased by 7.2 wpm, to 47.6; although this was still above the group mean score (42.5 wpm). Sam was the only student to show a

decrease in reading rate in his Wrap-Up Sessions (compared with his Start-Up Session results). The reduction in reading rate appeared to result from Sam's giving increased attention to aspects of the text which he had previously omitted or given only quick consideration. It appeared that these activities were carried out within a framework of increased concern for constructing meaning. Despite the substantial improvements observed in the Wrap-Up Sessions, Sam's reading reflected a low level of proficiency in the selection and use of language cues and reading strategies.

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

The procedure for assessing student response to correcting feedback following oral reading was applied to a sample of each student's conferences. The sampling method provided eight Start-Up Sessions for examination; these were comprised of: John, three sessions (numbers 5, 7 and 9); Max, two sessions (numbers 5 and 7); and Sam, three sessions (numbers 3, 5 and 7). Based on a review of the audio tape of each session, the investigator used the procedure, along with the instrument Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback, to assess the student's reading behavior.

Table 13 shows a statistical summary of the findings. The group mean results revealed that an average of 3.4 sentences were examined in each session. The group mean score of 74.7% for Monitoring indicated that the students assumed a large share of responsibility in noticing miscues which disrupted meaning in the sentences examined. However, the

Table 13

Mean Results of the Index of Student Response
to Correcting Feedback

Student	Sentences Examined in Session	Monitoring (%)	Correcting (%)	Combined (%)
John	4.0	57	53	55
Max	2.0	88	0	44
Sam	4.3	79	39	59
Group Mean	3.4	74.7	30.7	52.7

Note. The mean number of sentences examined was calculated using the following number of sessions: John, 3; Max, 2; and Sam, 3.

group mean score of 30.7% for Correcting indicated that they were quite reliant on the investigator for selecting and applying appropriate fix-up strategies. The group mean score of 52.7% for Combined (Monitoring and Correcting) reflected the two separate scores and indicated a moderate degree of independence in fulfilling those reading responsibilities following correcting feedback.

John's mean results indicated a moderate degree of reliance on investigator support (in the context of this activity) in both Monitoring (57%) and Correcting (53%), and yielded a Combined score of 55%.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 5 had revealed a score of 43% for semantic acceptability and a composite score of 80% for meaning change. In the feedback activity, John's independent attempts at sentences and at problem words within sentences (independently or supported by investigator's reading around the problem or discussing relevant information) all tended to produce high-quality tries. John actively searched, monitored, checked, and corrected.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 7 had revealed a score of 0% for semantic acceptability and no sentences coded for meaning change. In the feedback activity, John actively participated in all phases of the process--before, during, and after reading with the investigator. John showed understanding of the principles of effective strategies for predicting and confirming (including

rejecting and self-correcting). He showed willingness to take risks, even in difficult material. Before concluding the activity, the investigator read through the entire excerpt, using oral Cloze; John participated with enthusiasm and a high degree of success.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 9 had revealed a score of 29% for semantic acceptability and a composite score of 67% for meaning change. When working with materials at this level of difficulty, John benefitted from sharing the reading responsibility with a more able reader. His active involvement and his understanding of appropriate strategies for predicting and confirming were apparent during the shared reading activities. (As a sample of John's oral reading with his trade books and the subsequent feedback activities, the marked and coded typescript and the transcript of the whole feedback interaction related to Start-Up Session 9 are contained in Appendix Q.)

Max's mean results indicated a relatively high degree of independence in Monitoring (88%); however, his score for Correcting (0%) suggested a very heavy reliance on instructor support (in the context of this activity). His Combined score of 44% suggested a tendency towards dependence on instructor support in the feedback interactions. It should be noted that Max's results were derived from a comparatively small number of sentences examined (4).

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 5 had revealed a score of 59% for semantic acceptability and a

composite score of 100% for meaning change. In the feedback activity, when discussing the cooperatively achieved resolution to the omission "growled" in a sentence in the excerpt ("What do you want?" growled the man . . .), Max noted that, compared with other possibilities, like "said," "growled" was a good choice of words by the author. "It made the story more interesting," said Max. In a second sentence examined by the procedure, Max's rereading had substituted ". . . very dangerous equipment . . ." for the text item ". . . very delicate equipment. . . ." Upon discussion of the word, its context, and its graphic and sound characteristics, he rejected it. Although he did not identify the word "delicate," he was able to check and confirm the word when asked "Could it be 'delicate'?"

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 7 had revealed a score of 62% for semantic acceptability and a composite score of 100% for meaning change. In the feedback activity, Max's rereading showed he could (from amongst several choices proposed by the investigator) select a word that made sense and sounded right; additionally, he also showed he could independently check the choice against the text word and explain his reasoning, when asked by the investigator. (As a sample of Max's oral reading with his trade books and the subsequent feedback activities, the marked and coded typescript and the transcript of the whole feedback interaction related to Start-Up Session 7 are contained in Appendix R.)

Sam's mean results indicated a relatively good level of independence in Monitoring (79%), although his score on Correcting (39%) suggested he was quite reliant on the investigator for fixing the miscues he noticed during the activity. Sam's Combined score of 59% indicated, overall, a moderate degree of reliance on investigator support within the context of this activity.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 3 had revealed a score of 0% for semantic acceptability and no sentences coded for meaning change. In the feedback activity, Sam commented that he had trouble with a number of the words in the excerpt. His response to correcting feedback indicated that he benefitted from assisted reading experiences, such as oral Cloze, which enabled him to use his language strengths to support his problem-solving efforts while reading.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 5 had revealed a score of 19% for semantic acceptability and a composite score of 100% for meaning change. In the feedback activity, Sam showed that when asked to reread the selected sentences independently and/or with the investigator he improved his control of the reading process (from both a meaning and a surface-feature viewpoint). He increased his effectiveness in dealing with aspects of the text which, when reading within the context of uninterrupted reading of the excerpt, he had tended to dismiss prematurely, thereby omitting a high percentage of textual elements and associated

cues for constructing meaning.

RMI Procedure III results for Start-Up Session 7 had revealed a score of 10% semantic acceptability and a composite score of 50% for meaning change. In the feedback activity, Sam seemed to notice many of his miscues, especially when he did not recognize the word(s). However, he seemed not to apply several fundamental fix-up strategies for the word-level or sentence-level problems. Sam did seem to have these strategies available, as could be observed when he shared the reading activities with the investigator during assisted reading activities. He seemed to over-emphasize individual word recognition and under-emphasize the importance of keeping in mind "Did that make sense?" and/or "Did that sound right?" (As a sample of Sam's oral reading with his trade books and the subsequent feedback activities, the marked and coded typescript and the transcript of the whole feedback interaction related to Start-Up Session 7 are contained in Appendix S.)

The investigator examined the results of the RMI Procedure III assessments to determine whether any influence of the feedback procedure could be observed in subsequent oral reading sessions. Only semantic acceptability scores in Start-Up and Wrap-Up Sessions 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 were examined in relation to the schedule used for incorporating feedback within these sessions. The results of this review are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Semantic Acceptability Scores for Student Oral Reading of
Excerpts from Trade Books

Conference Characteristics	Scores (%)					Avg.
	Location in Sequence of Trade Books					
	1	3	5	7	9	
John						
Start-Up	12	52	43 (F)	0 (F)	29 (F)	27
Wrap-Up	47	67	57	37	43	50
Gain	35	15	14	37	14	23
Max						
Start-Up	62	44	59 (F)	62 (F)	82	62
Wrap-Up	100	69	91	75	94	86
Gain	38	25	32	13	12	24
Sam						
Start-Up	21	0 (F)	19 (F)	10 (F)	13	13
Wrap-Up	43	6	44	57	43	39
Gain	22	6	25	47	30	26

- Note. 1. (F) denotes Feedback by Investigator, provided to student following oral reading.
 2. Scores were derived from assessment according to Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987).

Because the student's oral reading in the Start-Up Session was of text not previously read or heard, the semantic acceptability score in that session is likely a good index of the difficulty level of the book relative to the student. On that basis, the results in Table 14 suggest there were wide variations in the initial difficulty levels of the books chosen by each student. The ranges of scores (and mean scores) for the students were: John, 0% to 52% (a mean of 27%); Max, 44% to 82% (a mean of 62%); and Sam, 0% to 21% (a mean of 13%). The high level of variation within the selections by each student suggests that some, perhaps even all, of the selections were not made in accordance with the modified Rule of Thumb procedure. Such variability within each student's selections seems to make any gauging of the effect of the feedback on subsequent oral reading sessions impracticable within the present study. While no clear patterns of feedback influence on subsequent sessions were readily discernible, it is noteworthy that Max, whose mean Start-Up Session score was considerably higher than those of John and Sam (and more likely to approach the difficulty levels the investigator originally intended for use in the study), showed a consistent increase in Start-Up Session semantic acceptability scores after feedback was introduced into his individualized reading program (59%, 62%, and 82%, respectively). While this pattern is not strong enough within the overall results to support any claims about the influence of the feedback procedure on subsequent oral

reading sessions in this study, it is consistent with such an influence.

Involvement and Reaction

Student Interviews

On May 15, 1990, the investigator met with each student individually to obtain the student's ideas and opinions about the recently completed reading project. The investigator used an interview schedule to structure the discussion, all of which was recorded on audio tape and later transcribed (see Appendix T).

The students' responses indicated that they had highly favorable views about the reading project. Each student selected and circled the "happiest" face (on a sheet showing a range of 5 facial expressions) to represent his opinion of the reading project. Furthermore, all students said that the reading project had helped them. While each answer was different, one factor common to all was the inclusion of a reference to spelling, which was not an explicit feature of the project nor a topic of inordinate emphasis in the Grade 4 program in general. This apparently is a reflection of the high degree of surface-feature concern held by the students and indicated on other occasions during the study. However, the students' responses also showed an awareness and appreciation of other aspects of reading; these aspects were clearly revealed as the students spoke about some of the features of the individualized reading programs and their experiences

during the reading project.

The students commented very positively regarding the procedure used for selecting books for use in the individualized reading programs. They enjoyed exploring the collection, as indicated by Sam's comment, "I had fun finding new books and learning about new authors." They valued the freedom to select, in John's words, ". . . any book we liked," realizing that, as Max observed, "if we didn't like (a book), we could put it back and pick a different one."

The students reported that they liked the feature of having an audio cassette tape of each book (to use in the personal-type tape player, with headphones, on loan to each student). They found using the tapes enjoyable and helpful; for example, Max noted that "when you're reading along . . . when there's a hard word . . . it was always on the tape player." One use the students made of the tapes was in the Grade 4 classroom during Sustained Silent Reading. As John explained, ". . . I used to read (the passage) over with my tape and then turn it off and read it silently again." The students also used the tapes at home. For example, Sam reported, "I likes getting and reading a book. But where there's words I can't . . . I have trouble (with); but with the tape, I likes listening to it." Both Sam and Max reported, as had John, that they used the tape and book together, by reading along and/or by stopping the tape and reading on their own. Additionally, there were times they used the tape alone; for example, as Sam mentioned, ". . .

when you can't get to sleep . . . you can listen to the tape."

The students' responses confirmed that throughout the project the tapes had not replaced the trade books nor undermined the students' independent reading experiences with the books. The tapes were a complementary, supportive feature which the students could, and did, make use of. The students' comments showed how they had adapted the use of the tapes as a support to their various experiences with their trade books, including extensive amounts of independent silent reading.

Another feature which the students particularly enjoyed was conferencing, provided in the project through the Start-Up and Wrap-up Sessions. In John's opinion, "Mostly I liked it all because it was fun." However, several specific aspects of conferencing with the investigator were mentioned by the students. They liked the experience of sharing with the investigator a more complete introduction to the books they had chosen during the selection sessions. In Sam's words, "You gets to hear about the book and find out what it's like when you're reading it with me." Reading by the students was also mentioned as an important aspect of conferencing. John stated, "I liked (the conferencing) because then me and you gets to read. . . . You reads half of it and I reads half of it." However, student opinion about such activities may be greatly influenced by how the more competent reader responds, especially to student miscues. This is

clearly indicated in Sam's recollection about his feelings during his first conferencing session with the investigator: ". . . I was right worried if I got a word wrong . . . until you told me it was alright if I got a mistake." Other activities which involved interaction with others and which all 3 students said they enjoyed related to retelling and discussing the stories. This was a regular aspect of conferencing with the investigator and was encouraged by the investigator as a regular feature of parent-child activities at home.

During the interview sessions, the investigator specifically asked for student response about things they disliked about the reading project. The following are three examples, one from each student, selected from the complete student response (contained in Appendix T):

1. When asked if there was anything he disliked about using the books (in his individualized reading program) in the Grade 4 classroom, John commented:

"Sometimes when the teacher talks I can't hear her (because of the headphones) and someone has to tell me the teacher wants me (i.e., after silent reading has finished)."

2. When asked if there was anything he disliked about using the books (in his individualized reading program) in the Grade 4 classroom, Sam commented:

"When you're listening to the tape and you're just in the middle of the page, the teacher says that silent reading is over (and you can't finish). . . ."

3. When asked if there was anything he disliked about Wrap-Up Sessions, Max commented:

"Maybe if it was a good book, you wanted to keep it . . . and you didn't want to give it back."

Basic Sight Words

On January 12, 1990, the investigator met with the students individually and administered the Dolch List of 220 Basic Sight Words (Cunningham, Arthur, & Cunningham, 1977). On May 14, 1990, he met with each student individually and readministered the Dolch List. The results are shown in Table 15.

The January results revealed a mean score of 154.3. Individual student's scores were: John, 147; Max, 184; and Sam, 132. The May results revealed a mean score of 186.7, a gain of 32.4. Individual student's scores (and gains) were: John, 184 (37); Max, 201 (17); and Sam, 175 (43).

Holdaway (1980) expressed the opinion that a mastery of basic sight words is essential to fluency and ease of reading. Referring to the 220 words in the Dolch List, Cunningham, Arthur, and Cunningham (1977) maintained that all students should have mastered these words by the end of Grade 3 (although, they observed, many have not). While no explicit teaching procedures for these words were used in this study or in the Grade 4 program, the students did show substantial gains in sight word recognition scores over the period of the individualized reading programs. One probable explanation appeared to be the students' extensive independent reading experiences over the course of their individualized reading programs. Anderson et al. (1985) noted that "independent reading is probably a major source of vocabulary growth" (p. 77). Similarly, K.S. Goodman (1985) asserted that ". . .

Table 15

Gains in Recognition Scores on the Dolch List of
220 Basic Sight Words

Student	January 1990	May 1990	Difference
John	147	184	37
Max	184	201	17
Sam	132	175	43
Group Mean	154.3	186.7	32.4

- Note. 1. Criteria for calculating reading level, using number of words recognized: 0-75 (Preprimer), 76-120 (Primer), 121-170 (First), 171-210 (Second or above), and 211-220 (Third or above).
2. This procedure is described in Cunningham, Arthur, and Cunningham (1977).

vocabulary is built in the course of language use including reading" (p. 838). In the context of this study, Sam observed, "I'm learning new words and stuff, like, from the books."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Learning to read with understanding and personal satisfaction is widely recognized as a fundamental educational goal for all children. Beginning at an early age and continuing through the preschool years, children growing up in a print-oriented society receive a wide range of experiences which introduce them to reading. By the time they enter school and encounter more formal experiences with print, most children have already acquired a great deal of understanding about reading; indeed, some will already be able to read independently. While most children will continue to make satisfactory progress in their reading development throughout the early years of school, a significant number will experience great difficulty. Research indicates that when these difficulties are not resolved early, they tend to create cumulative effects, resulting in deep and widespread negative consequences not only in reading development, but in many other aspects of the students' academic and personal lives.

Although there have been exceptions, efforts to help students experiencing significant difficulties in reading have generally not been very successful. A major criticism of these programs has been their tendency to adopt a reductionistic, "skills and drills" approach. In contrast, a growing number of researchers and practitioners are now

advocating a different approach--one which takes into account the holistic/constructivist and developmental nature of language learning and helps these students learn to read the way successful readers do. This approach has been greatly influenced by studies of homes in which children have learned to read before school entry or whose learning proceeded without difficulty after school entry. The need exists for incorporating the understandings derived from this area of study within the programs provided for students experiencing significant difficulties in reading. Because of its flexibility, the individualized reading program appears to be one especially promising framework for providing such programs.

This present study investigated the effects of an individualized reading program involving 3 Grade 4 boys who were experiencing significant difficulties in reading. The program, using trade books selected by the students, included scheduled conferences between the student and the investigator (who was also the resource teacher) and ample opportunities for the student to experience and respond to his books independently and with his parent(s). The program was conducted over a period of approximately 15 weeks (from January 24 to May 10, 1990) and was organized in a way that enabled each student to maintain active involvement in the whole-class activities of the Grade 4 program. The aim of the individualized reading program was to provide both instructional and independent experiences conducive to developing attitudes and strategies that foster independence

in reading and improved skill in word identification and comprehension. The major questions underlying this study were:

1. Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading development in the following areas:
 - (a) reading comprehension, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, by Cloze tasks, and by retelling following oral reading?
 - (b) reading vocabulary, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests?
 - (c) reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured by Cloze tasks and by Reading Miscue Inventory Procedures II and III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?
 - (d) reading awareness, as measured by the Reading Interview (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987) and by a procedure adapted from Jacobs and Paris (1987)?
 - (e) self-perceptions about reading, as measured by a procedure adapted from Paris and Oka (1986)?
2. Within the context of an individualized reading program as implemented in this study, will the use of a planned approach to providing verbal feedback following the student's oral reading of an excerpt from his self-selected trade book improve his use of reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured

by a procedure entitled Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback and by an adaptation of Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?

The answers, based directly on information which has been presented in more detail in Chapter IV, are outlined below.

1(a). Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading comprehension, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, by Cloze tasks, and by retelling following oral reading?

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test for comprehension, Level B, Form 1, was administered as a pretest prior to the individualized reading program component of the study. The results, converted to Grade Equivalents, revealed that the group mean score (2.0) was below grade level, as was each individual score (John, 2.1; Max, 2.2; and Sam, 1.7). The results on the posttest, using Level B, Form 2, revealed a group mean score of 2.2, an increase of 0.2. Individual student's scores (and increases) were: John, 2.1 (0.0); Max, 2.5 (0.3); and Sam, 2.1 (0.4). According to test norms, one would expect that during the 5-month interval between testing students making average progress would have made a gain of 0.5 (i.e., 5 months). All students' gains were less than this. Most progress was shown by Sam's score of 0.4 (i.e., 4 months). The use of standardized, norm-referenced tests (such as the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests) to assess

instructional interventions is increasingly being questioned. Instead, more emphasis on individual- and process-oriented methods is advocated. Two such methods for measuring comprehension were used in this study: Cloze tasks and retelling following oral reading.

Cloze tasks at the students' independent and/or instructional levels were selected from the Diagnostic Reading Program as pretests and posttests. Passages at the Grade 1 level were used as pretests prior to the individualized reading programs. The group mean score was 63%. Individual student scores were John, 71%; Max, 63%; and Sam, 54%. Two posttests were used immediately after the individualized reading programs; passages from the pretest were used as a same-forms posttest and other passages at the Grade 1 level were used as an alternate-forms posttest. The results showed a gain in the mean score on both the same-forms and alternate-forms posttests (10.6% and 7.3%, respectively). Individual student scores (and gains) on the same-forms posttest were: John, 71% (0%); Max, 73% (10%); and Sam 76% (22%). On the alternative-forms posttest, the individual scores (and gains) were: John, 85% (14%); Max, 65% (2%); and Sam, 60% (6%).

A second process-oriented method for assessing comprehension, retelling following oral reading, was used in the study. Retelling was used in conjunction with RMI Procedure II in pretest and posttest sessions. The selection The Helpful Giant was used as a pretest prior to the

individualized reading programs. The results of the retelling procedure indicated a group mean score of 65.3%. Individual scores were: John, 64%; Max, 69%; and Sam, 63%. The selection was readministered after the individualized reading programs as a same-form posttest; a second selection, The Balancing Girl, was used as an alternate-form posttest. The results of the same-form posttest revealed a mean score of 78.0%, a gain of 12.7% over the pretest score. Individual scores (and gains) were: John, 72% (8%); Max, 82% (13%); and Sam, 80% (17%). Results on the alternate-form posttest revealed a mean score of 78.7%, a gain of 13.4% over the pretest score. Individual scores (and gains) were: John, 76% (12%); Max, 79% (10%); and Sam, 81% (18%).

Whereas the results on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test had indicated a trend towards increased comprehension (though not to the extent expected for a 5-month period), the two process-oriented procedures (Cloze tasks and retelling following oral reading) clearly indicated increased student performance in reading comprehension as measured before and after the individualized reading programs.

1(b). Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading vocabulary, as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests?

During the study, measures of student vocabulary development were obtained by means of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test for vocabulary. Level B, Form 1, was administered as a pretest prior to the individualized reading program component

of the study. The results, converted to Grade Equivalents, revealed that the group mean score (1.7) was below their grade level of 4.4, as was each individual score: John, 1.5; Max, 2.1; and Sam, 1.5. (John's and Sam's results, because of extremely low raw scores, were assigned a score of 1.5, the lowest value in the test's table of norms.) The results on the posttest using Level B, Form 2, revealed a group mean score of 2.0, an increase of 0.3. Individual student scores (and increases) were: John, 2.3 (0.8); Max, 2.1 (0.0); and Sam, 1.7 (0.2). According to test norms, one would expect that during the 5-month interval between testing the students would have made a gain of 0.5 (i.e., 5 months). One student, John, showed a gain above the expected level. His increase of 0.8, which was 0.3 above the expected level, may even have been higher than measured (because of the procedure for handling his extremely low raw score). Both Max's and Sam's gains were less than expected (although Sam's gain may have been higher than measured, because of the procedure for handling his extremely low raw score). Results on a second procedure, not included as a formal component of this study but administered concurrently, showed distinct gains in word recognition. Students were assessed by the investigator by means of the Dolch List of 220 basic sight words in January and in May, 1990. The results in January revealed a group mean score of 154.3; the students' individual scores were: John, 147; Max, 184; and Sam, 132. The results in May revealed a group mean score of 186.7, a gain of 32.4.

Individual student scores (and gains) were: John, 184 (37); Max, 201 (17); and Sam, 175 (43). These substantial gains occurred during the period of the study, although no explicit procedure for teaching these words was used in the study or the Grade 4 language arts program in general. The growth evident in the students' vocabulary and sight word recognition occurred during the time period of this study and appeared to be related to their instructional and independent experiences with print and oral language during the period of their individualized reading programs.

1(c). Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured by Cloze tasks and by Reading Miscue Inventory Procedures II and III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?

Students' performances on Cloze tasks provide a measure of their ability to construct meaning while silently reading text. The students demonstrated by their comprehension results on the Cloze pretest and posttests (discussed in 1(a), above) increased effectiveness in using language cues and reading strategies to achieve meaning.

Students' use of reading strategies while reading orally was assessed by two miscue analysis procedures. RMI Procedure II was used to assess each student's oral reading of a pretest selection and two posttest selections chosen by the investigator from the current Grade 2 language arts program (though unfamiliar to the 3 students in this study). The

Helpful Giant was used as a pretest selection prior to the individualized reading programs and was readministered as a same-form posttest following the individualized reading programs. A second selection, The Balancing Girl, was administered as an alternate-form posttest.

On the pretest, the group mean score for Language Sense (S/PS), the combined values for Strength and Partial Strength patterns, was 38.5%, which indicated a relatively low level of proficiency in the students' selection and use of reading strategies to construct meaning. Group mean results also showed a heavy reliance on graphophonic cues. Individual scores for Language Sense (S/PS) were: John, 27.3%; Max, 62.3%; and Sam, 26.0%. Each student, but especially Sam, showed a high reliance on graphophonic cues. On the same-form posttest, the group mean score for Language Sense (S/PS) was 53.7%, an increase of 15.2% over the pretest. Individual scores (and gains) were: John, 46.8% (19.5%); Max, 74.0% (11.7%); and Sam, 40.3% (14.3%). The group mean and individual results showed, as in the pretest, heavy reliance on graphophonic cues. On the alternate-form posttest, the group mean score for Language Sense (S/PS) was 36.5%, a decrease of 2.0% compared with pretest results. Individual scores (and gains) were: John, 29.4% (2.1%); Max, 52.0% (-10.3%); and Sam, 28.0% (2.0%). The Language Sense (S/PS) scores on the alternate-form posttest compared with the same-form posttest and the even greater reliance noted on graphophonic cues suggest that the selection The Balancing Girl was in some

way(s) more difficult than the selection The Helpful Giant, despite efforts by the investigator to choose selections of comparable characteristics, including their anticipated difficulty for the students. Relative to the pretest results, the students' mean and individual scores on the same-form posttest indicated increased proficiency in the use of language cues and reading strategies in the process of constructing meaning as they read.

RMI Procedure III was used to examine samples of each student's oral reading of excerpts from his self-selected trade books during conferencing sessions over the course of his individualized reading program. The student read each excerpt on two occasions (in the Start-Up Session and in the Wrap-Up Session), thus providing an opportunity for same-form comparison. In Procedure III, proficiency in the use of reading strategies is indicated by the scores for syntactic and semantic acceptability and for degree of meaning change. The graphic similarity score indicates the extent to which the reader has made use of the graphophonic cueing system in the process of constructing meaning.

Group mean scores for the Start-Up Sessions revealed 48.7% for syntactic acceptability, 34.0% for semantic acceptability, and 86.3% for meaning change (No and Partial, combined). The score of 93.4% for graphic similarity (High and Some, combined) showed a heavy reliance on graphophonic cues. Together, these scores indicated a low level of proficiency

in the selection and use of language cues and reading strategies during reading of these materials. The results seemed to reflect the initial high level of difficulty of the materials selected by the students (relative to the students' independent reading abilities). The group mean results for the Wrap-Up Sessions revealed only a moderate degree of proficiency, yet this showed a distinct improvement over Start-Up Session results. The group mean scores were: syntactic acceptability, 66.3% (an increase of 17.6%); semantic acceptability, 58.3% (an increase of 24.3%); and meaning change, 90.3% (an increase of 4.0%). The graphic similarity composite score remained high, at 92.7% (a decrease of 0.7%). Although there was considerable variation in the overall proficiency shown by the students, each student showed distinct gains. The individual scores (and gains) for syntactic acceptability and semantic acceptability were: John, 60% syntactic acceptability (a gain of 14%) and 50% semantic acceptability (a gain of 23%); Max, 88% syntactic acceptability (a gain of 14%) and 86% semantic acceptability (a gain of 24%); and Sam, 51% syntactic acceptability (a gain of 25%) and 39% semantic acceptability (a gain of 26%). These results indicated that, on rereading the same text approximately 10 days later, the students showed an increased level of proficiency in selecting and using reading strategies while engaged in constructing meaning. Because of the wide variations in the difficulty levels of the trade books, both within the nine books chosen by each student and across the

nine-book selections of the 3 students, using the information provided by Procedure III as a way to measure progress over the course of the study was not practicable. However, the group mean and individual results on the Cloze task and RMI Procedure II indicated that over the period of the study the students did improve their proficiency in the selection and use of reading strategies.

1(d). Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's reading awareness, as measured by the Reading Interview (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987) and by a procedure adapted from Jacobs and Paris (1987)?

Reading interviews were conducted individually with each student prior to and following the individualized reading programs, on December 14, 1989, and May 15, 1990, respectively. In both sessions John indicated an awareness of the importance of "making sense" during reading. While he did in the December session mention several high quality strategies, in the May session he added to and elaborated on these. However, in both sessions John included "breaking it down," a strategy of dubious efficacy in proficient reading. John showed an awareness of the circumstances which are helpful to developing independence while learning to read. His remarks in both sessions revealed a positive view of what reading offers him. Moreover, his responses in May showed a more positive, self-confident view of his current and future levels of development as a reader.

Max's responses in both sessions reflected a high surface-feature orientation towards reading. He made no explicit reference to the role of "making sense." Instead, he referred to such aspects as spelling, accuracy, and hard words. In both sessions he referred to "breaking it down," which is a strategy of doubtful efficacy. While in the December session this was the first strategy Max identified, in the May session it was identified second to a strategy generally considered more effective for proficiency reading (skip it and go on). In both sessions, Max's responses indicated a positive view of what reading offers him and of his progress as a reader.

In both sessions Sam's responses indicated an awareness of the role that "making sense" plays in proficient reading. In December, he referred to several high-quality strategies available as he reads; however, he also included references to "sounding it out." His response in May included the same strategies; however, he identified them in a different order, with "sounding it out" mentioned last. Sam's comments about his experiences with "sounding it out" suggested he was becoming aware that this was not a very helpful strategy for him. Sam's responses in both sessions showed a high surface-feature orientation; he frequently referred to spelling, recognizing more words, and harder words. He indicated that he values his parents' involvement in his reading; although he is dubious about some aspects of these home experiences, especially "sounding out" words and reading aloud. Sam

seemed to have a positive view of what reading offers him and of his progress in reading. His responses in the May session indicated a change in his view about effective ways to help a reader experiencing difficulties; his suggestions were more holistic, less centered on surface features, and more interactive on the part of the participants.

The Reading Interviews in December revealed that to varying degrees each student reported beliefs and strategies which indicated a subskills view of reading. However, both John and Sam also explicitly referred to "making sense" as an important aspect of reading and included references to strategies and experiences consistent with this process. In the May sessions, John's and Sam's responses indicated increased recognition of the importance of making sense and awareness of appropriate strategies for achieving it. Interestingly, Max's responses in both sessions lacked any explicit reference to "making sense," although in actual reading situations (both in the study and elsewhere) he showed a tacit understanding of its role. All 3 students, in both sessions, seemed to have relatively positive views about the role of reading in their lives and of their present and future levels of development as readers.

Ideas About Reading, a 20-item multiple-choice instrument designed to assess reading awareness, was administered to the 3 students as a group prior to and following the individualized reading programs (on December 18, 1989, and May 16, 1990, respectively). The results of the pretest

revealed a group mean score of 25.6 (out of a possible maximum of 40.0). Each of the instrument's four major categories was relatively equally represented, with mean subscores (out of a possible maximum of 10.0) of 6.3 (Evaluation), 6.3 (Planning), 6.3 (Regulation), and 6.7 (Conditional Knowledge). Individual student's total scores on the pretest were: John, 28; Max, 26; and Sam, 23. Results on the posttest revealed a group mean score of 30.4, an increase of 4.8. While each of the four subscores showed an increase, the greatest gains were in two categories: (a) Evaluation of the reading task and one's own abilities (1.7); and (b) Planning to reach a specified reading goal (2.4). Individual student's total scores on the posttest were: John, 33 (a gain of 5); Max, 28 (a gain of 2); and Sam, 30 (a gain of 7). These were substantial gains, with the students' total scores on the posttest comparing quite favorably with those reported by Mulcahy et al. (1987).

The results of the Reading Interviews and the Ideas About Reading assessments indicated that in December these students held generally positive and favorable views about reading and displayed a good level of awareness of the strategic nature of reading. Moreover, the results in May indicated further growth, with certain aspects showing distinct increases, especially in awareness about the central role of "making sense" and of strategies appropriate to achieving this, for use before, during, and after reading.

1(e). Will an individualized reading program as implemented in this study improve the student's self-perceptions about reading, as measured by a procedure adapted from Paris and Oka (1986)?

The procedure was administered to the 3 students as a group on December 19, 1989, as a pretest and on May 16, 1990, as a posttest. The pretest results showed a group mean total score of 28.4 (out of a possible maximum of 35). The individual total scores on the pretest were: John, 27; Max, 26; and Sam, 32. The posttest results showed a group mean total score of 25.7, a gain of -2.7. Individual student total scores (and gains) were: John, 24 (-3); Max, 26 (0); and Sam, 27 (-5). The overall results showed a notable degree of stability; this is consistent with the observation by Paris and Oka (1986) that self-perceptions about reading likely are enduring characteristics and as such are not likely to be influenced by relatively brief instructional interventions. Moreover, the results showed a notable degree of similarity of scores on the pretest and the posttest within the same item for each student and across all students. Perhaps the most remarkable results were in response to the item "I think that I won't be a very good reader in high school." On both the pretest and the posttest, all 3 students rated it at the highest value on the scale, which indicated that they totally disagreed with the statement.

The posttest results revealed that despite a slight decline in the mean total score, the individual total scores

remained strongly positioned on the scale, indicating that positive self-perceptions were maintained over the period of the study.

2. Within the context of an individualized reading program as implemented in this study, will the use of a planned approach to providing verbal feedback following the student's oral reading of an excerpt from his self-selected trade book improve his use of reading strategies (prediction, confirmation, and correction), as measured by a procedure entitled Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback and by an adaptation of Reading Miscue Inventory Procedure III (Y.M. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987)?

Using the audio tapes of a sample of each student's Start-Up Sessions in which feedback by investigator was a component, the investigator examined the student's reading behavior while engaged in rereading sentences in which meaning-disruptive miscues had occurred during the original, independent reading. Using the instrument Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback, he rated the degree of independence shown by the student in noticing and resolving the miscues. The group mean results for this procedure showed that an average of 3.4 sentences were examined in each session. The group mean score for Monitoring (74.7%) indicated that in the context of the feedback activity the students were able to assume a large share of responsibility for noticing the meaning-disruptive miscues. However, the group mean score for Correcting (30.7%) indicated that they were

quite reliant on the investigator for support in resolving these miscues. The group mean score of 52.7% for Combined (Monitoring and Correcting) reflected the two separate scores and indicated that in the context of the feedback activity the students were able to assume a moderate level of independence in fulfilling these reading responsibilities.

John's mean results revealed a moderate degree of independence, in the context of the feedback activity, in both Monitoring (57%) and Correcting (53%), and yielded a Combined score of 55%. These results seemed quite favorable in relation to results of the RMI Procedure III assessments of his independent reading of these excerpts, which had revealed a low level of proficiency in John's selection and use of reading strategies.

Max's mean results revealed a relatively high degree of independence in Monitoring (88%); however, his score in Correcting (0%) suggested a very heavy reliance on investigator support for resolving the miscues noticed during the feedback activity. His Combined score of 44% suggested a tendency towards dependence on investigator support during the feedback activity. However, since Max's results were based on a comparatively small number of sentences examined (4), this may have strongly influenced the results, especially his Correcting score.

Sam's mean results revealed a relatively good level of independence in Monitoring (79%), although his score in Correcting (39%) suggested a strong reliance on investigator

support in resolving those miscues noticed during the feedback activity. Sam's Combined score (59%) indicated a moderate degree of independence in assuming these reading responsibilities within the context of the feedback activity. These results seemed quite positive in comparison with the results of the RMI Procedure III assessments of his independent reading of the excerpts, which had revealed an extremely low level of proficiency. It appeared that the feedback activity encouraged Sam not only to monitor for meaning but also to select and apply correcting strategies when needed.

The review of student response to correcting feedback indicated that despite the low levels of proficiency the students had shown during their initial independent reading of the excerpts, during the subsequent feedback activity they revealed a good deal of awareness about reading strategies and, with investigator support to the extent needed, showed increased proficiency in applying these strategies. Furthermore, the students seemed to enjoy the experiences and actively participated in discussing the subject matter, the particular reading tasks, and the reading process generally.

Conclusions

This study investigated the effects of an individualized reading program on the reading development of 3 Grade 4 boys who were experiencing significant difficulties in reading. The program, using trade books selected by the students, involved regular conferencing with the investigator and ample

opportunities for the students to experience and respond to their books independently and with their parents. The program, conducted over a period of approximately 15 weeks, was organized in such a way that the students were able to maintain active involvement in the whole-class Grade 4 language arts program. The anticipated outcomes of the individualized reading program were that each student would develop those attitudes and strategies that foster independence in reading and would show increased abilities in word identification and reading comprehension.

During the period of the study, individual- and process-oriented assessments showed improvements in the students' awareness about reading and in their reading proficiency, as indicated by their selection and use of reading strategies to construct meaning while reading and by direct measures of reading comprehension. The assessments revealed that the students maintained or increased their levels of interest and their self-perceptions related to reading and that they had highly favorable reactions regarding their experiences with the individualized reading program.

While many factors, some quite subtle, exert important influences during the course of any instructional intervention, several factors seemed to have been especially significant in this study. The individualized reading program was developed to complement the objectives and instructional approach underlying the Grade 4 language arts program in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, which is largely a

holistic, process-oriented program in which meaning is accorded a central role in reading and reading instruction. Continuing communication between the classroom teacher and the investigator helped ensure a consistency of instructional approach for the students and, through cooperation on scheduling, enabled the students to remain active members of the whole-class program.

Continuing communication between the parents and the investigator also played an important role in ensuring their support and in encouraging and enabling the parents to actively participate in their children's activities at home in a way consistent with the approach provided in school.

In addition to enabling the students to maintain active participation in the whole-class Grade 4 program, the individualized reading program provided a range of social contexts for student learning. The students met regularly with the investigator in individual conferences. They were encouraged to read and share related activities with their parents at home. They read their trade books, using tapes and personal tape players if desired, during the daily Sustained Silent Reading activities in the Grade 4 classroom. Another important social context for reading development was the group activities involving the 3 students and the investigator. The selection sessions, assessment sessions, and frequent informal meetings for organizational purposes all contributed to a noticeable spirit of camaraderie amongst the students. (In addition to these social contexts, the

students reported spending considerable time in solitary reading activities, especially at home.)

The individualized reading programs provided ample opportunity for the students to express their interests and preferences, to make use of their experiences and language strengths, and to influence or control their involvement in the programs. For example, the students eagerly explored the selection of trade books and made choices which reflected strong personal commitments. The desire to work with a particular title often took precedence over the difficulty of the book for independent reading; the student was aware that there were bridges available to him to make the book accessible (e.g., prior discussion with the investigator; use of the tape; listening to a parent read; and/or rereading sections himself). Other examples include the students' responsibility for organizing their activities at home on the days between conferences, the opportunity to choose favorite parts of the books for discussion with the investigator, and deciding appropriate ways to represent their personal responses to their books as My Turn activities.

The individualized reading programs were developed in a way that would encourage and enable the students to engage in high-volume reading and related experiences with print (e.g., read-along, listening, writing, and illustrating), both alone and within social contexts. A complementary feature of the individualized reading programs was extensive regular conferencing with the investigator. These conferences helped to

prepare the students for independent activities with their books and to review the activities upon completion. However, they also served as a context for instruction related to reading awareness and strategy development through such investigator/student interactions as discussion, questioning, modelling, and reinforcing and correcting feedback.

The results of the study demonstrated that Grade 4 students who are experiencing significant reading difficulties respond with interest and enthusiasm to a holistic approach and that an individualized reading program can be an effective means for providing independent and instructional experiences that benefit their reading development.

Implications

The growing recognition of the holistic and developmental characteristics of language learning is exerting a profound influence on educational programs. Increasingly it is being recognized that incorporating a holistic, developmental perspective within school programs is beneficial for the language development of all students, including those experiencing difficulties in reading (e.g., Clay, 1979; Buchanan, 1980; Holdaway, 1980, 1982; Church & Newman, 1985; Newman, 1985a; K.S. Goodman, 1986; Boehnlein, 1987; Phinney, 1988; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988). One holistic, developmental approach with proven effectiveness within the school setting is the individualized reading program (Holdaway, 1980).

The present study found that the 3 Grade 4 students, each of whom was experiencing significant difficulties in reading, responded favorably to a holistic approach developed within the framework of an individualized reading program. Resource teachers (special education teachers) should therefore give consideration to using the individualized reading program as a framework for developing their own holistic programs for readers experiencing difficulties.

Although these have been exceptions, the results of programs intended to help students experiencing significant difficulties in reading have not been encouraging (Clay, 1985; Haynes & Jenkins, 1986; Milligan, 1986; Allington, 1987). Criticisms of these programs have cited their tendency to establish a separate curriculum, unrelated to the regular classroom programs and based on a "skills and drills" approach which focuses on the students' language weaknesses, deprives them of time in genuine reading, and neglects helping them to develop the awareness and behaviors associated with proficient reading. Many prominent educators have advocated an alternate approach, based on a holistic, developmental perspective, which would serve to redress these program deficiencies and help the students learn to read the way successful readers do (Holdaway, 1980; Clay, 1985; Newman, 1985a; K.S. Goodman, 1986; Allington, 1987; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988; Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989).

In the present study, the 3 students maintained active involvement in the whole-class Grade 4 program. Within their

individualized reading programs, they engaged in instructional and independent reading experiences which were consistent with the objectives and instructional approach of the prescribed language program for Grade 4. The students enjoyed examining the collection of trade books (assembled by the investigator to reflect their ages, grade level, and interests) and choosing books of greatest personal interest. Frequently, their choices were books of exceptional difficulty as measured by the students' independent reading abilities; however, the students were aware of (and made informed use of) the techniques available in their individualized reading programs to make the books more accessible (e.g., introductions by the investigator; tapes and personal tape players for read-alongs; reading with parents at home; re-readings). During the approximately 10 days they had each book, the students had ample opportunities for reading and otherwise working with their books in school (mainly during daily Sustained Silent Reading in their classroom) and at home. The students accepted a large measure of the responsibility for organizing these activities. Besides those already mentioned, other areas of independence or choice provided within the individualized reading programs included selecting a favorite part of the story for sharing with the investigator, maintaining a simple record of reading activities in the reading folder, and selecting a My Turn personal-response activity (e.g., drawing a picture of a favorite scene) upon completing a book. In addition to the

time spent independently, the students met regularly with the investigator in individual conferences to initiate and to conclude activities relating to each trade book selected. Incorporated within these conferences were instructional activities which specifically focused on the student's reading awareness and strategy development through techniques such as discussion, questioning, investigator modelling, and the provision of reinforcing and correcting verbal feedback. Resource teachers should give consideration to the elements incorporated within the present study and decide whether, in whole or in part, these elements could be used in the resource teachers' programs for students experiencing difficulties in reading.

The study also raised some areas of possible interest for further investigation:

1. In an individualized reading program such as implemented in this study, what would be the effects if the investigator ensured greater student compliance with the procedure for selecting the trade books? Would using "easier" books (i.e., books which the modified Rule of Thumb or other student-oriented criteria showed were closer to the student's instructional level) contribute more substantially to the student's reading development and in what specific area(s)?
2. In the present study, the variability in the difficulty levels within each student's nine-book selection made it impractical to attempt to determine whether the

feedback activity influenced the student's reading performance in subsequent sessions. Within a context such as described in 1 (above) or another program where student books are of a more consistent level of difficulty, does the procedure for providing verbal feedback demonstrate any transfer effects to subsequent reading sessions?

3. Although it was not a focus of investigation, parent involvement was a major consideration during the development of this study and was solicited and actively encouraged by the investigator throughout the study. All parents responded with interest and support. Their involvement undoubtedly played a significant role in their children's programs. Investigators might consider examining parental involvement in school programs intended to help children experiencing difficulties. What are the characteristics of helpful involvement by parents? Can parents play a more effective role? What are the needs and expectations of the parents, the school, and the students in regard to cooperative efforts? In a social environment which is calling for increased cooperation between home and school and at a time when the approach to reading development for all students, including those with special needs, is changing considerably, obtaining the answers to these and related questions seems to be of particular importance.

4. Researchers and educators have noted that the results of many programs to help students experiencing reading difficulties have not been encouraging and that the prospects for significant improvement for most of these students are bleak. A growing number of researchers and educators are advocating a holistic approach for all students, including those experiencing difficulties. There is an obvious need to conduct research into holistic programs to determine the characteristics of effective programs and ways to apply these characteristics in other contexts. Two types of investigations which seem to be especially warranted amongst this research are long-term studies and case studies.

References

- Alberta Education. (1986). Diagnostic reading program. Edmonton: Government of Alberta.
- Allen, P. D. (1976). Implications for reading instruction. In P. D. Allen & D. Watson (Eds.), Findings of research on miscue analysis: Classroom implications (pp. 107-112). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Allington, R. L. (1987). Shattered hopes: Why two federal reading programs have failed to correct reading failure. Learning, 16, 60-64.
- Allington, R. L., & Shake, M. C. (1986). Remedial reading: Achieving curricular congruence in classroom and clinic. Reading Teacher, 39, 648-654.
- Altwerger, B., Edelsky, C., & Flores, B. M. (1987). Whole Language: What's new? Reading Teacher, 41, 144-154.
- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading.
- Badian, N. A. (1988). The prediction of good and poor reading before kindergarten entry: A nine-year follow-up. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 98-103, 123.
- Baghban, M. (1984). Our daughter learns to read and write. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Becher, R. M. (1985). Parent involvement and reading achievement: A review of research and implications for practice. Childhood Education, 62, 44, 46, 48-50.
- Boehnlein, M. (1987). Reading intervention with high-risk first-graders. Educational Leadership, 44, 32-37.
- Buchanan, E. (Ed.). (1980). For the love of reading. Winnipeg: C. E. L. Group.
- Butler, S. R., Marsh, H. W., Sheppard, M. J., & Sheppard, J. L. (1985). Seven-year longitudinal study of the early prediction of reading achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, 349-361.
- Carbo, M. (1987). Reading styles research: "What works" isn't always phonics. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 431-435.

- Chapman, D. L. (1986). Let's read another one. In D. R. Tovey & J. E. Kerber (Eds.), Roles in literacy learning: A new perspective (pp. 10-25). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Church, S., & Newman, J. M. (1985). Danny: A case history of an instructionally induced reading problem. In J. M. Newman (Ed.), Whole language: Theory in use (pp. 169-179). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clarke, M. A. (1987). Don't blame the system: Constraints on "whole language" reform. Language Arts, 64, 384-396.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). Reading: The patterning of complex behaviour (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties (3rd ed.). Auckland: Heinemann.
- Cullinan, B. E. (1987). Inviting readers to literature. In B. E. Cullinan (Ed.), Children's literature in the reading program (pp. 2-14). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Cunningham, P. M., Arthur, S. V., & Cunningham, J.W. (1977). Classroom reading instruction K-5: Alternative approaches. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- DeFord, D. E. (1981). Literacy: Reading, writing, and other essentials. Language Arts, 58, 652-658.
- Department of Education. (1987). Special education policy manual. St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Department of Education. (1988). Reading and writing difficulties: An educator's handbook. St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Department of Education. (1989). Program of studies. St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Doake, D. B. (1979). Preschool book handling knowledge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Doake, D. B. (1986). Learning to read: It starts in the home. In D. R. Tovey & J. E. Kerber (Eds.), Roles in literacy learning: A new perspective (pp. 2-9). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Doake, D. B. (1988). Reading begins at birth. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.

- Fagan, W. T. (1988). Literacy in Canada: A critique of the Southam Report. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34, 224-231.
- Farr, R., & Carey, R. F. (1986). Reading: What can be measured? Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Fielding, L., Wilson, P., & Anderson, R. (1986). A new focus on free reading: The role of trade books in reading. In T. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (pp. 149-160). New York: Random House.
- Fredericks, A. D., & Taylor, D. (1985). Parent programs in reading: Guidelines for success. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Gates-MacGinitie reading tests: Teacher's manual. (1980). Toronto: Nelson Canada.
- Goodman, K. S. (1973). Analysis of oral reading miscues: Applied psycholinguistics. In F. Smith, Psycholinguistics and reading (pp. 158-176). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Goodman, K. S. (1982). Strategies for increasing comprehension in reading. In F. V. Gollasch (Ed.), Language and literacy: The selected writings of Kenneth S. Goodman (Vol. II) (pp. 61-71). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Goodman, K. S. (1985). Unity in reading. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (3rd ed.) (pp. 813-840). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Goodman, K. S. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.
- Goodman, K. S. (1987). Beyond basal readers: Taking charge of your own teaching. Learning, 16, 62-65.
- Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. (1977). Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analysing oral reading. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 317-333.
- Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. (1981). A whole-language comprehension-centered view of reading development (Occasional Paper No. 1, Program in Language and Literacy). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.
- Goodman, Y. M. (1970). Using children's reading miscues for new teaching strategies. Reading Teacher, 23, 455-459.

- Goodman, Y. M. (1976). Strategies for comprehension. In P. D. Allen & D. Watson (Eds.). Findings of research on miscue analysis: Classroom implications (94-102). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Goodman, Y. M., & Burke, C. (1980). Reading strategies: Focus on comprehension. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (1987). Reading miscue inventory: Alternate procedures. New York: Owen.
- Grant, J., & Brown, C. (1986). Precocious readers: A comparative study of early reading and non early reading kindergarten entrants. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 32, 223-233.
- Grundin, H. U. (1985). A commission of selective readers: A critique of Becoming a nation of readers. Reading Teacher, 39, 262-266.
- Gunderson, L. (1989). A whole language primer. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.
- Haynes, M. C., & Jenkins, J. R. (1986). Reading instruction in special education rooms. American Educational Research Journal, 23, 161-191.
- Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy. Gosford, NSW: Ashton, Scholastic.
- Holdaway, D. (1980). Independence in reading (2nd ed.). Gosford, NSW: Ashton Scholastic.
- Holdaway, D. (1982). Shared book experience: Teaching reading using favorite books. Theory into Practice, 21, 293-300.
- Holdaway, D. (1984). Stability and change in literacy learning. London, Ontario: Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario.
- Huck, C. S. (1982). I'll give you the end of a golden string. Theory into Practice, 21, 315-321.
- Huey, E. B. (1908). The psychology and pedagogy of reading. New York: Macmillan. (Reprinted by MIT Press, 1968).
- Iredell, H. (1898). Eleanor learns to read. Education, 14. (Reprinted in Language Arts, 59, 668-671).

- Jacobs, J. E., & Paris, S. G. (1987). Children's meta-cognition about reading. Issues in definition, measurement and instruction. Educational Psychologist, 22, 255-278.
- Johnston, P. H. (1984). Assessment in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 147-182). New York: Longman.
- Krippner, S. (1963). The boy who read at eighteen months. Exceptional Children, 30, 105-109.
- Lamme, L. L. (1987). Children's literature: The natural way to learn to read. In B. E. Cullinan (Ed.), Children's literature in the reading program (pp. 41-53). Newark: DE: International Reading Association.
- Landsberg, M. (1985). Michele Landsberg's guide to children's books. Markham, Ontario: Penguin.
- Landsberg, M. (1986, April). Once upon a time, when pigs spoke rhyme. . . . Canadian Living, pp. 55-56, 59, 61-62.
- Larrick, N. (1982). A parent's guide to children's reading (5th ed.). Toronto: Bantam.
- Lass, B. (1982). Portrait of my son as an early reader. Reading Teacher, 36, 20-28.
- Leinhardt, G., & Bickel, W. (1987). Instruction's the thing wherein to catch the mind that falls behind. Educational Psychologist, 22, 177-207.
- Leu, D. J., Jr. (1982). Oral reading error analysis: A critical review of research and application. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 420-437.
- Limbrick, E., McNaughton, S., & Glynn, T. (1981). Training low progress readers to use contextual cues: generalized effects on comprehension, oral accuracy and rate. Educational Psychology, 1, 221-229.
- Lynch, P., & Peetoom, A. (1987). Three I's professional manual. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.
- Maring, G. H. (1978). Matching remediation to miscues. Reading Teacher, 31, 887-891.
- McInnes, J. (1983). LDR Networks: Teacher's resource book A. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- McNaughton, S., Glynn, T., & Robinson, V. M. (1981). Parents as remedial reading tutors. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- McTeague, F. (1987). The empowering pleasure of children's books. Canadian Journal of English Language Arts, 10, 38-46.
- Meaney, K. (1989 February 21). Three strings attached to literacy funding. The Evening Telegram, p. 6.
- Milligan, J. L. (1986). The seven most common mistakes made by remedial reading teachers. Journal of Reading, 30, 140-144.
- Mulcahy, R. F., Andrews, J., & Peat, D. (1987). Cognitive education: A longitudinal examination. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Nagy, W. E., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How many words are there in printed school English? Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 304-330.
- Newman, J. M. (1985a). Insights from recent reading and writing research and their implications for developing whole language curriculum. In J. M. Newman (Ed.), Whole language: Theory in use (pp. 7-36). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Newman, J. M. (1985b). Introduction. In J. M. Newman (Ed.), Whole language: Theory in use (pp. 1-6). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Paris, S. G., Cross, D. R., & Lipson, M. Y. (1984). Informed strategies for learning: A program to improve children's reading awareness and comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1239-1252.
- Paris, S. G., & Jacobs, J. E. (1984). The benefits of informed instruction for children's reading awareness and comprehension skills. Child Development, 55, 2083-2093.
- Paris, S. G., & Oka, E. R. (1986). Children's reading strategies, metacognition, and motivation. Developmental Review, 6, 25-56.
- Paris, S. G., & Wixson, K. K. (1986). The development of literacy: Access, acquisition, and instruction. In D. Bloome (Ed.), Literacy and schooling (pp. 35-54). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Park, B. (1986). Shared reading promotes student engagement. Highway One, 9, 29-32.
- Peetoom, A. (1986). Shared reading: Safe risks with whole books. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.

- Phinney, M. Y. (1988). Reading with the troubled reader. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.
- Poplin, M. S. (1988a). Holistic/constructivist principles of the teaching/learning process: Implications for the field of learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 401-416.
- Poplin, M. S. (1988b). The reductionistic fallacy in learning disabilities: Replicating the past by reducing the present. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 389-400.
- Reading Today. (1988). International literacy year. Reading Today, 5, 5.
- Reading Today. (1989). Perspectives on literacy. Reading Today, 6, 1.
- Rhodes, L. K., & Dudley-Marling, C. (1988). Readers and writers with a difference: A holistic approach to teaching learning disabled and remedial students. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rich, S. J. (1985). Restoring power to teachers: The impact of "whole language." Language Arts, 62, 717-724.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1982). The literary transaction: Evocation and response. Theory into Practice, 21, 268-277.
- Slaughter, H. B. (1988). Indirect and direct teaching in a whole language program. Reading Teacher, 42, 30-34.
- Smith, F. (1973). Twelve easy ways to make learning to read difficult. . . . In F. Smith, Psycholinguistics and reading (pp. 183-196). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Smith, F. (1985). Reading without nonsense (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers' College Press, Teachers' College, Columbia University.
- Snow, C. B. (1983). Literacy and language: Relationships during the preschool years. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 165-189.
- Spiro, R. J., Bruce, B. C., & Brewer, W. F. (Eds.). (1980). Theoretical issues in reading comprehension. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-407.

- Stewart, I. S. (1985). Kindergarten reading curriculum: Reading abilities, not reading readiness. Childhood Education, 61, 356-360.
- Strickland, D. S., & Morrow, L. M. (1988). New perspectives on young children learning to read and write. Reading Teacher, 42, 70-71.
- Strickland, D. S., & Morrow, L. M. (1989). Family literacy and young children. Reading Teacher, 42, 530-531.
- Taylor, J. (1977). Making sense: The basic skill in reading. Language Arts, 54, 668-672.
- Teale, W. H. (1987). The emergent literacy classroom. Reading Today, 5, 14.
- Tunnell, M. O., & Jacobs, J. S. (1989). Using "real" books: Research findings on literature based reading instruction. Reading Teacher, 42, 470-477.
- Veatch, J. (1968). How to teach reading with children's books (2nd ed.). New York: Owen.
- Winograd, P., & Greenlee, M. (1986). Students need a balanced reading program. Educational Leadership, 43, 16-21.

APPENDIX A

1A-Mid

MAX

David said to his dog Max, "Let's go
for a walk."

David and Max walked down the

1

David saw his friends playing.

"_____" I play too?" asked
2
David.

"_____" said his friends.
3

They _____ had fun playing
4
tag.

David _____ about Max.
5

Then David looked around.

Max _____ gone.
6

We'll help you _____ him,"
7
said the children.

Go on to the next page

_____ asked a man at

8

_____ bus stop,

9

"Have you _____ a dog?"

10

"No," said _____ man.

11

They asked a _____ on his

12

bicycle, "Have _____ seen a

13

dog?"

"No," _____ the boy.

14

They asked _____ girl

15

playing ball, "Have _____

16

seen a dog?"

"No," _____ the girl.

17

They looked _____ looked.

18

Soon it was _____ to go
19
home.

David was _____ sad.
20

He walked home.

David _____ Max by his
21
house.

"What _____ surprise!" said
22
David.

"Max came home without me."

Name: _____

Date: _____

1A-2

UP IN THE ATTIC

Timmy and Jack were at Grandmother's
old farmhouse.

It was too wet _____ play
1
outside.

It had _____ hard all that
2
morning.

"_____ can we do?" Timmy
3
asked.

"_____ know what to do!"
4
_____ Jack.
5

"Let's go up and _____ in
6
the attic."

At _____ top of the steps,
7
_____ stopped and looked
8
around.

Go on to the next page

_____ was dark and dusty
9
_____ the attic.
10

They stayed _____ to each
11
other.

"Look _____ there, Jack!"
12
said Timmy.

"Can you _____ that old
13
picture of Grandfather?"

_____ moved closer to the
14
_____.
15

Just then they heard _____
16
crash.

The boys were _____.
17

"I don't want to _____ here
18
now!" said Jack.

1A-2

"Let's _____!"

19

Timmy and Jack looked at each other
and then ran for the steps.

Name: _____

Date: _____

1B-Mid

A PET FOR ANN

Ann went to the farm.

She saw cows and _____.

1

She saw goats, pigs _____

2

chickens.

"Oh Dad! I really _____ a

3

pet," said Ann.

"I _____ a pet to take

4

_____ with me.

5

Can I _____ a cow?" asked

6

Ann.

"Oh Ann," _____ Dad.

7

"You can't have a _____ for

8

a pet.

It _____ too big.

9

Look for _____ little pet."

10

Go on to the next page

Ann looked around.

"_____ see a little duck,"

11

_____ Ann.

12

"Can I have a _____?"

13

"Ann, a duck is not _____

14

good pet for you," _____ Dad.

15

"A duck likes to _____ in a

16

pond.

We _____ not have a pond

17

_____ home."

18

Ann was sad.

"Here _____ a good pet for

19

_____, " said Dad.

20

Ann looked and laughed.

"_____ kitten," said Ann.

21

"A kitten is a good pet for me."

Name: _____

Date: _____

1B-2

DAISY'S FRIEND

Daisy heard a noise in the big can
on the picnic table.

She wagged her tail _____
1
barked.

Here was something _____
2
play with.

She looked _____ the can.
3

She saw _____ move.
4

A frog hopped _____.
5

A friend!

Daisy and her _____ played
6

tag a long _____.
7

Daisy ran and jumped.

The _____ hopped and
8
jumped too.

Go on to the next page

1B-2

_____ little frog hopped up

9

_____ a log.

10

Daisy looked up _____ saw

11

the children.

They _____ back from fishing.

12

"The _____ is on the log!

13

_____ did it get out?"

14

_____ cried.

15

Then the frog _____ off the

16

log and _____ gone.

17

Daisy barked at the _____.

18

"Goodbye little friend.

I _____ fun.

19

We will play another day."

Name: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX B

READING INTERVIEW

Name_____ Age_____ Date_____
Occupation_____ Educational Level_____
Sex_____ Interview Setting_____

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?

Do you ever do anything else?

2. Who is a good reader you know?

3. What makes_____a good reader?

4. Do you think_____ever comes to something she/he doesn't know?

5. "Yes" When _____ does come to something she/he doesn't know, what do you think he/she does?

"No" Suppose _____ comes to something she/he doesn't know. What do you think she/he would do?

6. If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?

7. What would a/your teacher do to help that person?

8. How did you learn to read?

9. What would you like to do better as a reader?

10. Do you think you are a good reader? Why?

APPENDIX C

IDEAS ABOUT READING

Name _____
Age _____ [] Boy [] Girl
School _____ Grade _____
Today's date _____ ID # _____

The questions in the following pages are to find out what you think about reading and your ideas about important things to do or look for when reading. This is not a test. For each question, circle one answer (a, b, or c) that seems best for you. Please answer all questions.

Circle the best answer for you.

1. What is the hardest part about reading for you?
 - a. Sounding out the hard words.
 - b. When I don't understand the story.
 - c. Nothing is hard about reading for me. _____
2. What would help you become a better reader?
 - a. If more people would help me when I read.
 - b. Reading easier books with shorter words.
 - c. Checking to make sure I understand what I read. _____
3. If you are reading a story for fun, what would you do?
 - a. Look at the pictures to get the meaning.
 - b. Read the story as fast as I can.
 - c. Imagine the story like a movie in my mind. _____
4. What is special about the first sentence or two in a story?
 - a. They always begin with "once upon a time."
 - b. The first sentences are the most interesting.
 - c. They tell what the story will be about. _____
5. How are the last sentences of a story special?
 - a. They are the exciting, action sentences.
 - b. They tell you what happened.
 - c. They are harder to read. _____
6. If you are reading for science or social studies, what would you do to remember the information?
 - a. Ask myself questions about the important ideas.
 - b. Skip the parts I don't understand.
 - c. Concentrate and try hard to remember it. _____
7. What things do you read faster than others?
 - a. Books that are easy to read.
 - b. Books that I have read before.
 - c. Books that have lots of pictures. _____

8. If you could only read some sentences in the story because you were in a hurry, which ones would you read?
- a. Read the sentences in the middle of the story.
 - b. Read the sentences that tell me the most about the story.
 - c. Read the interesting exciting sentences. _____
9. How can you tell which sentences are the most important ones in a story?
- a. They're the ones that tell the most about the characters and what happens.
 - b. They're the most interesting ones.
 - c. All of them are important. _____
10. If you are reading for a test, which would help you the most?
- a. Read the story as many times as possible.
 - b. Talk about it with somebody to make sure I understand it.
 - c. Say the sentences over and over. _____
11. When you tell other people about what you read, what do you tell them?
- a. What happened in the story.
 - b. The number of pages in the book.
 - c. Who the characters are. _____
12. If the teacher told you to read a story to remember the general meaning, what would you do?
- a. Skim through the story to find the main parts.
 - b. Read all of the story and try to remember the meaning.
 - c. Read the story and remember all of the words. _____
13. If you are reading a library book to write a book report, which would help you the most?
- a. Sound out words I don't know.
 - b. Write it down in my own words.
 - c. Skip the parts I don't understand. _____

14. Before you start to read, what kind of plans do you make to help you to read better?
- a. I don't make any plans. I just start reading.
 - b. I choose a comfortable place.
 - c. I think about why I am reading. _____
15. Why do you go back and read things over again?
- a. Because it's good practice.
 - b. Because I didn't understand it.
 - c. Because I forgot some words. _____
16. If you had to read very fast and could only read some words, which ones would you try to read?
- a. Read the new vocabulary words because they are important.
 - b. Read the words that you could pronounce.
 - c. Read the words that tell the most about the story. _____
17. What do you do if you come to a word and you don't know what it means?
- a. Use the words around it to figure it out.
 - b. Ask someone else.
 - c. Go on to the next word. _____
18. What do you do if you don't know what a whole sentence means?
- a. Read it again.
 - b. Sound out all of the words.
 - c. Think about the other sentences in the paragraph. _____
19. What parts of the story do you skip as you read?
- a. The hard words and parts I don't understand.
 - b. The unimportant parts that don't mean anything for the story.
 - c. I never skip anything. _____
20. Which of these is the best way to remember a story?
- a. Say every word over and over.
 - b. Think about remembering it.
 - c. Write it down in my own words. _____

Ideas About Reading
(Scoring Key)

1a. (1)	8a. (0)	15a. (1)
b. (2)	b. (2)	b. (2)
c. (0)	c. (1)	c. (0)
2a. (1)	9a. (2)	16a. (1)
b. (0)	b. (1)	b. (0)
c. (2)	c. (0)	c. (2)
3a. (1)	10a. (1)	17a. (2)
b. (0)	b. (2)	b. (1)
c. (2)	c. (0)	c. (0)
4a. (1)	11a. (2)	18a. (1)
b. (0)	b. (0)	b. (0)
c. (2)	c. (1)	c. (2)
5a. (1)	12a. (2)	19a. (1)
b. (2)	b. (1)	b. (2)
c. (0)	c. (0)	c. (0)
6a. (2)	13a. (1)	20a. (0)
b. (0)	b. (2)	b. (1)
c. (1)	c. (0)	c. (2)
7a. (1)	14a. (0)	
b. (2)	b. (1)	
c. (0)	c. (2)	

APPENDIX D

SELF-PERCEPTIONS ABOUT READING
(Practice Page)

Name: _____ Date: _____

Your teacher will read each of the items. After each item is read, use a check mark (✓) to show which of the five choices best shows your opinion.

1. I like to play games with my friends.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

2. I wish we had shorter gym periods.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

3. It feels like _____ will never get here.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

STOP

Note. In Item 3, "Christmas" was inserted in the pretest and "summer" was inserted in the posttest.

SELF-PERCEPTIONS ABOUT READING

Name: _____ Date: _____

1. I think reading is very difficult for me.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

2. If you are a good reader it helps you learn lots of other things.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

3. Reading does not take much effort for me.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

4. I am one of the best readers in my class.

Totally Disagree	Mainly Disagree	Partly Disagree and Partly Agree	Mainly Agree	Totally Agree
---------------------	--------------------	--	-----------------	------------------

5. My teachers do not help me learn how to read better.

<u>Totally</u> Disagree	<u>Mainly</u> Disagree	<u>Partly Disagree</u> and Partly Agree	<u>Mainly</u> Agree	<u>Totally</u> Agree
----------------------------	---------------------------	---	------------------------	-------------------------

6. I really enjoy reading.

<u>Totally</u> Disagree	<u>Mainly</u> Disagree	<u>Partly Disagree</u> and Partly Agree	<u>Mainly</u> Agree	<u>Totally</u> Agree
----------------------------	---------------------------	---	------------------------	-------------------------

7. I think that I won't be a very good reader in high school.

<u>Totally</u> Disagree	<u>Mainly</u> Disagree	<u>Partly Disagree</u> and Partly Agree	<u>Mainly</u> Agree	<u>Totally</u> Agree
----------------------------	---------------------------	---	------------------------	-------------------------

Name: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX E

Questions Asked in Procedure II and Procedure III*Question 1: Syntactic Acceptability*

Is the sentence syntactically (grammatically) acceptable in the reader's dialect and within the context of the entire selection?

Y--The sentence, as finally produced by the reader, is syntactically acceptable.

N--The sentence, as finally produced by the reader, is not syntactically acceptable (partial acceptability is not considered in this procedure).

Question 2: Semantic Acceptability

Is the sentence semantically acceptable in the reader's dialect and within the context of the entire selection? (Question 2 cannot be coded Y if Question 1 has been coded N).

Y--The sentence, as finally produced by the reader, is semantically acceptable.

N--The sentence, as finally produced by the reader, is not semantically acceptable (partial acceptability is not considered in this procedure).

Question 3: Meaning Change

Does the sentence, as finally produced by the reader, change the meaning of the selection? (Question 3 is coded only if Questions 1 and 2 are coded Y).

N--There is no change in the meaning of the selection.

P--There is inconsistency, loss, or change of a *minor* idea, incident, character, fact, sequence, or concept in the selection.

Y--There is inconsistency, loss, or change of a *major* idea, incident, character, fact, sequence, or concept in the selection.

Question 4: *Graphic Similarity*

How much does the miscue look like the text item?

H--A high degree of graphic similarity exists between the miscue and the text.

S--Some degree of graphic similarity exists between the miscue and the text.

N--No degree of graphic similarity exists between the miscue and the text.

Question 5: *Sound Similarity*^a

How much does the miscue sound like the expected response (ER)?

H--A high degree of sound similarity exists between the miscue and the ER.

S--Some degree of sound similarity exists between the miscue and the ER.

N--No degree of sound similarity exists between the miscue and the ER.

^aQuestion 5 (Sound Similarity) is not asked in Procedure III.

APPENDIX F

Selections Used in Pretest and/or Posttest Sessions

- Coville, B., & Coville, K. (1987). The helpful giant. In McInnes, J., The helpful giant and other stories (pp. 19-31). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson.
- Rabe, B. (1981). The balancing girl. In McInnes, J., Take a giant step (pp. 18-30). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson.

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

Name _____ Date _____ Start-Up# _____

Typescript Identification # _____

(a)	(b)	(c)			(d)			(e)
Number of Sentences Selected	Sentence Number on type- script	Miscue(s) Noticed			Miscue(s) Resolved			Score (Col. c + Col. d)
		by...			by...			
		S	S&I	I	S	S&I	I	
		2	1	0	2	1	0	
		Score = ____/____ (max.) = ____			Score = ____/____ (max.) = ____			Score = ____/____ (max.) = ____
		(Monitoring)			(Correcting)			(Monitoring and Correcting)

APPENDIX G

Note.

Maximum possible scores:

1. Monitoring (Col. c) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
2. Correcting (Col. d) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
3. Monitoring and Correcting (Col. e) = No. of Sentences x 4 pts.

Comments:

APPENDIX H

CONSENT

(regarding the participation of _____, grade 4, in a study of the effect of an individualized reading program to be conducted by Randy Noseworthy during the period of December, 1989, to April, 1990, approximately).

I/We have met with Randy Noseworthy to discuss my/our child's progress to date (_____, 1989) in relation to his Individualized Program Plan (I.P.P.).

In addition, Mr. Noseworthy has described the Individualized Reading Program which he proposes to provide for my/our child as part of Mr. Noseworthy's thesis in the Master of Education program at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

I/We understand that

(a) this individualized reading program is consistent with the goals, objectives, and instructional approaches agreed upon in the Program Planning Team meeting and described in the current I.P.P.;

(b) Mr. Noseworthy has received from the (name) School Board approval for conducting this program in (name) Elementary School as part of his thesis study;

(c) Mr. Noseworthy has obtained the support and cooperation of the school principal (name) and the grade four classroom teacher (name);

(d) the individualized reading program will be of approximately 12 weeks' duration;

(e) shortly before and again shortly after this 12-week period Mr. Noseworthy will meet with my/our child on several occasions to assess the following aspects of his reading development:

- reading comprehension,
- reading vocabulary,
- reading strategies,
- reading awareness, and
- self-perceptions about reading;

(f) Mr. Noseworthy will provide me/us with a summary of his findings relating to my/our child's progress during his involvement in the individualized reading program;

(g) the results will also be available to the other members of the program planning team as needed to help make decisions about my/our child's progress and his future educational program;

(h) apart from the two immediately preceding items, f and g, any information relating to my/our child's involvement in the individualized reading program and the study will only be released by Mr. Noseworthy in forms in which my/our child's and his family's identities are protected (e.g., by using a code number or a pseudonym in place of his real name); and,

(i) the following additional criteria:

Contingent upon the understandings identified in items a to i, above, I/we agree that _____ can participate in this individualized reading program and related activities; further I/we agree that Randy Noseworthy can use the information and results relating to this program to help plan my/our child's future educational program and to contribute to the thesis study and written documents being developed by Mr. Noseworthy.

signed: _____

signed: _____

date: _____

I agree to adhere to the terms described in the Consent form.

signed: _____ date: _____

Randy P. Noseworthy

_____, Nfld.
December 13, 1989

Dear _____:

As you may have already learned, I plan to meet with your child on Thursday, December 14, to begin the first set of assessment procedures discussed in our meeting. I expect to complete this set of procedures before school closes for the Christmas holidays. That will prepare the way for beginning your child's individualized reading program immediately after we return to school in the New Year.

Meanwhile, I am asking for your assistance by completing a questionnaire concerning your views and involvement relating to your child's reading development. I am enclosing a copy for each parent to complete individually. I apologize for adding this to your busy pre-Christmas agenda, but I feel that the information you provide through the questionnaire is very important to the development of an effective reading program for your child. If possible, please return the completed questionnaire(s) to me before school closes for the holidays on Friday, December 22.

Also enclosed, for your personal records, is a photocopy of the completed parental consent form.

If you have any questions or concerns about the matters contained in this correspondence or any other aspects of the reading program, please don't hesitate contacting me at school () or at home ().

I hope you and your family will have a safe and merry Christmas. I look forward to our cooperative efforts when the individualized reading program begins in January.

Sincerely,

Randy P. Noseworthy

Encl.

CONFIDENTIAL

PARENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

When completed...

(signature)

(date)

***PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
WHEN COMPLETED, to Randy Noseworthy.

- A. At home, does someone read books to your child?
(Yes or No) _____

If "yes",

- (1) Who? _____
- (2) How often? About _____ times a week.
- (3) How long at a time? About _____ minutes.
- (4) What kind of books are used and how often?
(Show by ✓)

often sometimes rarely or
never

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| (a) Textbooks in the Language program | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (b) Textbooks in other subjects | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (c) Trade books (see note*) assigned by teachers | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (d) Trade books chosen by parent(s) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (e) Trade books chosen by child | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| (f) Other(_____) _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
- (5) In a few words, how would you describe

(a) your child's feelings about these activities?

(b) the reader's(s') feelings about these activities?

***Trade books," as used here, means books other than textbooks. Trade books are the kind of books normally found in classroom libraries, school or community libraries, bookstores, and our homes.

- B. At home, does someone listen to your child as he reads aloud? (Yes or No) _____

If yes,

(1) Who? _____

(2) How often? About _____ times a week.

(3) How long at a time? About _____ minutes.

(4) What kind of books are used and how often?
(Show by ✓)

often sometimes rarely or
never

(a) Textbooks in the Language program _____

(b) Textbooks in other subjects _____

(c) Trade books assigned by teachers _____

(d) Trade books chosen by parent(s) _____

(e) Trade books chosen by child _____

(f) Other (_____) _____

5. In a few words, how would you describe

(a) your child's feelings about these activities?

(b) the listener's(s') feelings about these activities.

- C. When you're listening to your child read aloud and he comes to a word he doesn't know . . .

(1) What does he usually do?

(2) What do you usually do?

(3) Do you feel that what happens (as shown in 1 and 2 above) is a satisfactory way to deal with this occurrence?

Please explain your answer:

- D. When you're listening to your child read aloud and he says something that isn't the same as the word(s) in the book . . .

(1) What does he usually do?

(2) What do you usually do?

(3) Do you feel that what happens (as shown in 1 and 2 above) is a satisfactory way to deal with this occurrence?

Please explain your answer:

- E. How would you rate the level of interest your child usually shows towards reading the following kinds of books. (Show by ✓)

	<u>very</u> <u>high</u>	<u>high</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>low</u>	<u>very</u> <u>low</u>
(1) Textbooks in the Language program	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(2) Textbooks in other subjects	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(3) Trade books assigned by teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(4) Trade books chosen by parent(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(5) Trade books chosen by child	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(6) Other kinds of books? (_____)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please enter any comments about your ratings:

- F. (1) What would you say are your child's strong points in reading?

- (2) What would you say are your child's main difficulties in reading?

- (3) In your opinion, what are the main things a parent could look for to decide if his/her 9-year-old is a good reader?
-
-

- (4) How would you rate the progress you have observed in your child's reading during the period from September 5, 1989, to the present? (Circle one)

poor fair good very good excellent

- (5) How would you currently rate your child as a reader in relation to your personal standards for a student in grade 4? (Circle one)

far below somewhat on a par somewhat far above
my below my with my above my my
standards standards standards standards standards

- (6) Considering the demands and expectations of each grade, how would you rate your child's chances for being a successful reader? (Show by ✓)

	<u>very</u> <u>low</u>	<u>low</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>high</u>	<u>very</u> <u>high</u>
(a) by the end of grade 4	___	___	___	___	___
(b) by the end of grade 8	___	___	___	___	___
(c) by the end of grade 12	___	___	___	___	___

G. As a parent who is interested in helping your child's reading development . . .

- (1) What are the main difficulties or concerns you have in regard to trying to help your child at home?
-
-

- (2) Do you think the school might be able to help you more than it already does?
-
-

- (a) Please indicate any suggestions you might have about ways the school might be able to help you more than it already does.
-
-

H. Self-Evaluative Scale (adapted from Fredericks & Taylor, 1985)

Please check (✓) those items that you or your child do at home. Place two checks (✓✓) in front of those items that are done every day. Leave blank those items that are not done.

- ___ 1. I read to my child.
- ___ 2. I watch and talk about TV with my child.
- ___ 3. My child reads many different kinds of materials.
- ___ 4. My child has his/her own library or bookcase.
- ___ 5. I talk with my child about school.
- ___ 6. I enjoy reading a wide variety of materials.
- ___ 7. I help my child select his/her reading material.
- ___ 8. I write down stories my child tells me.
- ___ 9. My child has many experiences outside our home.
- ___ 10. I encourage my child in reading.
- ___ 11. I give my child books for birthdays or other occasions.
- ___ 12. I talk over the things my child reads.
- ___ 13. I attend parent conferences at school.
- ___ 14. Our family visits the local public library.

- ___ 15. Our family plays word games.
- ___ 16. My child has time to read at home.
- ___ 17. I help my child with his/her homework.
- ___ 18. I enjoy reading in my free time.
- ___ 19. I ask my child questions about his/her books.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire,
especially at this busy time of the year.

(signed) Randy Noseworthy

_____, Nfld.
January 22, 1990

Dear _____:

As you are probably aware, your child has selected the books he wishes to use during the first three weeks of his individualized reading program. Within the next several days I will be meeting with your child, at which time he will begin working with his first book. After that meeting (called a Start-Up Session), your child will be responsible for taking part in a series of activities (called On My Own) to be done in the grade four classroom and at home. This series will conclude in about six school days with a second meeting (called a Wrap-Up Session) involving your child and me. The following school day he and I will meet to begin a similar cycle of activities relating to his second book. This pattern will continue over the length of our project, which is about three months.

Each book will be divided into four parts, marked by small stickers. On each of the first four school days your child will be responsible for completing one part of the book by reading and/or by listening (to you and/or a cassette recording). He is asked to do this in his classroom and at home and to keep a brief written record of these activities in his Reading Log. On the fifth school day, he is asked to do an activity (called My Turn) as a way to show his personal response to the book. He will be encouraged to use his creativity in choosing and completing an activity that he finds enjoyable.

While I know there are many ways in which you will be encouraging and supporting your child's efforts, I am asking that you consider including several specific ideas and activities among them (see the attached sheets). I offer them to you for your consideration, to use or adapt or reject as you see fit. While I hope they will be helpful to you, the main thing is that you and your child find that the work you do together is enjoyable and beneficial.

Please feel free to contact me at school or at home (_____) if you desire any clarification or further information.

Sincerely,

(signed) Randy Noseworthy

Some thoughts and suggestions about

WORKING WITH YOUR CHILD AT HOME

- A. In general, your child will be working with each book for six school days (or about 7 or 8 calendar days). I would ask that you try to spend time with your child on 5 days in each of these cycles. I believe that about 20 minutes on each of these days would be adequate time for: (1a) listening as your child reads aloud for about 10 minutes from that day's part of his book and then tells you in his own words what has happened in the story so far, or (1b) reviewing with your child his My Turn activity; (2) reviewing the Reading Log to ensure your child has updated it today, and (3) making, in his Reading Log, your own entry, which should be a short but positive comment about your child's work that day.
- B. As your child is reading aloud, if he says a word or several words which are different from those written in the book...
1. If what he says makes sense within the story and sounds like the way people write or speak English, don't interrupt his reading at all.
 2. However, if what he says does not make sense or does not sound like the way people write or speak English, you might try this...

- (a) Wait. Don't interrupt him immediately. Give him 4 or 5 seconds. Let him read on to the end of the sentence or section. This will give him some time and extra information which may enable him to realize the problem by himself and possibly correct it by himself.
- (b) If the problem remains uncorrected, draw his attention to the sentence by asking "does that make sense?" or "does that sound right?" or other appropriate cue.
- (c) Ask him to reread the sentence. If he rereads it in a way that makes sense in the story and that sounds like English even if it's not totally like the wording in the book, praise him for correcting it so that it makes sense and sounds right; e.g., "Yes, that makes sense" or "That sounds right, now" or other appropriate comment.
- (d) If he has great difficulty with that part of the story or still reads it in a way that doesn't make sense in the story or doesn't sound like English, offer to read that part with him; e.g., "Let's read that part together."
- (e) If he has a lot of difficulty and is becoming overwhelmed by the oral reading task, offer to share in the whole task for that night; e.g., you read one paragraph and he read the next, or some similar sharing to make his task manageable and

satisfying. If that's too hard for him, offer to do all the reading for the 10 minutes as he listens and follows along visually. (Because of the way we are selecting the books for this project, it's not likely your child will experience such difficulty. If it does occur, please let me know without delay.)

- C. As your child reads aloud (or silently), if he comes to a word which he "doesn't know," you might try this...
1. Ask your child to begin the sentence again. He may be able to read the word himself in this rereading. If not, tell him to skip the unknown word for a moment and read on to the end of the sentence.
 2. If he still doesn't know the word, say "What word beginning that way makes sense there?" When he suggests a word, say "Check that it is the right word by listening to the way it ends and seeing if the letters at the end of the word on the page would fit."
 3. Whether or not his attempt and his checking have been totally successful, praise him for the things he did right. This will reassure him that he's on the right track to developing an essential strategy used in reading. If he still hasn't identified the word, tell him. (Periodically, you could also ask him to check your word. For example: "Could that word be _____? Check it and see.")

Randy Noseworthy
January 22, 1990.

May 17, 1990

Dear Parent(s),

As you are probably aware, your child has finished the part of our reading project that involved working with the trade books he had selected. We are now moving into the final phase, which involves a careful assessment of the reading project.

Over the next few days, I will be meeting with your child individually, as well as in a small group, to gather information useful in assessing the value of the reading project. In addition, I shall shortly be sending home to you a response form to help obtain your ideas and opinions about the reading project. These are two of the most important sources of information that will be used in assessing the project.

As I informed you last Friday, I shall be on leave from my position as a resource teacher for the remainder of the school year. While on leave, I will be devoting my full attention to assessing the project. In accordance with our agreement (cf. items f and g on the Consent form), I hope to be able to provide you and the school with the pertinent information about your child in advance of the final Program Planning Team meeting for 1989-90, presumably in early June.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at my home number (_____).

Sincerely,

(signed) Randy Noseworthy

Randy Noseworthy.

May 22, 1990

Dear Parent(s):

As you know, the reading project involving your child and his individualized reading program has essentially concluded. During last week your child and I met in both individual and small group sessions to do a variety of activities aimed at helping to evaluate his individual development in reading and the usefulness of the approach used in our reading project.

Because you have also been actively involved in this project and have a unique perspective on your child's response to his individualized reading program, no evaluation of the project would be complete without your ideas and opinions. I am therefore asking that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me on or before Friday, May 25, 1990.

If you have any questions or comments about this questionnaire, please do not hesitate calling me at home (_____).

Sincerely,

(signed Randy Noseworthy

Randy Noseworthy

CONFIDENTIAL

PARENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE #2

(Parent's Name)

When completed...

(signature)

(date)

Note

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, WHEN COMPLETED, TO RAN :
NOSEWORTHY ON OR BEFORE FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1990.

1. How would you rate the progress you have observed in your child's reading during the period from January, 1990, to the present? (Circle one)

poor fair good very good excellent

2. How would you currently rate your child as a reader in relation to your personal standards for a student in grade four? (Circle one)

far below somewhat on a par somewhat far above
my below my with my above my my
standards standards standards standards standards

3. Considering the demands and expectations of each grade, how would you rate your child's chances of being a successful reader... (Use ✓ marks)

	very low	low	moderate	high	very high
(a) in grade 5?	—	—	—	—	—
(b) in grade 8?	—	—	—	—	—
(c) in grade 12?	—	—	—	—	—

4. Regarding the activities and materials involved in your child's individualized reading program...

- (a) On average, how often did your child work with his books at home? (Circle one)

almost never	about 1 day a week	about 3 days a week	about 5 days a week	almost every day
-----------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------

- (b) On average, how long did your child spend each time he worked with his books at home? (Circle one)

little or no time	about 15 min.	about 30 min.	about 45 min.	about 60 min. or more
-------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------------------

- (c) Overall, how would you rate your child's level of interest in working with his books at home? (Circle one)

very low	low	medium	high	very high
-------------	-----	--------	------	--------------

5. What did you like best about the reading project?

6. In your opinion, what changes could have been made to improve the reading project?

7. How would you rate the value of the reading project in relation to your child's progress in reading this year?

(Circle one)

very	low	medium	high	very
low				high

8. In your opinion, should individualized reading programs such as the one just completed by your child be made available in the elementary grades next year?_____

(Please comment.)

9. (I welcome and appreciate any other comments and suggestions you may wish to add.)_____

>>> Thank you for your cooperation. Randy Noseworthy

APPENDIX I

Trade Books Chosen by Students in Selection Sessions

- Adler, D. A. (1984). Cam Jansen and the mystery of the monster movie. New York: Viking.
- Adler, D. A. (1980). Cam Jansen and the mystery of the stolen diamonds. New York: Dell.
- Adler, D. A. (1986). The fourth floor twins and the Silver Ghost Express. Markham, Ontario: Penguin.
- Adler, D. A. (1984). Jeffrey's ghost and the leftover baseball team. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Blume, J. (1971). Freckle juice. New York: Dell.
- Christian, M. B. (1985). Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the clumsy cowboy. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Christian, M. B. (1987). Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the stars-in-his-eyes mystery. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Conaway, J. (1982). Mysteries of Sherlock Holmes. Toronto: Random House.
- Fleischman, S. (1974). The ghost on Saturday night. New York: Scholastic.
- Hall, W. & Hoffman, M. (1986). The return of the Antelope. Markham, Ontario: Penguin.
- Jukes, M. (1985). Blackberries in the dark. New York: Dell.
- Krulik, N. E. (1989). Lassie: Digging up danger. New York: Berkley.
- Lauber, P. (1960). Champ: Gallant collie. New York: Scholastic.
- Levy, E. (1979). Frankenstein moved in on the fourth floor. New York: Harper & Row.
- Manes, S. (1983). Be a perfect person in just three days! New York: Bantam.
- Manes, S. (1979). The boy who turned into a TV set. New York: Avon.

- Naylor, P. R. (1979). How lazy can you get? New York: Scholastic.
- Siamon, S. (1986). Log house mouse. Toronto: Gage.
- Singer, M. (1984). The case of the sabotaged school play. New York: Harper & Row.
- Singer, M. (1984). Leroy is missing. New York: Harper & Row.
- Yeoman, J. (1976). The boy who sprouted antlers. Glasgow: Collins.

APPENDIX J

Scheduling of Trade Books and Related Conferencing Sessions

	<u>John</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Sam</u>
1.	<u>Mysteries of Sherlock Holmes</u> (J. Conaway)	<u>Log House Mouse</u> (S. Siamon)	<u>The Return of the Antelope</u> (W. Hall & M. Hoffman)
	Start-Up: Jan.26 Wrap-Up: Feb.5	Start-Up: Jan.25 Wrap-Up: Feb.1	Start-Up: Jan.24 Wrap-Up: Feb.1
2.	<u>The Fourth Floor Twins and the Silver Ghost Express</u> (D.A. Adler)	<u>The Boy Who Sprouted Antlers</u> (J. Yeoman)	<u>Blackberries in the Dark</u> (M. Jukes)
	Start-Up: Feb.7 Wrap-Up: Feb.13	Start-Up: Feb.6 Wrap-Up: Feb.15	Start-Up: Feb.6 Wrap-Up: Feb.19
3.	<u>The Case of the Sabotaged School Play</u> (M. Singer)	<u>Be a Perfect Person in Just Three Days</u> (S. Manes)	<u>How Lazy Can You Get?</u> (P.R. Naylor)
	Start-Up: Feb.16 Wrap-Up: Mar.5	Start-Up: Feb.23 Wrap-Up: Mar.6	Start-Up: Feb.22 Wrap-Up: Mar.2
4.	<u>Log House Mouse</u> (S. Siamon)	<u>The Ghost on Saturday Night</u> (S. Fleischman)	<u>Jeffrey's Ghost and the Leftover Baseball Team</u> (D.A. Adler)
	Start-Up: Mar.7 Wrap-Up: Mar.22	Start-Up: Mar.9 Wrap-Up: Mar.21	Start-Up: Mar.9 Wrap-Up: Mar.21
5.	<u>Leroy Is Missing</u> (M. Singer)	<u>Frankenstein Moved in on the Fourth Floor</u> (E. Levy)	<u>The Boy Who Turned into a TV Set</u> (S. Manes)
	Start-Up: Mar.26 Wrap-Up: Mar.30	Start-Up: Mar.23 Wrap-Up: Mar.30	Start-Up: Mar.23 Wrap-Up: Apr.2

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 6. <u>How Lazy
Can You Get</u>
(P.R. Naylor) | <u>Freckle Juice</u>
(J. Blume) | <u>Cam Jansen and the
Mystery of the
Stolen Diamonds</u>
(D.A. Adler) |
| Start-Up: Apr.2
Wrap-Up: Apr.10 | Start-Up: Apr.3
Wrap-Up: Apr.6 | Start-Up: Apr.15
Wrap-Up: Apr.11 |
| 7. <u>Sebastian (Super
Sleuth) and the
Stars-in-his-Eyes
Mystery</u>
(M.B. Christian) | <u>Lassie: Digging
Up Danger</u>
(N.E. Krulik) | <u>Champ: Gallant
Collie</u>
(P. Lauber) |
| Start-Up: Apr.11
Wrap-Up: Apr.23 | Start-Up: Apr.9
Wrap-Up: Apr.23 | Start-Up: Apr.12
Wrap-Up: Apr.24 |
| 8. <u>Lassie: Digging
Up Danger</u>
(N.E. Krulik) | <u>Cam Jansen and
the Mystery of the
Monster Movie</u>
(D.A. Adler) | <u>Sebastian (Super
Sleuth) and the
Clumsy Cowboy</u>
(M.B. Christian) |
| Start-Up: Apr.24
Wrap-Up: May 1 | Start-Up: Apr.25
Wrap-Up: Apr.30 | Start-Up: Apr.25
Wrap-Up: Apr.30 |
| 9. <u>Sebastian (Super
Sleuth) and the
Clumsy Cowboy</u>
(M.B. Christian) | <u>Cam Jansen and
the Mystery of the
Stolen Diamonds</u>
(D.A. Adler) | <u>Sebastian (Super
Sleuth) and the
Stars-in-his-Eyes
Mystery</u>
(M.B. Christian) |
| Start-Up: May 2
Wrap-Up: May 10 | Start-Up: May 2
Wrap-Up: May 10 | Start-Up: May 1
Wrap-Up: May 10 |

APPENDIX K

Students' Reported Reasons for Their Choices
of Trade Books (Numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9, only)John1. Mysteries of Sherlock Holmes (J. Conaway)

"Because I likes mystery stories, and . . . I had a look through this first before I done it . . . and it looked really interesting . . . when I got around up here (showed section). It looked real interesting because it's like there's a ghost in here (showed section). It's like (inaudible) there's a ghost. It's like that's what it's all about, ghosts and that."

(In answer to investigator question) "I know that Sherlock Holmes is a famous detective and his . . . headquarters is in . . . Scotland Yard, I think. And he's a famous detective. But I've never heard of that book before."

3. The Case of the Sabotaged School Play (M. Singer)

"I wasn't going to pick it 'cause it had 'school' on it . . . but I saw it was another book of Sherlock Holmes and that. And I thought if them two would be interesting, I said to myself that maybe another one would be interesting, too."

5. Leroy Is Missing (M. Singer)

"I like interesting books like that . . ." (John named the previous 4 titles--3 mysteries and 1 adventure story.)

7. Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the Stars-in-his-Eyes Mystery (M.B. Christian)

"Well, I picked 2 of them [i.e., Sebastian (Super Sleuth) mysteries] because I know if one is good, the other will be the same. I didn't even know if it was good or not; so I saw that it was a new book . . . and it's a mystery story (that's one thing I likes about it) and it looks like it might have comedy in it."

9. Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the Clumsy Cowboy
(M.B. Christian)

"I selected the other Sebastian (book); and I like dogs, too. So I said, well, I'll select 2 of 'em because . . . Sebastian and the Clumsy Cowboy (sic),

that sounds (like) it goes with Sebastian with Stars-in-his-Eyes (sic), and that one sounded pretty good. So I said, if this one's good, I know I'll like this (other) one. So, it's like I said I'll give both of 'em a try. So that's how I got these two."

Max

1. Log House Mouse (S. Siamon)

"When I looked through it, I saw these mice and all that and it reminded me of . . . something like Frog and Toad (characters created by Arnold Lobel)."

3. Be a Perfect Person in Just Three Days (S. Manes)

"I just like the title of it. (In response to a question by the investigator.) Probably my cousin (would like to be a perfect person)."

5. Frankenstein Moved in on the Fourth Floor (E. Levy)

"I read a little bit of it before and I found that good, but I never had a chance to read it all because someone else always had it. So I went and I got it out. And I like the cover of it. It's got a shadow there and two kids walking up (the stairs). They're right scared."

7. Lassie: Digging Up Danger (N.E. Krulik)

"Where I likes TV . . . and it's interesting . . . I thought, like, it was going to be the same one as on TV. I likes watching 'Lassie' (the television series)."

9. Cam Jansen and the Mystery of the Stolen Diamonds (D.A. Adler)

"I just read the title and it said 'diamonds.' So I said 'Oh, well. I might as well read about diamonds.' This is my second Cam Jansen book."

Sam

1. The Return of the Antelope (W. Hall & M. Hoffman)

"Well, first, these two kids, they live together. And they were walking along the beach. And then they met these little pirates, and their ship was wrecked. That was as far as I read. (Responding to the investigator's additional questioning.) Those little men interested me when I was looking at it . . . I just

saw them and said, 'Hmm. This looks good.' And then I looked at it."

3. How Lazy Can You Get? (P.R. Naylor)

"When I read the title How Lazy Can you Get? I thought I could learn a little about me or something . . . and see if I could make up jokes about it and stuff."

5. The Boy Who Turned into a TV Set (S. Manes)






"'Cause I kinda like TV. . . . Once in my classroom when (classmate) had it, I was looking at 'Little Critter' (created by Mercer Mayer) books. And I saw this one and I said, 'This looks interesting. I must try it after.' Then, after I got a chance down here (in resource room and the individualized reading program), I decided to try it."

7. Champ: Gallant Collie (P. Lauber)

"I likes dogs. Every book I picked (in the last selection session) was about dogs. . . . Champ and Lassie used to come on (TV). It started off when they were pups and the rest was when the children were growing up."

9. Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the Stars-in-his-Eyes Mystery (M.B. Christian)

"I don't know, I can't remember."

 <h1>Reading Record</h1> 		Name _____				
	Title and Author	Start-Up Date	Wrap-Up Date	My Opinion of the Book		
				Great 	OK 	Yuck 
#1						
#2						
#3						
#4						
#5						
#6						
#7						
#8						
#9						

READING LOG

Name _____

Dates: _____ to _____
START-UP WRAP-UP

Title: _____

Author: _____ Illustrator: _____

Publisher: _____ © Date: _____

START-UP SESSION COMMENTS: _____

ON MY OWN

In School...

(A) Read along with tape
(B) Read silently for 10 min.

Part 1.

A	B
---	---

Part 2.

A	B
---	---

Part 3.

A	B
---	---

Part 4.

A	B
---	---

At Home...

(C) Read along with tape
(D) Read silently for 10 min.
(E) Read aloud for 10 min.
(F) Told story so far.

Extras...

(G) [Explain what]

C	D	E	F	G
---	---	---	---	---

Parent's comments: _____

C	D	E	F	G
---	---	---	---	---

Parent's comments: _____

C	D	E	F	G
---	---	---	---	---

Parent's comments: _____

C	D	E	F	G
---	---	---	---	---

Parent's comments: _____

MY TURN

Parent's Signature _____

I decided to do this: _____

WRAP-UP SESSION COMMENTS: _____

 "I approve this Reading Log sheet." _____
 Student's Signature Date

Name: _____

Date: _____

Title: _____ Author: _____

I Wonder... I Think...

1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		

It's

MY TURN

to respond to the book I just read:

By drawing...

By writing...

Or by other ways (describe them)...

Student's signature: _____ Date: _____ 1990

(Use a separate sheet, if needed.)

APPENDIX M
READING INTERVIEW

Name: John

Date: December 14, 1989

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: Go on ahead and see what makes sense there.
I: Do you ever do anything else?
J: Read it over. You read it over once and you then read it over another time and you see what makes sense.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
J: My big brother. And I knows my little brother is going to be a good reader when he grows up, 'cause he knows how to read books now and he's only five years old.
3. I: What makes your big brother a good reader?
J: Because he doesn't skip school because he wants to . . . like when he's sick he wants to go to school and when he's not sick he always goes to school without no other reason unless Mom is going somewhere and he's got to go too. That's the only way he'll . . . stay out of school. And he stays in after school and when he does his homework he does it in school, so he's got none to do at home. I don't know any more.
4. I: Do you think your big brother ever comes to something he doesn't know?
J: Yeah.
5. I: When your big brother does come to something he doesn't know, what do you think he does?
J: Well, sometimes he asks Mom. And sometimes he just skips it and comes back to it.
6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
J: Well, you could say that . . . skip it and see what makes sense there the second time you reads it over. Or you could just put in something that makes sense. Or he could . . . say if it was like it said "hat" and he didn't know how . . . like he didn't know, and you go "ha" and he didn't know what it said and when he got it he'd go "ha" and then "teh" and then he'll get it, 'cause that's what I do sometimes.
I: Any other things you could do to help that person who was having a little bit of trouble reading?

- J: You could help him read it.
 I: How could you do that?
 J: Well, like when he don't know the words you could, like . . . just tell him to skip on or you could tell him what the word says.
7. I: What would a teacher do to help that person?
 J: She . . . I'd say they would say that . . . skip it and go on and read it over again to see what makes sense. And maybe like she would, she or he, would go like "He blank a book" and like, it's like you wouldn't say "He. . . ." You could say "He picked up a book" or "He read a book."
8. I: How did you learn to read?
 J: Ah, you, ah . . . you could read the same book over and when you get to know all of that you get to read another book.
 I: Is that how you learned to read?
 J: Yeah. That's how my little brother is learning to read now.
 I: Any other ways you remember that you learned how to read?
 J: Well, the teacher could have read the book and I read the book after.
9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
 J: Read more books. Teach other people. If you knows how to read, you could stand up in front of the class and you could read them a story or go to other people's classrooms and read them a story.
 I: (Gave an example from sports, then asked . . .) What sorts of things do you think you'll be doing later on?
 J: Teaching my little brother. Or reading books to Mom . . .
 I: What kind of books do you think she'd like to listen to?
 J: Christmas books or funny books. She likes mystery books.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
 J: Well, I ain't that good yet but I'd say that before I pass grade five . . . when I passes grade four I might not be able to read that good but when I passes grade five I'd say I'll be able to read better than I am now.
 I: What sort of things are in your mind that tell you you'll be better next year than this year?
 J: 'Cause we gets more harder books, more novels, and I'd say when I gets up to about grade six I'll be a little bit better than I am now.

11. I: Looking back since, say, grade three and looking at yourself right now, do you think you're a better reader now than you were back in grade three?

J: Yes.

I: What sort of things do you think about that tell you you're better?

J: When I comes up here we always does an activity about reading and I didn't go up here in grade three, only for plays and that. . . . And I'm reading more books than I was in grade three.

READING INTERVIEW

Name: John

Date: May 15, 1990

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
 J: I skips it and goes on; and when I finds out something that's good to help read it, I goes back to it. I makes it so that it makes sense. And I thinks then that it doesn't matter if I don't know what that means as long as I get it to make sense.
 I: Do you ever do anything else?
 J: Sometimes I just stays on it. First I goes to the first of it. I covers up the back of it and goes . . . just say it's "into," I covers it up and says "in" and then covers the top up and says "to" and I puts 'em both together and I says "into," and stuff like that. And another thing that I does is sometimes that's a word that might be on another page that I read over. . . . Sometimes I goes back to the other page and I looks at that word and . . . I reads that sentence and when I gets that right, then I goes back to that one. I reads that . . . sentence and then I . . . just say it was "went" on the other page. "I went to the store" and it said right here "I went to a party." So I just flips it over and says "I went to the store" and then I comes back and says "I went to the party." That's how I does it.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
 J: (Named 7 classmates).
3. I: What makes these people good readers?
 J: Because they get a lot of practice. (Classmate 1) has a whole lot of books home, so he gets a lot of practice. And (classmate 2), he was like born with a dictionary or he eats dictionaries for breakfast . . . and he's pretty smart. And (classmate 3), he's always reading.
4. I: Do you think they ever come to something they don't know?
 J: Sometimes.
5. I: When they come to something they don't know, what do you think they do?
 J: Sometimes (classmate 2) skips it and comes back to it. Sometimes (classmate 1) picks it out. Sometimes (classmate 3) just reads on across it and puts something that makes sense . . . like, say he didn't know

- this word and it said, "I blank to the store." He didn't know that one (blanked word) so he would say "I went to the store," "I got to the store," or something like that. That's what he would do.
- I: So are those things different from what you would do or the same as what you would do?
- J: Well, half of 'em is just the same.
- I: What ones do you think are different?
- J: Mostly the one that (classmate 1) does. He breaks it up. I skips it and puts in something that makes sense.
6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
- J: Well, I wouldn't read it for him. I would just tell him "What would make sense there?" and break it up . . . like "s__thing. . ." then break it up and they say "some" and then they knows the other one, and then they says "thing." That's what I would tell them to do. And if they couldn't get it after, I'd tell them to skip it and then go back to it; and if they couldn't get that one I would just spell half of it out and then I'd say "some" and then I'd say "What's the other thing?" and they'd say "thing."
7. I: How do you think a teacher would help that person? Would a teacher do the same things or something different?
- J: Well, they're practically the same things. Or the teacher might read over the thing and just say "blank." And then they would fill it in.
8. I: How did you learn to read?
- J: In kindergarten, the first time I read was when the teacher showed us the back of the book and it said "I Can Read." I was the first one to say it says, "I can read!!"
9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
- J: What I would like to do better in reading is (to) be helping people to read too . . . and I'd like to learn how to read better than I am now. It's like, the ones that I'm reading now, it's like, they're not very hard--some of 'em are, but not very much. And it's like I would like to read hard ones too now.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
- J: Well . . . I'm pretty good, but I ain't quite sure if I'm the best. I ain't the best, but . . . I'm learning how to read even better now.
11. I: Thinking about what you were like as a reader at the end of grade three and thinking about yourself now, would you say that you've changed over the past year?

J: Yes, I'd say I've changed a whole lot.

I: What sort of ways can you identify in your mind the way you've changed as a reader over this past year?

J: Well . . . it's like, I can read more difficult words than I could in grade three. And I'm getting to learn how to read a novel. It's like I used to take little books, like Little Critter and that. Now I'm getting to take novels and that. That's all I can think about.

I: Would you say those are really important changes?

J: Yeah.

READING INTERVIEW

Name: Max

Date: December 14, 1989

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
M: Sometimes, well, I gets mixed up and I stops. I keeps on trying to figure it out. My mother showed me (how) to break it down. Sometimes I gets it like that. And sometimes I skips it.
I: Any other things you can do?
M: Split up the words. Last night I was reading the book "What Will I Be When I Grow Up" and there was this thing--I forgets how it goes, "nowhere" or something like that--I went and broke it down. Like it was n-o at the first, I said "no--something at the end" and my Mom said that was good breaking it down but I forgets what the word was and she told me and then I went on.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
M: (Investigator's name), my father, my mother, my aunts and uncles.
3. I: What makes these people good readers?
M: Practising.
I: Anything else that makes people good readers?
M: Practising reading and learning words. A couple of other things that can help you to read.
I: What would they be?
M: Practising reading and practising words.
4. I: Do you think these people ever come to something they don't know?
M: Probably, yeah.
5. I: When these people do come to something they don't know, what do you think they do?
M: Probably go and ask their mother or something.
I: Are there any other things they might do?
M: They could ask their father or something.
I: Let's take someone, like your Dad or Mom . . . what do you think they probably do?
M: Sometimes my mother, when she comes to a word and she doesn't know what it means, like in science, I had to bring home my science a couple of months ago and there was this word there and I forgot what it meant and my father knew (it) and my mother didn't and I went and asked my father and he knew it. I forgets what it was, though.

6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
M: I would tell him to break down the words if he didn't know them. Say (to) bring home a couple of books and at nighttime get (their) mother and read to her sometimes to help (them) with their work and that.
I: Any other advice you could give to someone who's been having trouble?
M: You could read to them sometimes in class.
7. I: What would a teacher do to help that person?
M: Last time I had trouble reading she (the teacher) told me to come down in back (of class) and she had a list of words and I had to try to spell almost all of them.
I: Anything else?
M: Tell them to take home a couple of books and read them.
8. I: How did you learn to read?
M: When I was small, way back, probably when I was in kindergarten, or before kindergarten, me and my mother used to go out and down to my Nan's where she's got a little (building) in the back and we used to go down there and read books. Sometimes when my mother wasn't home, me and my cousin used to go there and I'd try to read to him sometimes.
9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
M: When I'm home I practise reading . . . if I gets good at reading . . . like last night I went and read a book that I read once--no, three or four times--I never knew a couple, only about three words, and I knew the rest.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
M: Ah, yeah.
I: What things can you think about or can do that tell you you're a good reader?
M: Well, probably where you're big and you knows all the words and that . . . and sometimes you (the investigator) helps us reading, you helps us read.
11. I: When you think back to when you were younger and in earlier grades and you think about what you are like now, would you say that you are a better reader now than you were before?
M: Yes.
I: Can you think of any ways that definitely tell you "Oh yeah, I used to be like this or I used to think like that but now I'm different?"
M: Well, no, Not really.

- I: Are there things you can imagine yourself doing in the future as you continue learning how to read better and better?
- M: Ah . . . well, last night I dreamt that I was a book writer. I read a couple of good books and then I used to read them over and see if the words were right.
- I: What an interesting dream. I can't remember if I ever dreamed that I was a writer. . . . What do you think that dream means?
- M: When I woke up that morning I thought I had about fifty books in my room, stacked. And when I woke up my mother said, "I thought I heard you talking in your sleep last night." And I said, "I probably was."

READING INTERVIEW

Name: Max

Date: May 15, 1990

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
M: If there's a word in the book and you don't know it, I just goes on and skips it sometimes.
I: Do you ever do anything else?
M: Sometimes I tries to break it up. . . . After I reads, when I comes to a period I goes back and reads it over again.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
M: (Classmate).
3. I: What makes (classmate) a good reader?
M: He's smart. . . . He's a very good speller.
4. I: Do you think (classmate) ever comes to something he doesn't know?
M: Yes.
5. I: When (classmate) does come to something he doesn't know, what do you think he does?
M: Probably the same thing I does . . . breaks it up or something.
6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
M: Probably I would read the book to them. Then after they'll read (the book) to me or something. Or I'll tell them how to break up the words or something.
7. I: What would a teacher do to help that person?
M: Ah . . . they could . . . spend some time with 'em, like go down back (in the classroom) and read to 'em and they'd read to the teacher.
8. I: How did you learn to read?
M: Well, the first time I started to read . . . I used to live down to my Nan's and she used to have two kitchens, like. There was one right down back by the basement, but it wasn't in the basement. And we went out there and I used to have this E.T. book. And I went out, me and my mother, and I tried to read that one. It's hard, though. I can still barely read it. There's hard words in it.

- I: Did you enjoy looking at the book and reading parts of it?
M: Yeah.
9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
M: (Better at reading) some of the words. The hard words.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
M: Mm. (Yes).
I: What sort of things can you think about to say that . . . to help you decide "Yeah, I'm a good reader"?
M: Well, we have spelling in our little notebooks that the teacher gave us. And last night I had to do them. And after I learned how to do them, I done some other spelling in a spelling book.
11. I: When you think back about a year ago when you were towards the end of grade three and you think about what you're like now in terms of your reading, would you say that you've changed?
M: Mm. (Yes).
I: What sorts of things do you notice most about it?
M: Well, I knows how to spell better, like the words and that. And I knows, like, almost all the words. When I was in grade one or something, when (cousin) was here, (teacher) picked me to read a book and it was long and I was there right tired, from reading . . . then, finally she had to go up and answer the door and (cousin) said, "Want me to go up and read for ya?" and I said, "Alright" and I sat down. . . . I was right tired.
I: So, how would you say you've changed . . . any other ways . . . in your reading?
M: Well, since I knows most of the words, I could read the book easier.
I: Any particular kind of books you're thinking about?
M: Mercer Mayer books and stuff . . . like that book E.T. You needs to know a lot of words.

READING INTERVIEW

Name: Sam

Date: December 14, 1989

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
S: If there's pictures, I look at the pictures and try to get an idea out of that. Like, if it says "He went to the . . ." and it shows a picture of a store, all you've got to do is say "store." That's what I does.
I: Do you ever do anything else?
S: Sometimes, like it says the word . . . the way it sounds, like "sssss" and I keeps on saying the words and all that. It don't work with me all that good, but Dad says I should try it.
I: Anything else that you do?
S: Sometimes, I skips that word and reads a little bit more; so then I can try to find what goes in the middle.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
S: (Named classmate). He can read the science book.
3. I: What makes (classmate) a good reader?
S: Brains . . . smart. He learns . . . he reads harder books and then he catches on.
4. I: Do you think (classmate) ever comes to something he doesn't know?
S: No, I don't think he does. I never heard him before. 'Cause those novels, like Ramona, he can read right through them probably one full one in one day.
5. I: Suppose I took out a novel and he didn't know what it was about and he started reading through it and came to something he didn't know, what do you think he might do?
S: He would probably ask you what the word was or something. What he usually does, he usually goes . . . like say the letters in the word, like at the end "i-n-g" means . . . like "scien-ce" or spell-ing. I-n-g spells "in" so when he sees that word at the end he tries to find the letters "s" or "n" . . . that doesn't spell anything, but he tries to say them faster and faster.
6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
S: Probably read something to them. And if I was a teacher I'd give them spelling. Or get his Mom to

read to him.

I: Anything else you might try?

S: The way (classmate referred to above) helps me. He goes "ssss" and all that. I don't like that because it takes me a "nice" while.

I: You mean, when (classmate) is near you when you're reading and you have trouble. . . .

S: Like in story problems, I ask him what's this word and he goes, "What do 's' . . . make the 's' sound."

7. I: You mentioned what a teacher might do to help a person who was having trouble. Can you think of other things a teacher might do to try to help that person having trouble?

S: Probably read it to them and read it to them more and again and again and then they'll probably be able to read it.

I: Any other ways a teacher could help a person?

S: Tell them, like (grade three teacher) told me, say you get stuck on a word. Skip it and by the time you come to the next period or something, go back and try to make a sentence out of it again. Like, say, "I am . . ." and you didn't know "the", "I am . . ." you didn't know "the", ". . . a boy," "I am a boy," "I am the boy." Like she says, I goes on a little bit.

I: Do you find that helps you? Do you ever try that?

S: That helps me.

8. I: How did you learn to read?

S: My Mom and Dad helped me; my brother; teachers; uncles. . . . How I learned to read, Mom and Dad used to read books, a book, over and over again until I knew it backwards and inside out. Like these . . . not Mercer Mayer, but Black Cat, Doctor Seuss books . . . Mom and Dad used to get a whole pile like that of them. Like one year, I wasn't even in school, (brother) was going to the junk sale (school bazaar), Mom said for him to get some books for me. He bought about seven Mercer Mayer books for me. And there's one . . . I've still got one or two (briefly described contents).

I: Those are really good ones. . . . Any other things about learning to read that you recall . . . about how you learned to read?

S: I read at the same time and I listened and read, like Mom and Dad; like Mom, first she'll read a little bit of it and then ask me to read a little bit of it after. And Dad, first when I was in kindergarten, made me learn the colors, like to spell the colors so I could learn them. I didn't even know my colors. I knew how to spell them but I didn't know what colors they were. Say if I saw black I'd probably spell "red." I'd say, "There's r-e-d."

9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
S: Read harder books. Read story problems. I loves math, but there's only one problem I don't like-- reading story problems. (Gave example.)
I: What seems to cause you problems when you're reading story problems?
S: Hard words. Some words I know how to read . . . that's weird, like, say if I could read "Here I am all by myself." Some words I don't know how to spell but I know how to read them, that's weird. Like "spring," I can read spring but I don't know how to spell it. That's kind of weird.
I: Do you think that other people are the same way or do you think that you're different from everyone else like that?
S: Some people are like me too.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
S: Pretty good.
I: What kinds of things in your mind sort of say "Well, I'm a pretty good reader now"? What sort of things can you think about that you can do or that you know about that sort of tell you, "Yeah, I'm a pretty good reader!"?
S: I can read to somebody else, like my little cousin. She comes to our house on weekends. She used to bring a whole bunch of books and when we came home with our math book and our homework, she used to go through our bookbag and take out a math book and say "Read to me." She used to love people read story books.
11. I: If you think about when you started grade four or maybe when you were in grade three and you think about yourself now, would you say that you're a better reader now than you were earlier?
S: Yeah.
I: What sort of things can you think about that tell you that "Yes. I'm better now than I was, say, last year"?
S: I can read harder books. Last year I couldn't read really hard ones. Last year I could only read ones by, like, Mercer Mayer or some kinds like that. Now this year I can read Nate the Great novels and Cam Jansen, well, I'm not really very good at Cam Jansen; I can only read about five pages a day. 'Cause I'm not that good. I have a lot of words (that cause me) trouble, but sometimes Mom tells me what they are.

READING INTERVIEW

Name: Sam

Date: May 15, 1990

1. I: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
S: I usually try to put in a word that fits there. And if I can't find a word that fits there, I usually goes and asks a teacher or like just skip it and come back to it after.
I: Do you ever do anything else?
S: I knows something else she told us. We could put down whatever we liked. . . . Sometimes, I'll try to sound it out or something. But I'm not good at that so that don't work that good for me.
2. I: Who is a good reader you know?
S: (Classmate).
3. I: What makes (classmate) a good reader?
S: I don't know. Learning. Listening. And hearing I know something else that makes him a good reader--spelling.
4. I: Do you think (classmate) ever comes to something he doesn't know?
S: Yeah.
5. I: When (classmate) comes to something he doesn't know, what do you think he does?
S: Well, most of the time he sounds it out. That's what he tells me to do.
I: Do you find that that's useful advice? Is it helpful for you?
S: Not that much helpful.
I: The other things that you mentioned earlier . . . you find these things are more helpful for you, do you?
S: Mm. (Yes).
6. I: If you knew someone was having trouble reading how would you help that person?
S: Well, maybe like . . . I would read a book with them and I'd stop and ask them to read certain parts, and stuff like that.
7. I: What would a teacher do to help that person?
S: They would probably like . . . sometimes they would . . . get them to read it to them. At first they would read it and probably got them to read it to

them after . . . and get them to practice so that they'll know the words more.

8. I: How did you learn to read?
S: Parents.
I: How do you think your parents probably helped you learn how to read?
S: Sometimes they wrote something on a sheet and they kept on getting me to say it. But I never learned how to spell it but they kept on getting me to say it.
9. I: What would you like to do better as a reader?
S: I'd like to read books better.
I: Any particular kind of books?
S: Novels. Well, I already can read novels, but not hard ones.
10. I: Do you think you are a good reader?
S: Not a really good one; but kinda like so-so.
I: Could you explain that a bit more?
S: I'm not really all that great. . . . I'm kinda good and kinda a bit bad. Like, some books I can read and some I can't.
I: Would you say there's a particular reason there's a difference like that?
S: Can you say that again?
I: You said that sometimes when you're reading you're good and other times you're not so good. Do you know why there seems to be a difference in how you're reading sometimes?
S: Well, sometimes . . . I can't just, like, pick up a big, fat novel and just start reading it like that. But just getting a little story book, like Good Charlotte--not Good Charlotte but, ah . . . a little story book like The Three Little Pigs or something like that--I can read that probably without looking at it 'cause I'm used to it. . . . Books I'm used to reading--could be hard, but I'm used to it--I can read it a little bit. Books I'm not used to, I can't read that much.
11. I: Just think back about you and your reading say a year ago when you were coming to the end of grade three . . . and thinking now about where you are coming towards the end of grade four, thinking about your reading, have you changed in any way?
S: I think I did. I think I changed.
I: What sorts of ways do you think you've probably changed . . . as a reader?
S: Well, I learned more spelling words; so that means I should be able to notice it on books and stuff. Before, I never knew some words and now I knows those words, and stuff like that.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER John	DATE Dec. 14, 1989
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE SCHOOL
Strength	15.6	27.3	SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Pretest)		
Partial Strength	11.7		REPEATED MISCS ACROSS TEXT		
Weakness	72.7		LINE	READER	TEXT COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS				that	what Sentence 43
Graphic				town	tower Sentences 53, 61 and 65
High	57.1	87.6		from	front Sentence 56
Some	30.5			told	thought Sentence 57
None	12.4			the	he Sentence 68
Sound				friends	friend Sentence 77
High	39.1	76.2			
Some	37.1				
None	23.8				
RETELLING					
Holistic Score					
or Comments					
Scored on Retelling Guide:					
64%					
MPHW		TIME 24:50			
COMMENTS					
Reading Rate = $706 \div 24.83 = 28.4$ w.p.m.					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>John</u>		DATE <u>Dec. 14, 1989</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_				
							SELECTION <u>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</u>				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect <u>(1)</u>	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
1	1	who	whose	✓			✓				
2	2	king	kind	✓				✓			
3	3	didn't	did	✓			✓				
4	4	think	things	✓			✓				
5	5	there	were	✓				✓			
6	6	the	his			✓			✓		
7	7	bay	bathub		✓			✓			
8	8	with	water		✓			✓			
9	9	helped	held	✓			✓				
10	10	keeping	keep	✓			✓				
11	11	said	stayed	✓			✓				
12	12	town	tower	✓			✓				
13	13	same	sometimes		✓		✓				
14	14	have	angry		✓				✓		
15	15	when	with	✓				✓			
16	16	Small	Smith				✓				
17	17	gardening	harvesting	✓	✓		✓				
18	18	he	And			✓					
19	19	with	with		✓				✓		
20	20	Monday	major's	✓			✓				
21	21	feast	wife		✓		✓				
22	22	tree	tree	✓			✓				
23	23	he	The	✓							
24	24	you	You're	✓			✓				
25	25	he	a			✓					
COLUMN TOTAL				15		7		3		13	
PATTERN TOTAL				7		5		13			
PERCENTAGE											
a. TOTAL MISQUES _____				COLUMN TOTAL							
b. TOTAL WORDS _____				TOTAL MISQUES							
a ÷ b × 100 = MPIW _____				PERCENTAGE							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER John		DATE Dec 14, 1989		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYY	Partial Strength YYP	Weakness NN_				
							SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Pretest)				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (1)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
24											
25	Y	N									
26	Y	N									
27		N									
28		N									
29		N									
30		N									
31		N									
32		N									
33		N									
34		N									
35		N									
36		N									
37	Y	N									
38		N									
39		N									
40	Y	Y									
41	Y	Y									
42	Y	N									
43		N									
44		N									
45		N									
46		N									
47		N									
48	Y	Y									
49	Y	Y									
50	Y	Y									
COLUMN TOTAL					2	3	20				
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											
					a. TOTAL MISCUES ____			COLUMN TOTAL			
					b. TOTAL WORDS ____			TOTAL MISCUES			
					a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____			PERCENTAGE			
					14	8	3	13	6	6	

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>John</u>		DATE <u>Dec. 14, 1989</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN... YN...				
76		2	2	1							
77	4										
Totals for...											
76-77					0	0	2				
51-75					3	1	21				
26-50					2	3	20				
1-25					7	5	13				
COLUMN TOTAL							12	9	56		
PATTERN TOTAL							77				
PERCENTAGE							15.6	11.7	72.7		

SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect <u>(1)</u>	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
48	76	3 face	sitting						
49	77	from	front	✓			✓	✓	
48	78	song	stone	✓					
50	71	from	for	✓				✓	
51	80	journey	almost		✓				✓
52	51	the	that	✓					
53	82	then	there	✓			✓	✓	
53	83	it	were			✓			✓
53	54	flash	flashes	✓			✓		
53	52	came	coming		✓		✓		
56	90	and	he			✓			✓
56	31	all	at			✓			✓
58	98	under	only		✓				✓
60	87	shined	shut					✓	
60	90	light	right	✓				✓	
61	91	they	there					✓	✓
61	72	the	a			✓		✓	
61	73	from	of	✓				✓	
63	74	cluck	struck	✓				✓	
63	93	ran	right		✓			✓	✓
63	96	about	above	✓					✓
63	77	head	heart	✓					✓
64	78	ciffer	safe	✓					✓
66	57	hurrah	hir		✓				✓
66	100	to	the						✓
COLUMN TOTAL				13	8	4	7	11	7
TOTAL MISQUES									
TOTAL WORDS									
PERCENTAGE									

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <i>John</i>		DATE <i>Dec 14, 1989</i>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY	Weakness NN_				
							SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</i>				
							WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT				
SENTENCE No.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect <i>Q</i>	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
74	101	<i>Coming</i>	<i>come</i>	✓			✓				
75	102	<i>Some time</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	✓			✓				
75	103	<i>away</i>	<i>anyway</i>	✓			✓				
76	104	<i>the</i>	<i>all</i>			✓					
76	105	<i>his</i>	<i>he</i>		✓			✓	✓		
<i>Totals for 101-105</i>				3	1	1	3	1	1		
<i>Totals for 76-100</i>				13	8	4	7	11	7		
<i>Totals for 51-75</i>				15	8	2	5	12	8		
<i>Totals for 26-50</i>				14	8	3	13	6	6		
<i>Totals for 1-25</i>				15	7	3	13	9	3		
<i>COLUMN TOTAL</i>				60	32	13	41	39	25		
<i>a. TOTAL MISCUES</i>				<i>TOTAL MISCUES</i>		<i>105</i>					
<i>b. TOTAL WORDS</i>				<i>PERCENTAGE</i>		<i>57.1 30.5 12.4 39.1 37.1 23.8</i>					
<i>a + b x 100 = MPH</i>											

NAME John DATE Dec. 14, 1989

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting
5. Mayor..... (2)
6. Mayor's wife..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind, helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things, that inadvertently caused problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2) 2
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 2

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2)
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2)

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1)
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1) 1
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1) 1
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1)
 - by harvesting..... (1)
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2)

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry
he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to
leave town. (4) 4
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied.
He packed and moved to a cave far away
from town. (4)
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend
Harry went. (4) 4

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
 - he demonstrated his power by
temporarily turning the mayor into a
goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone
toads, the wizard forced the people
to bring him everything he
wanted..... (3) 3
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more,
even after the people had nothing left to give.
They hid in their empty houses and waited for the
worst. (6)
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shav-
ing, looking into a mirror on a chain around his
neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up
Will and ran for the town. (6)

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 6

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 6

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 6

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 17 points

b. Development..... 16 points

II. Events..... 31 points

Total points 64

Name: John

Date: Dec. 14, 1989

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

Discussed people who are gentle, kind, mannerly and helpful to others (e.g., fire fighters).

INFERENCES:

The giant could quickly clear the town after a big snowfall.

The giant got into trouble because of his size and strength.

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Didn't understand how mirror came to be in magic-throwing scene.

Harry knew the townspeople were in trouble because he could feel it.

COMMENTS:

During reading, student frequently subvocalized as he tried to figure out difficult sections.

After reading, student was able to discuss his evaluation of his own performance, as well as his insights during the oral reading. He felt the selection was generally hard for him.

The retelling was done in two parts, following oral reading of each of the two parts in the selection.

STUDENT: JohnDATE: Dec. 14, 1989

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: The Helpful GiantAUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

¹Once upon a time, there was a giant ^Cwho ^Hwhose
 name was Harry. ^RHe was friendly, he was ^Hbrave,
^{UC}and he was ^Hkind. ^RBut sometimes ^{UC}he ^Hdidn't think ^Hhe ^{UC}did things
^{UC}that ^Hwere ^Hfoolish.

1. Y Y N2. Y N -3. N N -

⁴Harry liked helping people. ^RIn summer, ^Che
^{UC}would ^Hmake ^Hpine trees ^Hinto fans to cool off the
 town.

4. Y Y N5. Y Y N

^RHe carried ^Nwater ^Sin his bathtub to help people
^Swith ^Hwater ^Htheir gardens.

6. Y N -

^RHe even ^Chelped ^Hup ^Hthe steeple ^Hwhile a church
 was being built.

7. Y Y Y

^C He carried ^H Keeping
 8 But the best thing Harry did was keep the

wicked wizard from ^{t-} taking over the town.

8. Y Y Y

One boy

9 Nobody knew about this, because the wizard

never dared to make trouble as long as Harry

was around.

9. N N -

^{uc} said ^H town
 10 The wizard stayed up in his big tower on the

hill. 11 He looked down on the town and made

10. Y N -

wicked plans.

11. N N -

^C Some ^{uc} S H
 12 Sometimes people got hay when angry with Harry when

he tried to be helpful.

12. N N -

^R S P
 13 Like the time he helped Will Smith dig for

fishing worms.

13. Y Y Y

^H
 14 And the time he helped with the harvesting.

14. Y Y P

^C N ^{uc} S
 15 He worried with some
 And, worst of all, the time he picked some

flowers for the mayor's wife. ^H S ^C ^t
 Monday feast
 16 The flowers turned

15. N N -

^C ^{uc} ^H ^C
 17 out to be the very mayor's best apple tree!

16. Y Y Y

^H
He
17 The mayor was very angry. ^H 18 "You're nothing
^N the ^H make
but a trouble maker, Harry," he said. 19 "Now, get
out of town!"
^C 20 "That's right!" cried the people. ^C ^{UC} 21 "You are
^{away} ^H
always causing trouble."

17. N N -18. N N -19. Y Y N20. Y Y N21. Y Y N

^{UC} ^{took} ^H ^H ^H ^{-n't} ^{UC}
22 Harry thought his heart would break. 23 But
^{UC} ^{told} ^S ^N ^{every} ^C
24 then he thought about all the messes he had
made. 25 Maybe the people were right.
^{AC} ^{he} ^{trotted} ^{UC} ^{UC} ^{was}
26 Wiping away his tears, Harry went home and
^{UC} ^{picked it} ^R ^{carried}
27 packed. 28 Then he moved to a cave far away from

22. N N -23. N N -24. Y Y N25. N N -26. N N -

the town.
^{UC} ^{was} ^{where} ^{was} ^S ^{UC} ^{what}
27 But Will Smith followed him to see where he
^{UC} ^{was} ^{where} ^{was} ^S ^{UC} ^{what}
28 He didn't want to lose his friend.
^{UC} ^{was} ^{where} ^{was} ^S ^{UC} ^{what}
29 ("He didn't want to leave his friends")

27. Y N -28. Y N -

[Part I = 13:00]

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

^{UC} ^{that} ^{he} ^S ^{AC} ^{no one} ^{knowing} ^{no} ^S ^{could} ^C ^S ^{now}
29 When the wizard saw Harry leave, he knew
there was nothing to stop him from taking over

the town.

29. N N -

^{UC}Finished^S ^Htried ^C^{UC}the^N
³⁰First, he turned the mayor into a goat.
³¹The spell only ^{UC}last^H ^Nthe ^Hhorses ³²But ^Cthe^S
^Sonly ^Hnow ^She ^Smumbled
 proved how strong his magic was.
³³Next, he told the people they must ^{there's much}bring him
^Sanything he asked for. ^{from}^{UC}^HIt ^P
³⁴If they refused, he would
turn them into stone ^{there}toads. ^{the}³⁵They knew he could
do it, so they ^{UC}^Hgave him what he ^{wondered}wanted.

30. N N -31. N N -32. N N -33. N N -34. N N -35. N N -

³⁶But the wizard was ^{free}greedy, and soon ^Rhe ^P
wanted more...and more... ^Hand ^{move}more!

36. N N -

³⁷Before long, the people ^Phad nothing left to
^Hgave ^Hgive him.

37. Y N -

³⁸When the people told the wizard this, ^{his}he was
 very ^Pangry. ³⁹He told them they had until sunset to
^{\$P-}find more, or...poof! ⁴⁰He would turn them into
^a^Hstone toads!

38. N N -39. N N -40. Y Y P

⁴¹The people didn't know what to do. ⁴²They hid^S in their^H ^{tears}^P empty houses and waited for the worst

41. Y Y N

to happen.

42. Y N -

⁴³Will knew what to do. ⁴⁴He^N ^{that}^{RM} ^{w-}^R went to get Harry.

43. N N -44. N N -

⁴⁵Harry was sitting ^{store}^S ^{from}^H ⁱⁿ front of his cave, shaving.

45. N N -

⁴⁶He was looking in his shaving mirror that he

wore on a chain around his neck.

46. N N -

⁴⁷"Harry, you've got to help us!" cried Will.

47. N N -

⁴⁸"The wizard is going to turn us into ^{song}^H stone toads!"

48. Y Y P

⁴⁹Harry didn't even finish shaving. ⁵⁰He picked

49. Y Y Y

up Will and ran ^{from}^C ^{journey}^S for town. ⁵¹It was almost sunset

50. Y Y N

⁵²He knew that time was ^{when he got there}^R ^{the}^H running out.

51. Y N -52. Y Y N

⁵³There were flashes of light coming from the ^{town}^{RM} tower on the hill. ⁵⁴The wizard was getting his

53. Y Y Y

magic ready.

54. Y N -

⁵⁵Harry put Will down. ⁵⁶He went to ^{stand}^{UC} ^{S-} in

55. Y Y N

RM N
from all
front of the town.

RM
told
thought.

57 "I'll let the magic hit me," he
58 "After all, I'm only a foolish giant. 59 Who

cares if I turn into a stone toad?"

56. N N -

57. N N -

58. N N -

59. N N -

S H
shined light
60 He shut his eyes tight and waited.

R H N UC from H
they wa- the
61 Then there was a blinding flash of light from

R RM R
the tower. 62 The wizard had thrown his magic. 63 It

H S H H
duck ran about head
struck Harry right above his heart.

60. N N -

61. N N -

62. Y N -

63. N N -

H R
after
64 But Harry was safe. 65 The magic hit his shaving

RM UC S C
town hurrah to S
mirror and bounced back to the tower. 66 It hit the

wizard and turned him into a stone toad!

67 Harry opened his eyes. 68 He didn't really know

RM
the n-
what happened, but he knew he wasn't turned

S-
into stone.

64. Y N -

65. N N -

66. N N -

67. N N -

68. N N -

69 The people rushed out of their houses.

R
70 "Hurray for Harry! Harry is our hero!" they

69. N N -

- cried. ⁷¹The mayor gave Harry ^Ra medal. 70. Y Y N
 71. N N -
- ^{uc} ^H coming
⁷²"Come back and live with us," said Will. ⁷³"We 72. N N -
need you." 73. N N -
- ⁷⁴From that day on, Harry lived with the
 people in the town. ⁷⁵Of course, ^Hsometimes he did 74. N N -
 some foolish things, but everyone loved him
 away. ^H ^C ^N ^S
⁷⁶After ^{the} ^{his} all, he was brave and ^{K-}kind. ⁷⁷And he 75. N N -
 was ^C ^{uc} ^{-S} ^{RM} their friend. 76. N N -
 77. Y N -

[Part II = 11:50]

Q.1
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 77)

Y 33 (43 %)N 44 (57 %)

Q.2
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 77)

Y 21 (27 %)N 56 (73 %)

Q.3
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 21)

N 12 (57 %)P 3 (14 %)Y 6 (29 %)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 24:50.Reading Rate = 28.4 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for
 complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

	%	%	READER <i>John</i>	DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>
LANGUAGE SENSE			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE SCHOOL
Strength	29.9	146.8	SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>	
Partial Strength	16.9			
Weakness	53.2		REPEATED MISCUES ACROSS TEXT	
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS			LINE	COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
Graphic				
High	62.9	188.6	<i>did</i>	<i>didn't</i> Sentences 41 and 49
Some	25.7		<i>town</i>	<i>lower</i> Sentences 53 and 61
None	11.4			
Sound				
High	38.6	171.4		
Some	32.8			
None	28.6			
RETELLING				
Holistic Score				
or Comments				
<i>Scored on Retelling Guide</i>				
<i>72%</i>				
MPHW _____				
TIME <i>15:00</i>				
COMMENTS				
<i>Reading Rate = 706 ÷ 15 = 47.1 wpm</i>				

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SKILLS								READER John		DATE May 16, 1970					
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1, 2, 3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL					
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ YN_								
1	Y	Y	N		✓										
2	Y	Y	N	- Y		✓									
3	Y	N	Y				✓								
4	Y	Y	N	P	✓										
5	Y	N	Y			✓									
6	Y	Y	N	Y	✓										
7	Y	N	Y	N		✓									
8	Y	N	N	-			✓								
9	Y	Y	N	-			✓								
10	Y	N	Y	N		✓									
11	Y	Y	N	-			✓								
12	Y	N	Y	N		✓									
13	Y	N	Y	N			✓								
14	Y	Y	N	-	✓										
15	Y	N	Y	N		✓									
16	Y	Y	N	- Y			✓								
17	Y	N	Y	N			✓								
18	Y	Y	Y	N	✓										
19	Y	Y	Y	N	✓										
20	Y	Y	Y	N	✓										
21	Y	Y	N	-			✓								
22	Y	Y	N	- Y		✓									
23	Y	N	Y	N			✓								
24	Y	Y	Y	Y		✓									
25	N	N	-				Y								
COLUMN TOTAL					8	7	10								
PATTERN TOTAL															
PERCENTAGE															
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT															
SENTENCE No.	MISQUE No.	READER Dialect Ⓢ	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND								
				H	S	N	H	S	N						
5	1	he	In			✓			✓						
5	2	palm	plane		✓			✓							
5	3	fan	fans	✓				✓							
6	4	crops	gardens		✓			✓							
7	5	helpful	herd	✓				✓							
7	6	with	while	✓				✓							
8	7	he	the	✓					✓						
8	8	keeping	keep	✓				✓							
9	9	even	never	✓				✓							
10	10	down	tower	✓				✓							
11	11	he	and			✓		✓	✓						
11	12	spells	plans		✓			✓							
13	13	a	the			✓		✓							
13	14	with	will	✓				✓							
13	15	dug	dig	✓				✓							
14	16	he	And			✓			✓						
14	17	hardest	harvesting	✓				✓							
16	18	may	mayor's	✓				✓							
18	19	you	You're	✓				✓							
20	20	that	That's	✓				✓							
21	21	to	You		✓			✓							
21	22	always	always	✓				✓							
23	23	they	then					✓							
24	24	apples	picole	✓				✓							
25	25	he	his		✓			✓							
COLUMN TOTAL				16	5	4		12	9	4					
TOTAL MISQUES															
PERCENTAGE															
a. TOTAL MISQUES ____															
b. TOTAL WORDS ____															
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____															

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER John		DATE May 16, 1976		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYY	Partial Strength YYP	Weakness NN_				
							SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Posttest)				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (D)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
24	Y	N									
25	Y	N									
26	Y	N									
27	Y	N									
28	Y	N									
29	Y	N									
30	Y	N									
31	Y	N									
32	Y	N									
33	Y	N									
34	Y	N									
35	Y	N									
36	Y	N									
37	Y	N									
38	Y	N									
39	Y	N									
40	Y	N									
41	Y	N									
42	Y	N									
43	Y	N									
44	Y	N									
45	Y	N									
46	Y	N									
47	Y	N									
48	Y	N									
49	Y	N									
50	Y	N									
COLUMN TOTAL					5	2	18	a. TOTAL MISCUES ____			
PATTERN TOTAL								b. TOTAL WORDS ____			
PERCENTAGE								a ÷ b x 100 = MPHW ____			
				COLUMN TOTAL				15	8	2	
				TOTAL MISCUES				9	8	8	
				PERCENTAGE							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER John		DATE May 16, 1990	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL			
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_						
SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Posttest)										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT			
		READER		TEXT		4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
		Dialect ①				H	S	N	H	S	N		
51	Y	N	-										
52	Y	Y	P		✓								
53	N	Y	N						✓		✓		
54	Y	Y	N		✓								
55	Y	Y	N						✓				
56	N	N	-										
57	Y	Y	N										
58	Y	Y	P		✓								
59	Y	Y	P		✓								
60	N	Y	-										
61	Y	N	Y		✓								
62	N	N	-										
63	N	N	-										
64	Y	N	-		✓								
65	N	N	-		✓								
66	N	N	-		✓								
67	Y	Y	N		✓								
68	N	Y	-										
69	Y	Y	N		✓								
70	Y	Y	N		✓								
71	N	Y	-										
72	Y	Y	N		✓								
73	Y	Y	N		✓								
74	Y	Y	N		✓								
75	N	N	-										
COLUMN TOTAL					8	4	13						
PATTERN TOTAL													
PERCENTAGE													
		READER		TEXT		4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
		Dialect ①				H	S	N	H	S	N		
46	51	Harry	his										
46	51	knew	neck	✓	✓					✓	✓		
50	53	little	will	✓						✓			
52	54	right	running		✓					✓			
53	55	then	where	✓									
53	56	they	were		✓								
53	57	the	of					✓					
53	58	at	on	✓									
56	59	from	front	✓					✓				
57	60	lead	let	✓					✓				
57	61	whithered	thought		✓								
59	62	you	I					✓					
59	63	try	turn	✓									
59	64	stones	stone	✓					✓				
61	65	blinking	blinding	✓					✓				
68	66	real	really	✓					✓				
68	67	was	wasn't	✓					✓				
68	68	lead	stone		✓								
70	69	Harry	Hurrah	✓						✓			
75	70	always	anyway	✓						✓			
		COLUMN TOTAL		13		5	2	6	6	8			
		TOTAL MISQUES											
		PERCENTAGE											

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

(Goodman, Watson, Watson, Burke)

NAME JohnDATE May 16, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting

5. Mayor..... (2) 6. Mayor's wife..... (1) 1

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind, helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things, that inadvertently caused problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2) 2
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 1

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2) 1
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2) 2

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1)
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1) 1
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1) 1
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1) 1
 - by harvesting..... (1) 1
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2) 1

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to leave town. (4) 3
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied. He packed and moved to a cave far away from town. (4) 3
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend Harry went. (4) 4

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
- he demonstrated his power by temporarily turning the mayor into a goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone toads, the wizard forced the people to bring him everything he wanted..... (3) 3
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more, even after the people had nothing left to give. They hid in their empty houses and waited for the worst. (6) 4
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shaving, looking into a mirror on a chain around his neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up Will and ran for the town. (6) 3

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 3

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 4

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 4

I. Character Analysis:

- a. Recall..... 18 points
b. Development..... 18 points

II. Events..... 36 points

Total points 72

Name: John

Date: May 16, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

Even if someone messes up, you shouldn't treat them like dirt.

Student was able to discuss concepts of friendship and caring about others.

INFERENCES:

The reason he inadvertently caused trouble was because he was so big.

Light coming from Harry's chest was his love and it overcame the magic of the wizard.

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Didn't understand role of mirror in confrontation with wizard's magic.

Will's only reason for going to ask Harry to come back was because of friendship (student didn't also indicate it was to help save the town from the wizard).

Lady who owned the apple trees was the person who ordered Harry to leave town.

COMMENTS:

Student said he noticed that he could read the story more easily and could understand it more compared with first reading (five months ago).

STUDENT: John DATE: May 16, 1990
 TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____
 TITLE: The Helpful Giant
 AUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

¹Once upon a time, there was a giant whose
 name was Harry. ^(R)²He was friendly, he was (brave,
 and he was kind. ³But sometimes he did things
 that were foolish.

1. Y Y N

2. Y Y Y

3. N N -

⁴Harry liked helping people. ^(R)^(C)^N^{He}⁵In summer, he
^(R)^S^{UC}^(C)^{le-}⁶would make palm trees into fans to cool off the
 town.

4. Y Y N

5. Y Y P

^(C)⁷He carried water in his (bathtub) to help people
^(C)^S^{UC}^{crops}⁸water their gardens.
^(UC)^(C)^{UC}^{help}^{helped}^H⁹He even held up the steeple while a church
 building ^(d)¹⁰was being built.

6. N N -

7. Y Y Y

^CBut ^{he} the best thing Harry did was keep ^{ing} the

^R wicked wizard from taking over the town.

8. Y Y N

⁹Nobody knew about this, because the wizard
^{UC} ^H never ^{even} dared to make trouble ^C ^{UC} ^{the} ^{time} as long as Harry
 was around.

9. N N -

¹⁰The wizard ^{S-} stayed up in his big ^{UC} ^H tower on the
 hill. ^C ^{a-} ¹¹He looked down on the town, and made
 spells
 wicked plans.

10. N N -11. Y Y Y

^R ¹²Sometimes people got angry with Harry when

he tried to be helpful.

12. Y Y N

^C ^N ^a ^{ti-} ¹³Like the time he helped Will ^H ^{with} ^{smal-} ^H ^{dug} Smith dig for

fishing worms.

13. N N -

^C ^N ^{He} ¹⁴And the time he helped with the harvesting ^H

14. Y Y N

¹⁵And, ^{worst} of all, the time he ^{picked} some
 flowers for ^{UC} ^{maid} ^{may} ^H the mayor's wife. ¹⁶The flowers turned
 out to be ^C ^{people's} ^{UC} the mayor's best apple trees!

15. N N -16. Y Y Y

¹⁷The ^Cmayor^H was very angry. ¹⁸"You^Hre nothing but a trouble maker, Harry," he said. ¹⁹"Now, get out of town!"

²⁰"That^Cs right!" cried the people. ²¹"You^S ^{T_o}are always ^Hway causing trouble."

17. N N -18. Y Y N19. Y Y N20. Y Y N21. N N -

²²Harry^C ^Hthought his heart would break. ²³But ^Cthey then he ^Hthought about all the ^Cmesses he had made. ²⁴Maybe^C ^Hthe apples people were right.

²⁵Wiping^{uc} away ^Hhis ^Stears, Harry went home and ^{uc}picked ^Hthere ^Hpacked. ²⁶Then he moved to a cave ^Hcare ^{uc}far away from

the town.

²⁷But ^CWill ^SSmith followed him ^Rto see where he ^Swhere went. ²⁸He ^Cdidn't ^Hwant to lose his friend.

[Part I = 6:30]

22. Y Y Y23. N N -24. Y Y Y25. N N -26. Y N -27. N N -28. Y Y N

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

²⁹When the wizard ^Hwas saw Harry ^Cleave, he knew there was nothing to ^Rstop him from taking over the town.

29. Y N -

³⁰First, he turned the mayor ^C ^H ^N ^{to the} into a goat.
³¹The ^H ^{He} spell only lasted ^H ³ for three hours. ^{he} ³²But it
proved how strong his magic was.

30. N N -31. Y N -32. Y N -

³³Next, he told the people they must bring him
^C ^{any} ⁵ anything he asked for. ³⁴If they refused, he would
 turn them into stone toads. ³⁵They knew he could
 do it, so they gave ^R ^{us} ^{that} ^{their} ⁵ him what he wanted.

33. N N -34. N N -35. Y N -

³⁶But the wizard was greedy, and soon he
^H ³⁷wanted more...and more...and more!

36. N N -

³⁷Before long, the people had nothing left to
 give him.

37. Y Y N

³⁸When the people told the wizard this, he was
very angry. ³⁹He told them they had until sunset to
find more, or...poof! ⁴⁰He would turn them into
stones
stone toads!

38. Y N -39. N N -40. Y Y P

41. The people ^{(C) RM} didn't know what to do. 42. They hid ^S in their ^{cupboards} empty houses and ^(R) waited for the ^(R) worst.
43. Will knew ^(R) what to do. 44. He ^{(R) H} went to get ^(R) Harry.
45. Harry was ^{still S} sitting ^{(C) H} in front of his ^{(C) caring UC} cave, ^{(C) sharing UC} shaving.
46. He ^(R) was ^(R) looking in his ^{(R) H} shaving mirror ^{then} that he ^S knew ^H wore on ^S a chain ^{Harry knew} around his neck.
47. "Harry, you've got to help us!" cried Will.
48. The wizard is going to turn us into stone toads!
49. Harry ^{RM} didn't even ^(C) finish shaving. 50. He ^H picked up Will and ran ^{(C) t-} for town. 51. It was ^(C) almost sunset
- when he got there. 52. He ^S knew that time was ^S right ^S running out.
53. There ^{H S} were ^{(C) N} flashes ^{the} of light ^(C) coming from the ^{RM H} town of tower on the hill. 54. The wizard was getting his magic ready.
55. Harry put Will down ^{And} ^(C) he went to stand in

41. Y Y N42. N N -43. Y Y N44. Y Y Y45. N N -46. N N -47. N N -48. N N -49. Y N -50. Y Y N51. Y N -52. Y Y P53. N N -54. Y Y N55. Y Y N

from^H front^S of the town. 57 "I'll let the magic hit me," he^R 56. N N -
 #hithered thought. 58 "After all, I'm only a foolish giant. 59 Who 57. Y N -
 cares if I^{UC} turn^N his^C into a stone^H, toad^{-S}? 58. Y Y Y
 59. Y Y P

60 He^R shut his eyes tight and waited. 60. N N -
 61 Then there was a blinding^H flash of light from
 town^{RM} the tower. 62 The wizard had thrown his magic. 63 It 61. Y Y Y
 struck Harry (right above) his heart. 62. N N -
 63. N N -

64 But Harry was safe. 65 The magic hit his shaving 64. Y N -
 mirror and bounced back to the tower. 66 It hit the 65. N N -
 wizard and turned him into a stone toad! 66. N N -
 67 Harry opened his eyes. 68 He^R didn't^H really know 67. Y Y N

what happened, but he knew he wasn't^H turned
 into stone. 68. N N -

69 The people rushed out of their houses. 69. Y Y N
 70 Hurray^{UC} for Harry! Harry is our hero! they 70. Y Y N

cried. ⁷¹The mayor gave Harry a medal.

70. Y Y N
71. N N N

⁷²"Come back and live with us," said Will. ⁷³We need you."

72. Y Y N
73. Y Y N

⁷⁴From that day on, Harry lived ^Cwith the people in the town. ⁷⁵Of course, sometimes he did

74. Y Y N

some foolish things, but everyone loved him

^Halways anyway. ⁷⁶After all, he was brave and kind. ⁷⁷And he

75. N N N
76. Y Y N

was their friend.

77. Y Y N

[Part II = 8:30]

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 46 (60 %)

N 31 (40 %)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 36 (47 %)

N 41 (53 %)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 36)

N 23 (64 %)

P 4 (11 %)

Y 9 (25 %)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 15:00.

Reading Rate = 47.1 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>John</u>		DATE <u>May 17, 1990</u>									
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL									
					Strength	Partial Strength	Weakness	SELECTION <u>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</u>										
					Y Y N	Y Y Y	N N _	WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT										
					Y Y N	Y Y Y	N N _	SENTENCE No.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (D)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC H S N			5 SOUND H S N			
1	Y	Y	N	✓				2	1	balls	books	✓	✓		✓			
2	Y	Y	N	✓				3	2	smarts	markers	✓			✓			
3	Y	Y	N	✓				4	3	then	them	✓			✓			
4								5	4	he	in			✓				
5	2	2	2					6	5	to	a					✓		
6	2	2	2					7	6	that	that's	✓			✓			
7								8	7	stupid	simple	✓						
8	Y	Y	N	✓				9	8	it's	it	✓			✓			
9	Y	Y	N					10	9	town	tower	✓			✓			
10								11	10	belong	balance	✓			✓			
11	Y	Y	P		✓			12	11	I'll	YOU'LL	✓	✓		✓			
12	Y	N	N					13	12	Mrs.	Ms.	✓			✓			
13	Y	N	N					14	13	set	set	✓			✓			
14	Y	N	N					15	14	myself	My	✓	✓		✓			
15	Y	N	N					16	15	every	Even	✓					✓	
16	Y	N	N					17	16	Miss	Ms.	✓						
17	Y	N	N					18	17	Jacob	Joliet	✓	✓		✓			
18	Y	Y	N		✓			19	18	part	private	✓			✓			
19	Y	N	N					20	19	stund	started	✓			✓			
20	N	N	N					21	20	her	she	✓					✓	
21	N	N	N					22	21	small	made	✓			✓			
22	N	N	N					23	22	before	from	✓					✓	
23	N	N	N					24	23	as	last	✓			✓			
24	N	N	N					25	24	carefully	careful	✓			✓			
25	N	N	N					26	25	they	then	✓						
COLUMN TOTAL					3	2	20	COLUMN TOTAL					19	4	2	12	8	5
PATTERN TOTAL								TOTAL MISCUES										
PERCENTAGE								PERCENTAGE										
								a. TOTAL MISCUES ____										
								b. TOTAL WORDS ____										
								a - b x 100 = MPHV ____										

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER John		DATE May 17, 1990	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL			
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ YN_						
SELECTION The Balancing Girl (Posttest)										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT			
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (d)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND						
				H	S	N	H	S	N				
26	N												
27	Y	Y	N	-	✓								
28	Y	Y	Y	N	✓								
29	Y	Y	Y	Y	✓								
30	N	N	N	-					✓				
31	N	N	N	-					✓				
32	Y	Y	N	-	✓				✓				
33	Y	Y	Y	P		✓							
34	Y	N	N	-					✓				
35	Y	Y	Y	P		✓							
36	Y	Y	N	-					✓				
37	Y	Y	N	-					✓				
38	Y	Y	N	-	✓								
39	N	N	N	-					✓				
40	Y	Y	Y	N	✓								
41	Y	Y	N	-	✓								
42	Y	Y	Y	N	✓								
43	Y	Y	N	-					✓				
44	N	N	N	-					✓				
45	N	N	N	-					✓				
46	N	N	N	-					✓				
47	Y	Y	N	-					✓				
48	Y	Y	N	-					✓				
49	Y	Y	Y	P		✓							
50	N	N	N	-					✓				
COLUMN TOTAL					6	5	14						
PATTERN TOTAL													
PERCENTAGE													
32	26	fumble	popple			✓				✓			
33	27	fur	from		✓						✓		
34	28	town	flowers		✓						✓		
35	29	country	city			✓					✓		
36	30	Mrs.	Margaret			✓					✓		
37	31	could	couldn't		✓						✓		
38	32	town	city			✓			✓				
39	33	we'll	it'll		✓						✓		
40	34	helped	held		✓				✓				
41	35	it	it's							✓			
42	36	strang	bagged		✓				✓				
43	37	Jesus	first			✓				✓			
44	38	play	pay		✓				✓				
45	39	from	at					✓					
46	40	day	carriant			✓		✓			✓		
47	41	everybody	Everyone		✓			✓					
48	42	3 fin	sake			✓					✓		
49	43	were	went		✓				✓				
50	44	visit	visited		✓				✓				
51	45	even	every		✓						✓		
52	46	blew	bought			✓					✓		
53	47	to	and				✓				✓		
54	48	pushing	pushes		✓				✓				
55	49	finishing	first		✓	✓			✓				
56	50	dominates	domino						✓				
COLUMN TOTAL					13	10	2	8	10	7			
TOTAL MISCUES													
TOTAL WORDS													
a + b x 100 = MPHW					PERCENTAGE								

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER John		DATE May 17, 1990	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCS IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)		TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_	SELECTION The Balancing Girl (Posttest)		
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT										
SENTENCE No.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND			
				H	S	N	H	S	N	
51	Y									
52	Y									
53	Y									
54	Y									
55	Y									
56	Y									
57	Y									
58	Y									
59	Y									
60	Y									
61	Y									
62	Y									
63	Y									
64	Y									
65	Y									
66	Y									
67	Y									
68	Y									
69	Y									
70	Y									
71	Y									
72	Y									
73	Y									
74	Y									
75	Y									
COLUMN TOTAL					2	4	19			
PATTERN TOTAL										
PERCENTAGE										
a. TOTAL MISCS ____					COLUMN TOTAL			12	6	1
b. TOTAL WORDS ____					TOTAL MISCS			9	7	3
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____					PERCENTAGE					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

[illegible]

NAME John DATE May 17, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Balancing Girl" (Berniece Rabe)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Margaret, the Balancing Girl..... (10) 10
2. Tommy..... (5) 5
3. Ms. Joliet, the Gr. 2 teacher..... (2) 2
4. Other students..... (1) 1
 - a. school in general
 - b. Gr. 2 class
 - c. William
5. Parents/public..... (1) 1
 - a. generally
 - b. William's grandmother
 - c. Tommy's dad
6. Principal..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Margaret (12 points)

- a. Good at balancing..... (3) 3
- b. Wanted Tommy to acknowledge her balancing ability..... (3) 3
- c. Pleased to use her balancing ability to help others..... (3) 3
- d. Pleased to see Tommy finally acknowledge her ability..... (3) 3

2. Tommy (8 points)

- a. Unkind towards Margaret
regarding her balancing
ability..... (4) 3
- comment re: Magic Markers
 - demolition (?) of
tower/castle
- b. Changed his attitude
towards Margaret's
balancing ability..... (4) 4

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Something Special

1. Margaret was very good at balancing; for example,
- books on head (stationary)
 - books on head (moving)
 - on crutches

One day she balanced Magic Markers in a row on a shelf. Ms. Joliet acknowledged her special ability; but Tommy made an unkind remark about it.

(7) 6

2. Margaret thought up a special project which might change Tommy's opinion. She built a castle. However, someone knocked it down. Margaret blamed Tommy.

(6)

3. Ms. Joliet told the class about a school carnival to support UNICEF. She asked for ideas for helping. Tommy, William, and Margaret each made good suggestions.

(7) 5

B. Part Two: The Domino City

4. Margaret worked hard on her suggestion, which involved her constructing a "domino city." Everyone watched her project with keen interest.

(7) 5

5. Margaret couldn't remove a cookie someone had dropped in the middle of the dominoes. Tommy volunteered to get it, but Ms. Joliet said she would. Very carefully, she removed the cookie without disturbing the dominoes.

(6) 6

6. Everyone wanted to be the one who would push the first domino. Ms. Joliet said it would be determined by drawing a name out of a hat at the end of the carnival. Everyone clapped for Margaret and her project.

(7) 3

C. Part Three: The School Carnival

7. At the carnival, Margaret visited every booth, including those developed from William's and Tommy's suggestions. Towards the end, the principal called everyone to the grade two room for the Grand Finale.

(6) 2

8. From a hat containing all the names, William's grandmother drew the winner--Tommy. He stepped up but delayed, which prompted Margaret to exclaim, "Well, push!" He did, harder than needed; but the dominoes fell as planned. Everyone cheered.

(7) 7

9. Margaret and Tommy exchanged comments which suggested that not only had the balancing project been a financial success but that it had led to a change in Tommy's attitude about Margaret's balancing ability.

(7) 4

POINTS

I. Character Analysis:

- a. Recall..... 19 points
b. Development..... 19 points

II. Events..... 38 points

Total points 76

Name: John

Date: May 17, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

Everybody's got a special gift. It doesn't matter if someone can do something better than you.

Student volunteered comment about himself--that he has two special gifts. (Briefly discussed this.)

INFERENCES:

Tommy was jealous of Margaret's balancing ability.

Tommy and Margaret used to be like enemies, but in the end they changed and became friends.

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Margaret wanted someone to knock down the "fence" in the domino city.

She drew name out of a bag (student later corrected).

Margaret could balance balls on her head.

Tommy never knocked down anything Margaret balanced (before domino city event).

Carnival was to support school; didn't mention UNICEF.

COMMENTS:

Student said he would rate story as hard for him to read. He explained the reason as ". . . all the big words and that"; also, "I didn't see some of those words before; that's why I couldn't read them."

He said that, in terms of getting the main ideas from the story, he did "so-so."

STUDENT: John DATE: May 17, 1990
 TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____
 TITLE: The Balancing Girl
 AUTHOR: Berniece Rabe

Part One: Something Special

- ¹Margaret was very good at balancing. ²She
 could balance ^(C) ^Sballs ^(R)books on her head. ³She could glide
 along on her wheelchair and the books would not
 fall off. ⁴She could even balance herself and hop
 with her crutches.
- ⁵One day at school, ^(C) ^{Ma-}Margaret collected all the
^H Magic ^H Markers. ⁶She ^H balanced ^N them in ^H neat ^N rows
 on the shelf.
- ⁷Ms. Joliet said, ^(R) ^(C) ^N "You have a very steady hand,"
 Margaret.
- ⁸"Anybody can do that," Tommy said.
- ⁹"That's ^H simple."

1. Y Y N2. Y Y N3. Y N -4. N N -5. N N -6. N N -7. N N -8. Y Y N9. N N -

¹⁰Margaret ^Pplanned and ^Pplanned. ¹¹She wanted
to do something very special that Tommy could
^Hnot call ^{stupid}simple.

10. N N -11. Y Y P

¹²It took a long time and ^Hgreat care, but at ^Hlast
^HMargaret finished ^{it's}it. ¹³She had ^{UC}finished a ^{AC}fine
castle made of six towers, with a cone balanced
^{UC}gently on top of each.

12. N N -13. N N -

¹⁴At recess, someone knocked down Margaret's
^Htown tower. ¹⁵Margaret knew who did it.

14. Y N -15. N N -

¹⁶"Tommy," she said, "if you knock down
^{UC}anything ^{UC}I ^{UC}balance again, ^{UC}YOU'LL BE SORRY!"
^Hanything ^{UC}I ^{UC}balance again, ^{UC}YOU'LL BE SORRY!"

16. Y N -

¹⁷Ms. ^{J-}Joliet told the children ^{they were}going to
have a school ^{carnival} to ^{raise money} for

¹⁸She asked the children to think of ways

17. N N -

they could help.

18. Y Y Y

¹⁹Tommy said, "We can ^{UC}set up a fishpond."

19. Y N -

²⁰My dad and I could run the fishpond booth. ²¹People

20. N N -

would pay to fish for presents."

²²Everybody clapped for Tommy's idea.

^H
every
²³Even

Margaret clapped.

²⁴"We can be clowns," said William, "and sell

balloons."

²⁵The children clapped for William's ^Cide-idea.

²⁶Margaret whispered her idea to Ms. Joliet.

^H
Miss ^SJacob

²⁷Ms. Joliet liked the idea. ²⁸She said Margaret could

have a ^{uc}part ^Hprivate corner in the classroom where she could work.

[Part I = 5:15]

Part Two: The Domino City

²⁹The next morning, Margaret started ^Hstand setting

up dominoes. ³⁰Very, very carefully, she ^Hher balanced

each one and ^{mad}made it stand up just a little way

before ^Has ^Hfrom the last one. ³¹She had to be very careful. ^Hly

³²If ^{RM}every ^oone (finger touched) a domino and made it

fall, ^Cthey ^Hall the dominoes would ^Stumble topple down,

21. N N -

22. N N -

23. N N -

24. N N -

25. N N -

26. N N -

27. Y Y N

28. Y Y Y

29. Y Y Y

30. N N -

31. N N -

one by one.

32. N N -

³³Soon, Margaret used up all the dominoes in the room. ^{RM}Mrs. ^CMs. Joliet borrowed more ^Hfor from grade

33. Y Y N

one and ^{RM}every even more from grade three. ³⁵Just about

34. Y Y P

everybody ^ostood and watched while Margaret

built a whole city full of highways, bridges,

^Htown and towers.

35. N N -

³⁶At snack time, ^Rsomeone ^Cdropped a ^ocook-cookie in the middle of the domino ^Scountry.

36. Y Y P

^CMrs. ³⁷Margaret tried to reach it, but she ^{UC}couldn't. ³⁸I

37. Y N -

can't get that cookie," she said. ³⁹One ^Hslip and the

38. Y Y N

^Stown whole city ^Hwill fall down!"

39. N N -

^CWe'll ⁴⁰"I'll get it for you," said Tommy.

40. Y Y N

⁴¹Mrs. ^{RM}Joliet stopped him just in time. ⁴²"I'll do it, Tommy," she said.

41. Y Y N

^RThe whole class watched and ^Hhelped ^otheir breath. ⁴³Even Ms. ^{RM}Jacob ^{RM}help ^{RM}breath as she

42. Y Y N

43. Y N -

reached over and lifted out the cookie.

44. N N -

^C place. ^H "It ^S finished," she said.

45. N N -

46. N N -

^S ^R Everyone begged (and begged) to be the one to
push down the first domino.

47. Y N -

^{RM} Mrs. Jacob
^{UC} ^{play} ^H Ms. Joliet said, "If you want to be the one,
you have to ^{P-} pay to put your name in the hat.

48. Y N -

^R Then a name will be ^C drawn ^N from the end ^{UC} of the
day ^S carnival."

49. Y Y P

^H ^{Everybody} ^S Everyone clapped for Margaret. ^S Some of the

50. N N -

children said they would guard Margaret's

corner so the ^S domino city would be safe.

51. Y N -

[Part II = 6:00]

Part Three: The School Carnival

^S On the day of the carnival, the children and
parents ^H were ^R went from room to room to see the
different booths. ^H Margaret visited ^H even every one.

52. Y Y P

53. N N -

^R She ^S bought balloons and ^S won a prize at the

fishpond. ^{Her} ^{RM} ^C "She got a rubber spider."

54. N N -
55. N N -

⁵⁶Then there was a message on the loudspeaker.

56. N N -

⁵⁷The principal said, "It's time for the Grand

Finale!" ⁵⁸Come to the grade two room ^R ^C ^N and see the

57. N N -

domino city. ⁵⁹You may be the lucky one who

^H pushing ^S pushes down ^{UC} the ^{finishing} first ^{da -} domino."

58. N N -

59. N N -

⁶⁰People crowded into the grade two classroom.

60. N N -

⁶¹They got as close as they could to Margaret's ^H

corner. ⁶²Ms. Joliet held ^{AC} ^N out ^{of a} the hat with all the

61. Y Y Y

names ^C ^S in it. ⁶³William's grandmother pulled out

62. N N -

^C ^H ^S the name. ⁶⁴She read it out ^{reached} loud: "It's Tommy!"

63. Y Y Y

64. Y N -

^C ^H ^S the name. ⁶⁵Tommy ^{stopped} ^{UC} ^S ^C surprised ^{it's} inside the corner and stood

^H from for a long time, looking at Margaret.

65. Y N -

^R ^R ^C ^R "Well, push!" said Margaret.

66. Y Y N

⁶⁷Tommy pushed ^{that} ^H ^R harder than he needed ^H to, but

^S was ^H everything went beautifully ^{chicken} ^{chicken} ^{chicken} ^{RM} ⁶⁸Click, click, click, a

67. N N -

^{uc}chick ^{RM} chicken
^H thousand times ^{uc}click. ⁶⁹The dominoes took their
^H turns falling, ⁷⁰When they were all down, ^{there}
 was a big ^{cheer}.

68. Y N -69. Y Y Y70. N N -

⁷¹Tommy looked at Margaret and ^{yelled}, "I
 knocked down something you ^{built} balanced, and ^{I'm}
 not sorry!"

71. N N -

⁷²"I'm not sorry either," ^{said} called Margaret. ⁷³"My
^{RM} domino ^{could} ^{uc} ^{AC} ^{have} corner made a hundred and one dollars
 and thirty ^{cents} for ^{UNICEF}."

72. Y Y N73. N N -

⁷⁴Someone ^{sho-} shouted,

Hurrah for ^{uc}the
 ba-
 Balancing ^{Girl}!

74. N N -

⁷⁵And Margaret was ^{sure} she heard Tommy
^{join} in the cheer.

75. N N -

[Part III = 6:15]

<u>Q.1</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.2</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.3</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 22)
Y <u>34</u> (<u>45</u> %)	Y <u>22</u> (<u>29</u> %)	N <u>11</u> (<u>50</u> %)
N <u>41</u> (<u>55</u> %)	N <u>53</u> (<u>71</u> %)	P <u>5</u> (<u>23</u> %)
		Y <u>6</u> (<u>27</u> %)

No. Words in Selection = 739.

Total Reading Time = 17:30.

Reading Rate = 42.2 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

APPENDIX C

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>Dec 14, 1989</i>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL				
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_							
SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</i>										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT				
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND							
				H	S	N	H	S	N					
1	Y	Y	N	✓										
2	Y	Y	N	✓										
3	Y	Y	N	✓										
4	Y	Y	N	✓										
5	Y	Y	N	✓										
6	Y	Y	N	✓										
7	Y	N	Y	✓										
8	Y	Y	N	✓										
9	Y	N	Y	✓										
10	Y	N	Y	✓										
11	Y	Y	N	✓										
12	Y	Y	N	✓										
13	Y	N	Y	✓										
14	Y	Y	N	✓										
15	Y	N	Y	✓										
16	Y	Y	N	✓										
17	Y	Y	N	✓										
18	Y	Y	N	✓										
19	Y	N	Y	✓										
20	Y	Y	N	✓										
21	Y	Y	N	✓										
22	Y	N	Y	✓										
23	Y	Y	N	✓										
24	Y	Y	N	✓										
25	Y	N	Y	✓										
COLUMN TOTAL					11	4	10							
PATTERN TOTAL														
PERCENTAGE														
					a. TOTAL MISCUES _____					COLUMN TOTAL				
					b. TOTAL WORDS _____					TOTAL MISCUES				
					a ÷ b × 100 = MPH _____					PERCENTAGE				

MISCE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>Dec. 14, 1984</i>					
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL						
					Strength	Partial Strength	Weakness	SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</i>									
					Y Y N	Y Y Y Y Y P	N N Y N	WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
								SENTENCE No.	MISQUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC H S N			5 SOUND H S N		
26		N	N	1			✓	15	26	<i>times</i>	<i>time</i>	✓			✓		
27	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			16	27	<i>tree</i>	<i>trees</i>	✓			✓		
28	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	18	28	<i>you</i>	<i>you're</i>	✓			✓	✓	
29	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			18	29	<i>was</i>	<i>he</i>	✓		✓			✓
30	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			19	30	<i>how</i>	<i>Now</i>	✓			✓	✓	
31	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			20	31	<i>that</i>	<i>That's</i>	✓			✓		
32	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	22	32	<i>through</i>	<i>thought</i>	✓			✓	✓	
33	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			23	33	<i>mess</i>	<i>messes</i>	✓			✓		
34	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	25	34	<i>whipping</i>	<i>Whipping</i>	✓			✓		
35	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			25	35	<i>the</i>	<i>his</i>	✓	✓				✓
36	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	25	36	<i>trees</i>	<i>fears</i>	✓			✓	✓	
37	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			25	37	<i>picked</i>	<i>packed</i>	✓			✓		
38	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			28	38	<i>cause</i>	<i>lose</i>	✓	✓		✓	✓	
39	✓	✓	✓	1	✓	✓		28	39	<i>friends</i>	<i>friend</i>	✓			✓		
40	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	29	40	<i>leaving</i>	<i>fears</i>	✓			✓		
41	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			31	41	<i>last</i>	<i>lasted</i>	✓			✓		
42	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	32	42	<i>he</i>	<i>his</i>	✓			✓	✓	
43	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			33	43	<i>be</i>	<i>bring</i>	✓	✓				✓
44	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	33	44	<i>them</i>	<i>anything</i>	✓			✓	✓	
45	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	35	45	<i>nothing</i>	<i>they</i>	✓		✓			✓
46	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			34	46	<i>you</i>	<i>refused</i>	✓	✓				
47	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			34	47	<i>force</i>	<i>stone</i>	✓			✓		
48	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			34	48	<i>food</i>	<i>stone</i>	✓			✓		
49	✓	✓	✓	1	✓		✓	34	49	<i>stones</i>	<i>foods</i>	✓			✓	✓	
50	✓	✓	✓	1	✓			25	50	<i>there</i>	<i>they</i>	✓			✓		
COLUMN TOTAL					11	3	11	a. TOTAL MISQUES ____					COLUMN TOTAL				
PATTERN TOTAL								b. TOTAL WORDS ____					TOTAL MISQUES				
PERCENTAGE								a + b x 100 = MPIW ____					PERCENTAGE				

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>Dec. 14, 1989</i>	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL			
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_						
31	Y	Y	N	✓									
32	Y	Y	N	✓									
33	Y	Y	Y	✓									
34	Y	Y	N	✓									
35	Y	Y	N	✓									
36	Y	Y	N	✓									
37	Y	Y	N	✓									
38	Y	Y	N	✓									
39	Y	Y	N	✓									
40	Y	Y	N	✓									
41	Y	Y	N	✓									
42	Y	Y	N	✓									
43	Y	Y	N	✓									
44	Y	Y	N	✓									
45	Y	Y	N	✓									
46	Y	Y	N	✓									
47	Y	Y	N	✓									
48	Y	Y	N	✓									
49	Y	Y	N	✓									
50	Y	Y	N	✓									
51	Y	Y	N	✓									
52	Y	Y	N	✓									
53	Y	Y	N	✓									
54	Y	Y	N	✓									
55	Y	Y	N	✓									
56	Y	Y	N	✓									
57	Y	Y	N	✓									
58	Y	Y	N	✓									
59	Y	Y	N	✓									
60	Y	Y	N	✓									
61	Y	Y	N	✓									
62	Y	Y	N	✓									
63	Y	Y	N	✓									
64	Y	Y	N	✓									
65	Y	Y	N	✓									
66	Y	Y	N	✓									
67	Y	Y	N	✓									
68	Y	Y	N	✓									
69	Y	Y	N	✓									
70	Y	Y	N	✓									
71	Y	Y	N	✓									
72	Y	Y	N	✓									
73	Y	Y	N	✓									
74	Y	Y	N	✓									
75	Y	Y	N	✓									
COLUMN TOTAL					15	3	7						
PATTERN TOTAL													
PERCENTAGE													

SENTENCE NO.		MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
					H	S	N	H	S	N
36	31	ready		greedy	✓				✓	
37	32	he		the	✓				✓	
38	33	there		this		✓			✓	
39	34	there		port			✓			✓
40	35	knew		would		✓				✓
41	36	steam		stage		✓			✓	✓
42	37	camp		empty		✓			✓	
43	38	went		went	✓			✓	✓	
44	39	the		a			✓	✓		
45	40	clean		chain	✓				✓	
46	41	was		you've		✓				✓
47	42	gave		got	✓	✓			✓	
48	43	wanted		didn't	✓					✓
49	44	Will's		Will	✓					
50	45	turn		fewer	✓			✓	✓	
51	46	while		I'll		✓				
52	47	getting		let				✓		
53	48	set		hit		✓			✓	
54	49	him		me		✓				✓
55	50	sure		shut	✓				✓	
56	51	though		fight	✓					✓
57	52	is		was		✓			✓	
58	53	no		a			✓			✓
59	54	threw	②	threw	✓			✓		
60	55	below		above						✓
COLUMN TOTAL					11	10	4		7	9
TOTAL MISCUES										
TOTAL WORDS										
a + b × 100 = MPHW					PERCENTAGE					

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

(Goodman, Watson, Burke)

NAME MaxDATE Dec. 14, 1989

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting

5. Mayor..... (2) 2
6. Mayor's wife..... (1) 1

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind,
helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things,
that inadvertently caused
problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2)
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 2

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2) 2
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2) 2

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1)
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1)
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1)
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1)
 - by harvesting..... (1) 1
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2) 1

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to leave town. (4) 4
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied. He packed and moved to a cave far away from town. (4) 2
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend Harry went. (4)

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
 - he demonstrated his power by temporarily turning the mayor into a goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone toads, the wizard forced the people to bring him everything he wanted..... (3) 3
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more, even after the people had nothing left to give. They hid in their empty houses and waited for the worst. (6) 3
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shaving, looking into a mirror on a chain around his neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up Will and ran for the town. (6) 3

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 6

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 2

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 6

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 20 points

b. Development..... 18 points

II. Events..... 31 points

Total points 69

Name: Max

Date: Dec. 14, 1989

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

Discussed ideas about people who help other people.

INFERENCES:

Mayor probably felt bad about kicking Harry out of town
(end of part one).

MISCONCEPTIONS:

People hid in their closets until sunset, at which time the
wizard would be gone.

Didn't understand how wizard was turned into stone (i.e.,
role of the mirror).

Thought Will and Mayor might be the same character.

COMMENTS:

At end of part one, student omitted identifying two key
characters (wizard and Will).

Student rated the first part as being of medium difficulty
for him.

At end of part two, student identified wizard and Will.

Student rated the overall story medium although some words
were hard.

The retelling was done in two parts, following oral reading
of each of the two parts in the selection.

STUDENT: MaxDATE: Dec. 14, 1989

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: The Helpful GiantAUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

¹Once upon a time, there was a giant whose
 name was Harry. ²He was friendly, he was brave,
 and he was kind. ³But sometimes ^Che ^{UC}didn't ^Hdo things
 that were foolish.

1. Y Y N2. Y Y N3. Y Y N

⁴Harry liked ^{to help} helping people. ⁵In ^{the} summer, he
 would ^{UC}take ^Hmake ^Rpine trees into fans to ^Rcool off the
 town.

4. Y Y N5. Y N -

^Cprob-
⁶He carried water in his bathtub to help people
 water their gardens.

^{UC}And ^NHe even ^{UC}held up the ^{stairs}steeple while a church
^C^Sand building ^Hthings ^Swas being built.

6. Y Y N7. N N -

^{h-} But the best thing ^C Harry ^{liked} ^S did was ^H keep ^A the
^{UC} wacky wack ^H wicked wizard from taking over the town.

8. Y Y Y

^R Nobody knew about this, ^{because} the wizard
^{UC} never ^{dared} ^{to} ^{RM} ^H make ^{UC} trouble as ^{long} as Harry
 was around.

9. N N -

^H The wizard ^{stand} stayed up in his ^H big ^C tower ^a on the

hill. ^H He looked down on the town and made
 wacky wicked plans.

10. N N -11. Y Y P

^H Sometimes people ^H get hungry with Harry ^C ^{AC} when
^H he's tired
 he tried to be helpful.

12. Y N -

^{UC} ^H Make ^C ^H Like the time ^{he} ^{helped} Will Smith dig for
^H fishing worms.

13. N N -

^C ^{w-} And the time he helped ^H with the harvesting ^{UC}

14. Y Y N

^R ^H And, ^{worst} of all, the time ^H ^{-S} ^R he picked some
 flowers for the mayor's wife. ^H The flowers turned
 out to be the mayor's best apple trees!

15. N N -16. Y Y P

¹⁷The mayor was very angry. ¹⁸"You ^{re} nothing
but a trouble maker, ¹⁹"^{How} ^{Now} he said. ²⁰"That ^s right!" cried the people. ²¹"You are
out of town!"

17. Y Y N18. Y Y N19. N N -

²⁰"That ^s right!" cried the people. ²¹"You are
²²always causing trouble."

20. Y Y N21. Y Y N

²²Harry thought his ²³heart would break. ²⁴But
then he ²⁵thought about all the messes ²⁶he had

22. N N -23. Y Y P

made. ²⁶Maybe the people were right.

24. Y Y N

²⁷Whipping the trees ²⁸Harry went home and
picked packed. ²⁹Then he moved to a ³⁰cave far away from

25. Y N -

³¹the town.

26. N N -

³²But Will Smith followed him to see where he
went. ³³He didn't want to lose his friend ³⁴

27. Y Y N28. Y N -

[Pm: 1: 8:00]

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

³⁵When the wizard saw Harry leave ³⁶he knew
there was ³⁷nothing to stop him from taking over
the town.

29. Y Y N

³⁰First, he turned the mayor into a goat.
³¹The spell only lasted^(d) for three hours. ^(R)But it
^(C)proved^(S) how strong ^(H)his magic was.
³³Next, he told the people they must ^(UC)bring^(H) him
^(H)nothing^(UC) anything he asked for. ^(S)there you ^(S)force
³⁴If they refused, he would
^(S)turn them into stone toads. ^(H)toad stones ^(C)There
³⁵They knew he could
 do it, so they gave him what he wanted.

30. Y Y N31. Y Y N32. N N -33. Y N -34. N N -35. Y Y N

³⁶But the wizard was ^(UC)greedy^(H), and soon he
 wanted more...and more...and more!
³⁷Before long, ^(C)he^(H) the people had nothing left to
 give him.

36. Y N -37. Y Y N

³⁸When the people told ^(C)the wizard^(S) this, he was
 very angry. ³⁹He told them they ^(R)had^(UC) until^(UC) sunset to
 find more, ^(R)or...poof! ^(N)seve^(UC) ^(S)knew^(UC) ^(UC)turned^(UC)
^(C)foam^(S) stone toads! ⁴⁰He would ^(UC)turn^(UC) them into

38. Y Y N39. Y Y Y40. Y N -

⁴¹The people didn't know what to do. ⁴²They hid
^S
 in their empty houses and waited for the ^{S-}worst

41. Y Y N

to happen.

42. N N -

⁴³Will knew what to do. ^{UC}^{UC}He ^{wanted}^{want}^H^{wa-}went to get Harry.

43. Y Y N44. Y Y Y

⁴⁵Harry was sitting in front of his ^Rcave, ^Sshaving.

45. Y Y P

⁴⁶He was looking in his ^{this}^{RM}shaving mirror that he
^N^H
 wore on a chain around his ^{the clean}neck.

46. N N -

^{UC}^C^S^{was}^N^{gave}
⁴⁷"Harry, you've got to help us!" cried Will.

47. Y N -

⁴⁸"The wizard is going to turn us into stone toads!"

48. Y Y N

⁴⁹Harry ^{UC}^H^{wanted}didn't even finish ^Sshaving. ⁵⁰He picked
^C^H
 up Will's ^{the}and ran for town. ⁵¹It was almost sunset

49. N N -50. Y Y N

when he got there. ⁵²He knew that time was

51. Y Y N

running out.

52. Y Y N

⁵³There were ^Cflashes of light coming from the
^H
 tower on the hill. ⁵⁴The wizard was getting his
 magic ready.

53. Y Y Y54. Y Y N

⁵⁵Harry put Will down. ^R⁵⁶He went to stand in

55. Y Y N

front of the town. ^SWhile ^{UC}getting ^S ^{UC}set ^Shim ^S 57 "I'll let the magic hit me," he
 thought. ^SAfter all, I'm only a foolish giant. ^SWho
 cares if I turn into a stone toad?"

56. Y Y N57. Y N -58. Y Y N59. Y Y N

^C ^H ^H ^R
 60 He ^{sure} shut his eyes tight and ^{though} waited
 61 Then ^{UC} ^S ^C ^C ^N
 there was a blinding flash of light from
 town ^{RM} ^R ^H ^D
 the tower. The wizard had thrown his magic. 63 It
 struck Harry right ^{below} above his heart.

60. Y Y Y61. N N -62. Y Y N63. Y Y P

64 But Harry was safe. 65 The magic hit his shaving
 mirror and bounced back to the tower. 66 It hit ^S ^{RM} ^C ^H
 the wizard ^R and turned him ^R into a stone toad!

64. Y N -65. N N -66. Y Y N

67 Harry opened his eyes. 68 He didn't really know
 what happened, but he knew he wasn't turned
 into stone.

67. Y Y N68. Y Y N

69 The people rushed out of their houses.
^S ^C ^R ^H ^C ^{RM}
^SWashy ^Hherle ^Cthere
 70 "Hurra for Harry! Harry is our hero!" they

69. Y Y N

UC H - S R main S
 cried. ⁷¹The mayor gave Harry a medal.

70. Y N -
 71. Y N -

⁷²"Come back and live with us," said Will. ⁷³We
 need you."

72. Y Y N

73. Y Y N

⁷⁴From that day on, Harry lived with the
 people in the town. ⁷⁵Of course sometimes he did

74. Y Y N

some foolish things, ⁷⁶but everyone loved him

⁷⁷After all, he was brave and kind. ⁷⁸And he
 was ⁷⁹their farther friend.

75. N N -
 76. Y Y N

77. Y N -

[Part I = 12:45]

Q.1
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 77)

Y 61 (79 %)

N 16 (21 %)

Q.2
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 77)

Y 48 (62 %)

N 29 (38 %)

Q.3
 (No. Sentences
 Coded = 48)

N 38 (80 %)

P 5 (10 %)

Y 5 (10 %)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 20:45.

Reading Rate = 34.0 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER <i>Max</i>	DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE
				SCHOOL	
Strength	<i>53.2</i>	<i>74.0</i>	SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>		
Partial Strength	<i>20.8</i>		REPEATED MISCS ACROSS TEXT		
Weakness	<i>26.0</i>		LINE	READER	TEXT
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS					COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
Graphic				<i>wacky</i>	<i>wicked</i>
High	<i>62.7</i>	<i>89.6</i>		<i>the</i>	<i>his</i>
Some	<i>26.9</i>			<i>then</i>	<i>when</i>
None	<i>10.4</i>			<i>wanted</i>	<i>went</i>
Sound				<i>wasn't</i>	<i>was</i>
High	<i>32.8</i>	<i>61.2</i>			
Some	<i>28.4</i>				
None	<i>38.8</i>				
RETELLING					
Holistic Score					
or Comments					
<i>82%</i>					
<i>Scored on Retelling Guide</i>					
MPHW					
TIME <i>16:00</i>					
COMMENTS					
<i>Reading Rate = 706 ÷ 16 = 44.1 wpm</i>					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYY	Partial Strength YYN	Weakness YN				
SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>											
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (U)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
1	1	<i>Some</i>	<i>sometimes</i>		✓			✓			
2	2	<i>didn't</i>	<i>did</i>	✓				✓			
3	3	<i>like</i>	<i>things</i>		✓					✓	
4	4	<i>out</i>	<i>that</i>		✓						
5	5	<i>looked</i>	<i>like</i>	✓				✓			
6	6	<i>who</i>	<i>he</i>		✓						
7	7	<i>like</i>	<i>make</i>	✓							
8	8	<i>planting</i>	<i>pine</i>		✓				✓		
9	9	<i>Harry</i>	<i>He</i>		✓				✓		
10	10	<i>cried</i>	<i>carried</i>	✓					✓		
11	11	<i>the</i>	<i>his</i>		✓						
12	12	<i>lawns</i>	<i>gardens</i>		✓				✓		
13	13	<i>never</i>	<i>even</i>	✓						✓	
14	14	<i>filled</i>	<i>held</i>		✓				✓		
15	15	<i>steeples</i>	<i>steeple</i>	✓				✓			
16	16	<i>the</i>	<i>a</i>			✓				✓	
17	17	<i>built</i>	<i>built</i>	✓				✓			
18	18	<i>whisky</i>	<i>wished</i>		✓				✓		
19	19	<i>his</i>	<i>this</i>	✓						✓	
20	20	<i>wasn't</i>	<i>was</i>		✓				✓		
21	21	<i>power</i>	<i>power</i>	✓					✓		
22	22	<i>oh</i>	<i>on</i>		✓					✓	
23	23	<i>then</i>	<i>when</i>	✓					✓		
24	24	<i>a</i>	<i>for</i>			✓			✓		
25	25	<i>fish</i>	<i>fishing</i>	✓				✓		✓	
COLUMN TOTAL		13	6	6							
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											
a. TOTAL MISCUES ____				COLUMN TOTAL		15	8	2	10	7	8
b. TOTAL WORDS ____				TOTAL MISCUES							
a + b x 100 = MPHW ____				PERCENTAGE							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)		
					Strength	Partial Strength	Weakness
26	Y	Y	N	P	✓		
27	Y	Y	N		✓		
28	Y	Y	N		✓		
29	Y	Y	P		✓		
30	Y	Y	N		✓		
31	Y	Y	N		✓		
32	Y	N	N				✓
33	Y	Y	N		✓		
34	Y	Y	P		✓		
35	Y	Y	N		✓		
36	Y	Y	N		✓		
37	Y	Y	N		✓		
38	Y	Y		Y	✓		
39	Y	Y			✓		
40	Y	N					✓
41	Y	Y	N		✓		
42	Y	N					✓
43	Y	Y	N		✓		
44	Y	Y	P	Y	✓		
45	Y	Y			✓		
46		N	N				✓
47		N	N				✓
48	Y	Y	P		✓		
49	Y	Y	N		✓		
50	Y	Y	N		✓		
51							
COLUMN TOTAL					12	8	5
PATTERN TOTAL							
PERCENTAGE							

READER		Max		DATE		May 16, 1990			
TEACHER				AGE/ GRADE		SCHOOL			
SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>									
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (U)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
15	26	he	And			✓			✓
15	27	the	Some		✓				✓
15	28	from	for	✓				✓	✓
16	29	mayor	mayor's				✓		
21	30	troubles	trouble	✓					
22	31	hurt	break		✓				✓
23	32	all	about		✓				✓
23	33	about	all		✓				✓
23	34	madness	messes	✓				✓	
23	35	and	he			✓			✓
24	36	may	Maybe	✓				✓	
25	37	picked	packed	✓			✓		
26	38	the	a			✓			✓
27	39	wanted	went	✓				✓	
29	40	leaving	leave	✓				✓	
33	41	any	anything		✓				
35	42	he	he	✓			✓		
38	43	he	When	✓					✓
38	44	there	this		✓			✓	
38	45	is	he			✓			✓
38	46	wrong	angry	✓					✓
40	47	turned	turn	✓			✓		
40	48	himself	them		✓				✓
42	49	swears	worst	✓				✓	✓
43	50	this	his	✓					
a. TOTAL MISCUES				COLUMN TOTAL				14	
b. TOTAL WORDS				TOTAL MISCUES				7	
a + b x 100 = MPH				PERCENTAGE				4	
								8	
								5	
								12	

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL			
					Strength	Partial Strength	Weakness						
					YYN	YYY YYP	NN_ YN_						
51	2	2	2	-			✓						
52	2	2	2	-			✓						
53	2	2	2	-			✓						
54	2	2	2	-			✓						
55	2	2	2	-	✓		✓						
56	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
57	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
58	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
59	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
60	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
61	2	2	2	-			✓						
62	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
63	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
64	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
65	2	2	2	-			✓						
66	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
67	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
68	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
69	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
70	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
71	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
72	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
73	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
74	2	2	2	-	✓	✓							
75	2	2	2	-			✓						
CUMULON TOTAL PATTERN TOTAL					14	2	9						
PERCENTAGE													

SELECTION		WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISQUE NO.	READER	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
46	51	the	a			✓			✓		
47	52	Willie	Will	✓			✓				
48	53	gone	going	✓				✓			
50	54	to	for		✓				✓		
52	55	want	was	✓				✓			
53	56	flash	flashes	✓			✓				
53	57	edge	fewer		✓				✓		
53	58	of	on	✓					✓		
53	59	lawns	hill						✓		
63	60	below	above	✓					✓		
65	61	owner	power	✓				✓			
68	62	was	wasn't	✓					✓		
68	63	turning	turned	✓			✓				
70	64	Harry	Murrah	✓				✓			
70	65	it's	is	✓				✓			
70	66	the	they	✓				✓			
75	67	away	anyway	✓				✓			
Totals for 51-67				18	3	1	4	7	6		
Totals for 26-30				14	7	4	8	5	12		
Totals for 1-25				15	8	2	10	7	8		
CUMULON TOTAL MISQUES				42	18	7	22	19	26		
TOTAL MISQUES				67							
PERCENTAGE				62.7	26.9	10.4	32.8	28.4	38.8		

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

[illegible]

NAME MaxDATE May 16, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting

5. Mayor..... (2) 26. Mayor's wife..... (1) 1

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind,
helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things,
that inadvertently caused
problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2) 1
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 1

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2) 1
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2) 2

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1) 1
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1)
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1)
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1)
 - by harvesting..... (1) 1
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2) 1

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to leave town. (4) 3
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied. He packed and moved to a cave far away from town. (4) 4
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend Harry went. (4) 4

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
- he demonstrated his power by temporarily turning the mayor into a goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone toads, the wizard forced the people to bring him everything he wanted..... (3) 3
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more, even after the people had nothing left to give. They hid in their empty houses and waited for the worst. (6) 6
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shaving, looking into a mirror on a chain around his neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up Will and ran for the town. (6) 6

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 6

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 6

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 4

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 20 points

b. Development..... 17 points

II. Events..... 45 points

Total points 82

Name: Max

Date: May 16, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

The reader would learn not to be mean (like turning people into "frogs" and things like that) and not to fight.

INFERENCES:

Harry probably felt sad when he went against the wizard because he was hurting somebody (i.e., wizard).

Harry inadvertently caused problems because he was so big compared to the other people.

He probably tried harder not to cause problems so he could stay in the town (at the end of the story).

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Took apple trees to use as a fan.

The wizard was also a giant.

Harry planned to use the shaving mirror to reflect the magic and turn the wizard into a stone toad.

COMMENTS:

Said he couldn't remember reading this story in December (5 months ago).

STUDENT: Max DATE: May 16, 1990
 TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____
 TITLE: The Helpful Giant
 AUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

¹Once upon a time, there was a giant whose

name was Harry. ²He was friendly, ^{and} he was brave,

and he was kind. ^(C) ^SBut ^Ssometimes he ^Hdidn't ^Slike ^Sthings

^(C) ^Sout ^Sthat were foolish.

^(UC) ^(C) ^Hlooked ^Sthe ^(UC) ^Swho ^SHarry ^Sliked ^Shelping people. ³In ^Ssummer, ^She

^Hlike ^Splanting ^Swould make ^Spine trees into ^(C) ^Sfans to cool off the

town.

1. Y Y N

2. Y Y N

3. N N -

4. Y Y N

5. N N -

^S ^HHarry ^Scried ^Sthe ^SHe carried water in his bathtub to help people

^Slawn ^Swater their gardens.

^(UC) ^Hhold ^(UC) ^Hsteeples ^Hsteep- ^Nthe ^SHe even held up ^(C) ^Sthe ^Ssteeple while a church

^Hbuilt ^Swas being built.

6. Y N -

7. N N -

^(R) ⁸But the best thing Harry did was keep the
^H wacky
 wicked wizard from taking over the town.

8. Y Y Y

^(C) ^(C) ^H ^(UC)
⁹Nobody knew about this, because the wizard
 never dared to make trouble as long as Harry
^H ^{-n't}
 was _A around.

9. N N -

¹⁰The wizard stayed up in his big tower ^H ^(C) ^H
^{town} ^{oh} on the
^(UC) ^{all}
¹¹He looked down on the town and made
^{RM} ^{UC}
^{wacky}
^{wicked} plans.

10. Y Y Y11. Y Y Y

¹²Sometimes ^{the} _A people got angry with Harry ^(C) ^H
^{then} when
 he tried to be helpful.

12. Y Y N

^(C) ^{He} ^{liked} ^(C) ^N
¹³Like the time he helped Will Smith dig ^a for
^H
^{fishing} worms.

13. Y Y P

¹⁴And the time he helped with the harvesting.

14. Y Y N

^(C) ^N ^{He} ^S
¹⁵And, worst of all, the time he picked some ^{the}
^H
^{from} flowers for the mayor's wife. ¹⁶The flowers turned
 out to be ^(C) ^H
the mayor's best apple trees!

15. Y Y Y16. Y Y N

17The mayor was very angry. 18"You're ^{(C)@}nothing
but a trouble maker, Harry," ^(C)he said. 19Now, get
out of town!"

20 "That's right!" cried the people, 21 "You are
(C) H (u) -5
(always) causing trouble."

22 Harry thought his heart would break. 23 But
then he thought about all the messes he had
made. 24 Maybe the people were right.

25 Wiping away his tears, Harry went home and
picked
packed. 26 Then he moved to a cave far away from
the town.

(C) ^{Sm-} (R) (C)
27 But Will Smith followed him to see where he
 H
 wanted
 went. ²⁸ He didn't want to lose his friend.

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

29 When the wizard saw Harry leave^{RM} he knew^H leaving.
there's
there was nothing to stop him from taking over
the town.

³⁰First, he turned the mayor into a goat.

30. Y Y N

³¹The spell only lasted for three hours. ³²But it

31. Y Y N

^{AC}strengthened
proved how strong his magic was.

32. N N -

³³Next, he told the people they must bring him

^Cany
anything he asked for. ^RIf they refused, he would

33. Y Y N

turn them into ^Sstone ^Stoads. ³⁵They knew ^Che ^Hcould

34. Y Y P

do it, so they gave him what he wanted.

35. Y Y N

³⁶But the wizard was greedy, and soon he

wanted more...and more...and more!

36. Y Y N

³⁷Before long, the people had nothing left to

give him.

^{UC}Then ^HHe ^HWhen the people told the wizard ^{UC}this, ^Sthere ^Cis ^Nhe ^{was}

37. Y Y N

^Hwrong ^Rvery angry. ³⁹He told them they had until sunset to

38. Y Y Y

find ^{some}more, ^{or}...poof! ⁴⁰He ^Hwould ^Sturn ^Hthem into

39. Y Y Y

stone toads!

40. Y N -

- 41 The people didn't know what to do. 42 They hid ^H Y Y N
^{RM} wars
 (in) their empty houses and waited for the worst
- to happen. 42. Y H -
- 43 Will knew what to do. 44 He went to get Harry. 43. Y Y N
^{RM} wanted
 44. Y Y Y
- 45 Harry was sitting in front of his cave, (shaving). 45. Y Y P
^{RM} this
 (C) looked the
- 46 He was looking in his (shaving mirror) that he 46. N N -
^N the
 (C) wore on a (chain) around his neck.
- 47 "Harry, you've got (to help us!" cried Will. 47. N N -
^{UC} haven't ^{UC} have ^{AC} (C) ^H Willie
 (see below)
- 48 "The wizard is going to turn us into stone (loads!" 48. Y Y P
^C gone ^H
- 49 Harry didn't even finish shaving. 50 He picked 49. Y Y N
^C to ^S
- up Will and ran for town. 51 It was almost sunset 50. Y Y N
^{RM} then at the ^H wait
- when he got there. 52 He knew that time was 51. N N -
- running out. 52. N N -
- #47. "Harry, haven't you to help us?"
-
- 53 There were flashes of light coming from the 53. N N -
^R ^H
^S ^H ^S
 edge of the lawn (the) hill. 54 The wizard was getting his
- magic ready. 54. N N -
^{RM} wanted
- 55 Harry put Will down. 56 He went to stand in 55. Y Y N

front of the town. ⁵⁷"I'll let the magic hit me," he 56. Y Y Y
 thought. ⁵⁸"After all, I'm only a foolish giant. ⁵⁹Who 57. Y Y N
 58. Y Y N
 cares if I turn into a stone toad?" 59. Y Y N

⁶⁰He shut his eyes tight and waited. 60. Y Y P

⁶¹Then there was a blinding flash of light from
 the tower. ⁶²The wizard had thrown his magic. ⁶³It 61. N N -
 62. Y Y N
 stuck to ^(R) ^H
 struck Harry right ^{below} above his heart. 63. Y N -

⁶⁴But Harry was safe. ⁶⁵The magic hit his shaving 64. Y Y N
 mirror and bounced back to the tower. ⁶⁶It hit the 65. N N -
 wizard ^(R) ^{owner} and turned him into a stone toad! 66. Y Y N

⁶⁷Harry opened his eyes. ⁶⁸He didn't really know 67. Y Y N
 what happened, but he knew he wasn't ^H ^{turning} turned 68. Y N -
 into stone.

⁶⁹The people rushed out of their houses. 69. Y Y N
 (C) ^H Harry (C) ^H it's (C) ^H the
 70 "Hurrah for Harry! Harry is our hero!" they

cried. ⁷¹The mayor gave Harry a medal.

70. Y Y N
71. Y Y N

⁷²"Come back and live with us," said Will. ⁷³We need you."

72. Y Y N

73. Y Y N

⁷⁴From ^{today} that day on, Harry lived with the

people in the town. ⁷⁵Of course, sometimes he did

74. Y Y N

some foolish things, but everyone loved him

away ^H anyway. ⁷⁶After all, he was brave and kind. ⁷⁷And he ^C wasn't ^R was their friend.

75. Y N -
76. Y Y N

77. Y Y N

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 63 (82 %)

N 14 (18 %)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 57 (74 %)

N 20 (26 %)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 57)

N 41 (72 %)

P 8 (14 %)

Y 8 (14 %)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 16:00.

Reading Rate = 44.1 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 17, 1990</i>	
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE SCHOOL	
Strength		<i>42.7</i>	<i>52.0</i>	SELECTION <i>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</i>			
Partial Strength		<i>9.3</i>					
Weakness		<i>48.0</i>					
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS				REPEATED MISCUES ACROSS TEXT			
Graphic				LINE	READER	TEXT	COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
High		<i>64.9</i>	<i>93.5</i>		<i>Miss</i>	<i>Ms.</i>	<i>Sentence 17.</i>
Some		<i>28.6</i>			<i>every</i>	<i>even</i>	<i>Sentence 34.</i>
None		<i>6.5</i>			<i>began</i>	<i>begged</i>	<i>Sentence 47</i>
Sound							
High		<i>35.1</i>	<i>72.7</i>				
Some		<i>37.6</i>					
None		<i>27.3</i>					
RETELLING							
Holistic Score							
or Comments							
<i>Scored on Retelling Guide</i>							
<i>79%</i>							
MPHW							
TIME		<i>17:45</i>					
COMMENTS							
<i>Reading Rate = $739 \div 17.75 = 41.6$ wpm</i>							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							
SENTENCE NO.	MISUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)		
					Strength		Weakness
					YYN	YYY YYP	
1	Y	Y	N		✓		
2	Y	Y	N		✓		
3	Y	Y	N				✓
4	Y	Y	N				✓
5	Y	Y	N				✓
6	Y	Y	N		✓		
7	Y	Y	N			✓	
8	Y	Y	N		✓		
9	Y	Y	N		✓		
10	Y	N	N				✓
11	Y	Y	N		✓		
12	Y	Y	N			✓	
13	Y	Y	N				✓
14	Y	Y	N		✓		
15	Y	Y	N			✓	
16	Y	Y	N			✓	
17	Y	N	N				✓
18	Y	Y	N				✓
19	Y	Y	N		✓		
20	Y	N	N				✓
21	Y	Y	N		✓		
22	Y	Y	N		✓		
23	Y	Y	N		✓		
24	Y	Y	N		✓		
25	Y	Y	N				
COLUMN TOTAL					13	3	9
PATTERN TOTAL							
PERCENTAGE							

READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 17, 1990</i>							
TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE							
SCHOOL									
SELECTION <i>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</i>									
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
1	1	hear	wheelchair		✓			✓	
2	2	her	the	✓					✓
3	3	on	and		✓				
4	4	top	hop	✓				✓	
5	5	called	collected	✓				✓	
6	6	marks	Markers	✓				✓	
7	7	Miss	Mrs.	✓				✓	
8	8	that	That's	✓				✓	
9	9	wanted	wanted	✓				✓	
10	10	couldn't	could	✓				✓	
11	11	didn't	had		✓				✓
12	12	flower	flowers	✓				✓	
13	13	one	someone		✓			✓	
14	14	lot	kneaded	✓	✓				✓
15	15	and	knead	✓				✓	
16	16	any	anything			✓		✓	
17	17	take	think		✓			✓	
18	18	fast	fishpond		✓			✓	
19	19	boof	booth		✓			✓	
20	20	prizes	presents	✓				✓	
21	21	William	William	✓				✓	
22	22	Willie's	William's	✓				✓	
23	23	here	her	✓				✓	
24	24	care	curtfully		✓			✓	
25	25	said	she		✓			✓	
COLUMN TOTAL				14	11	0	10	10	5
b. TOTAL WORDS									
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW				PERCENTAGE					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 17, 1990</i>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL		
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ YN_				
SELECTION <i>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</i>							WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT				
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (d)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
24	3c	26	once	each	✓					✓	
27	3d	27	every	even	✓					✓	
28	3e	28	figured	finger	✓				✓	✓	
29	3f	29	the	toucher		✓			✓		
30	3g	30	dominoes	domino	✓			✓		✓	
31	3h	31	tip	topple		✓			✓		
32	3i	32	class	room			✓			✓	
33	3j	33	careful	full		✓			✓		
34	3k	34	buildings	bridges	✓				✓		
35	3l	35	that	At	✓			✓			
36	3m	36	stick	snack	✓				✓		
37	3n	37	step	slip	✓				✓		
38	3o	38	will	I'll	✓				✓		
39	3p	39	them	him	✓				✓		
40	3q	40	then	The	✓				✓		
41	3r	41	then	their	✓				✓		
42	3s	42	life (d)	lived	✓			✓			
43	3t	43	begin	begged	✓					✓	
44	3u	44	the	a		✓				✓	
45	3v	45	begin	be	✓		✓		✓		
46	3w	46	that	at	✓				✓		
47	3x	47	way	day	✓				✓		
48	3y	48	from	of	✓					✓	
49	3z	49	waited	went	✓	✓			✓		
50	3aa	50	boosts	but the	✓				✓		
COLUMN TOTAL				18		5		2		10	
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											

a. TOTAL MISCUES ____
b. TOTAL WORDS ____
 $a \div b \times 100 = \text{MPHW} \text{ ______}$

COLUMN TOTAL
TOTAL MISCUES
PERCENTAGE

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <i>Max</i>		DATE <i>May 17, 1990</i>							
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL						
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_									
SELECTION <i>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</i>							WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISQUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND									
				H	S	N	H	S	N							
50	51	terrible	rubber	✓												
51	52	she	there													
52	53	what	was	✓	✓				✓	✓						
53	54	mess	message	✓					✓							
54	55	garden	grand	✓						✓						
55	56	came	come	✓					✓							
56	57	classroom	room		✓				✓							
57	58	to	and				✓			✓						
58	59	Samuel	see	✓					✓							
59	60	it	the				✓			✓						
60	61	push	pushes	✓					✓							
61	62	Margaret	Margaret's	✓					✓							
62	63	it	the				✓			✓						
63	64	every	everything	✓					✓							
64	65	careful	beautifully	✓	✓					✓						
65	66	then	When	✓												
66	67	there	they	✓												
67	68	knocked	knocked	✓												
68	69	something	something	✓	✓											
69	70	you're	you	✓					✓							
70	71	balancing	balanced	✓					✓							
71	72	I'm	My		✓					✓						
72	73	shoe	sure	✓	✓				✓	✓						
73	74	her	she	✓						✓						
74	75	hand	heard	✓					✓							
COLUMN TOTAL				10	2	13	COLUMN TOTAL				16	6	3	8	9	8
PATTERN TOTAL							TOTAL MISQUES									
PERCENTAGE							PERCENTAGE									
a. TOTAL MISQUES				b. TOTAL WORDS				a + b x 100 = MPH								

NAME MaxDATE May 17, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Balancing Girl" (Berniece Rabe)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Margaret, the Balancing Girl..... (10) 10
2. Tommy..... (5) 5
3. Ms. Joliet, the Gr. 2 teacher..... (2) 2
4. Other students..... (1) 1
 - a. school in general
 - b. Gr. 2 class
 - c. William
5. Parents/public..... (1) 1
 - a. generally
 - b. William's grandmother
 - c. Tommy's dad
6. Principal..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Margaret (12 points)

- a. Good at balancing..... (3) 3
- b. Wanted Tommy to acknowledge
her balancing ability..... (3) 1
- c. Pleased to use her
balancing ability to
help others..... (3) 3
- d. Pleased to see Tommy
finally acknowledge
her ability..... (3) 3

2. Tommy (8 points)

- a. Unkind towards Margaret regarding her balancing ability..... (4) 3
- comment re: Magic Markers
 - demolition (?) of tower/castle
- b. Changed his attitude towards Margaret's balancing ability..... (4) 4

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Something Special

1. Margaret was very good at balancing; for example,

- books on head (stationary)
- books on head (moving)
- on crutches

One day she balanced Magic Markers in a row on a shelf. Ms. Joliet acknowledged her special ability; but Tommy made an unkind remark about it.

(7) 4

2. Margaret thought up a special project which might change Tommy's opinion. She built a castle.

However, someone knocked it down. Margaret blamed Tommy.

(6) 4

3. Ms. Joliet told the class about a school carnival to support UNICEF. She asked for ideas for helping. Tommy, William, and Margaret each made good suggestions.

(7) 6

B. Part Two: The Domino City

4. Margaret worked hard on her suggestion, which involved her constructing a "domino city." Everyone watched her project with keen interest.

(7) 6

5. Margaret couldn't remove a cookie someone had dropped in the middle of the dominoes. Tommy volunteered to get it, but Ms. Joliet said she would. Very carefully, she removed the cookie without disturbing the dominoes.

(6) 5

6. Everyone wanted to be the one who would push the first domino. Ms. Joliet said it would be determined by drawing a name out of a hat at the end of the carnival. Everyone clapped for Margaret and her project.

(7) 3

C. Part Three: The School Carnival

7. At the carnival, Margaret visited every booth, including those developed from William's and Tommy's suggestions. Towards the end, the principal called everyone to the grade two room for the Grand Finale.

(6) 3

8. From a hat containing all the names, William's grandmother drew the winner--Tommy. He stepped up but delayed, which prompted Margaret to exclaim, "Well, push!" He did, harder than needed; but the dominoes fell as planned. Everyone cheered.

(7) 6

9. Margaret and Tommy exchanged comments which suggested that not only had the balancing project been a financial success but that it had led to a change in Tommy's attitude about Margaret's balancing ability.

(7) 6

POINTS

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 19 points

b. Development..... 17 points

II. Events..... 43 points

Total points 79

Name: Max

Date: May 17, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

You shouldn't brag or feel bad because someone you didn't like gets picked.

You shouldn't fight.

INFERENCES:

She was probably a nice person.

At the end, Margaret and Tommy became friends again.

Tommy probably couldn't balance things like pencils and that could be why he used to knock down Margaret's things.

Margaret may have felt she should be the one to knock down the domino city, since she had made it.

If a second story about The Balancing Girl were written, a good idea would be to put no fighting in it and Tommy and Margaret would be best friends and have a camping adventure.

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Tommy never said anything unkind to Margaret.

Margaret balanced pencils on the shelf.

Margaret's reason for building the towers was because she liked building things (student didn't recognize the purpose--to change Tommy's opinion of her ability).

Didn't recognize that the school was raising the money for UNICEF.

A lady put the cookie amongst the dominoes.

Margaret told Tommy not to try to remove it.

Domino city raised money by charging people to see it.

COMMENTS:

Student said he found the selection to be of medium difficulty.

STUDENT: MaxDATE: May 17, 1990

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: The Balancing GirlAUTHOR: Berniece Rabe

Part One: Something Special

- ¹Margaret was very good at balancing. ²She could balance books on her head. ³She could ^(C)glide along ^(C)on ^Sher ^Hwheelchair and the books would not fall off. ^(R)⁴She could ^(R)even balance herself and hop with her ^(uc)crutches.
- ⁵One day at school, Margaret ^(uc)called ^Hcollected all the Magic Markers. ⁶She balanced them in neat rows on the shelf.
- ⁷Miss ^(R)Joliet said, "You have a very steady hand, Margaret."
- ^(R)⁸"Anybody can do that," Tommy said.
- ^(C)⁹"That ^H(s) simple."

1. Y Y N2. Y Y N3. Y N -4. Y N -5. Y N -6. Y Y N7. Y Y P8. Y Y N9. Y Y N

¹⁰Margaret ^Pplanned and ^Pplanned. ^HShe ^{waited}wanted
to do something very special that Tommy could ^Hnot
not call simple.

¹²It took a long time and great care, but at last
Margaret finished it. ^CShe ^{didn't}had finished a fine
castle made of six ^Ctowers, ^Hwith a cone ^Pbalanced
^Pgently on top of each.

¹⁴At recess, ^Ssomeone ^Uknocked ^Udown Margaret's
tower. ¹⁵Margaret knew who did it.

¹⁶"Tommy," she said, "if you ^{kick}knock down
^{any}anything I balance again, YOU'LL BE SORRY!"

¹⁷Ms. ^{Joliet}told the children they were going to
have a school carnival ^{to raise}money for
^{UNICEF}. ¹⁸She asked the children to ^{take}think of ways
they could help.

¹⁹Tommy said, "We can set up a fishpond. ²⁰My
dad ^{and}I could run ^{to}the ^{fast}fishpond ^{boat}booth. ²¹People

10. N N -11. Y N -12. Y Y N13. Y Y P14. Y N -15. Y Y N16. Y Y P17. N N -18. Y N -19. Y Y N20. N N -

prizes^H
would pay to fish for presents."

21. Y Y N

²²Everybody clapped for Tommy's idea. ²³Even

22. Y Y N

Margaret clapped.

23. Y Y N

²⁴"We can be clowns," said William,^H ^(R)and sell

balloons."

24. Y Y N

²⁵The children clapped for William's idea.^H
^{Willie's}

25. Y Y N

²⁶Margaret^(C) whispered^(U) her^{here's} idea to ^(R)Ms. ^(J)Joliet.^H

26. N N -

²⁷Ms. ^(J)Joliet liked the idea. ^(R)²⁸She said Margaret could

27. N N -

have a ^(P)private corner in the classroom where she

could work.

28. Y Y P

Part Two: The Domino City

²⁹The next morning, Margaret started setting

up dominoes. ³⁰Very, very ^(U)careful^S, ^(C)she^S balanced^S

29. Y Y N

^(C)once^H ^(E)each one and made it stand up just a little way

from the last one. ³¹She had to be very careful.

30. N N -31. Y Y N

³²If even one finger touched ^(A)domino^{-es} and made it

fall, then all the dominoes would ^(T)tip^S topple down,

one by one.

32. Y N -

³³Soon, Margaret used up all the dominoes in the room. ^{class} ^N Ms. Joliet borrowed more from grade

33. Y Y N

^{RM} ^{every} one and even more from grade three. ³⁵Just about

34. N N -

everybody stood and watched while Margaret

^S ^{careful} built a whole city full of highways, ^{uc} ^{b-} ^{buildings} ^H bridges,

and towers.

35. Y N -

^H ^H That stick

³⁶At snack time, ^{Someone} ^{Someone} dropped a cookie in

the middle of the domino city.

36. Y N -

³⁷Margaret tried to reach it, but she couldn't. ³⁸I can't get that cookie," she said. ^H ^{step} ^D "One slip and the

37. Y Y N

38. Y Y N

whole city will fall down!"

39. Y Y Y

^H ^{Will} ⁴⁰"I'll get it for you," said Tommy. ^{AC}

40. Y N -

^H ⁴¹Ms. Joliet stopped ^{them} him just in time. ⁴²"I'll do it,

41. N N -

Tommy," she said.

42. Y Y N

^H ^{Then} ⁴³The whole class watched and ^H ^{then} held their

breath. ⁴⁴Even Ms. Joliet held her breath as she

43. N N -

H ^(d)
reached over and lift^{ed} out the cookie.

44. N N -

⁴⁵The next day, Margaret put the last domino in place. ⁴⁶"It's finished," ^(R)she said.

45. Y Y N46. Y Y N

H ^{began} ^{RM} ^{began}
⁴⁷Everyone begged and begged to be the one to push down the first domino.

47. Y N -

^(C)if ^{you} have to pay ^(to) put ^{out} your name in the hat.

48. N N -

^(C)the ^N ^s ^{began} ^{uc} ^H ^{that}
⁴⁹Then a name will be drawn at the end of the carnival."

49. N N -

⁵⁰Everyone clapped for Margaret. ⁵¹Some of the children said they would guard Margaret's corner so the domino city would be safe.

50. Y Y N51. N N -

Part Three: The School Carnival

^(R)⁵²On the ^H ^H ^{way} ^{from} day of the carnival, the children and ^swaited parents went from room to room to see the ^H ^(d)boats different booths. ⁵³Margaret visited every one.

52. Y N -53. N N -

⁵⁴She bought balloons and won a prize at the

fishpond. ^{terrible} ^H 55 She got a rubber spider.

54. Y Y N
55. Y Y Y

^{she} ^{what} ^{mess} 56 Then there was a message on the loudspeaker.

56. N N -

^{Garden} ^H 57 The principal said, "It's time for the Grand

^{came} ^H ^{classroom} ^{to} ^{sawee} ^H Finale! 58 Come to the grade two room and see the

57. Y N -

^a domino city. 59 You may be the lucky one who

58. N N -

^H pushes down the first domino."

59. N N -

60 People crowded into the grade two classroom.

60. Y Y N

^{get} ^C ^H 61 They got as close as they could to Margaret's

^a corner. 62 Ms. Joliet held out the hat with all the

61. Y Y N

names in it. 63 William's grandmother pulled out

62. N N -

the name. 64 She read it out loud: "It's Tommy!"

63. Y Y Y
64. Y Y N

65 Tommy stepped inside the corner and stood

for a long time, looking at Margaret.

65. Y Y N

66 "Well, push!" said Margaret.

66. Y Y N

67 Tommy pushed harder than he needed to, but

^H ^{careful} ^S everything went beautifully. 68 Click, click, click, a

67. N N -

<u>Q.1</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.2</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.3</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 39)
Y <u>53</u> (<u>71</u> %)	Y <u>39</u> (<u>52</u> %)	N <u>32</u> (<u>82</u> %)
N <u>22</u> (<u>29</u> %)	N <u>36</u> (<u>48</u> %)	P <u>4</u> (<u>10</u> %)
		Y <u>3</u> (<u>8</u> %)

No. Words in Selection = 739.

Total Reading Time = 17.45.

Reading Rate = 41.6 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER <i>Sam</i>		DATE <i>Dec. 14, 1989</i>	
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE	
SCHOOL				SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</i>			
Strength		<i>18.2</i>	<i>26.0</i>	REPEATED MISCUES ACROSS TEXT			
Partial Strength		<i>7.8</i>		LINE	READER	TEXT	COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
Weakness		<i>74.0</i>			<i>many</i>	<i>mayor's</i>	<i>Sentence 16.</i>
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS							
Graphic					<i>was</i>	<i>wasn't</i>	<i>Sentence 27.</i>
High		<i>51.6</i>	<i>94.3</i>		<i>that</i>	<i>this</i>	<i>Sentence 38.</i>
Some		<i>42.7</i>			<i>did</i>	<i>didn't</i>	<i>Sentences 49 and 68</i>
None		<i>5.7</i>			<i>hills</i>	<i>hill</i>	<i>Sentence 53</i>
Sound					<i>town</i>	<i>power</i>	<i>Sentences 61 and 65.</i>
High		<i>24.2</i>	<i>76.6</i>		<i>his</i>	<i>hit</i>	<i>Sentence 66.</i>
Some		<i>52.4</i>			<i>his</i>	<i>him</i>	<i>Sentence 75.</i>
None		<i>23.4</i>					
RETELLING							
Holistic Score							
or Comments							
<i>Scored on Retelling Guide:</i>							
<i>63%</i>							
MPHW							
TIME		<i>12:00</i>					
COMMENTS							
<i>Reading Rate = $706 \div 12 = 58.8$ wpm</i>							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER Sam		DATE Dec. 14, 1989				
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL						
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ NN_									
SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Pretest)										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT						
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND									
				H	S	N	H	S	N							
1	1	who	whose	✓			✓									
2	2	would	were	✓	✓			✓								
3	3	some	summer	✓			✓									
4	4	could	carried	✓	✓			✓								
5	5	wait	water	✓				✓								
6	6	best	bathtub					✓								
7	7	when	water		✓			✓								
8	8	that	there		✓			✓								
9	9	giant	gardens		✓			✓								
10	10	help	held	✓			✓		✓							
11	11	ceiling	steeples		✓				✓							
12	12	with	while	✓				✓								
13	13	carriage	church		✓				✓							
14	14	keeping	keep	✓			✓									
15	15	that	this	✓				✓								
16	16	yards	yards	✓			✓									
17	17	lived	never		✓			✓								
18	18	last	long	✓				✓								
19	19	say	stayed	✓				✓								
20	20	town	tower	✓			✓									
21	21	hill	hill	✓												
22	22	when	with	✓				✓								
23	23	wanted	when	✓				✓								
24	24	so	he			✓			✓							
25	25	them	fried		✓				✓							
COLUMN TOTAL					3	4	18	COLUMN TOTAL			13	11	1	7	13	5
PATTERN TOTAL								TOTAL MISCUES								
PERCENTAGE								PERCENTAGE								
a. TOTAL MISCUES ____					b. TOTAL WORDS ____					a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____						

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

(Goodman, Watson, Burke)

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>Sam</u>		DATE <u>Dec. 14, 1989</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_				
							SELECTION <u>The Helpful Giant (Pretest)</u>				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect <u>(d)</u>	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
26	26	helping	helpful	✓			✓				
27	27	with	will	✓				✓			
28	28	idem	dig		✓			✓			
29	29	everyone	harvesting		✓				✓		
30	30	a	And		✓				✓		
31	31	all	of			✓			✓		
32	32	of	all			✓			✓		
33	33	times	time	✓			✓				
34	34	fruit	flower's		✓						
35	35	many	mayor's	✓				✓			
36	36	was	wife	✓							
37	37	much	mayer		✓			✓			
38	38	you	You're	✓				✓			
39	39	kind	thought		✓				✓		
40	40	understanding	would					✓			
41	41	there	then	✓				✓			
42	42	garagings	message	✓				✓			
43	43	mate	made	✓			✓				
44	44	many	Maybe	✓							
45	45	that	right		✓			✓			
46	46	was	worrying					✓			
47	47	he	his		✓			✓			
48	48	was	went		✓			✓			
49	49	where	Will	✓				✓			
50	50	she	Smith						✓		
COLUMN TOTAL				10	13	2	3	16	6		
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											
a. TOTAL MISCUES ____				COLUMN TOTAL							
b. TOTAL WORDS ____				TOTAL MISCUES							
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____				PERCENTAGE							

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER Sam		DATE Dec. 14, 1989	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_			
51		N	N							
52	Y	N	Y	N	✓					
53		N	N							
54	Y	N	N							
55	Y	Y	N		✓					
56		N	N							
57		N	N							
58	Y	N	N							
59	Y	N	N							
60		N	N							
61		N	N							
62		N	N							
63		N	N							
64	Y	N	N							
65		N	N							
66		N	N							
67	Y	N	N							
68		N	N							
69	Y	Y	N		✓					
70		N	N							
71		N	N							
72		N	N							
73	Y	Y	N		✓					
74		N	N							
75		N	N							
COLUMN TOTAL					4	0	21	COLUMN TOTAL		
PATTERN TOTAL								TOTAL MISQUES		
PERCENTAGE								PERCENTAGE		

SENTENCE NO.	MISQUE NO.	READER Dialect (D)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
27	51	his	him	✓				✓	
27	52	when	where	✓				✓	
28	53	did	didn't					✓	
28	54	loss	lose	✓				✓	
28	55	friends	friend	✓				✓	
30	56	faster	first	✓				✓	
30	57	laught	turned		✓			✓	
30	58	the	a			✓		✓	
30	59	ground	goat		✓			✓	
30	60	of	for	✓					✓
30	61	there	three	✓				✓	
30	62	house	news	✓				✓	
30	63	if	it	✓				✓	
30	64	from	loads		✓			✓	
30	65	greater	greasy		✓			✓	
30	66	was	wanted		✓			✓	
30	67	no	nothing		✓			✓	
30	68	he	the	✓				✓	
30	69	just	until		✓				✓
30	70	from	find		✓			✓	
30	71	even	more	✓				✓	
30	72	for	so	✓				✓	
30	73	pop	put	✓				✓	
30	74	had	hid	✓				✓	
30	75	house	houses	✓				✓	
a. TOTAL MISQUES				COLUMN TOTAL			16		
b. TOTAL WORDS				TOTAL MISQUES			8		
a + b x 100 = MPH				PERCENTAGE			1		
							8		
							14		
							3		

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER Sam		DATE Dec. 14, 1989	
SENTENCE NO.	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			MEANING CHANGE			STRENGTH		WEAKNESS		TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL
	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	YVN	YYY YYP	NN _{YYN}	Strength	Partial Strength	Weakness				
76				-									
77	Y				✓								
Totals for...													
76-77					0	1	1						
51-75					4	0	21						
26-50					7	1	17						
1-25					3	4	18						
COLUMN TOTAL				14	6	57							
PATTERN TOTAL				77									
PERCENTAGE				18.2	7.8	74.0							

WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE No.	MISQUE No.	READER Dialect @	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
42	76	went	waited	✓					
42	77	over	far	✓					
45	78	sad	sifting		✓			✓	✓
46	79	the	front		✓			✓	
46	80	country	cave		✓			✓	✓
46	81	shock	snarling		✓			✓	
46	82	could	wore		✓			✓	
48	83	rude	turn	✓				✓	
48	84	to	into	✓				✓	✓
49	85	feet	finish		✓			✓	
51	86	with	when	✓				✓	
51	87	his	he		✓			✓	
51	88	then	there	✓				✓	
53	89	wild	were		✓			✓	
53	90	the	of			✓			✓
53	91	long	light		✓			✓	
53	92	for	from	✓				✓	
56	93	first	front	✓				✓	
57	94	last	let	✓				✓	
57	95	emiric	magic	✓				✓	
57	96	his	hit	✓				✓	
57	97	main	me		✓			✓	
58	98	lonely	only	✓				✓	
59	99	cut	cores		✓			✓	
59	100	should	turn		✓			✓	✓
COLUMN TOTAL				13	11	1	6	14	5
a. TOTAL MISQUES									
b. TOTAL WORDS									
a + b × 100 = MPI%W									
PERCENTAGE									

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER Sam		DATE Dec. 14, 1989	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYP	Weakness NN_YN_			
SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Pretest)										
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT										
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (d)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND			
				H	S	N	H	S	N	
59	101	go	into		✓				✓	
60	102	Shall	Shut		✓			✓		
61	103	of	from	✓					✓	
62	104	strake	stage		✓			✓		
63	105	in	it	✓			✓			
64	106	before	where	✓					✓	
65	107	picked	back		✓				✓	
66	108	put	opened		✓				✓	
68	109	was	wasn't	✓			✓			
69	110	ran	rushed					✓		
70	111	Hurry	Hurrah	✓	✓			✓		
70	112	if	for	✓					✓	
70	113	out	our	✓			✓			
70	114	at	here		✓				✓	
70	115	country	cried		✓				✓	
71	116	the	a			✓	✓			
72	117	the	said			✓			✓	
72	118	well	With	✓			✓			
74	119	for	from	✓				✓		
74	120	when	with	✓				✓		
75	121	Swan	something		✓			✓		
75	122	away	anyway	✓				✓		
77	123	very	their		✓				✓	
77	124	friendly	friend	✓			✓			
COLUMN TOTAL				12	10	2	6	8	10	
PATTERN TOTAL										
PERCENTAGE										
a. TOTAL MISCUES ____				COLUMN TOTAL						
b. TOTAL WORDS ____				TOTAL MISCUES						
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW ____				PERCENTAGE						

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

(Goodman, Watson, Burke)

NAME SamDATE Dec. 14, 1989

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting
5. Mayor..... (2)
6. Mayor's wife..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind,
helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things,
that inadvertently caused
problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2)
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 2

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2) 2
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2) 2

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1)
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1)
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1) 1
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1)
 - by harvesting..... (1) 1
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2) 1

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to leave town. (4) 2
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied. He packed and moved to a cave far away from town. (4) 2
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend Harry went. (4)

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
- he demonstrated his power by temporarily turning the mayor into a goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone toads, the wizard forced the people to bring him everything he wanted..... (3) 2
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more, even after the people had nothing left to give. They hid in their empty houses and waited for the worst. (6) 3
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shaving, looking into a mirror on a chain around his neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up Will and ran for the town. (6) 4

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 6

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 2

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 4

I. Character Analysis:

- a. Recall..... 17 points
b. Development..... 18 points

II. Events..... 28 points

Total points 63

Name: Sam

Date: Dec. 14, 1989

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

Just because a person makes a mistake, that doesn't mean they're no good.

Student discussed concept of people (real or fictitious) who help others.

INFERENCES:

The story is a fairy tale.

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Many wizards.

Asked for fruit and Harry brought whole tree.

Didn't focus on Will as person who was sad to see Harry go (Part I).

Harry actively stopped wizard's take-over attempts (in Part I).

Didn't specify where wizard(s) lived.

COMMENTS:

The retelling was done in two parts, following oral reading of each of the two parts in the selection.

Following retelling of part one, student rated the story as hard. However, after retelling of part two, he said the story was "hard and medium." This seemed consistent with the changes noticeable in his oral reading and retelling (compared with part one). He said in part two he was getting more curious about what would happen (in the story).

STUDENT: SamDATE: Dec. 14, 1989

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: The Helpful GiantAUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

¹Once upon a time, there was a giant ^(C) ^(UC) ^H whose
 name was Harry. ²He was ^(C) ^{ver-} friendly, ^(R) he was ^(P) brave,

1. Y Y N

and he was kind. ³But sometimes he did things

2. Y Y Y

^(UC) ^S would
 that were foolish.

3. N N -

⁴Harry liked helping people. ⁵In ^(UC) ^H ^{S-} summer, he
 would make _____ breakfast to the feed of _____,
 would make _____ pine trees into fans to cool off the

4. Y Y N

town.

5. Y N -

^(UC) ^S ^H ^S
 could wait best
⁶He carried water in his bathtub to help people
^S ^S ^S
 when that giant
 water their gardens.

6. N N -

^(C) ^(UC) ^{helped} ^(UC) ^S ^S ^S
^{H-} He ^{even} help H ceiling with carriage
 held up the steeple while a church

on top
 was being built.

7. Y N -

⁸But the best thing Harry did was ^③keeping keep the

wicked wizard from taking over the town.

8. Y Y Y

⁹Nobody knew about ^{that}this, because the wizard ^{-S} had ^slived ^Hnever ^{loss}dared to make trouble as long as Harry

was around.

9. N N -

¹⁰The wizard ^{say}stayed up in his big ^{town}tower on the ^Hhill. ^{-S}¹¹He looked down on the town and made

10. N N -

wicked plans.

11. Y N -

¹²Sometimes people got angry with ^{when}Harry ^{was wanted}when ^④he ^{with}tried ^sto ^Nbe ^Hhelpful.

12. Y Y Y

¹³Like the time he helped Will ^{with}Smith ^{dem}dig for fishing worms.

13. N N -

¹⁴And the time he helped with ^{everyone}the harvesting.

14. Y N -

¹⁵And, ^⑤worst ^Nof all, the time ^{-S}he picked some ^{fruit}flowers ^Rfor ^Hthe ^{many}mayor's wife. ^H¹⁶The ^{miss}flowers turned ^{RM}out to be the ^{many}mayor's best apple trees!

15. Y N -

16. N N -

- 17^SThe ^{much}mayor was very angry. 18^H"you^{re} nothing 17. N N -
- but a ^{us}trouble ^{make}maker, Harry," he said. 19^H"Now, get 18. N N -
- out of town!" 19. Y Y N
- 20^H"That's right!" cried the people. 21^H"You are 20. N N -
- a waste 21. Y Y Y
- always causing trouble."

- 22^SHarry ^{took}thought his ^oheart ^Swould ^{break}break 23^HBut 22. Y N -
- there ^Hthen he ^Hthought about all the messes he had 23. N N -
- ^Hmate. ^{us}many ^{by}many ^HH ^Sthat 24^HMaybe the people were right. 24. N N -
- 25^SWiping away his ^She ^Stears, Harry went home and 25. N N -
- packed. 26^HThen he moved to a cave far away from 26. N N -
- the town. 27^HBut Will Smith ^Swhen ^Sshe ^Hhis ^Hwhen followed him to see where he 27. N N -
- went. 28^HHe didn't ^{loss}want to lose his friend ^S 28. N N -

[Part I: 5:20]

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

- 29^HWhen the wizard saw Harry leave, he knew 29. Y Y N
- there was nothing to stop him from taking over
- the town.

^HFaster ^Staught ^Nthe ^Sground
³⁰First, he turned the mayor into a goat.
³¹The spell ^{on-}only ^Hlasted ^Hfor ^Hthree ^Hhours. ³²But it
proved how strong his magic was.

369

30. N N -

31. N N -

32. N N -

³³Next, he told the people they must bring him
anything he asked for. ³⁴If they refused, he would
turn them into ^Sstone ^{town}toads. ³⁵They knew he could
do it, so they gave him what he wanted.

33. N N -

34. N N -

35. Y Y N

^Sgreater
³⁶But the wizard was greedy, and soon he
^Swanted more...and more...and more! ^{powerful}

36. Y N -

³⁷Before long, the people had ^{no}nothing ^Sleft to
give him.

37. Y Y P

³⁸When the people told the wizard ^{that}this, he was
very angry. ³⁹He told them they had until ^Ssunset to
^Sfrom ^Hever ^Hfor ^Hpop
find more, or...poof! ⁴⁰He would turn them into
stone toads!

38. Y Y N

39. N N -

40. N N -

- ⁴¹The people didn't know what to do. ⁴²They ^{had} hid ^H 41. Y Y N
^{to get} ^H ^H ^H
 in their empty houses and waited for the worst
^{h-}
 to happen. 42. N N -
⁴³Will knew what to do. ⁴⁴He went to get Harry. 43. Y Y N
⁴⁴Harry was sitting in front of his cave, shaving. 44. Y Y N
^{sad} ^S ^{the} ^S ^{country} ^S
⁴⁵Harry was sitting in front of his cave, shaving. 45. N N -
^R ^S
⁴⁶He was looking in his shaving mirror that he
^H ^{shack}
^{wood} wore on a chain around his neck. 46. N N -
^{ca-}
⁴⁷"Harry, you've got to help us!" cried Will. 47. Y Y N
^H ^H
⁴⁸"The wizard is going to turn us into stone toads!" 48. N N -
^{rule} ^{to}
⁴⁹Harry didn't even finish shaving. ⁵⁰He picked 49. Y N -
^C ^{RM} ^{feel} ^S
up Will and ran for town. ⁵¹It was almost sunset 50. Y N -
^H ^S ^H
^{with his} ^{then}
^{when he got there.} ⁵²He knew that time was 51. N N -
 running out. 52. Y Y N
-
- ^S ^N ^S ^H
^{was} ^{the} ^{long} ^{for}
⁵³There were flashes of light coming from the
^{RM} ^{-S}
tower on the hill. ⁵⁴The wizard was getting his 53. N N -
magic ready. 54. Y N -
^R
⁵⁵Harry put Will down. ⁵⁶He went to stand in 55. Y Y N

^Hfirst
 front of the town. ⁵⁷"I'll ^Hlet the ^Hmagic ^Shit me," ^Hhe
 thought. ⁵⁸"After all, I'm ^Honly ^Ha foolish giant. ⁵⁹Who
^Scut ^Sshould ^Sgo
 cares if I turn into ^Sa stone toad?"

371

56. N N -

57. N N -

58. Y N -

59. Y N -

^Sshall
⁶⁰He shut his eyes ^Stight and ^Swaited.

60. N N -

⁶¹Then there was a ^Sblinding flash of light from
^{RM}town ^{his town}the tower. ⁶²The wizard had ^Sthrown his ^Hmagic. ⁶³It
^Hbefore
^{struck}Harry ^{right}above his ^{heart}.

61. N N -

62. N N -

63. N N -

⁶⁴But Harry was ^Ssafe. ⁶⁵The ^{RM}magic hit his ^{RM}shaving
^Spicked
^{mirror and bounced}back to the tower. ⁶⁶It ^{his}hit ^{the}
^{the}
^{wizard}and ^{turned}him into a stone toad!
^{put}
⁶⁷Harry opened his eyes. ⁶⁸He ^{RM}didn't ^Hreally know
 what happened, but he knew he ^Hwasn't ^{turned}
 into ^{stone}.

64. Y N -

65. N N -

66. N N -

67. Y N -

68. N N -

^Sran
⁶⁹The people rushed out of their houses.
^{UC} ^HHarry ^Hof ^Hout ^Sof
⁷⁰"Hurray for Harry! Harry is our hero!" they

69. Y Y N

- ^Scountry
cried. ⁷¹The ^Nmayor gave Harry a ^{the}medal. 70. N N -
71. N N -
- ⁷²"Come back and live with us," ^{said} ^Nthe ^Hwell ⁷³We 72. N N -
- need you." 73. Y Y N
- ^HFor ⁷⁴From that day on, Harry ^Hlived ^{when}with the
people in the town. ⁷⁵Of ^{co-}course, ^Csoon ^Ssometimes he did 74. N N -
- some foolish things, but everyone ^{RM}loved ^{his}him
^Haway ⁷⁶After ^{the way}all, he was brave and kind. ⁷⁷And he 75. N N -
76. N N -
- ^Svery ^Hly ⁷⁸was their friend. 77. Y Y Y

[Part II = 6:30]

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 34 (44 %)

N 43 (56 %)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 20 (26 %)

N 57 (74 %)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 20)

N 14 (70 %)

P 1 (5 %)

Y 5 (25 %)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 12:00.

Reading Rate = 58.8 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER Sam	DATE May 16, 1990
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE
				SCHOOL	
Strength		26.0	40.3	SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>	
Partial Strength		14.3			
Weakness		59.7			
REPEATED MISQUES ACROSS TEXT					
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS				LINE	COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
Graphic				READER	TEXT
High				<i>Fruit</i>	<i>flowers</i>
Some				<i>a</i>	<i>his</i>
None				<i>Canyon</i>	<i>canoe</i>
Sound				<i>with</i>	<i>will</i>
High				<i>Power</i>	<i>power</i>
Some				<i>he</i>	<i>it</i>
None				<i>something</i>	<i>stone</i>
RETELLING				<i>something</i>	<i>sometimes</i>
Holistic Score					
or Comments					
Scored on Retelling Guide		80%			
IMPHW		TIME 13:00			
COMMENTS					

Reading Rate = $706 \div 13 = 54.3$ wpm

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>Sam</u>		DATE <u>May 16, 1990</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYYP	Weakness NN_YN				
							SELECTION <u>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</u>				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE No.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
1	1	who	whose	✓							
2	2	aborn	brave		✓			✓			
3	3	something	sometimes	✓						✓	
4	4	wondered	would		✓				✓		
5	5	these	rees	✓							
6	6	couldn't	carried		✓				✓		
7	7	wait	water	✓					✓		
8	8	when	water		✓				✓		
9	9	these	their	✓							
10	10	giants	gardens	✓					✓		
11	11	have	even							✓	
12	12	helped	held	✓				✓			
13	13	streets	steple	✓					✓		
14	14	with	while	✓					✓		
15	15	the	a			✓				✓	
16	16	bad	best	✓	✓				✓		
17	17	didn't	did	✓				✓			
18	18	did	dared		✓						
19	19	a	his			✓				✓	
20	20	four	lower	✓			✓				
21	21	wisard	wicked	✓					✓		
22	22	pieces	plans	✓					✓		
23	23	with	will	✓					✓		
24	24	this	Smith	✓						✓	
25	25	hole	worass		✓					✓	
COLUMN TOTAL				16	7	2	5	14	6		
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											
a. TOTAL MISCUES ____				TOTAL MISCUES							
b. TOTAL WORDS ____				PERCENTAGE							
a + b × 100 = MPHW ____											

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER <i>Sam</i>		DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>	
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISCS IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL			
					Strength YYY	Partial Strength YYN	Weakness YYN						
SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT			
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (D)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND						
				H	S	N	H	S	N				
26	Y	Y	P		✓								
27	Y	Y	N					✓					
28	Y	Y	N					✓					
29	Y	Y	N	✓									
30	Y	Y	N										
31	N	N	N										
32	N	N	N										
33	Y	N	N					✓					
34	N	N	N										
35	Y	Y	N	✓									
36	Y	Y	N	✓									
37	Y	Y	N	✓									
38	N	N	N										
39	Y	Y	N										
40	Y	Y	N	✓									
41	Y	Y	N	✓									
42	N	N	N										
43	Y	Y	N	✓									
44	Y	Y	N	✓									
45	N	N	N										
46	Y	Y	N	✓									
47	Y	Y	N	✓									
48	N	N	N										
49	Y	Y	N	✓									
50	Y	Y	N	✓									
COLUMN TOTAL					8	3	14	a. TOTAL MISCS —			COLUMN TOTAL		
PATTERN TOTAL								b. TOTAL WORDS —			TOTAL MISCS		
PERCENTAGE								a + b × 100 = MPHW —			PERCENTAGE		

SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC	5 SOUND
		Dialect (D)		H S N	H S N
14	26	hay	harvesting		
15	27	would	worst	✓	
19	28	times	time	✓	
15	29	fruit	flowers	✓	
15	30	maid	mayor's	✓	
16	31	tree	turned	✓	
16	32	tree	trees	✓	
20	33	called	cried	✓	
22	34	fried	thought	✓	
22	35	heard	heart	✓	
22	36	wondering	would	✓	
23	37	through	thought	✓	
23	38	8 missings	messes	✓	
24	39	the	a		
26	40	canyon	cave	✓	
27	41	small	smith	✓	
27	42	what	where	✓	
28	43	did	didn't	✓	
28	44	what	want	✓	
30	45	fried	turned	✓	
30	46	to	the	✓	
30	47	make	mayor	✓	
30	48	ghost	goat	✓	
31	49	last	lasted	✓	
31	50	of	for	✓	
COLUMNS TOTAL				13	11
TOTAL MISCS				1	6
PERCENTAGE				14	5

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)		
					Strength		Weakness
					YYY YYN	NN YYN	
51	N	N	N	-			✓
52	Y	Y	N	-	✓		
53	N	Y	N	-			✓
54	Y	N	N	-			✓
55	Y	Y	N	-	✓		
56	N	N	N	-			✓
57	N	N	N	-			✓
58	N	N	N	-			✓
59	N	N	N	-			✓
60	Y	Y	N	-	Y	✓	
61	N	N	N	-			✓
62	Y	Y	N	-	✓		
63	Y	Y	Y	P		✓	
64	Y	Y	N	-			✓
65	Y	Y	Y	P		✓	
66	Y	Y	N	-			✓
67	Y	Y	Y	N	-	✓	
68	Y	Y	N	-			✓
69	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	✓	
70	Y	Y	N	-			✓
71	N	N	N	-			✓
72	N	N	N	-			✓
73	Y	Y	Y	P		✓	
74	Y	Y	Y	N	-	✓	
75	N	N	N	-			✓
COLUMN TOTAL					5	5	15
PATTERN TOTAL							
PERCENTAGE							

READER Sam

DATE May 16, 1990

TEACHER

AGE/
GRADE

SCHOOL

SELECTION The Helpful Giant (Posttest)

WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT

SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
31	51	these	three	✓					✓
31	52	houses	hours	✓				✓	
32	53	it's	it	✓				✓	
34	54	before	proved	✓					✓
32	55	become	bring		✓				✓
34	56	some	stone	✓					✓
36	57	angry	greedy	✓				✓	
36	58	se	soon	✓				✓	
36	59	went	wanted	✓				✓	
36	60	moving	more		✓			✓	
38	61	is	he			✓			
39	62	use	until		✓				✓
39	63	from	find		✓				✓
39	64	for	more	✓				✓	
39	65	over	poof	✓				✓	
40	66	something	stone		✓				✓
42	67	had	hid	✓				✓	
42	68	the	their	✓				✓	
42	69	when	waited		✓			✓	
42	70	words	worst	✓				✓	
43	71	well	Will	✓					
43	72	now	knew	✓					
45	73	the	his		✓				✓
46	74	this	that	✓				✓	
46	75	wondered	wore	✓					

a. TOTAL MISCUES ____

b. TOTAL WORDS ____

a ÷ b × 100 = MPH ____

COLUMN TOTAL

TOTAL MISCUES

PERCENTAGE

17 7 1 6 10 9

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>Sam</u>		DATE <u>May 16, 1990</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ YN_				
76		N	N	I							
77		N	N	I							
<i>Totals for...</i>											
76-77					0	0	2				
51-75					5	5	15				
26-50					8	3	14				
1-25					7	3	15				
COLUMN TOTAL							20	11	46		
PATTERN TOTAL							77				
PERCENTAGE							26.0	14.3	54.7		

SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (d)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
46	76	ch	on	✓					✓
47	77	you	you've	✓				✓	
48	78	hurt	turn	✓					✓
51	79	he	it			✓			✓
51	80	went	when	✓				✓	
53	81	then	there	✓					✓
53	82	when	were	✓				✓	
53	83	came	coming		✓				✓
54	84	angry	getting		✓				✓
54	85	he	his		✓				✓
56	86	for	of	✓					✓
57	87	well	I'll	✓				✓	
57	88	let's	let	✓				✓	
57	89	he	hit		✓			✓	
57	90	mate	me	✓				✓	
57	91	turned	thought		✓				✓
61	92	here	there	✓				✓	
61	93	building	blinding	✓				✓	
61	94	first	flash		✓				✓
61	95	lights	light	✓				✓	
62	96	turned	thrown	✓					✓
63	97	shot	struck		✓				✓
63	98	head	heart	✓				✓	
66	99	wigwags	wigwags	✓				✓	
68	100	very	really	✓					✓
COLUMN TOTAL				17	7	1	7	9	9
a. TOTAL MISCUES									
b. TOTAL WORDS									
a ÷ b × 100 = MPHW									
COLUMN TOTAL									
TOTAL MISCUES									
PERCENTAGE									

MISCU ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <i>Sam</i>		DATE <i>May 16, 1990</i>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)			AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL		
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YY	Weakness NN_				
							SELECTION <i>The Helpful Giant (Posttest)</i>				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE No.	MISQUE NO.	READER Dialect (1)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
68	101	was	wasn't	✓			✓				
68	102	turning	turned	✓			✓				
69	103	shouted	rushed	✓				✓			
69	104	for	of	✓					✓		
69	105	Harry	houses		✓				✓		
70	106	Harry	Murrah	✓				✓			
70	107	from	for	✓					✓		
71	108	mate	mayor		✓			✓			
74	109	came	come	✓				✓			
73	110	we'll	We	✓			✓				
75	111	for	Of	✓					✓		
75	112	cross	course	✓				✓			
75	113	for	loved		✓				✓		
75	114	always	anyway	✓				✓			
		Totals for	101-114	11	3	0	4	5	5		
		Totals for	76-100	17	7	1	7	9	9		
		Totals for	51-75	17	7	1	6	10	9		
		Totals for	26-50	13	11	1	6	14	5		
		Totals for	1-25	16	7	2	5	14	6		
a. TOTAL MISQUES ____				COLUMN TOTAL		74	35	5	28	52	34
b. TOTAL WORDS ____				TOTAL MISQUES		114		114			
a + b x 100 = MPHWS ____				PERCENTAGE		64.9	30.7	4.4	24.6	45.6	29.8
COLUMN TOTAL											
PATTERN TOTAL											
PERCENTAGE											

NAME SamDATE May 16, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Helpful Giant" (Bruce & Katherine Coville)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant..... (6) 6
2. Wizard..... (5) 5
3. Will Smith..... (4) 4
4. Townspeople..... (2) 2
 - in general
 - who were hot
 - who kept gardens
 - who built church
 - who were harvesting
5. Mayor..... (2) 1
6. Mayor's wife..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Harry, the giant
 - a. friendly, brave, kind,
helpful..... (2) 2
 - b. sometimes did foolish things,
that inadvertently caused
problems..... (2) 2
 - c. felt bad about these problems..... (2) 2
 - d. willing to die to save others..... (2) 1

2. Wizard

- a. wanted to take over the town..... (2) 2
- b. didn't dare try because
of Harry being around..... (2) 2
- c. wicked; greedy & ruthless..... (2) 2

3. Will Smith

- a. cared about his friend Harry..... (2) 2
- b. didn't give up, despite danger.... (2) 2
- c. confident that Harry would
help..... (2) 2

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Harry Tries to Help

1. Harry was a friendly, brave, and kind giant,
who sometimes did things that were foolish.
He liked to help, and did things like
 - fanned people (with pine trees)..... (1)
 - watered gardens (using bathtub)..... (1)
 - helped builders (held up church
steeple)..... (1)
 - unknown to himself and townspeople,
he kept the wizard from taking
over the town..... (1) 1
2. Sometimes people got angry with Harry when he
tried to be helpful; such as,
 - by digging fishing worms for Will
Smith..... (1)
 - by harvesting..... (1) 1
 - by picking flowers, for the mayor's
wife (mayor's best apple trees)..... (2) 1

3. The mayor, supported by the people, told Harry he was a troublemaker. He ordered Harry to leave town. (4) 3
4. Though deeply saddened, Harry complied. He packed and moved to a cave far away from town. (4) 3
5. Will Smith followed to see where his friend Harry went. (4) 4

B. Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

6. The wizard began to take over the town:
- he demonstrated his power by temporarily turning the mayor into a goat..... (3)
 - threatening to turn them into stone toads, the wizard forced the people to bring him everything he wanted..... (3) 3
7. However, the wizard was greedy and demanded more, even after the people had nothing left to give. They hid in their empty houses and waited for the worst. (6) 6
8. Will Smith went to get Harry. He found Harry shaving, looking into a mirror on a chain around his neck. Harry didn't hesitate to help. He picked up Will and ran for the town. (6) 5

9. The flashes of light from the tower meant the wizard was getting his magic ready. Harry put Will down and, selflessly, stood in front of the town to protect it from the wizard's magic.

(6) 6

10. A blinding light flashed from the tower and struck Harry. However, Harry was safe. The magic hit his shaving mirror and bounced back to the tower. It hit the wizard and turned him into a stone toad.

(6) 6

11. The people were overjoyed that Harry had saved them. The mayor gave him a medal. Will asked him to come back to live in the town, which he did. He was the same old Harry, but now everyone loved him and realized he was their friend.

(6) 4

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 18 points

b. Development..... 19 points

II. Events..... 43 points

Total points 80

Name: Sam

Date: May 16, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

You shouldn't just use people because of the way they act. For example, you shouldn't be mad at people just because, like, they broke one of your glasses or something. You shouldn't yell. You should say that's alright or something.

Student was able to discuss other characters (in other stories) who had characteristics that this story reminded him about.

INFERENCES:

Harry was clumsy, which caused problems when he tried to help others.

When Will told Harry about the wizard, he probably got a fright, wondering if the townspeople were alright (student gave realistic example).

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Refers to wizard's being turned into a "toadstool," or a frog.

Probably confused by word "mayor." Student said one character was the "mate."

Harry drained the fishing pond.

Harry went to get fruit and brought back the whole tree.

COMMENTS:

Appears to make extensive use of pictures--perhaps to extent that it overly influences his use of text-based cues(?).

Student said he recalled having read the story last December (5 months ago). He said that before (in December) he found he couldn't read it that well but today, after about two pages, he said he could go "zip" and read those pages easily.

STUDENT: SamDATE: May 16, 1990

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: The Helpful GiantAUTHOR: Bruce and Katherine Coville

Part One: Harry Tries to Help

'Once upon a time, ^(C)there ^{wa-}was a giant ^(C)whose ^Hname was Harry. ^(C)He was ^{frien-}friendly, he was brave, and he was ^(C)kind. ^HBut sometimes he ^(AC)didn't ^{something}do ^(C)things that ^(C)were foolish.

1. Y Y N2. N N -3. N N -

^S'Harry liked helping people. ^(R)In ^(UC)summer, ^Hhe ^{wondered}would make ^(C)pine ^Htrees into ^(C)fans to ^(C)cool off the town.

4. Y Y N5. N N -

^S'He carried water in his ^(C)bathtub to help people when these giants ^Hwater their ^Hgardens. ^(C)every ^Hhave ^Hhelped ^Hstreets ^Hwith the ^Nchurch ^(C)He even held up the steeple while a church was being built.

6. N N -7. N N -

^{bad S} But the best thing Harry ^{C H} did ^{-n't} was keep ^C the

wicked wizard from taking over the town.

8. Y N -

^{uc did} Nobody knew about this, because the wizard

never ^{d-} dared to make trouble as long as Harry

was around.

9. Y N -

^{uc} The wizard stayed up ^{the a N} in his big ^H tower on the

hill. ^{H H} He looked down on the town and made

wizard ^{passes} wicked plans.

10. Y Y Y11. Y N -

^{uc} Sometimes people got angry with Harry when

he tried to be helpful.

12. Y Y N

^{H with H} Like the time he helped Will Smith ^{uc} dig for

fishing ^S hole worms.

13. Y N -

^{uc S} And the time he helped with the ^{hay ha-} harvesting.

14. Y Y P

^{S would} And, worst of all, ^{H -S} the time he picked some

fruit ^S flowers for the mayor's ^{S maid} wife. ^{fruit R M H} The flowers ^{tree} turned

15. N N -

out to be the mayor's best ^H apple tree!

16. N N -

¹⁷The ^{UC}mayor ^Cwas very angry. ¹⁸"You're nothing but a trouble maker, ^CHarry," he said. ¹⁹"Now, get out of town!"

17. N N -18. Y Y N19. Y Y N

²⁰"That's right!" ^Hcried the people. ²¹"You are always causing trouble."

20. Y Y N21. Y Y P

²²Harry ^Stried ^Hheard ^Swondering his heart would break. ²³But ^Hthrough ^{missings}then he thought about all the messes he had made. ²⁴Maybe the people were right.

22. N N -23. N N -24. Y Y N

²⁵Wiping ^Caway his tears, Harry went home and ^Nthe ^Scanyon ^Rpacked. ²⁶Then he moved to a cave far away from the town.

25. N N -26. Y Y P

²⁷But Will ^SSmith ^Sfollowed him to see where he went. ^HHe ^Hdidn't ^{what}want to lose his friend. ^aRM

27. Y N -28. Y N -

Part Two: The Wizard Takes Over

²⁹When the wizard saw Harry leave, he knew there was nothing to stop him from taking over the town.

29. Y Y N

30 First, he ^{tried}^H to ^{make}^S a ^{ghost}^H goat.

30. Y N -

31 The spell ^{only}^H lasted^H for three hours. 32 But it ^{before}^H proved^H how strong^H his magic^H was.

31. N N -32. N N -

33 Next, he told the people they must ^{become}^S bring him

anything he asked for. 34 If they refused, he would

33. Y N -

turn^H them into stone ^{Some}^S toads. 35 They knew he could

34. N N -

do it, so they gave him what he wanted.

35. Y Y N

36 But the wizard was ^{angry}^H, and soon he ^{so}^H wanted ^{moving}^S more...and more...and more!

36. Y Y Y

37 Before long, the people had nothing left to give him.

37. Y Y N

38 When the people told the wizard this, ^{is}^N he was very angry. 39 He told them they had until ^{use}^S sunset to find more, or...poof! 40 He would turn them into something stone toads!

38. N N -39. N N -40. Y Y Y

⁴¹The people ^(R) didn't know what to do. ⁴²They ^{had} ^H hid ^S in their ^H empty houses and waited for the worst ^H woods

41. Y Y N

to happen.

42. N N -

^(R) ^(C) ^H ^H ^{well} ^{now} ⁴³Will knew what to do. ⁴⁴He went to get Harry.

43. Y Y N44. Y Y N

⁴⁵Harry was sitting in front of his cave, shaving.

45. N N -

⁴⁶He was looking in his shaving mirror ^{this} that he ^H wondered ^{oh} ^H wore on a chain around his neck.

46. N N -

⁴⁷"Harry, ^(C) ^H you've got to help us!" cried Will.

47. Y Y N

⁴⁸"The wizard is going to ^(C) ^H turn us into stone toads!"

48. N N -

⁴⁹Harry didn't even finish shaving. ^(C) ^{RM} ^{He} ⁵⁰He picked up Will and ran for town. ⁵¹It was almost sunset

49. Y N -50. Y Y N

when he got there. ⁵²He knew that time was running out.

51. N N -52. Y Y N

⁵³There were flashes of light coming from the ^{RM} tower on the hill. ⁵⁴The wizard was getting his ^{angry} ^{he}

53. N N -

magic ready.

54. N N -

⁵⁵Harry put Will down. ⁵⁶He went to stand in

55. Y Y N

- front^{for H} of the town. 57 "I'll let^{well H} the ^{-s}magic hit me," he^{he's mate H} 56. N N -
 turned^S thought. 58 "After all, I'm only a foolish giant. 59 Who 57. N N -
 cares if I turn into a ^{St-}stone toad?" 58. N N -
 59. N N -

- Here, his eyes has shut.
 60 He shut his eyes tight and waited. 60. Y Y Y
 (AC) there^H here building first^{H -s}
 61 Then there was a blinding flash of light^S from
 town^{RM} (UC) threw² turned^H 61. N N -
 the tower. 62 The wizard had thrown his magic. 63 It 62. Y Y N
 shot^S (AC) under^H head^(UC)
 struck Harry right above his heart. 63. Y Y P

- 64 But Harry was safe. 65 The magic hit his shaving 64. Y N -
 mirror and (bounced) back to the tower. 66 It hit the 65. Y Y P
 wizard^{H -s} and turned him into a ^{toad stool}stone toad! 66. Y N -
 67 Harry opened his eyes. 68 He didn't really know 67. Y Y N
 what happened, but he knew he ^{was^H wa-^H turning}wasn't turned
 (UC) someone something RM into stone. 68. Y N -

- 69 The people shouted for Harry 69. Y Y Y
 rushed out of (their) houses.
 Harry from
 70 "Hurray for Harry! Harry is our hero!" they

cried. ⁷¹The ^Smate mayor gave Harry a medal.

70. Y N -
71. N N -

⁷²"Come back and live with us," said Will. ⁷³"We ^Hll

72. N N -

need you."

73. Y Y P

⁷⁴From that day on, Harry lived with the
people in the town. ⁷⁵Of course, sometimes he did

74. Y Y N

some foolish things, but everyone ^Sloved him

anyway. ⁷⁶After all, he was brave ^Rand ^Rkind. ⁷⁷And he

75. N N -

76. N N -

was their friend.

77. N N -

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 44 (57%)

N 33 (43%)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 77)

Y 31 (40%)

N 46 (60%)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 31)

N 20 (65%)

P 6 (19%)

Y 5 (16%)

No. Words in Selection = 706.

Total Reading Time = 13:00.

Reading Rate = 54.3 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II READER PROFILE

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

		%	%	READER <i>Sam</i>	DATE <i>May 17, 1990</i>
LANGUAGE SENSE				TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE
STRENGTH				SCHOOL	
Strength	<i>17.3</i>	<i>28.0</i>	SELECTION <i>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</i>		
Partial Strength	<i>10.7</i>		REPEATED MISCUES ACROSS TEXT		
Weakness	<i>72.0</i>		LINE	READER	TEXT
GRAPHIC/SOUND RELATIONS					COMMENTS (place in text, correction, etc.)
Graphic				<i>balanced</i>	<i>planned</i>
High	<i>56.2</i>	<i>96.2</i>		<i>Miss</i>	<i>Ms.</i>
Some	<i>40.0</i>			<i>Johnson</i>	<i>Juliet</i>
None	<i>3.8</i>			<i>Johnsons</i>	<i>Juliet</i>
Sound				<i>every</i>	<i>even</i>
High	<i>22.8</i>	<i>67.6</i>		<i>I</i>	<i>I'll</i>
Some	<i>44.8</i>			<i>helped</i>	<i>aid</i>
None	<i>32.4</i>			<i>the</i>	<i>she</i>
RETELLING				<i>bryan</i>	<i>begged</i>
Holistic Score				<i>dominers</i>	<i>domino</i>
or Comments				<i>girls</i>	<i>grude</i>
<i>Scored on Retelling Guide 81%</i>				<i>Margaret</i>	<i>Margaret's</i>
MPHW		TIME <i>13:45</i>		<i>looked</i>	<i>look</i>
COMMENTS					
<i>Reading Rate = $739 \div 13.75 = 53.7$ wpm</i>					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							
SENTENCE NO.	NO. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)		
					Strength VYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ VN_
1	Y	Y	N		✓		
2	Y	Y	N		✓		
3	Y	N	N				✓
4	Y	N	N				✓
5	Y	N	N				✓
6	Y	Y	N				✓
7	Y	Y	N	Y		✓	
8	Y	Y	N		✓		
9	Y	Y	N			✓	
10	Y	Y	N	Y			✓
11	Y	N	N				✓
12	Y	N	N				✓
13	Y	N	N				✓
14	Y	Y	N	P	✓	✓	
15	Y	N	N				✓
16	Y	Y	N				✓
17	Y	Y	N				✓
18	Y	Y	N		✓		✓
19	Y	N	N				✓
20	Y	N	N				✓
21	Y	N	N				✓
22	Y	N	N				✓
23	Y	N	N				✓
24	Y	Y	P		✓		✓
COLUMN TOTAL					6	4	15
PATTERN TOTAL							
PERCENTAGE							

READER		DATE							
Sam		May 17, 1990							
TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE							
SELECTION		SCHOOL							
The Balancing Girl (Posttest)									
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
3	1	book	books	✓			✓		
4	2	river	even	✓					✓
4	3	on	and		✓				✓
4	4	top	hop	✓			✓		
6	5	meas	Mugs		✓			✓	
6	6	on	in	✓				✓	
6	7	river	nest		✓			✓	
7	8	Miss	Ms.	✓				✓	
7	9	Judy	Joliet	✓				✓	
7	10	spiral	steady	✓	✓				✓
7	11	head	head	✓				✓	
9	12	this	That's	✓				✓	
10	13	balanced	planned	✓				✓	
11	14	switched	wanted	✓			✓		
11	15	spiral	Simple	✓				✓	
12	16	switch	task	✓				✓	
12	17	last	long	✓				✓	
12	18	finally	finished		✓			✓	
13	19	fun	finished		✓			✓	
13	20	castle	Castle	✓					✓
13	21	two	four's	✓					✓
14	22	push	recess		✓				✓
14	23	knocking	knocked	✓				✓	
14	24	fun	power	✓				✓	
16	25	again	knock	✓				✓	
COLUMN TOTAL				18	7	0	5	14	6
a. TOTAL MISQUES				TOTAL MISQUES					
b. TOTAL WORDS				PERCENTAGE					
a ÷ b × 100 = MPMW									

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE										READER Sam		DATE May 17, 1990	
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCS IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL				
					Strength YYY	Partial Strength YY	Weakness NN						
SELECTION The Balancing Girl (Posttest)										WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT			
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (d)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND						
				H	S	N	H	S	N				
26													
27													
28													
29													
30													
31													
32													
33													
34													
35													
36													
37													
38													
39													
40													
41													
42													
43													
44													
45													
46													
47													
48													
49													
50													
COLUMN TOTAL					6	0	19						
PATTERN TOTAL													
PERCENTAGE													
16		26	build	balance									
17		27	Judges	Juliet									
17		28	morning	money									
17		29	up	for									
17		30	Stand	set									
19		31	on	a									
21		32	play	pay									
21		33	the	clapped									
22		34	kept	for									
22		35	over	clapped									
22		36	came	Juliet									
22		37	Johnson	Juliet									
28		38	better	private									
28		39	beefin	lover									
28		40	her	the									
30		41	careful	she									
30		42	the	balanced									
30		43	blacks	it									
30		44	is	stand									
30		45	standing	from									
30		46	for	even									
32		47	every	finger									
32		48	finally	fouled									
32		49	to										
a. TOTAL MISCS					b. TOTAL WORDS					c. PERCENTAGE			
11					13					1			
5					10					10			

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISCUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1.2.3)		
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_YN_
51							
52							
53							
54							
55							
56							
57							
58							
59							
60							
61							
62							
63							
64							
65							
66							
67							
68							
69							
70							
71							
72							
73							
74							
75							
COLUMN TOTAL					1	4	20
PATTERN TOTAL							
PERCENTAGE							

READER Sam		DATE May 17, 1990							
TEACHER		AGE/ GRADE							
SCHOOL		SCHOOL							
SELECTION The Balancing Girl (Posttest)									
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT									
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect (1)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
32	51	the	it			✓			✓
32	52	dominus	domino	✓					
32	53	some	soon	✓				✓	
34	54	brought	berroused		✓				✓
34	55	of	from	✓					✓
34	56	morning	more		✓				
35	57	stopped	stoad	✓					
35	58	put	built		✓				
35	59	town	towers	✓					
36	60	Six	Siack		✓				
36	61	Comb	combie		✓				
40	62	I	I II						
40	63	get	got	✓	✓				
42	64	don't	do	✓					
43	65	I	The			✓			
43	66	whole	whole		✓				✓
43	67	helped	held	✓					✓
44	68	all	and		✓				
45	69	Miss	Margaret		✓				✓
46	70	it	It's	✓					
47	71	began	bigged	✓					✓
47	72	pause	push	✓					✓
47	73	one	down	✓					✓
49	74	each	end		✓				✓
51	75	Margaret	Margaret's	✓	✓				✓
COLUMN TOTAL				13	10	2	5	11	9
a. TOTAL MISCUES				TOTAL MISCUES					
b. TOTAL WORDS				PERCENTAGE					
a + b x 100 = MPHW				PERCENTAGE					

MISCUE ANALYSIS PROCEDURE II CODING FORM

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE							READER <u>Sam</u>		DATE <u>May 17, 1990</u>		
SENTENCE NO.	No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE	1 SYNTACTIC ACCEPTABILITY	2 SEMANTIC ACCEPTABILITY	3 MEANING CHANGE	PATTERN (See 1,2,3)			TEACHER	AGE/ GRADE	SCHOOL	
					Strength YYN	Partial Strength YYY YYP	Weakness NN_ YN_				
							SELECTION <u>The Balancing Girl (Posttest)</u>				
WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT											
SENTENCE NO.	MISCUE NO.	READER Dialect ①	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND				
				H	S	N	H	S	N		
52	76	Said	and	✓				✓			
57	77	she	The	✓							
57	78	picked	principal		✓						
58	79	girls	grade								
59	80	might	may		✓				✓		
59	81	push	pushes	✓					✓		
60	82	Classrooms	classroom	✓					✓		
63	83	William	William's	✓							
63	84	put	pulled		✓				✓		
66	85	we'll	well	✓					✓		
66	86	put	push	✓					✓		
67	87	that	than	✓					✓		
67	88	in	he			✓					
67	89	careful	beautifully			✓			✓		
68	90	and	a		✓				✓		
68	91	those	thousand	✓						✓	
69	92	clicked	click	✓					✓		
69	93	lost	there	✓	✓					✓	
70	94	then	there						✓		
71	95	some	something		✓				✓		
71	96	buir	balanced						✓		
73	97	those	thirty		✓						
73	98	of	for	✓						✓	
74	99	Something	someone	✓					✓		
74	100	Should	shouted	✓					✓		
Totals for...											
51-75					1	4	20				
76-90					6	0	19				
91-105					6	4	18				
COLUMN TOTAL							13	8	54		
PATTERN TOTAL							75				
PERCENTAGE							17.3	10.7	72.0		

a. TOTAL MISQUES	COLUMN TOTAL	14	10	1	8	9	8
b. TOTAL WORDS	TOTAL MISQUES						
a + b x 100 = MPH	PERCENTAGE						

© 1987 Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

LANGUAGE SENSE

SENTENCE NO.

No. MISQUES IN SENTENCE

1

2

3

MEANING CHANGE

PATTERN
(See 1,2,3)

Strength

Partial Strength

Weakness

YNN

YYY YYP

NN_YN_

COLUMN TOTAL

PATTERN TOTAL

PERCENTAGE

READER Sam

DATE May 17, 1990

TEACHER

AGE/ GRADE

SCHOOL

SELECTION The Balancing Girl (Posttest)

WORD SUBSTITUTION IN CONTEXT

SENTENCE NO.	MISQUE NO.	READER Dialect (D)	TEXT	4 GRAPHIC			5 SOUND		
				H	S	N	H	S	N
74	101	heuring	Murrah		✓			✓	
74	102	from	for	✓				✓	
75	103	class	cheer		✓				✓
# 24	104	Will	William	✓				✓	
# 25	105	Will	William's	✓				✓	
Totals for 101-105				3	2	0	1	3	1
Totals for 76-100				14	10	1	8	9	8
Totals for 51-75				13	10	2	5	11	9
Totals for 26-50				11	13	1	5	10	10
Totals for 1-25				18	7	0	5	14	6
a. TOTAL MISQUES <u>*Errata</u>				59	42	4	24	47	34
b. TOTAL WORDS _____				105			105		
a ÷ b x 100 = MPH _____				PERCENTAGE	56.2	40.0	3.8	22.8	44.8

NAME SamDATE May 17, 1990

RETELLING GUIDE for "The Balancing Girl" (Berniece Rabe)

I. CHARACTER ANALYSIS (40 points)

A. Recall (20 points)

1. Margaret, the Balancing Girl..... (10) 10
2. Tommy..... (5) 5
3. Ms. Joliet, the Gr. 2 teacher..... (2) 2
4. Other students..... (1) 1
 - a. school in general
 - b. Gr. 2 class
 - c. William
5. Parents/public..... (1) 1
 - a. generally
 - b. William's grandmother
 - c. Tommy's dad
6. Principal..... (1)

B. Development (20 points)

1. Margaret (12 points)
 - a. Good at balancing..... (3) 3
 - b. Wanted Tommy to acknowledge
her balancing ability..... (3) 2
 - c. Pleased to use her
balancing ability to
help others..... (3) 3
 - d. Pleased to see Tommy
finally acknowledge
her ability..... (3) 3

2. Tommy (8 points)

- a. Unkind towards Margaret regarding her balancing ability..... (4) 4
- comment re: Magic Markers
 - demolition (?) of tower/castle
- b. Changed his attitude towards Margaret's balancing ability..... (4) 4

II. EVENTS (60 points)

A. Part One: Something Special

1. Margaret was very good at balancing; for example,
- books on head (stationary)
 - books on head (moving)
 - on crutches

One day she balanced Magic Markers in a row on a shelf. Ms. Joliet acknowledged her special ability; but Tommy made an unkind remark about it.

(7) 7

2. Margaret thought up a special project which might change Tommy's opinion. She built a castle. However, someone knocked it down. Margaret blamed Tommy.

(6) 4

3. Ms. Joliet told the class about a school carnival to support UNICEF. She asked for ideas for helping. Tommy, William, and Margaret each made good suggestions.

(7) 5

B. Part Two: The Domino City

4. Margaret worked hard on her suggestion, which involved her constructing a "domino city." Everyone watched her project with keen interest.

(7) 5

5. Margaret couldn't remove a cookie someone had dropped in the middle of the dominoes. Tommy volunteered to get it, but Ms. Joliet said she would. Very carefully, she removed the cookie without disturbing the dominoes.

(6) 5

6. Everyone wanted to be the one who would push the first domino. Ms. Joliet said it would be determined by drawing a name out of a hat at the end of the carnival. Everyone clapped for Margaret and her project.

(7) 5

C. Part Three: The School Carnival

7. At the carnival, Margaret visited every booth, including those developed from William's and Tommy's suggestions. Towards the end, the principal called everyone to the grade two room for the Grand Finale.

(6) 2

8. From a hat containing all the names, William's grandmother drew the winner--Tommy. He stepped up but delayed, which prompted Margaret to exclaim, "Well, push!" He did, harder than needed; but the dominoes fell as planned. Everyone cheered.

(7) 5

9. Margaret and Tommy exchanged comments which suggested that not only had the balancing project been a financial success but that it had led to a change in Tommy's attitude about Margaret's balancing ability.

(7) 5

POINTS

I. Character Analysis:

a. Recall..... 19 points

b. Development..... 19 points

II. Events..... 43 points

Total points 81

Name: Sam

Date: May 17, 1990

PLOT STATEMENTS:

(Not elicited.)

THEME STATEMENTS:

You shouldn't tease a girl because afterwards she might help you. (Student gave examples, using a real life incident from his father's childhood and a reference to a book student had read last year.) You shouldn't tease someone or hurt someone's feelings because they could help you later on.

INFERENCES:

The people who didn't like her all that much were jealous over her being so good at balancing. (Student later specified that there was only one person--Tommy.)

Margaret probably didn't expect Tommy to win.

Tommy probably felt embarrassed to be the winner since he had done those things against Margaret.

Margaret probably said something loud to Tommy at the end because it had big words (i.e., size of print).

If student were writing a story as a continuing adventure of The Balancing Girl, he suggested it could involve Margaret and Tommy being friends and balancing things (together).

MISCONCEPTIONS:

Ficked names out of a bag (later corrected).

All the other people didn't like her that much (cf., Inference #1); they would knock down her balancing work, like castles. (In response to probe, the student said there was only about one person who was like that--Tommy.)

Tommy put the cookie in the domino city.

Tommy's unkind remark was referring to Margaret's balancing dominoes (i.e., student didn't refer to Magic Markers).

Student didn't identify central purpose of carnival (i.e., support UNICEF).

Domino city was not identified as a fundraiser.

Purpose of castle was also for the carnival.

Teacher picked name (later corrected).

COMMENTS:

Student said that when he's reading, by the time he gets to the end he has forgotten a lot of what happened earlier in the story (both this selection and other selections in general).

Student reported that as he was reading this selection he felt he was understanding what was happening.

Student referred to an episode of TV show "Amen" which featured domino event.

Student rated the story as being hard to read. In response to investigator's questioning, he said that under other circumstances, he would have chosen to ask his parents to help him by their reading a page and his reading the same page afterwards. He said it's something he does and finds helpful.

STUDENT: Sam DATE: May 17, 1990
 TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____
 TITLE: The Balancing Girl
 AUTHOR: Berniece Rabe

Part One: Something Special

- ¹Margaret was very good at balancing. ²She
 could balance books on her ^(R)head. ³She could glide
 along on her wheelchair and the books ^Hwould not
 fall off. ⁴She could ^Hnever ^Son ^Htop
 with her crutches. ⁵One day at school, ^(R)Margaret collected all the
^SMess ^{UC}Magic ^HMarkers. ⁶She balanced them ^{UC}in ^Hneat ^Srows
 on the shelf. ⁷Ms. Joliet said, "You have a very steady hand,
 Margaret."
⁸"Anybody can do that," Tommy said.
⁹"That's simple."

1. Y Y N2. Y Y N3. Y N -4. Y N -5. N N -6. Y N -7. Y Y Y8. Y Y N9. Y Y N

^Hbalanced ^{RM}balanced ^Hwatched
 10 Margaret planned and planned. 11 She wanted

10. Y Y Y

to do something very special that Tommy could

^Hspecial
 not call simple.

11. Y N -

^Hlooked ^Hlost
 12 It took a long time and great care, but at last

^Sfinally ^Sfun ^R
 Margaret finished it. 13 She had finished a fine

12. N N -

^Hcloth ^{uc}twelve ^H
 castle made of six towers, with a cone balanced

gently on top of each.

13. N N -

^Seach ^Cso- ^HKnocking
 14 At recess, someone knocked down Margaret's
^Htower. 15 Margaret knew who did it.

14. N N -

^Hknow
 16 "Tommy," she said, "if you knock down

^Sbuild ^R
 anything I balance again, YOU'LL BE SORRY!"

16. Y Y P

^{RM}Miss ^SJudgeon

17 Ms. Joliet told the children they were going to
 have a school carnival to raise ^Smoney for ^Hmorning of

UNICEF. 18 She asked the children to think of ways

17. N N -

they could help.

18. Y Y N

^Sstand ^Non fishing poles
 19 Tommy said, "We can set up a fishpond. 20 My

19. Y N -

^Cdad ^{Sa-}and I ^Ccould run the fishpond booth. 21 people

20. N N -

play ^H the ^S
would pay to fish for presents."

21. N N -

²²Everybody ^{kept} ^S ^{over} ^H clapped for Tommy's idea. ²³Even

22. Y N -

^{came} ^S
Margaret clapped.

23. Y N -

²⁴"We can be clowns," said William ^H, "and sell

balloons."

24. N N -

²⁵The children clapped for William's ^H idea.

25. Y Y P

²⁶Margaret whispered her idea to Ms. Joliet. ^{Miss Johnsons} ^{RM} ^S

26. N N -

^{RM} ^S
Miss Johnson

²⁷Ms. Joliet liked the idea. ²⁸She said Margaret could

27. N N -

^S ^H ^H
better ^{coffin} ^{her}
have a private corner in the classroom where she

could work.

28. N N -

Part Two: The Domino City

²⁹The next morning, Margaret started setting

up dominoes. ³⁰Very, very carefully, ^H ^{the blocks} ^S she balanced

29. N N -

^R ^H ^H ^{-ing}
each one and made it stand ^{up} just a little way

^H
for
from the last one. ³¹She had to be very careful. /

30. N N -31. Y Y N

^H ^S ^S ^N ^H ^{-es}
every finally to the
³²If even one finger touched a domino ^{and} made it

fall, then all the dominoes would topple down,

one by one.

32. N N -

^H
Some
^{RM} ^{RM} ^S ^H
33 Soon, Margaret used up all the dominoes in
Miss Johnson brought of
the room. 34 Ms. Joliet borrowed more from (grade)
^{RM} ^S
every morning
one and even more from (grade) three. 35 Just about

33. N N -

34. N N -

^H
every boy stopped
everybody stood and watched (while) Margaret
^S
put
built a (whole) ^{Carefully} city full of (highways, bridges,
^{town} ^H
and towers.

35. N N -

^S ^S
Six Comb
36 At snack time, someone dropped a cookie in

the middle of the domino city.

36. Y N -

^R
37 Margaret tried to (reach) it, but she couldn't. 38 "I
can't get that ^R (cookie)," she said. 39 "One (slip) and the

37. Y N -

38. Y Y N

(whole city) will fall down!"

39. N N -

^S ^H
got
40 "I (11) get it for you," said Tommy.

40. Y N -

^{RM} ^{RM}
Miss Johnsons

41 Ms. Joliet stopped him just in time. ^C ^{RM} ^H
do it,

41. Y Y N

Tommy," she said.

42. Y Y N

^N ^S ^H
I won't helped
43 The whole class (watched) and held (their)
^{RM} ^{RM} ^{RM} ^{RM}
Every Miss Johnson helped the
(breath). 44 Even Ms. Joliet held her (breath) as she

43. N N -

all ^S
 (reached) over and (lifted) out the cookie.

44. N N -

^{Miss}
^S
 45 The next day, Margaret put the last domino in
 place. 46 "It (s) (finished)," she said.

45. Y N -46. N N -

^H ^{RM}
 47 Everyone begged and begged to be the one to
^H ^{uc} ^H
 pause / one
 push down the first domino.

47. N N -

^{RM} ^{RM}
 Miss Johnson
 48 Ms. Joliet said, "If you want to be the one,

you have to pay to put your name in the hat.

48. Y Y N

^S
 49 Then a name will be drawn at the end of the ^{each}

(carnival)."

49. N N -

50 Everyone clapped for Margaret. 51 Some of the

50. Y Y N

children said they would (guard) Margaret (s) ^H

^{RM} ^{-es}
 (corner) so the domino city would be (safe).

51. N N -

Part Three: The School Carnival

^H
 52 On the day of the carnival, the children and ^{Said}
 (parents) went from room to room to see the

(different booths). 53 Margaret (visited) every one.

52. N N -53. N N -

54 She (bought balloons) and (won) a (prize) at the

fishpond. ⁵⁵She got a rubber spider.

54. N N -
55. N N -

⁵⁶Then there was a message on the loudspeaker.

56. N N -

^H ^S
She picked
⁵⁷The principal said, "It's time for the Grand

Finale! ⁵⁸Come to the ^{girls} grade two room and see the

57. N N -

^S
domino city. ⁵⁹You may be the lucky one who

58. Y N -

^H
pushes down the first domino." ^{RM}

59. N N -

⁶⁰People crowded into the ^{girls} ^{RM} grade two classroom. ^H ^{-S}

60. N N -

⁶¹They got as close as they could to Margaret's ^{RM}

corner. ^{Miss Johnson helped to} ⁶²Ms. Joliet held out ^{the} the hat with all the

61. Y Y Y

^H ^S
names in it. ⁶³William's grandmother pulled out

62. Y N -

the name. ⁶⁴She read it out loud: "It's Tommy!"

63. N N -

64. Y Y N

⁶⁵Tommy stepped inside the corner and stood

for a long time, looking at Margaret.

65. N N -

^H ^{we} ^H
We'll push
⁶⁶"Well, push!" said Margaret.

66. Y N -

⁶⁷Tommy pushed harder ^{that in} than he needed to, but

^{careful} ^S
everything went beautifully. ⁶⁸Click, click, click, a ^S ^{and}

67. N N -

those^H H -ed looked last^{RM S}
 thousand times click. ⁶⁹The dominoes took their
 (turns falling). ⁷⁰When they (were) all down, there^{went then H}
 was a big (cheer).

68. Y N -69. Y N -70. N N -

⁷¹Tommy looked at Margaret and yelled, "I
 knocked down ^(C) ^S ^{built S}
 something you balanced, and I'm
 not sorry!"

71. Y Y P

⁷²"I'm not sorry (either)," called Margaret. ⁷³"My
^{RM -es}
 domino ^(corner) made a (hundred) and one (dollars)
 and thirty ^(cents) for (UNICEF)!"

72. Y Y P73. N N -

⁷⁴Someone shouted, ^{H H}
^{something should}
^{S H}
 Hearing from
 Hurrah for the

Balancing Girl!

74. Y N -

⁷⁵And Margaret was sure she heard Tommy
^S
 class
 join in the cheer.

75. Y Y Y

<u>Q.1</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.2</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 75)	<u>Q.3</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 21)
Y <u>38</u> (<u>51</u> %)	Y <u>21</u> (<u>28</u> %)	N <u>13</u> (<u>62</u> %)
N <u>37</u> (<u>49</u> %)	N <u>54</u> (<u>72</u> %)	P <u>4</u> (<u>19</u> %)
		Y <u>4</u> (<u>19</u> %)

No. Words in Selection = 739.

Total Reading Time = 13:45.

Reading Rate = 53.7 wpm.

Note. See Coding Forms and Reader Profile form for complete statistical information, including Q. 4 & Q. 5.

APPENDIX Q

STUDENT: John SELECTION #: 9

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the Clumsy CowboyAUTHOR: Mary Blount Christian LOCATION OF EXCERPT:
Page(s) 4-5

- (C) ^S walking ^H disposer
 1 "Get that -- that walking garbage disposal out of
 here!" Chief yelled. 2 "You're off this case! 3 You have
 some ^(C) ^{uc} ^{as} ^{your} ^S ^{favor} ^S ^{personal} time ^{coming}. 4 "Do ^{us} all a ^{favor} and
 take it! 5 I don't want to see ^{any} ^N either of your faces
 until Monday." 6. Y Y N
 2. Y Y N
 3. Y Y Y
 4. N N -
 5. Y N -
 6. N N -
 7. N N -
 8. N N -
 9. N N -
 10. Y Y Y
 11. N N -
 12. N N -
- 6 "But, Chief!" John ^(C) ^{uc} ^{as} ^{your} ^S ^{favor} ^S ^{personal} time ^{coming}. 7 "Didn't I find the
 ransom note -- one of only two clues we have so
 far? 8 And you said the entire force had to work
 around the clock until ^(C) ^{uc} ^{going} ^{go} ^H ^S we got that million-dollar
 random racehorse back. 9 You even wanted us to find it be-
 fore the race on Tuesday!" 10 Sebastian glared at John. 11 Taking all the credit
 for finding that note was shameful! 12 Someday the

public would know the truth! ¹³He had a good mind

12. N N -

to write his memoirs, expose everything. ¹⁴If only

13. Y N -

those typewriter keys weren't too small for his

^H paw.

14. Y N -

¹⁵Chief sputtered. ¹⁶Getting you two out of my

15. N N -

hair for the whole weekend is like adding an en-

desperately

tire detective squad. ¹⁷Now, out of my office! ¹⁸Out!"

16. N N -

17. Y Y N

18. Y Y N

¹⁹Sebastian trotted out, head held proudly high.

19. N N -

²⁰We kept John between himself and Chief, just in

case Chief decided to throw something. ²¹He did

20. N N -

have a temper!

21. N N -

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 21)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 21)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 6)

Q.4
(Miscues
Coded = 24)

Y 9 (43%)

Y 6 (29%)

N 4 (67%)

H 13 (54%)

N 12 (57%)

N 15 (71%)

P 0 (0%)

S 9 (38%)

Y 2 (33%)

N 2 (8%)

No. Words in Excerpt = 186.

Total Reading Time = 4:50.

Reading Rate = 39 wpm.

Feedback by Investigator Following Oral Reading
by John in Start-Up Session 9

- I: How do you think this story is so far, as far as reading it by yourself? Would you say it's easy, medium, or hard?
- J: Hard.
- I: Hard, yeah? You don't feel, eh. . . . Do you feel good that you'll be able to enjoy the story, though . . . with the way that the project goes?
- J: Yeah.
- I: Yeah? Okay. What will make it a bit easier for you, do you think? What things will help you to enjoy it, even though right now, the first time you saw it, reading it on your own seemed to be a bit hard?
- J: Listen to it on tape and read it over again.
- I: What's happening in this part of the story so far that you've read?
- J: Chief told them to get out. It's like, if Chief needed someone instead of the other ones he could call on them. . . . And Sebastian is the one who got 'em all into trouble.
- I: Okay. Well, I think you got the gist of it; and as I say, as you listen to it you'll probably pick up a little more of the details of it. But let's look at it now. . . . Can I ask you to read this part, right here (points to sentence 7). . . . Now, how does the Chief feel about John and Sebastian when this part (of the story) starts? This part that you read. . . . How is he feeling about John and Sebastian?
- J: Mad.
- I: Mad. Okay. Why is he mad with them?
- J: Because there's one of the horses . . . and Sebastian got him right upset. He kicked down the door and ran away.
- I: Okay. Well, let's have a look here. . . . Could you read this part . . . right here, and read as far as here (pointing to sentences 6 and 7).
- J: But, but Chief. . . . But Chief, John . . . didn't I fire the noise . . . one of only . . . one of . . . one of only two clues we have . . . so . . . f- . . . fan.
- I: Does that sound right? One of only two clues we have so fan.
- J: So . . .
- I: One of only two clues we have so. . . . What would make sense there and sound right? One of only two clues we have so . . .
- J: Far.
- I: Is that "far"?
- J: F-a-r . . . yeah.

I: Yes? And it makes sense there and it looks like "far."
That's right, because "fan" ends in what letter . . . what
sound is at the end?

J: N.

I: N. And what's written down, what's down there?

J: F-a-r.

I: R. And does that match with what "far" ends in?

J: Yes.

I: Yes? Yes, that's right. It is far. . . . Now, it says
one of only two clues. Can you remember the clues that
they had so far?

J: Ah . . . they had a ransom note.

I: Okay, and what was the other clue?

J: Ah . . .

I: Okay, there was one other one. As you listen to the story
(on tape) you'll probably hear what the other clue is.
Yes, certainly a ransom note is one. And let's see, in
this part here it says: "But Chief, John" and then you
left out that one there. It means that John is saying
something in a certain way, but I won't say what it is
right now. "But Chief." Okay, I'll tell you, "But Chief,
John pro-" (Sentence 6.)

J: Proclaimed.

I: Proclaimed? Oh, boy! That would have been another . . .

J: Pro-claimed . . . Pro-ces. . . .

I: Maybe if you look at what comes after "pro" . . .
t-e-s-t.

J: "Teh" . . . "t".

I: John pro-.

J: Protested.

I: Protested. Yeah.

J: Is it?

I: Protested? What do you think "protested" means? Have you
ever heard tell of people going on a picket line protest-
ing something? That means that they're against it . . .
they're saying "No, no. I don't agree with that." And
John is saying "But Chief" because Chief is not feeling
too good about things, right? And John is trying to stick
up for him and Sebastian. "But Chief," John protested.
You read the last part right here--one of only two clues
we have so far--I wonder about this part (pointing to
sentence 7). Can you read that part?

J: Didn't I . . . didn't I find the. . . .

I: Now, this thing here (pointing to words "ransom note"),
these two words here . . . the thing that he's talking
about. . . . Didn't I find the--whatever he says there
(the author) tells us that it's this thing here, look,
which is . . .

J: One of the two clues . . .

I: Yes. Now, what could that be? Didn't I find the--what
did you tell me the clue was?

J: Ransom . . . note. Didn't I find the ransom note!

I: Yes. Is that "ransom note" there?

J: Yeah.

- I: Yes, it is, isn't it? Yeah, Okay! Didn't I find the ransom note--one of only two clues we have so far? . . . What do you think the ransom note would be for?
- J: A horse.
- I: What kind of a horse was it, a work horse?
- J: Stallion.
- I: Yes? What kind of activity did that particular horse do?
- J: Racing.
- I: Racing. Okay . . . and right here in the next part . . . let's have a look and see what it says. Can you read right there? (Sentence 8).
- J: And you said that . . . no, and you said the . . . and you said the right . . . forward. . . .
- I: This word here (pointing to "force") . . . who did they work with? Who did John and Sebastian work with? And the Chief?
- J: Ah . . .
- I: Who did they work for?
- J: Ummh?
- I: What kind of jobs did they do?
- J: They're police officers.
- I: Okay. So they worked for the . . . police department, right? And another word for police department is . . . the police force. And you said the entire force . . . had to work around the--
- J: Clock.
- I: Until--
- J: We got the million-dollar . . . re- . . . back. Re-house back, or something.
- I: Re-house back. Does that sound right? What is it they're trying to get back? A million dollars. Are they trying to get a million dollars back?
- J: Or, ah. The ranch horse back.
- I: A ranch horse?
- J: Ah?
- I: Is that "ranch horse"? (pointing to "racehorse" in sentence 8 and then to the word "ranch" on the front cover).
- J: (After examining the words) No.
- I: No. Not quite, is it? But it is "horse" at the end, isn't it? What kind of horse would it be? What does the horse do?
- J: Ah, there's a working horse . . . a racing horse . . . could be a racing horseback.
- I: Yes? See if that fits. And you said the entire force had to work around the--
- J: Clock.
- I: Until--
- J: We got the million-dollar racing horse back. That would fit.
- I: Yes? It is right. Well, they don't say racing horse, they just say--
- J: Racehorse.

- I: Racehorse. They just call it a racehorse, r-a-c-e is "race" and h-o-r-s-e is "horse." You know, that's kind of unusual. . . . What's the name of the story?
- J: Sebastian.
- I: Yes. And . . . what else?
- J: The case of the haunted ranch.
- I: Yes, it is, isn't it? It talks about that. And in the actual title it says Sebastian (Super Sleuth) and the--
- J: And the Clumsy Cowboy.
- I: Yes. And it's about a haunted ranch. And we talked about the kind of ranch you go to for a holiday, or another kind of name for it is--what kind of a ranch?
- J: Ah . . . a vacation ranch.
- I: Yes, but what do they call it? Right here, look (pointing to a location in the book) . . . D-u-d-e . . . the kind of a ranch you go to for a holiday . . . Cowboys say, "Hey, --,"
- J: Dude!
- I: Yeah, dude ranch.
- J: Like (classmate) says, "Yo, dudes!"
- I: Now, I'm wondering. They're talking about cowboys and stuff but yet the other part they're talking about . . . what kind of horse is missing? Is it a cowboy's horse?
- J: No.
- I: No, what kind of a horse is it?
- J: A racing horse.
- I: A race horse. Now . . . I wonder how that will fit together?
- J: Yeah, I know. See, that's the horse, right? And so, like he dresses up like a cowboy . . . like, he rides the horse and gets all the ghosts away.
- I: Well, that might be the way Mary Blount Christian develops the story.
- J: He's a GhostBuster.
- I: You'll find out pretty soon, won't you.
- J: Sir, instead of Slimer (a character in GhostBusters) . . . Sebastian.
- I: I wonder if you'll be able to figure out how those two go together? I think you'll be able to see how the two ideas, about the two horses. . . .
- J: You knows. (Referring to the fact that Investigator reads stories onto tapes.)
- I: Oh, I know. Yes. That's why I wouldn't pretend I didn't know. I'm just wondering how fast you're going to be able to figure out all the clues and that. I'll bet you'll do a good job of figuring it out before it actually says it.

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

Name John Date May 2, 1990 Start-Up# 9

Typescript Identification # _____

(a)	(b)	(c)			(d)			(e)
Number of Sentences Selected	Sentence Number on type-script	Miscue(s) Noticed by...			Miscue(s) Resolved by...			Score (Col. c + Col. d)
		S	S&I	I	S	S&I	I	
1	7		✓			✓		2
2	6			✓		✓		1
3	8	✓				✓		3
		Score = $\frac{3}{6}$ (max.) = <u>50</u> % (Monitoring)			Score = $\frac{3}{6}$ (max.) = <u>50</u> % (Correcting)			Score = $\frac{6}{12}$ (max.) = <u>50</u> % (Monitoring and Correcting)

Note.

Maximum possible scores:

1. Monitoring (Col. c) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
2. Correcting (Col. d) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
3. Monitoring and Correcting (Col. e) = No. of Sentences x 4 pts.

Comments: When working with material as difficult as this, John benefits from sharing the reading responsibility with a more-able reader. John's active involvement and his understanding of appropriate strategies for predicting and confirming were apparent during the shared activities of the procedure. (See typed transcript of the complete feedback activity.)

APPENDIX R

STUDENT: Max SELECTION #: 7

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: Lassie: Digging Up DangerAUTHOR: Nancy E. Krulik LOCATION OF EXCERPT: Page(s) 2-3

^(R)
 1As the remote-control toy airplane flew over

her head, Lassie jumped high in the air and

opened her mouth wide. 2She was trying/desper-

1. Y Y P

ately to ^{teach} catch the ^{air} plane. 3In her dog mind, Lassie

2. Y Y P

thought she and ^{Willie} Will, the boy who was her mas-

ter were playing/^N their ^{an} old game of fetch. ^(C) ^S But to

3. N N -

Lassie's surprise, as soon as she jumped up to

^H catch the model airplane, ^{air} the ^{was} plane moved even

higher, as though ^{they} the ^{boy} toy had ^a mind of its own.

4. N N -

^{air} 5Of course, the plane didn't have a mind at all.

5. Y Y N

^(R) ^H 6It shifted ^(R) its course only because Will had moved

at the ^H joystick that controlled it. 7But Lassie couldn't

6. N N -

know this. Confused, the mighty collie stood on
 her powerful hind legs and jumped around in a ^Ccirc-
 cle, following the ^{air- RM}plane with her eyes as it flew off
 over a hill.

7. Y Y N8. Y Y P

<u>Q.1</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 8)	<u>Q.2</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 8)	<u>Q.3</u> (No. Sentences Coded = 5)	<u>Q.4</u> (Miscues Coded = 11)
Y 5 (62%)	Y 5 (62%)	N 2 (40%)	H 7 (64%)
N 3 (38%)	N 3 (38%)	P 3 (60%)	S 2 (18%)
		Y 0 (0%)	N 2 (18%)

No. Words in Excerpt = 138.

Total Reading Time = 3:55.

Reading Rate = 35 wpm.

Feedback by Investigator Following Oral Reading
by Max in Start-Up Session 7

- I: Okay. Very good. I think we'll stop right there. I'd say you did a really good job on this. Remember I told you this morning, that this was a really long story. This is no piece of cake. Would you say that this is easy, medium or hard reading? (Student answered: "Well, probably medium and hard.") Well, for the first time that you've read any of it, I thought you did a really good job. Can you tell me, in the part you just read, what was happening . . . in your own words?
- M: She was trying to jump after an airplane. And Will kept on moving it up after she jumped.
- I: I wonder what the dog thought about that.
- M: It was right weird to her, like . . . probably it was right . . . strange.
- I: Do you think that Will was being kind, or unkind?
- M: Well, not really. He wasn't being mean or anything. He was just, like. . . . Well, I likes throwing the ball. I'll toss it to the dog and he jumps up after it. He likes that. It's the same thing.
- I: I guess it's a lot like when you're friends, you can do things and you know you're having fun with each other and you're not doing it to, to . . .
- M: Hurt.
- I: . . . hurt or make someone feel bad.
- M: Or like, if you're playing . . . that one where you throws a ball to each other and there's a fellow in the middle. You throw it over and he's got to run back and forth.
- I: Yes. Do you know what that's called?
- M: Ah . . . "Monkey in the Middle."
- I: Yeah . . . and the person in the middle sure feels like a monkey sometimes.
- M: That was like my dog. Me and (friend) were having a pass. He used to try and get the ball. Dog used to go up, aaah! and slip on the ice and go back over and slip on the ice again. (Note: Refers to an informal game using hockey sticks and a ball.)
- I: I noticed a couple of things as you were reading, as well, that I thought I'd like to mention to you. I wonder about this part here (pointing to text) . . . if you could read this part, starting right here and ending here (sentence 2). . . .
- M: She was trying . . . to catch the airplane.
- I: I wonder what that word is all about, there (pointing to "desperately")? I wonder what information that gives us about what's happening. Do you have any idea what it might be?
- M: No.

I: Okay. Well, it sort of reminds me . . . you talked about Monkey in the Middle. In this case, the dog is sort of like in the middle. And after a while, you keep trying and trying--you want to do it--but after a while you're sort of wondering if it's possible to do it. And this word says that after a while, when you've tried everything to get something, you start sometimes giving it a last try or trying some really . . . last-chance things of getting it. And when you do things like that, I guess that by that time you're starting to feel this way (masking the -ly suffix).

M: Angry.

I: Angry? Ah . . . well, probably not quite angry . . . although you probably would after a while . . . start to feel angry. Sometimes you do get frustrated and get kind of angry, even in games with your friends. This one is . . . "She was trying. . . ." Could that be angrily . . . "She was trying angrily to catch the plane"? Could that word be "angrily"?

M: No.

I: No? Why couldn't it be "angrily"?

M: Because "angrily" don't start with "d".

I: Right . . . could it be "desperately"?

M: Yeah.

I: Yes? And would it make sense? "She was trying desperately to catch the plane."

M: Yeah.

I: That's right. That's the word Nancy (Krulik) used there when she was writing the story. . . . I'm wondering what do you call. . . . Like you've got two dogs that are your family pets, right?

M: Yes.

I: What do you call the people who are in charge of the dogs or own the dogs?

M: Well, sometimes they're owners.

I: Yes, owners. That's right. Dog owners. And if it was a man or a boy, what is another word you could use for the owner? Do you know?

M: No.

I: Right here they use the word in this sentence (sentence 3). "In her dog mind. . . ." By the way, I thought that was quite good (the way) you picked up on that right away . . . "In her dog mind." That didn't throw you off at all (referring to student's oral reading). "In her dog mind. . . ." Can you read that part right there, that sentence? M: (Lassie thought) she and Will, the boy who was her . . .

I: Can you tell me what word comes after "her"? Can you point to the word that comes after "her", ". . . the boy who was her. . . ." Okay. And it's "m-a-s." Is there anything else we need to know?

M: Right here (pointing to "ter" on the next line).

I: Why do we need to know this to know the word that comes after "her"?

M: There's an "r" at the end, sort of.

- I: Um-hm.
M: Like . . .
I: And here you've got "m-a-s" and something after the "s" there. . . . Do you know what that is?
M: A . . . hyphen?
I: Yes. "M-a-s" and then a hyphen. What have we got next?
M: "t-e-r."
I: Yeah, okay. Why have they got it like that, I wonder?
M: Because where they couldn't fit it down here. . . .
I: So actually the word is either "m-a-s" hyphen "t-e-r" or else they showed with the hyphen there that they couldn't finish it and it would be "m-a-s-t-e-r" and the hyphen was only used to show it joins, is that right? (Investigator wrote the word on a sheet of paper.) I wonder what that word could be now?
M: It looks something like "monster."
I: Monster. . . . It looks something like "monster" doesn't it (Investigator wrote "monster") because it started with an "m" and it's got "s-t-e-r", "-ster" and we've got an "m" at the beginning. But we've got an "o-n" there. But we need an "a" (pointing to the two words written by Investigator) . . . "m-a-s-t-e-r." I wonder what word that could be? It means something the same as an owner of a dog; but the owner or the person there in this case is actually a boy, a male. What's another word for owner . . . of a dog? The dog is owned by a person; and the person who owns him or is in charge of him is called . . .
M: I don't know.
I: Could that word be owner?
M: No.
I: No. Why not?
M: Because it starts with "m".
I: Well, the boy who was her. . . . Could it be "playmate"?
M: No.
I: It couldn't be that could it? Could it be . . . "master"? The boy who was her master?
M: Yes.
I: Yes? But does "master" make sense there? You had the dog and the owner of the dog, the boy, is called a master? Does that make sense?
M: I think.
I: Have you ever heard tell of that?
M: Yes.
I: Have you ever heard tell of a person who was the owner called a master?
M: Yes, it's like a little boy is a master.
I: Yes, that's right. Sometimes, probably when you got mail when you were a little kid--or maybe even now some people don't like to call you Mister (student's name) yet, they may sometimes call you Master (student's name) when they address it. I can remember getting things like that--Master (Investigator's name).
M: I got one, I think, so far.

- I: Well, that's what it means, alright. It refers to a boy. So, sometimes that word is used, "Master." Do you know of any other ways that the word "master" is used?
- M: Like a king, a master of people.
- I: That's right, yes. Or like the famous "Masters of the Universe."
- M: Like He-Man.
- I: Yes. Well, to a dog, I guess the boy who is the owner or is in charge of him is like the master. Do you know what they call the woman or girl?
- M: The . . . oh, I'm not sure.
- I: Well, it's this one . . . (Investigator wrote "mistress" on the sheet of paper). That's the term that they use. Have you ever heard this word (pointing to "Mistress") Mary, Quite contrary, How does your garden grow? Do you know the word that goes in that?
- M: No.
- I: "Mistress." Mistress Mary, Quite contrary, How does your garden grow? Well, that's what it is. "Mistress" is for a girl or a woman . . . when she's the owner. . . . And "Master" is a man or a boy who is the owner. . . . Well, I thought you got a really good start on that story. Do you think you're going to like this story?
- M: Yeah.
- I: I wonder . . . we still haven't found out very much about what that "digging up" might be all about. They were talking about planes there, and out in the field. . . . Well, you'll find out all about it over the next few days as you start working on (the book).

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

Name Max Date _____ Start-Up# 7

Typescript Identification # _____

(a)	(b)	(c)			(d)			(e)
Number of Sentences Selected	Sentence Number on type-script	Miscue(s) Noticed by...			Miscue(s) Resolved by...			Score (Col. c + Col. d)
		S	S&I	I	S	S&I	I	
		2	1	0	2	1	0	
1	2	✓					✓	2
2	3	✓					✓	2
		Score = $\frac{4}{4}$ (max.) = <u>100%</u> (Monitoring)			Score = $\frac{0}{4}$ (max.) = <u>0%</u> (Correcting)			Score = $\frac{4}{8}$ (max.) = <u>50%</u> (Monitoring and Correcting)

Note.

Maximum possible scores:

1. Monitoring (Col. c) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
2. Correcting (Col. d) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
3. Monitoring and Correcting (Col. e) = No. of Sentences x 4 pts.

Comments: In examining sentence #2, student showed he could (from choices offered by investigator) select a word that made sense and sounded right ("angrily"); but he also showed he could check the chosen word against the text word independently (and explain his reasoning when asked by investigator). Before looking at sentence #3, the investigator asked the student what was a name for a boy or man who owned a dog. Student's only suggestion was "owner." In examining sentence #3, student pointed to the unknown word, told name "hyphen," and explained why it's used in this situation. Student noted that word looked something like "monster." After brief discussion, investigator asked student, "Could that word be 'owner'?" Student was able to respond, with explanation. Then, with "playmate." Then "master." (See typed transcript of the complete feedback activity.)

APPENDIX S

STUDENT: Sam SELECTION #: 7

TYPESCRIPT CODE NUMBER: _____

TITLE: Champ: Gallant CollieAUTHOR: Patricia Lauber LOCATION OF EXCERPT: Page(s) 6-7

- ^H chased ^S under ^S followed
¹He teased the cat until she went (for) him. ²Then 1. N N -
^H flew ^S apart ^{uc} uum- ^R
 he fled, pretending (terror). ³Through the house he 2. Y Y Y
 ran. ⁴Rugs skidded up the walls. ⁵Champ ^H Chairs (rocked) and 3. N N -
 (fell). ⁶The house looked as if a small (tornado) had 4. N N -
 (struck). 5. N N -
^H house ^S fuller ^H began ^R He
⁷He (teased) the horse, Snowball. ⁸He barked. ⁹He 7. N N -
^{uc} las- ^S Snow- ^S happily ^R
 (leaped) (for) Snowball's (nose). ¹⁰He nipped at the (horse's) 8. Y N -
 heels. ¹¹Snowball tried to defend himself. ¹²Clown 9. N N -
 10. N N -
 11. Y Y N
^H always ^S followed ^H
 (danced) away from Snowball's (hoofs). ¹³Snowball was 12. Y N -
 (usually) a (calm, quiet horse). ¹⁴He was (steady). ^C No ^S 13. N N -
 (upset him -- except) Clown. ¹⁶Just the sight of (Clown) ¹⁵Nothing 14. Y N -
^H make ^S same
 made Snowball (quiver with anger). 15. N N -
 16. N N -

^{tried} ^H ^{funniest} ^S ^{ug} ^R ^{had} ^H
 17 Clown teased the family. 18 He hid things -- the 17. Y N -
^{evening} ^{paper,} ^a ^{slipper,} ^{your} ^H ^{Matt's} ^{scarf.} ¹⁹ ^{while} 18. N N -
^{they} ^s ^{searched,} ^{was} ^H ^{he} ^{watched} ^{(with} ^{laughing)} ^{eyes.} ²⁰ ^{He} 19. N N -
^a ^H ^{played} ^{games} ^{with} ^{Miss} ^{Mrs.} ^{(Raymond's} ^{mop.)} ²¹ ^{He} ^{played} 20. Y N -
^{tug-of-war} ^H ^{when} ^{she} ^{took} ^{the} ^{shook} ^a ^{blanket.} 21. N N -

Q.1
(No. Sentences
Coded = 21)

Y 7 (33%)

N 14 (67%)

Q.2
(No. Sentences
Coded = 21)

Y 2 (10%)

N 19 (90%)

Q.3
(No. Sentences
Coded = 2)

N 1 (50%)

P 0 (0%)

Y 1 (50%)

Q.4
(Miscues
Coded = 26)

H 15 (58%)

S 10 (38%)

N 1 (4%)

No. Words in Excerpt = 130.

Total Reading Time = 3:10.

Reading Rate = 41 wpm.

Feedback by Investigator Following Oral Reading
by Sam in Start-Up Session 7

- I: Would you say, from your first reading of the book, that it looks like it might be easy, medium or hard?
- S: Hard.
- I: Hard? What do you think makes it hard?
- S: The long words and stuff.
- I: Yes? Do you think it's only the long words?
- S: Well, some short ones.
- I: Maybe we could read some together . . . I'll read some with you and I'll ask you a couple of things there. I'll read the first one to get us started. (Read: "But he remained as full of mischief as a puppy," which immediately precedes the segment contained on the typescript.) Now, the next part here . . . what do you think (the story is about) in the next part, here . . . the part you just read? What do you think this is about?
- S: I think it was about when him and the cat was playing chase and wrecking the house and that. This other. . . Miss (I can't get her name) . . . Champ played with her or something.
- I: What kind of things did Champ do with that woman, Miss, do you know?
- S: I don't know because I couldn't get the words.
- I: Okay, well let's see what we can do together as a team, alright . . . would you read the first line as far as the period right there. (Pointing to sentence 1.)
- S: He . . . he . . . he.
- I: Having trouble with the second word there?
- S: Umm.
- I: Okay. Why don't you skip that, for a moment anyway, and see if that helps you.
- S: The cat understand she flew over him, then. . .
- I: We can stop there (at "him"). Did that make sense to you, what you said? (Repeats sentence as it was finally produced by student.)
- S: No. That wasn't the word after "she."
- I: It made sense from having seen what's happening in the picture didn't it. Because sometimes you say the cat "flies" at you, right? You know, even though the cat doesn't have wings, sometimes you say "the cat flew right at you." It just means that she went so fast; it describes how she went. She didn't really fly like a bird would fly, right? So what you said did make sense. But you were wondering . . . you were thinking that it wasn't exactly that written down there. Is that what you were thinking?
- S: Umm.
- I: Why were you thinking that?

- S: Because it would be weird. Because a cat wouldn't jump on top of a dog or something.
- I: Okay, now what would a dog have to do maybe to cause that?
- S: Try to hit the cat.
- I: Okay. Yes. And do you think that Champ or Clown or whatever the dog is called there . . . do you think that that dog would hit the cat or try to hurt the cat?
- S: No.
- I: What might he do, though, if he was always causing . . . like it said here, he was full of mischief? What might a dog, or even a person, do to an animal if he were full of mischief? What might you do to get the cat to fly at you like you said?
- S: Bug 'em.
- I: Bug 'em? Okay, what's another word for "bug"?
- S: Tease.
- I: Okay. Now, I'm wondering. Is the word "tease" used in this first sentence? Have a look at it and see.
- S: He teased the cat.
- I: You think this (pointing to "tease") is "tease", here? It does look like the word tease and it fits there, doesn't it. Yes, it is the word "tease." Maybe when you look at (the sentence) now, see if you can make better sense of it.
- S: He teased the cat until she. . . .
- I: Okay, where are you looking now? At this word? And what does this say?
- S: "From" or "for."
- I: Which would it be, "from" or "for"?
- S: "For."
- I: Okay. So you've got "He teased the cat until she . . . something . . . for him."
- S: Until she went for him.
- I: Yeah! Very good indeed. That's right. Then, he fled. What does that mean, "he fled"? Fled. Like you said "The robbers fled the scene." What does that mean?
- S: I don't know.
- I: Well, that means they "took off." So, then he fled, pretending terror. So "pretending terror" means that he took off pretending he was terrified by this cat. Now, where did he go? Well, you said he went . . . something the house he ran. Now, what would that be there? "Then he fled, pretending terror." What could that word be . . . the house he ran? What would make sense there?
- S: Through.
- I: Through the house he ran. Very good! How about you start reading right there and finish off right there (pointing to sentences 1, 2, and 3).
- S: He teased the cat until she . . . went for him. Then, he . . . (I don't know the word) . . . pretending terror. Through the house he ran.
- I: Okay. Here's a picture that shows what's going on. In that picture, it talks about different things. This thing here, what's that?

S: A rug.
 I: A rug. . . . Okay, and what's this?
 S: A chair.
 I: Alright. Now, what do you think is happening to all of that stuff . . . with the dog running around with the cat after him?
 S: Flying over the house.
 I: "Through the house he ran." Now, what happened here? (pointing to sentence 4.)
 S: Rugs. . . .
 I: And then you said . . . you can skip that word (skidded) for now, what's that?
 S: Up the wall.
 I: Okay. Rugs . . . something. . . .
 S: (Interjection) slid.
 I: Good work! Slid . . . yes, it could be slid, couldn't it. That makes sense. And the word that they use here was skidded. Patricia Lauber decided to use the word skidded, but that means the same doesn't it? Rugs skidded up the walls. And then what happened?
 S: Chairs . . . rocked and. . . .
 I: What's happening to this one (pointing to picture)?
 S: Fell.
 I: Chairs rocked and fell. Very good! Yes. Alright . . . and now, this last part.
 S: The house looked as if it small tornado had . . . had . . .
 I: The house looked as if a small tornado had . . .
 S: Wrecked it.
 I: Wrecked it, yes. And it wrecked it because it struck. Struck. The house looked as if a small tornado had struck. Ever hear tell of that?
 Now, let's see what else he did.
 S: He . . . he tried. No. He teased the . . . he teased the . . .
 I: Okay. What's this here?
 S: Snowball.
 I: Okay. And it's got a capital there. So, what do you think "Snowball" is?
 S: The cat's name.
 I: Okay. You think it's a cat? It could be a cat's name. I've heard of cats called Snowball. This one is not a cat, though. This one is that (pointing to word "horse") kind of animal.
 S: Horse.
 I: A horse is right. How did you know it was horse?
 S: I just got, like, all mixed up. I saw it and said, "How do you spell 'house'? House, house." We had it for spelling once. I goes h-u-s-e, and then I goes "horse."
 I: Okay. So he teased the horse, Snowball. What did he do?
 S: He . . .

- I: The dog, now. He teased the horse, Snowball. He . . . we're talking about a dog. What do you think makes sense for a dog to do . . . when he's teasing? It's one of the things he might do.
- S: Bite.
- I: Bite? Okay, is that word "bite"? It starts off with "b" like in "bite."
- S: No.
- I: No? Alright, what else could it do . . . that a dog does? . . . Dog's are known for this. . . . Especially when someone comes around that's new or they get excited.
- S: Bark.
- I: Yeah! Is that "bark"?
- S: No.
- I: Is it "barking"?
- S: No.
- I: No? But is it "bark" at the beginning . . . b-a-r-k?
- S: Umm.
- I: Is that bark, b-a-r-k?
- S: No, I don't think.
- I: It's not? It is though. It begins with a "b", then you've got "a-r" - "bar"-kah, "bark." And "ed" at the end makes the word "barked" . . . barked. So, it's "He barked." He leaped for Snowball's--oh, look what he leaped for!
- S: Snowball's nose.
- I: Yeah. He nipped at the horse's . . . another part of the horse. . . .
- S: Tail.
- I: Tail? Would it be "tail"?
- S: No. Tail starts with "T".
- I: Okay. That's "heels." Snowball tried to defend himself. Clown danced away from Snowball's hoofs. Snowball was usually a calm . . . quiet horse. I wonder was he calm and quiet around Clown, or Champ?
- S: No, I don't think.
- I: (Explained what the student should do to prepare for Wrap-Up Session in about a week's time.)

Note. In the story, Champ: Gallant Collie, the dog's name changes from Clown to Champ.

Index of Student Response to Correcting Feedback

Name Sam Date _____ Start-Up# 7

Typescript Identification # _____

(a)	(b)	(c)			(d)			(e)
Number of Sentences Selected	Sentence Number on type-script	Miscue(s) Noticed by... S S&I I 2 1 0			Miscue(s) Resolved by... S S&I I 2 1 0			Score (Col. c + Col. d)
1	1	✓				✓		3
2	3			✓	✓			2
3	4	✓				✓		3
4	5	✓				✓		3
5	6	✓				✓		3
6	7	✓				✓		3
7	8	✓					✓	2
		Score = $\frac{12}{14}$ / $\frac{14}{14}$ = $\frac{86}{100}$ % (Monitoring)			Score = $\frac{7}{14}$ / $\frac{14}{14}$ = $\frac{50}{100}$ % (Correcting)			Score = $\frac{19}{28}$ / $\frac{28}{28}$ = $\frac{68}{100}$ % (Monitoring and Correcting)

Note.

Maximum possible scores:

1. Monitoring (Col. c) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
2. Correcting (Col. d) = No. of Sentences x 2 pts.
3. Monitoring and Correcting (Col. e) = No. of Sentences x 4 pts.

Comments: Student seems to notice many of his miscues, especially when he doesn't recognize the word(s). However, he seems not to be applying several fundamental "fix-up" strategies for the word-level or sentence-level problems. He seems to have these strategies available, as can be observed when sharing the reading activity with the investigator during assisted reading. However, he seems to place over-emphasis on individual word recognition and underemphasis on keeping in mind "Is this making sense?" and/or "Is this sounding right?" (See the typed transcript of the complete feedback activity.)

APPENDIX T

Student Interview after the Completion of
the Individualized Reading Programs

Name: John:

May 15, 1990

1. I: In your opinion, what were the best things about this reading project?
J: First we got to listen to you on tape. Then we got to read to our mothers by ourselves and tell our parents about it.
2. I: Do you think this reading project has helped you? (Explain.)
J: Yeah. It's helped me in reading, spelling, and stuff like that. It's helped me in a whole lot of ways.
3. I: Would you recommend that other people try this kind of reading project? (Explain.)
J: Yeah. Especially people that don't know how to read very much.
4. I: If someone else wanted to try a reading project like this, what things could be changed to improve it?
J: Well, they could change . . . the kind of books that we've been having. Like we have mystery novels and stuff like that. Well, they could have . . . stuff like . . . funny novels and that. People likes them too.
5. I: Which face best shows your opinion of the reading project? (Circle one.)
J: (John circled the "happiest" face on the range of 5 facial expressions.)
6. I: For each of the following aspects of the reading project, tell what you liked and what you didn't like about . . .
 - 6.A. I: Selecting the books.
J: (Liked.) You could select your own books; and if you didn't get a chance to read one book, you'd get a chance at it again after. We selected any book we liked and we had three sessions to select them. And every time we selected a book, we might have had new books, and that.
(Didn't like.) When you wants that same book and someone else got it before you.

6.B. I: Start-Up Sessions.

J: (Liked.) Mostly I liked it all because it was fun.
(Didn't like.) Nothing.

6.C. I: Using the books in the grade 4 classroom.

J: (Liked.) I liked that because that helped me a lot.
Like sometimes I bes (i.e., ". . . I am . . .") there
around for 10 minutes just trying to figure out one
word. And like I used to read it over with my tape
and then turn it off and read it silently again.
(Didn't like.) Sometimes when the teacher talks I
can't hear her (because of the headphones) and someone
has to tell me the teacher wants me (i.e., after
silent reading has finished).

6.D. I: Using the books at home.

J: (Liked.) Because when I'm bored--like I use it for
silent reading at home, too--but when I'm bored, I
just takes out the book and lie down in the chair and
listen to it.
(Didn't like.) Sometimes, when I've got to go to bed,
it's like I'm not allowed to have anything on--like a
tape recorder or anything like that. When I'm out in
the living room, I don't like it because I've got to
do my silent reading and there bes good shows on. So
I've got to do it when the good shows are on, too.

6.E. I: Wrap-Up Sessions.

J: (Liked.) I liked that because then me and you gets to
read. . . . You reads half of it and I reads half of
it.
(Didn't like.) Only sometimes when it's Language Arts
and we're making stuff down (in grade 4 classroom) and
it's like I've got to come and do my Wrap-Up Session
. . . that's pretty fun, though . . . the Wrap-Up
Sessions.

6.F. I: Any other things about the reading project we haven't
talked about?

J: Nothing.

Student Interview after the Completion of
the Individualized Reading Programs

Name: Max

Date: May 15, 1990

1. I: In your opinion, what were the best things about this reading project?
M: When we're reading along . . . when there's a hard word . . . it was always on the tape player. (Also) we got to pick our own books.
2. I: Do you think this reading project has helped you? (Explain.)
M: Yeah, with some words. Like, if we don't know how to spell, it's on the tape player. And after a while, when you does it over sometimes, you knows what (the word) says and that.
3. I: Would you recommend that other people try this kind of reading project? (Explain.)
M: Mm. Yeah. Maybe if you're not very good at spelling.
4. I: If someone else wanted to try a reading project like this, what things could be changed to improve it?
M: Well, nothing to me! I liked it the way it was.
5. I: Which face best shows your opinion of the reading project? (Circle one.)
M: (Max circled the "happiest face" on the range of 5 facial expressions.)
6. I: For each of the following aspects of the reading project, tell what you liked and what you didn't like about . . .
- 6.A. I: Selecting the books.
M: (Liked.) If we didn't like (a book) we could put it back and pick a different one, count off a hundred words and see if it's too hard, easy, or in between. (Didn't like.) Maybe, if you had the book and after you read it, like, you didn't like it and you already had it picked.
- 6.B. I: Start-Up Sessions.
M: (Liked.) I liked when we . . . after, when you opened it up again, we could look and see when we started off. (Apparently, this was a reference to Wrap-Up Sessions.) At first I liked the best where it was our first time (choosing books and reading them with tape player). (Didn't like.) Nothing.

6.C. I: Using the books in the grade 4 classroom.

M: (Liked.) I saw 'em before and I didn' read 'em. So I had a chance to read 'em then. Sometimes when it was reading time I already had a book, and I wasn't finished with it; so I wanted to finish off that one. And when I got that one finished, I went down to get it and it was gone . . . I should have hid it.
(Didn't like.) Nothing.

6.D. I: Using the books at home.

M: (Liked.) You probably read 'em before. . . . If you read 'em before and you knows all the words in it, you could read it yourself too.
(Didn't like.) Nothing.

6.E. I: Wrap-Up Sessions.

M: (Liked.) Well, like when you're finished with the book you tells all about it on the tape and that.
(Didn't like.) Maybe if it was a good book, you wanted to keep it . . . and you didn't want to give it back.

6.F. I: Any other things about the reading project we haven't talked about?

M: Nothing.

Student Interview after the Completion of
the Individualized Reading Programs

Name: Sam

Date: May 15, 1990

1. I: In your opinion, what were the best things about this reading project?
 S: The things I liked are listening to the headsets. And telling the best parts of the story (after) you reads it. And starting a new book. Other things are . . . when I reads a book . . . at night, I've got nothin' to do, I likes getting and reading a book. But where there's words I can't . . . I have trouble (with); but with the tape, I likes listening to it.
 I: When you're listening to the story on tape, do you like to follow along in the book as well?
 S: That's what I usually does.
 I: Do you follow along with the words as well as just listening?
 S: Sometimes . . . I follows along with the words and stops the tape and goes back and tries to read it out, like. Like that part where you've got those (coding stickers); when I usually goes over that with the tape, I stops and I goes back to see if I could read it.
2. I: Do you think this reading project has helped you? (Explain.)
 S: Yeah, I've found some changes. Before, I couldn't get some of the spelling words and now I can. And I'm learning new words and stuff, like, from the books.
3. I: Would you recommend that other people try this kind of reading project? (Explain.)
 S: Yes, I'd say. With other people, the teacher don't know a good way to teach them or something . . . then they can try out (this project) and see if it works . . . and try to teach the students with it.
 I: Do you think that other students around your age or grade might be interested in this?
 S: Mm. (Yes.)
4. I: If someone else wanted to try a reading project like this, what things could be changed to improve it?
 S: Maybe they could change, like instead of having the headsets, get their parents to read to them and get them to read it after . . . like try to read half of part one or something. Or like all those things we had to do in our (folder), probably they wouldn't be allowed to go to part two until they did all the things in part one.

5. I: Which face best shows your opinion of the reading project? (Circle one.)
 S: (Sam circled the "happiest" face on the range of 5 facial expressions.)
6. I: For each of the following aspects of the reading project, tell what you liked and what you didn't like about . . .
- 6.A. I: Selecting the books.
 S: (Liked.) I had fun finding new books and hearing about new authors. And I likes picking out the new books.
 (Didn't like.) When you wants a book and someone else gets it and then you can't have it (right away).
- 6.B. I: Start-Up Sessions.
 S: (Liked.) You gets to hear about the book and find out what it's like, when you're reading it (with me).
 (Didn't like.) When you've got to read it back . . . I have a little trouble and that's why I don't like it that much.
 I: I think you mentioned a few times that you don't spend a lot of time reading out loud is that right?
 S: I don't really like reading out loud because I get a lot of words I make mistakes in.
 I: Ordinarily . . . forgetting about the reading project . . . ordinarily, how often or in what situations do you read out loud? Do you ever read out loud to anybody?
 S: Sometimes I reads out loud. Like, I can't . . . (student struggled to express his ideas) . . . say, if I read a book to Mom and she asked me to read it to my Aunt, like, I'll start to get words, like, missed out and I'll make mistakes and I'll get right worried and stuff. That's why I don't like reading out loud. But say if it was like my little cousin, like about 4 or 5 year old, and they asked you to read a book they had in their room, then I'll read it and I won't be worried or nothin'.
 I: Did you feel sort of worried when, say, I asked you to read out loud?
 S: Like, the first time I did the book thing, when we were just starting it all, and you asked me to read it out loud, I was right worried if I got a word wrong, like I'd mess it all up. And that's why I got worried the first time, until you told me it was alright if you got a mistake.
 I: So really the part that's causing a little bit of difficulty for you when you read out loud is the way people react to it. Is that it?
 S: Mm. (Yes.)

- I: So if a little kid enjoys the story or if whoever is listening doesn't sort of start pointing out mistakes or whatever they might call it, then you don't mind reading out loud.
- S: Mm. (Yes.)
- I: I think that that's a very important thing for people who are listening . . . and I'm sure you probably, when you're listening to someone read . . . know that even though you might have some ideas that you think they should have done something else, still I guess you realize what happens when someone sort of butts in.
- S: Mm. (Yes.)
- 6.C. I: Using the books in the grade 4 classroom.
- S: (Liked.) When you're reading a book and you just gets to the ending and it's real exciting and the teacher says, "OK, class. Silent reading's over" and you're getting right nervous and you wants to see what the next part is. . . .
- I: So that's the part you didn't like.
- S: That's the part I liked . . . like, waiting for it. That's the part I liked.
- I: Oh, you liked having to wait to find out what happened.
- S: Yeah, I tries to think of what might happen. Like, say if I was reading Jeffrey's Ghost, that part where they were heading home and (if) the teacher told me to stop--she didn't really--I was there getting ready to go and (while I was) I was trying to think of what will happen. When he couldn't find Jeffrey on his way home I was there. . . . "Did he disappear? Where did he go? Was he just like a friend to come and help or something?" That's what I likes about it.
- I: That's the way that people who really enjoy reading and are good at reading . . . that's the way they get involved with books. Just like that. It goes to show you're really developing well as a reader . . . you're experiencing all the things that people who enjoy reading and are good at reading do. That's what we all do . . . and we think about "What's happening next? What might happen?" and "I can't wait to find out!" Those are all the things that show you're really developing well, as a reader.
- S: (Didn't like.) When you're listening to the tape and you're just in the middle of the page, the teacher says that silent reading is over (and you can't finish) and then when you get home you're all lost and you can't find your spot.
- I: So that's a good place for the bookmarks we made. Maybe we should have made a lot more.

6.D. I: Using the books at home.

S: (Liked.) When you've got nothing to do or just hanging around the house or at night when you can't get to sleep . . . you can listen to the tape. . . . (Didn't like.) Say if I was going to my Nan and Pop's and Mom told me to take a book to read . . . my friends come along but Mom says first to finish the part in the book and I've got to finish it but I want to go out with my friends.

6.E. I: Wrap-Up Sessions.

S: (Liked.) I can't wait to see what the next book will be like.

(Didn't like.) Waiting (for the next book).

6.F. I: Any other things about the reading project we haven't talked about?

S: How did we like using our headsets. Did we find it good or bad?

I: Okay. What did you think about using the headsets?

S: (Liked.) I thought it was kind of fun wearing headsets (while reading a book).

(Didn't like.) If you're in bed listening and you wants to lie down, and the thing (on the headset) sticks right into your ear.



