STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this professional paper in partial fultillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this professional paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication on this professional paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Jerry S. Bryson

Date August 6, 1975

COMMON READING MISTAKES MADE BY TWENTY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

JERRY SUZANNE BRYSON

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

with concentration in

Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

Approved:

Willis Vandever
Chairman, Examining Committee

Harold D. Sullivan
Head, Major Department

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1975

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Without the help and encouragement from many people this paper would not have been written. Greatful appreciation is expressed to the Manhattan School District for their willing cooperation in this study. Special acknowledgement is made to Dr. Willis Vandiver, chairman of the committee, and his wife for their help and Dr. Vandiver's constant encouragement in the writing of this paper. Special acknowledgement is made to the late Dr. Gary Smith who was helpful at the start of this paper.

In particular, the constant encouragement and support from husband, Kenneth Roy, is acknowledged. Also acknowledged is the support of two families who said it was possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

ABSTRACT viii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 3

Application to Educational Theory 3

General Questions to be Answered. 5

General Procedure. 5

Limitations and/or Delimitations. 7

Definition of Terms 9

Summary 10

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. 12

Introduction 12

What Is Reading 13

What Are We Doing for Remedial Readers. 15

Results of Remedial Reading Programs 19

Informal Reading Inventories 21

Phonics 27

The Importance of Student Interest 28

Summary 30

3. PROCEDURES. 32

Introduction 32

Chapter Page

Population Description and Sampling Procedure 33

Experimental Treatments 34

Method of Collecting Data 36

Method of Organizing Data 38

Analysis of Data 38

Precautions Taken for Accuracy 39

Summary 39

4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA 41

Introduction 41

The Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory 41

The Kaleidoscope Readers 46

Phonics 49

Student Interests and Informal Reading Inventories 51

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 53

Summary 53

Conclusions 53

Recommendations 54

APPENDIXES 56

Appendix A: Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory Check Sheet 57

Appendix B: The Kaleidoscope Readers Informal Reading Inventory Check Sheet 59

Chapter Page

Appendix C: Phonics Check Sheet 61

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 63

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Distribution of Student Instructional Grade Levels 42

2. Distribution of Common Reading Errors among Twenty Junior High School Students by Percent of Total Words Read on the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory 43

3. Distribution of Common Reading Errors among Twenty Junior High School Students by Percent of Total Words Read on The Kaleidoscope Readers Informal Reading Inventory 47

4. Percentages of Errors Made by Ten Junior High Students in Stage I Phonics Skills 49

ABSTRACT

This study dealt with an attempt to determine two things: (1) could common student errors be found in reading and (2) could students read at a higher grade level using materials in which they were interested. Through a review of literature and an analysis of data, it was hoped that these questions would be answered.

The population for this study was twenty seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students from Manhattan, Montana, who were reading below their perspective grade levels. They were both mentally and physically able to learn to read but for various reasons their instructional levels were all below their grade levels.

The investigator met with each student for at least two half hour periods. During the first half hour they were all given an informal reading inventory from the Ginn 360 reading series. Check sheets were kept to keep track of errors made and to determine instructional levels. They were also given an interest inventory. During the second meeting the students were to choose from three selections, which had been chosen for each of the students based on individual reading levels and interests. These selections were from The Kaleidoscope Readers. They were all given informal reading inventories on their choices. Finally, a Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills was given to the students.

From the analysis of data the following conclusions were drawn: (1) Several errors and deficiencies were found to be common amoung the students studied. (2) The most common error found for these twenty students was improper phrasing. This usually resulted from a student repeating a word or a phrase or stopping to decode a word. (3) Fluency is very important for the student to maintain the stream of thought. When a student had a high amount of improper phrasing along with repetition and/or misreading, his comprehension was usually low. (4) There were three other common errors. There were substitution, omission, and insertion. Usually these errors made little difference in student comprehension. (5) Half of the twenty students were found to still be in stage I phonics skills. These students needed the most practice in double consonants and short vowel sounds. (6) Students did not read material of interest to them at a higher level of difficulty than regularly chosen material.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Miles Zintz (1974:1) stated in his book, Corrective Reading, that from 10 to 15 percent of the children who attended school had problems in the area of reading. Paul Avery (1972:7) wrote an article on a survival literacy study which was conducted by the National Reading Council. It reported that:

> "...4.3 million Americans must be considered functionally illiterate in modern society, and that as many as thirty-four percent of Americans are limited-by inadequate reading skills-in their ability to achieve their full potential in modern society."

What exactly does it mean for a person to be functionally illiterate in modern society? Even though there seems to be no universal agreement on the exact reading level for functional illiteracy, it seems to mean that if a person cannot read above the fourth grade reading level he is considered functionally illiterate. There are many people who cannot properly fill out simple application forms or read many of the newspapers and magazines. Some of these people are mentally and/or physically handicapped to the degree that the classroom teacher can be of little help in teaching them to read. One purpose of this study was to determine if there were common errors that junior high school students made in reading. Students used were both mentally and physically able to learn to read but for a combination of reasons were not reading at their perspective grade levels.

There have been numerous studies done to find out if interest in what a student reads has anything to do with how well he reads. One of these studies is Margery Bernstien's (1955:238-288). In her study she concluded that interest can effect a student's reading ability, especially in the area of comprehension. Moreover, many new reading materials have been published that were meant to be used with readers who were in junior high school and high school but who read at a much lower instructional level. These materials were advertised as the high-interest low-vocabulary books. Some of these materials included the Galaxy Program by Scott Foresman, Holt's Impact by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., Scope/Reading by Harper and Row, Turner-Livingston Reading Series by Follett Publishing Co., Checkered Flag Series by Field Education Publications, Teen-Age Tales by D. C. Heath and Co. and many others too numerous to list.

In this study the investigator used selected stories from one of these new series and matched them with a particular group of student's instructional levels and interests as obtained by an informal reading inventory and an interest inventory. Student errors were tabulated on both the initial informal reading inventory and an informal reading inventory which was given with the materials that the individual students chose to read. A diagnostic phonics test was used to determine if there were common phonic errors made. A subsidiary purpose was to determine if the individual students could read at a

higher grade level using the materials that they chose to read, rather than the materials given to them to read based on the initial informal reading inventory.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if: (1) common student errors could be found from the two informal reading inventories and a diagnostic phonics test, and (2) if students could read at a higher grade level using materials they chose rather than the materials chosen for the initial informal reading inventory.

Application to Educational Theory

On September 23, 1969, James E. Allen Junior, U. S. Commissioner of Education, stated in a landmark speech that he felt the right to read was, "...as fundamental as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He felt that not acquiring basic reading skills and a "...desire..." to read as being, "...a barrier to success that for many young adults produces the misery of a life marked by poverty, unemployment, alienation, and in many cases, crime." Allen wanted educators to stop dickering about methodology and use all of their resources to help eliminate the reading deficiencies that the people of our nation have (Carlson, 1972:7).

The introduction from Evelyn Campbell's program, "Authorized

Course of Instruction for the Quinmester Program," seems to point out the need for more research in the area of remedial reading for the junior and senior high school students:

> "The incidence of students lacking the ability to read simple sentences and unlock familiar words is becoming increasingly apparent in junior and senior high school. Moreover, little or no provision is being made to remediate such difficulties. Ranging from seriously disabled to good readers, there are many high school students who indicate a need for basic-intensive to higher-level instruction in decoding skills" (1971:4).

As was stated before, there were many new high-interest low-vocabulary reading series on the market that were meant for the junior and senior high school students who were not reading on their grade levels. Educators needed to find if there were specific ways that these reading series could be used with the students who can not read on grade level, for few of these reading series came with more than an introduction and an answer book. According to Pilgrim and McAllister's book, Books, Young People and Reading Guidance, predictable patterns of interest do exist in young adults (1965:45). These patterns have been used to help construct the stories in these reading series. The problem lies in that there are many different areas of interest included in many of these high-interest low-vocabulary books.

Students who have reached junior high school with reading deficits do not all have the same interests or specific reading problems. These high-interest low-vocabulary reading materials could

become very useful if students' interests could be matched with specific stories or books. It would also be time saving to the instructor if specific students' problems in reading could be found and matched with students' interests so that some areas of instruction could be dealt with through small group instruction rather than individually.

General Questions to be Answered

(1) Could common student errors be found by tabulating student errors in two informal reading inventories and a diagnostic phonics test?

(2) Could individual students read at a higher grade level using materials they chose rather than the materials chosen from the initial informal reading inventory?

(3) Could this information be used to group these twenty students for some of their reading instruction?

General Procedure

The data for this professional paper was assembled from a review of literature that contained six main parts. Foremost was a discussion of what reading is. The next two parts were interrelated. They included current happenings in remedial reading and the results of some remedial reading programs. The last three parts were also interrelated in that they dealt with the testing that was done in

Chapter IV. They included a discussion on Informal Reading Inventories, elements of phonics, and finally, student interests and how they effect reading. The materials for the review of literature were obtained from the Montana State University Library.

The first step of the investigation was conducted by administering an informal reading and an interest inventory to twenty seventh, eighth and ninth grade students from the Manhattan School, grades K through eight, and from Manhattan High School, grades nine through twelve. Using the information gathered from these two instruments, the investigator assembled at least three separate reading selections for each student from The Kaleidoscope Readers. These were matched to each student's instructional level and interests. The investigator prepared informal reading inventories for each of these reading selections. Each student was asked to choose from these selections the one he would like to read. The student was then given an informal reading inventory that had been prepared by the investigator for the selection that he chose. Some students were asked to read at more than one grade level, depending on how well they read the self-selected material.

The next step of this inventory was to modify and structure the information gained from the two reading inventories and the diagnostic phonics test in such a way as to determine if there were common student errors that could be found in the material that the students

used.

Finally, the investigator determined if individual students could read at a higher grade level using materials that they had chosen to read rather than the materials read on the initial informal reading inventory.

Limitations and/or Delimitations

Due to a lack of time and funds the study was delimited to testing the students in one school. These twenty students were chosen by their teachers as having low grades in most of their subjects, reading below grade level, and having normal intelligence.

The investigator chose the selected readings from The Kaleidoscope Readers because this material was designed with graded selections to use with junior high students. Also, it contained many different selections that were related to the varied student interests as determined on their interest inventories.

Scheduling was difficult since the students also had classes to attend while the investigation was going on. Due to this, the students sometimes had to be stopped from completing an informal reading inventory. They were not stopped in their reading of specific selections, but sometimes they had to be detained from going on to a higher grade until the next meeting.

The intensity of student feeling towards the testing could

have had some effect on the results of the study. First of all, the testing was done by the investigator, and not the regular classroom teacher. This can frighten students, who are timid or not used to strangers, and impede normal response. However, such a reaction was not outwardly visible to the investigator. The writer discussed with each student the reasons for his or her being tested before the tests were given. They were told that their teachers had recommended them because they were having some problems in reading. The investigator was going to try to determine some specific things that their teachers could do for them to improve their reading. Affirmative comments were received from all except one student concerning their desire to learn to read better and from their teachers relaying comments that the students had said to them about the testing. After a little more discussion with the one student concerning the purpose of the tests, he, too, seemed to respond more favorably. These comments were encouraging to the investigator, but regardless of what the students said, all of them had suffered many years with reading deficits and even outright reading failure. This may have very easily had a negative effect on their performance with the two informal reading inventories and the diagnostic phonics test.

The students voiced their enjoyment in getting out of classes, but here again there may have been a negative effect on their performances because of the stigma of leaving classes to be tested.

Finally, the testing was done during the last month of school. All of these variables that could not adequately be assessed by the investigator could have had a negative effect on the individual student's performances.

Definition of Terms

(1) Informal Reading Inventory: a teacher-made instrument designed to help the teacher determine the following things about individual students: a student's basal, instructional, and frustrational level. It will also determine the grade level at which that student would benefit in reading instruction and specific problems that a student has in reading or skills that he may lack.

(2) Interest Inventory: an evaluative device used to determine areas of personal interest in a student's reading. In this study it was an instrument made by the writer used to determine individual student's interests so that selections of high interest could be selected.

(3) Diagnostic Phonics Test: a device designed to diagnose specific areas of difficulty that students have in phonics. The test used in this study was one developed by Dr. Willis Vandiver (1975:1-4) for testing and diagnosing Stages I, II, and III phonics.

(4) Instructional Level: According to Betts (1946:447-450) this is the level at which the child can successfully read yet with

enough challenge for growth. The student should comprehend at least 75 percent of what he reads, pronounce at least 95 percent of the words correctly, have good phrasing, use a conversational tone in reading, and be free from observable tension while he is reading.

(5) Misreading: this occurs when the student sees a word and then misreads another in its place that is similar in spelling. An example of this would be seeing the word cove and reading it as cave.

(6) Substitution: this occurs when a student substitutes one word for another in reading. It differs from misreading in that the two words do not look anything alike, but thdy may both fit the context of the sentence. An example of this would be seeing the word in and reading it as at.

Summary

Teaching junior high students to read whose instructional levels are well below their grade levels is a difficult job for the teacher. These students have met with failure and frustration for several years, and it can be difficult to motivate and persuade them to try just one more time. It was the attempt of this investigator to determine if common errors could be found in the reading of twenty junior high school students in Manhattan, Montana. This was attempted through the use of two informal reading inventories and a diagnostic

phonics test. The second of the two informal reading inventories was made by using selections chosen from The Kaleidoscope Readers that had been matched to individual student instructional levels and interests as determined by an interest inventory.

Chapter 2

John Bormuth defined literacy as:

> "...being able to respond appropriately to written language; in this sense, it is one of man's most valued skills" (1973-73:9).

Bormuth wrote that we spend much of our time trying to make the world literate. He also felt that we used statistics to give testimony to our nation's literacy problem which were not based on either a careful analysis of the concept of literacy or on suitable methods of measurement (1973-74:10).

None-the-less, we do know that there are students in school who are not reading on their grade levels. Although some students read above their grade levels, this report dealt with those junior high school students who were reading below their grade levels and who were mentally and physically normal.

The organization of this review of literature is in six parts. Foremost is a discussion of what reading is. The next two parts are interrelated. They include what is happening now in remedial reading, and what some results were for students who took remedial reading. The last three parts are also interrelated in that they deal with the testing which was done in Chapter IV. They include a discussion on informal reading inventories, elements of phonics, and student interests and how they effect reading.

What Is Reading?

In order to think about correcting reading problems, first a working definition of what reading is must be obtained. George and Evelyn Spache (1973:4-5) discussed what reading entailed in the beginning of their book Reading in the Elementary School. They explained that the reader first directs his mind to the printed page for the purpose of finding meaning from the printed symbols. He uses mental associations to get the meaning from each word such as the word form, its meaning, and its sound. He uses these mental associations to distinguish one word from another. He also uses other clues to help him, such as general configuration, distinctive characteristics of shape, some of the letters or syllables, and the implications of the sense or pattern of the sentence. They felt that initially the process begins with word recognition. As the reader gains the meanings of successive words, he puts these into thoughts or ideas. Thus the reader must mentally hold the meanings of the first words in a sentence until it is completed to get its full meaning. More mature readers retain the meanings of successive sentences and so form the main idea of a paragraph.

Elkind (1974:10-20) suggested that many of the errors made in beginning reading are not discrimination errors but inferential errors. The reader infers the whole from seeing only part of a word. He said

that these errors are high, cognitive level errors because this is exactly what more mature readers do. Elkind also suggested these errors should be encouraged temporarily and that you should initially sacrifice accuracy for fluency. He felt that once a child was a fluent reader he could always improve accuracy, but if he is not fluent, the opposite could prove difficult.

In the same article (1974:10-20) Elkind stated that he felt the next step in reading was a phase of rapid silent reading. At this point the child has mastered concept formation and the inferential aspects of reading and he can recognize printed words easily and rapidly. Now the major task for the reader becomes interpretation or construction of meaning. This is where the child relates the printed symbols with his own concepts and ideas. We call this reading comprehension.

Elkind (1974:10-20) stated that there were three things a reader's comprehension depended on: visual independence, meaning construction and receptive discipline. Visual independence means that the visual-verbal system becomes independent of the sensory-motor system. During rapid reading the reader has fewer motor fixations and wider visual segments of scanning. The reader has less motor involvement and more conceptual inference activity. The eyes move less and the brain does more work. Meaning construction is the activity of the reader giving meaning to the words he is reading by relating them to

the concepts he has formed through his own development. Receptive discipline means that the reader is willing to respond to the representations of others. He has to be receptive to the representations of others and then interpret these representations according to his own conceptual frame of reference to be a good reader.

Goodman (1967:126-135) said virtually the same thing in his article when he stated:

> "The reader as a user of language and in response to the graphic display on the page, processes three kinds of information: syntactic, semantic, and graphophonemic. Reading becomes a selection of and partial use of, available language cues from a perceptual input based on the reader's expectations. The reader then makes tentative decisions which are confirmed, rejected, or revised as reading progresses."

Hittleman discused what he felt readability was in an article in The Reading Teacher (1973:783-789). He felt that comprehension and readability were the same things. They were both based on the ability of the reader to assign meaning to a printed message and complete the act of communication that had been initiated by the writer. According to Hittleman, readability dealt with the interrelationship among the characters of the reader, the author and the topic that was being read.

What Are We Doing for Remedial Readers?

Margaret J. Early (1973:60) began her article, "Taking Stock: Secondary School Reading in the 70's," with this statement:

> "In spite of the steady increase in professional books and courses in secondary reading, in spite of the Journal of Reading

> and increased attention to the high school level at national and local conferences, only very limited progress has been made in extending reading instruction to the twelth grade. It is the exceptional school system that offers courses in reading and study skills beyond the eighth grade. Only in rare instances do I find high school departments other than English demanding teachers who are skilled in teaching reading."

Ms. Early felt, for those students who were illiterate in the upper grades, that the most we could hope to do was to make them functionally literate so they could fill out job applications, social security and other forms so necessary in our lives.

Shuman (1974:47-49) divided the nonreaders into two categories: the student who cannot turn the printed symbols into sound and those who can but are so non-fluent that they forget what they have just read. He says both types are technically nonreaders.

Shuman (1974:47-49) accounted for the rise in high school graduates who are very poor readers or even nonreaders to two factors. First, during the first decade of this century only 10 percent of the teen-aged population attended school beyond the eighth grade. Today because of social changes, 90 percent of the teen-aged population go beyond the eighth grade in school. Secondly, Shuman pointed out that while the teacher may do his best with individual students, the students have to want to learn to read and then practice what they are taught. Shuman suggested that the best way to work with students who had reading deficiencies is to build up their self confidence as well as correct their errors.

Mocker (1974:444) found in working with adults who were remedial readers four things seemed to be important:

> "(1) Have the students select the material which they want to learn how to read. (2) The learner must also be involved in deciding the purpose for reading the material. (3) Begin the lesson with the adults verbalizing why this lesson (context) is important and what it will mean to each one of them so that the learning will be personal. (4) The teacher should attempt to create a means for the adult to transfer the classroom skill into a life skill."

Since many teen-agers no longer act or feel like they are children, there would be possibilities of incorporating some of these ideas into a remedial reading program for them.

W. John Harker (1975:451-461) reviewed some of the reading materials that were presently being used with remedial readers. These were from the high-interest low-vocabulary series. He said that generally the materials could be divided into two kinds: the comprehensive programs that were designed to replace the conventional English program and the supplementary materials that were meant for use in the English program along with other materials. Belonging in this first category were such programs and series as the Galaxy Program by Scott Foresman and Co., Scope/Reading by Harper and Row, Turner-Livingston by Follett Publishing Co., and so on. In the second category were such series as the Checkered Flag Series by Field Publications, the Racing Wheels Series by Benefic Press, Teen-Age Tales by D. C. Heath and Co. and others. Harker felt that one of the reasons

reading problems continue in secondary schools even with these high-interest low-vocabulary materials may be due to the way they are being used in the classroom.

Harker (1975:451-461) said that the guidebooks for teachers show distinct differences in teaching methodologies suggested for the implementation of these materials. One of these philosophies puts a strong emphasis on the importance and efficiency of appealing to students' interests to develop a strong motivation to read. The second of these also stresses interests and motivation, but it also stresses the development of reading skills that have been determined to be necessary for effective reading.

Harker (1975:451-461) summed up his article by stating that remedial readers would be willing to read only if they experienced success in reading. He said teachers not only needed to develop motivation, but they needed to enforce that motivation by the teaching of the basic skills necessary for successful reading. He felt that the successful use of these high-interest low-vocabulary materials would be determined by the specific manner in which these skills were taught, not just by whether or not they were taught.

Susan Gross and her contemporaries (1974:782-789) felt a very important part of any reading or language arts program was the teaching process. They expressed that without such skills as word discrimination, vocabulary development, and comprehension the student could not

read new material with success. These skills were not to take the place of established reading or language arts programs but become part of them. The skill development should be for all students. They didn't feel that every skill needed to be taught at every level. Most important was that each student should procede at his own rate and in some semblance of chronological continuity.

Sister Rita Klosterman (1970:159) seemed to sum up what the preceding authors have said. She found through reading the research that had been done in reading that an eclectic approach to the teaching of reading based on the needs of the individual student would produce the greatest growth in reading achievement. Three factors are implied in her statement: diagnosis of reading abilities, individualized instruction, and teaching techniques and materials that are suited to the individual child.

Results of Remedial Reading Programs

Robinson and Smith (1962:22-27) did a study on forty-four students who had been to the University of Chicago Reading Clinic ten years before for remedial reading instruction to find out if the students had "caught up" in reading. They found in a review of literature many references to the statement that students who are retarded in reading never become competent readers or "catch up" with their classmates.

The extent of reading retardation among these forty-four students had varied from one to several grade levels. The major difficulties of these students included word recognition, vocabulary, comprehension, rate and various combinations of these problems. The students' chronological ages ranged from seven to eighteen years.

Robinson and Smith (1962:22-27) found the following about these students. Only three of them did not complete high school. More than half of them had completed college at the time of the report, and the reports that the researchers received lead them to conclude that eventually more than three fourths of the students would graduate from college. From this the investigators concluded that able students who are retarded in reading can be rehibilitated educationally so as to fulfill their occupational ambitions.

Bruce Balow (1965:581-586) found much the same as the aforementioned investigators. He found that severe reading disabilities were not corrected by short-term intensive treatment, but they are helped by it. Even maintenance sessions of an hour or so per week did not cure it, although they helped. He found that severe reading difficulties needed long-term treatment rather than the short course that is usually used in the current remedial reading programs. He said the remedial reading courses were helpful, but they needed to last far longer than they currently did for the severely disabled reader.

Informal Reading Invnetories

Harold Livingston (1972:402-410) explained the meaning of formal test scores. He felt the term comprehension had too many different meanings to too many different people. He stated that reading experts agreed the term comprehension should be dropped. Instead we should talk in terms of literal comprehension, interpretation and critical reading. If this should be done for the formal reading inventories, should it not also be done for the informal reading inventory?

What has brought about the surge of reading tests for reading placement? John E. Daniel (1962:590-600) felt the public schools had contributed greatly to this. The educators in their efforts to more nearly meet the individual reading instructional needs of their elementary school pupils through the division of classes into graded reading groups had substantially contributed to the emergence of reading placement tests.

Joseph Kender (1970:165+167) found through a literature search of various studies on the informal reading inventory that it was better at evaluating the specific reading problems of children. He found the criteria for using these inventories was not based on scientific research. He felt more research needed to be done to determine what percentages in comprehension and word recognition would be

scientifically acceptable standards for informal reading inventories.

This agreed with an earlier article that Kender wrote (1968:337-342). In his article he stated that the literature concerning both the construction and the scoring of the informal reading inventory was conflicting. He also stated that the criteria used to score the informal reading inventory was even more conflicting. He suggested three things should be observed with informal reading inventories. First, the material used for it should be from the material which would be used to instruct the student. Secondly, the use of criteria would have to be based on a solid foundation in reading diagnosis. Finally, the person who gives the inventory should be throughly knowledgeable about the reading process and well skilled in administering the instrument.

Brittain (1970:216-220) suggested it was important to not rely rigidly on the results of an informal reading inventory. In his review of literature on motivational considerations he found that errors on the test were influenced by achievement motivation, aspiration level, reaction to threat, degree of curiosity and the desire for novelty. He concluded that the influence of motivation in reading scores showed the importance of flexibility in estimating individual instructional levels from informal reading inventories.

Frose (1971:432-438) dealt with using word lists which were intended to give a grade level prediction that was used for further

testing or for direct grade placement for instruction. These lists were sometimes used before an informal reading inventory to give the teacher an idea of what grade level to start testing the student. He found the basic weakness of the word lists was the fact that they were usually dated. None-the-less, he found from his study that the sums of the total number of words correctly pronounced on the word lists could be a useful criteria for determining grade level placements. He also felt more research should be done on them.

On an informal reading inventory both factual and inferential questions are used. Rachel Boyd (1970:173-178) defined factual questions as those questions where the desired answer was stated explicitly in the text in either exact or paraphrased form. She said that an inferential question was one where the students had to draw their own conclusions about the presented facts. Sometimes they required the students to analyze the relationships of ideas to each other and to the article as a whole. Boyd found in her study that reading comprehension required a variety of specialized skills in order to answer both factual and inferential questions. She suggested we needed to determine these skills and teach them to our students.

Bliesmer (1972:268-272) listed several things he felt were important to remember when giving an informal reading inventory. He felt it should be given whenever a teacher wanted to test a specific skill for a student. It shouldn't be just on specific occasions like

every Friday at 1:00. The informal reading inventory should be used to help both the teacher and the student check specific skills. The materials the teacher uses should be on the student's reading level. If a student responds incorrectly to a question, the teacher should try to find out why he answered as he did. The writing should be minimized and oral testing should be used whenever possible, depending on what skill the teacher is testing. The teacher should use questions which require more than just a factual answer. Finally, the teacher should use materials that will check the skill that is being tested.

Emmett Betts is a noted source on reading and informal reading inventories. In his book Foundations of Reading Instruction (1946:438-450), he outlined the procedures for giving an informal reading inventory. Betts stated that an informal reading inventory would net a teacher four general things about the student. It would determine the student's independent reading level, his instructional level, his frustration level, and his probable capacity level.

Betts said that the independent reading level was the highest reading level at which the individual could read with full understanding and freedom from mechanical difficulties. This was usually the level the students read recreational material. Independent reading was not usually done above the instructional level.

The instructional level, according to Betts, was the highest

reading level at which systematic instruction could be started. For the instructional or basal level a student would have to get a score of at least 90 percent, based on both inferential and factual questions. The student would have to be free of observable tensions, finger pointing at words and lip movement. He had to have an acceptable reading posture. For his oral reading he would have to have rhythm, proper phrasing, accurate interpretation of punctuation, accurate pronunciation of more than 95 percent of the words, use a conversational tone, and comprehend at least 75 percent based on his factual and inferential questions. His silent reading would have a higher rate of comprehension than his oral reading.

Frustration level was the reading level at which the individual was confused by the language of the reading materials. Betts said that it was determined by a comprehension score of less than 50 percent, an inability to pronounce 10 percent or more of the running words, an inability to anticipate meaning and an unfamiliarity with the facts that were discussed in the material. The student would also use finger pointing to read the material and show observable tension. He was usually distracted easily from his reading. In his oral reading he would have little rhythm, fail to interpret punctuation and have practically no eye-voice span. Such things would occur as meaningless word substitutions, repetition of words, insertion of words and partial or complete word reversals.

Probable reading capacity, according to Betts, was the highest level at which the student could comprehend material read aloud to him. This was determined by a minimum comprehension score of at least 75 percent, accurate pronunciation of words comprising the general and specific vocabulary, precise use of words describing the facts or experience, ability to supply additional information and the ability to use language structure in oral discussion as complex as that used in the reading selection.

Betts (1946:438-450) suggested to begin the informal reading inventory that if possible material should be used which was of interest to the reader. If this wasn't possible, then a purpose for reading it would be given. Both the student and the examiner needed a copy of the instrument so the examiner could easily mark the mistakes. The examiner would check the student's comprehension of both silent and oral reading by the means of both factual and inferential questions. The student's rate of comprehension would be expected to increase as he progressed to harder reading material. Betts suggested one way of estimating a starting reading level for the student would be through the use of graded word lists. At each level the student would first read silently and then orally. The four different levels would be determined for each student. Lastly Betts said that some type of permanent record would have to be made of the examiner's observations. The form would be simple and sufficiently descriptive

to have a high diagnostic value.

Phonics

Jeanne Chall (1967:1-372) surveyed more than fifty years of reading research. She reached the conclusion that instructional programs which stressed early phonics helped average and below average children read better than similar children who were taught reading through programs with an early meaning emphasis. Bliesmer and Yarborough (1965:500-504) focused their attention on ten different reading programs. They found that children who were taught letter-sound correspondences directly (synthetic phonics) produced significantly higher reading scores than children who were taught phonics analytically through words.

William S. Gray's book, On Their Own in Reading (1960:32-52), explains the three stages in phonic analysis. Gray stated the first of these stages consisted of seven areas. First was the consonant and vowel sounds in all positions. Next came common word endings. The student would then learn consonant and vowel diagraphs in all positions. The student would also learn the twenty-four blends in all positions, the dipthongs, and the contractions. The order that these are taught is dependent of the author of the reading series being used.

Next Gray introduced stage II phonics. Stage II depended on

the knowledge gained in stage I. It consisted of all things learned in stage I plus multisyllable words. The student would learn an auditory perception of syllables and visual clues to syllabication.

Finally, Gray introduced stage III phonics skills. These skills also depended on the knowledge gained in stages I and II. They consisted of all things learned in stages I and II plus accent and stress. The student learned auditory perception of accent and visual clues to accent.

Gray (1960:53) wrote:

> "Because many words that pupils encounter at all grade levels are inflicted and derived forms, ability to use structural analysis is essential. Based on visual scrutiny of total word form, structural analysis is the means by which a reader identifies meaning units within a word and associates total meaning with inflected or derived form."

The Importance of Student Interest

Estes and Vaughan (1973:149-153) said a high interest could be shown to be parallel with superior comprehension except for children who were reading well below their grade level. In their study they found the selections students liked best produced a high comprehension level. They also found the reading selections students liked least produced a low comprehension level. They felt from the results of their study that more information could be gained about students taking an informal reading inventory if interest were varied across several possible areas in much the same way that reading

difficulty is varied across grade levels.

Margery Bernstein (1955:283-288) found that a group of pupils reading two stories of equal readability, where one story was much more interesting than the other, read the more interesting story with superior comprehension. She said that it led to the implication that school programs which encouraged pupils to cork in the areas of their interests created situations conducive to effective reading.

Ojala and McNeill (1972:140) felt it was vital to make informal surveys of what students view and read if only to get some indication of what specific books, movies, and television programs were currently popular. They felt information of this kind could help the teacher in bringing to the English program material that had a great deal of meaning to the student.

Henry Goetze (1972:1-34) found several interesting things in his study on student interests. He found mystery-detective stories seemed to be favorites at all levels for students. He also found that boys and girls generally differed in their first choice of reading interests. Further he found, that in gereral, junior high school students read what was currently of interest plus some books by the classical authors.

Carolyn Carmichael (1972:1-28) felt many of teen-agers' problems, concerns, and needs were reflected through and could be observed in books. She felt books were needed for the teen-age reader

that were designed for young adult readers. These books needed to satisfy the many needs of the teen-agers.

Pilgrim and McAllister (1968:167-171) suggested five steps to follow in making an informal interest inventory:

> "(1) Ask questions that can be answered briefly so the student won't get bored....(2) Do not ask questions in which a right answer is implied....(3) Be definite in the questions you ask so that the answers will not be confusing, but leave room for a student's individuality....(4) Don't ask questions that will be offensive or seem to be prying into a student's personal affairs ....(5) Ask questions on the maturity level of the students that you are dealing with...."

Summary

Remedial reading instruction has been shown to have both a short-term and long-term benefit to the remedial reader. It has been argued though, that this instruction needs to continue for a longer length of time than what is usually encountered in our schools.

The informal reading inventory has been shown to be of benefit to the classroom teacher in placing students in graded reading material on their instructional levels. It has been shown that motivation and interest can influence reading scores and they should be taken into account when giving an informal reading inventory.

Phonics has been proven to hold an important place in reading instruction and therefore, should be diagnostically tested to instruct the individual properly. Only through testing can the teacher find what each child needs in phonics instruction, for not all students

need the same instruction.

In conclusion, many educators feel that diagnostic testing is an integral part of teaching reading. It is done in order to diagnose individual student reading problems and to aid in the placing of the student in the proper reading materials. Chapter three uses the afore mentioned review of literature to design the procedures used in this study.

Chapter 3

Introduction

This investigator believes that there are students in every junior high school in the United States that are reading several grades below their grade level. These students have been given many "names" such as Slow Learner, a student with Dyslexia, a student with learning disabilities, and so on. For this study, this investigator will be dealing with students who have the mental capabilities to learn to read but for one reason or another have not suceeded. These students will be referred to in this study as remedial readers. There are some students who will not be able to read because of mental or physical disabilities. These students will not be included in this study.

Junior High teachers who are expected to deal with the remedial readers are often perplexed concerning how to help them in their classrooms. This investigator believed that the first step should be the specific diagnosis of these students' reading problems. The knowledge that some students were still in stage II phonics and at the third grade instructional level would provide an instructional beginning. Generally, students with serious reading deficiencies are in that condition for a number of reasons. Diagnosis of the specific reasons is very important for the teacher to be able to proceed with instruction.

This investigator was attempting to determine what the nature of the reading errors were among seventh, eighth, and ninth graders in the Manhattan School District. This investigator was also trying to determine if the individual students could read at a higher grade level when the material was interesting to them.

Population

Manhattan School District of Gallatin County, Montana, was chosen for this study for two reasons: (1) it was close enough to the investigator so that a large amount of traveling time was unnecessary, and (2) it was far enough away from Montana State University not to have had its students used in an excessive amount of studies.

The school district consists of two public schools and one private school. The two public schools were used for this study. Manhattan School, grades K through eight, had a population of 273 pupils and Manhattan High School, grades nine throug twelve, had a population of 162 pupils. The investigator was studying the reading problems of remedial junior high students. The two English teachers who taught these grades were asked to pick the students who were having the most reading problems for this study. Five boys were picked from the seventh-grade, eight boys were picked from the eighth-grade, and six boys and one girl were picked from the ninth-grade. These choices were made by using standardized test scores, classroom

grades and teacher recommendations.

Experimental Treatments

The students to be tested were seen one at a time, over at least two one-half hour periods a week apart. Some of the students were seen for an extra fifteen to thirty minutes, depending on the length of time it took for them to read their reading selections.

During the first half hour meeting the student and the investigator got acquainted and discussed the reasons he was to be tested. This was done to create rapport and to help put the student at ease for testing purposes.

After this introductory discussion, each student was asked to read a set of ten words from an index card which was on the first grade level. If the student did well with the first set of words, he was given a second set of ten words which was on the second grade level. The student kept on reading increasingly difficult word lists until he missed at least two words from materials at that grade level. If he missed more than two words on the first grade level, he was then moved down to primer or further down to preprimer. These graded word lists were read to help determine the general instructional level of each student. The students were purposely started at a low grade level with these lists to insure success and help establish a rapport with the students. This investigator felt that if the

students could start off the interviews with success, this would help to establish confidence and make the student feel better about the testing situation.

The investigator then gave each student an informal reading inventory for the previously determined grade level. If the student did exceptionally well on the informal reading inventory, he was then tested at a higher level until his instructional reading leves was determined. If he did poorly on the informal reading inventory, he was tested at a lower level until his instructional reading level was determined.

The last thing that was done during that first half hour meeting was to administer to each student an interest inventory. The interest inventory was one constructed by the writer.

One week later the student was seen for the second half hour meeting. During the week that had elapsed the investigator had used the interest inventories to find at least three reading selections from The Kaleidoscope Readers that matched the interests and instructional levels of each student. The student was given at least three selections from which to choose. Each student was asked to survey them and decide which one he would rather read. Then he was asked to choose one of the three selections and next he was given an informal reading inventory prepared from it by the investigator.

During the last fifteen minutes of this second half hour, the student was given a Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills (Vandiver, 1975). If the student was able to get 80 percent correct on the stage I phonics skills, he then progressed on to stage II. If he was able to get 80 percent correct on stage II phonics skills, he progressed on to stage III. If the student did not make at least an 80 percent on stage I phonics skills, he was tested on the various elements included in stage I. This completed the testing done for each student.

Method of Collecting Data

The data were collected from two separate informal reading inventories and a Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills. The first informal reading inventory was given from the Ginn 360 Reading Series. The writer familiarized herself with Standard Marking Procedures found in the introduction to the test. Errors were marked as the student was reading. At the end of the testing day a check sheet was filled out for the student (See Appendix A) and his instructional level was determined.

The next task the investigator gave the student was to complete the interest inventory. There were ten open-ended questions for each student to answer concerning his interests.

Having found the students' instructional levels and their

interests, the investigator then found at least three reading selections for each student from which to choose that were based on both their instructional levels and their indicated interests. The students were to look over the selections selected for them and choose a selection which they would like to read. For each of the selections offered to the students, the investigator had prepared an informal reading inventory to go along with them. When the students had surveyed the selections and made their choices, an informal reading inventory was administered on their selections, following the same procedures as outlined by Betts in Foundations of Reading Instruction (1946:438-450). The results were entered on a check list like the one seen in Appendix B.

The fourth diagnostic instrument administered to each student was the Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills (Vandiver, 1975). On this survey students were expected to make both oral and written responses. The test consisted of stages I, II, and III phonics skills. If the student did not attain at least 80 percent proficiency on stage I phonics skills, he was not allowed to progress to stages II and III. Instead, he took a second phonics test used to indicate the various elements in stage I phonics in which the student indicated weakness. A proficiency score of 80 percent was required before testing the next stage. The results were placed on a phonics check sheet (See Appendix C).

Method of Organizing Data

The data from the first test were organized in two ways. First the investigator had a reading selection identical to the one the student was reading, from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory. Standard Marking Procedure was used to keep track of errors on the investigator's copy of the test. Secondly, the different kinds of errors made were tabulated on a check sheet (See Appendix A).

The data collected from the interest inventories were studied to determine areas of interest for individual students. A list was then made for each student of the interests he had indicated on his inventory.

The data from the second informal reading inventory were organized in exactly the same way as the first informal reading inventory. After the data were organized from both informal reading inventories, the mistakes made were computed into percentages for individual students (See Table 2, pages 43 and 44).

The percentages of student errors made on the Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills were compiled on individual check lists (See Appendix C).

Analysis of Data

The major purpose for this study was to determine common errors that students make. Instruments used to determine this were two

informal reading inventories and a Diagnostic Survey of Phonics Skills. From these the writer would be able to compare common student errors. Common areas of weakness could then be detected and corrected.

A second purpose was to find if students would read at a higher grade level when using materials in which they were interested.

Precautions Taken for Accuracy

To make sure that the investigator did not miss any of the student errors in the reading inventories or on the phonics test, each session with every student was taped and then played back to double check the results. To insure accuracy a hand calculator was used in the computing of averages and percentages.

Summary

Determining common student errors can be helpful to a teacher who is trying to teach students reading skills. If there are common errors, the students could possibly be taught some of these skills in small groups instead of individually. This could make teaching more efficient and learning easier for those students who are behind in reading. Secondly, if interest does make a difference in how well a student reads, this fact should be utilized in the classroom to improve reading. The writer wished to test these ideas to determine if they were sound.

In Chapter 4 will be the results which were found concerning the existence of common student errors. It will also have the results obtained from students reading material in which they were interested.

Chapter 4

Introduction

The analysis of data in Chapter 4 is presented in four parts. Part one will analyze the data from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory. Part two will analyze the data from the informal reading inventories given to the students on The Kaleidoscope Readers. Part three will analyze the data from the phonics inventory. Finally, part four will analyze the students' instructional grade levels as determined by the Ginn 360 and the independent readings from The Kaleidoscope Readers.

The Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory

The main purpose of this study was to find if there were common errors made in reading by twenty seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students. In order to determine this, the mistakes that these twenty students made on the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory were examined first. Next the investigator examined the mistakes that these twenty students made on reading selections from The Kaleidoscope Readers. These selections were also in the form of an informal reading inventory. A comparison of common errors in these inventories was made. Finally, the investigator examined the phonics test that the students had taken to determine common phonics errors that the twenty students made.

After the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory was administered

and checked, individual check sheets were made for each student (See Appendix A). These check sheets showed the number of errors made by each student for the reading levels in which he was tested.

By listening to students reading and keeping track of errors they made, the investigator was able to determine the students' instructional levels. It was found that these twenty students varied in their instructional levels from low second grade to high sixth grade. The distribution of these reading levels is found in Table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of Student Instructional Grade Levels

Grade Levels	No. of Students
Low Second	2
Mid Second	1
End Second	2
End Third	2
Mid Fourth	2
End Fourth	1
Mid Fifth	7
End Fifth	2
End Sixth	1

Each student read from at least two reading levels, and some from as many as four. The arithmetic mean percentage of errors was

computed on each level, for each student. This enabled the investigator to compute the average percentage of mistakes that individual students made from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory. These percentages were based on what percent of the time the student made specific errors while he was reading. These errors were then listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of Common Reading Errors among Twenty Junior High School Students by Percent of Total Words Read on the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory

Students Identified by Numbers	Hesitation	Misreading	Omission	Substitution	Insertions	Repetitions	Intonation	Improper Phras.	Punctuation
1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	1
2	0	2	0	1	1	6	0	16	0
3	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	16	0
4	0	4	0	1	0	8	0	18	0
5	0	3	1	1	1	5	0	16	0
6	0	2	1	2	0	3	0	19	0
7	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	3	1
8	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	10	0
9	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	9	0
10	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	14	1

Table 2 (continued)

Students Identified by Numbers	Hesitation	Misreading	Omission	Substitution	Insertions	Repetitions	Intonation	Improper Phras.	Punctuation
11	0	3	1	1	0	6	0	13	0
12	0	4	3	1	1	3	0	15	0
13	0	2	1	7	0	6	0	25	1
14	0	2	1	3	2	2	0	11	1
15	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	2
16	0	6	1	2	1	2	0	11	1
17	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	5	0
18	0	3	1	1	0	3	0	10	0
19	0	5	1	1	1	2	0	8	0
20	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	11	0

Using these percentages of student errors, it was apparent that the largest number of mistakes was made in imporper phrasing. In fact, there were no students who did not have phrasing mistakes. Also, an examination of each student's errors revealed that the largest percentage of errors was made in phrasing.

The next most common student error was found to be repeating words. These ranged from 1 percent to 8 percent. There was a group average of 4 percent on repetitions.

The third most common error was misreadings. These ranged

from 1 percent to 6 percent. In reviewing the students' reading selections, the investigator could find no words that were missed by all students. There were no commonly misread words by students reading on a particular grade level.

Substitution errors were made by sixteen of the twenty students. Twelve of these students only made these errors 1 percent of the time. Student number thirteen made substitution errors 6 percent of the time. This same student used improper phrasing 25 percent of the time, which was the largest percentage of the group for phrasing errors.

Omission errors were made by fourteen of the twenty students. One of those fourteen made omission errors 3 percent of the time, whereas the other thirteen students made them only 1 percent of the time. The words that most of the students omitted were articles such as the and a.

Incorrect punctuation was used by seven of the students. Six of them only used it 1 percent of the time, while one of the students used it 2 percent of the time. Through a survey of the students' individual errors it was found that 37 percent of the time they ignored question marks, 52 percent of the time they ignored periods and 11 percent of the time they ignored commas.

Insertion errors were made by six of the students. One of the students made these errors 2 percent of the time, whereas the

other five made them only 1 percent of the time they were reading. Upon examination of the students' inventories it was found that most of the insertions made were articles and adjectives.

Only two of the students made hesitation errors and these occurred only 1 percent of the tiem. No students made intonation errors.

The Kaleidoscope Readers

Only one selection was read in The Kaleidoscope Readers by fifteen of the twenty students. Of the remaining students four read two selections and one read three selection. The percentages were averaged for those students who read more than one selection. They were then arranged similar to the percentages from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory in Table 2. The Kaleidoscope percentages are found in Table 3, page 47.

The results found in Table 3 are very similar to the results found in Table 2. The most common error in Table 3 was found to be improper phrasing. Every student made this type of error, ranging from 3 to 18 percent.

The second most common error was repetitions. Repetition errors were made by nine of the students 2 percent of the time while only one of the students exhibited it 6 percent of the time. All of the students made repetition errors at least 2 percent of the time.

Table 3

Distribution of Common Reading Errors among Twenty Junior High School Students by Percent of Total Words Read on The Kaleidoscope Readers Informal Reading Inventory

Students Identified by Numbers	Hesitation	Misreading	Omission	Substitution	Insertions	Repetitions	Intonation	Improper Phras.	Punctuation
1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	10	0
2	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	13	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	10	0
4	0	1	1	1	0	6	0	11	0
5	0	3	1	1	1	5	0	16	0
6	0	4	4	1	1	3	0	18	1
7	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	7	1
8	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	12	0
9	2	2	1	1	0	3	1	8	0
10	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	14	0
11	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	13	0
12	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	14	0
13	2	0	1	3	1	5	0	8	0
14	0	2	1	0	1	4	0	14	0
15	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	11	2
16	0	4	1	1	0	2	0	11	1
17	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	5	0
18	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	6	0
19	0	3	0	1	1	3	0	4	0
20	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	1

The third most common error was misreading. From the twenty students seventeen of them exhibited this error. They ranged from 1 to 4 percent.

The fourth most common student error was omission with thirteen of the students exhitibint it. Of these, twelve students were found to err 1 percent of the reading time while one student erred 4 percent of the time.

The fifth most common error was substitution one word for another. There were twelve students who exhibited this error. Of these ten students substituted 1 percent of the time, while 1 did it 2 percent of the time.

Words were inserted where they did not belong by eight students. Seven of these exhibited this 1 percent of the time while one student inserted 2 percent of the reading time. Upon examination of individual student's readings, it was found that the most common insertion errors were articles and adjectives.

Only five students ignored punctuation marks. Of these four students did this 1 percent of the time, while one student did it 2 percent of the time.

Again only two of the students exhibited hesitation errors, but they did it 2 percent of their reading time. It was found that students nine and ten were hesitating on Table 2, but on Table 3 it was students nine and thirteen who were making hesitation errors.

None of the students were found to be exhibiting intonation errors.

Phonics

Upon first analysis of the phonics data it was apparent that ten of the students were still in stage I phonics, two were still in stage II, five were in stage III and three passed all three of the phonics stages. Those students who did not pass stage I phonics skills exhibited similarity of errors. Table 4 lists these errors by percentages for each of those ten students.

Table 4

Percentages of Errors Made by Ten Junior High Students in Stage I Phonics Skills

Initial and Ending Consonants:										
A. Changing the first letter of a word.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B. Changing the last letter of a word.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Writing the letter with which a word begins.	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D. Writing the two letters with which a word begins.	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	14	0	0
E. Writing the letter with which a word ends.	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F. Writing the two letters with which a word ends.	17	0	33	50	17	17	17	17	17	17
Short Vowels	20	10	10	10	10	20	0	10	0	30

Table 4 (continued)

Beginning Blends:										
A. Writing the two letters with which a word begins.	20	0	10	10	0	5	5	10	0	5
B. Writing consonant blends you hear.	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Pointing to beginning consonants in words.	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0
D. Writing the two letters with which a word ends.	13	25	0	75	0	0	0	50	0	25
Understanding Endings:										
A. Pronouncing the word "play" with the three endings "s," "ed," and "ing".	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B. Pronouncing the word "work" with the three endings.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. Pronouncing the word "jump" with the three endings.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D. Pronouncing the word "help" with the three endings.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The students were to listen to a list of words and write the two letters with which they ended. This proved to be the most common error. All of the students who made mistakes in that section missed the last two letters in the word stiff. Invariably they wrote that the last letters were if. This was the only common student error in this category.

The next most common error made by these ten students was mistaking a short e for what was actually a short i. Still another error that seemed to trouble students was writing the two letters with

which a word began when the word was heard. Even though six of the ten students made errors in this category, none of the errors were common.

Finally, when students were asked to write the first two letters of a word read to them, the only common error was ho for wh in the word who.

The two students who could not pass stage II phonics skills either made mistakes with prefixes or suffixes. Upon examination of individual student's tests, it was found that they made no common errors. Both students had almost an equal number of prefix and suffix errors.

Of the five students who could not pass stage III phonics skills, four of them had the most common trouble with division of the words into syllables. Only one of the students had more trouble with pronunciation. In rank order the words annulet and unavoidable were the most often incorrectly divided into syllables.

Student Interests and Informal Reading Inventories

All twenty of the students read a selection of their choice from The Kaleidoscope Readers. As shown on Tables 2 and 3 the students' errors were similar from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory and the informal reading inventory given to the students on their choices from The Kaleidoscope Readers. Generally the students'

individual errors seemed to drop about 1 percent from the Ginn 360 Informal Reading Inventory to The Kaleidoscope Readers selections. However, it was not shown that the students could read at a higher grade level using materials in which they were interested.

Chapter 5

Summary

This paper had two purposes. The main purpose was to determine if common student errors could be found in reading. It was found that there were common student errors made as measured by two informal reading inventories and a phonics diagnostic test. The second purpose of this paper was to determine if students could read at a higher grade level with materials in which they were interested. It was found that the students made fewer errors on reading selections of their choice, but the difference was insignificant. In fact, the students were not able to read material at a higher grade level just because it was interesting to them.

Conclusions

On the basis of the review of literature and the information gathered and precessed by the writer the following conclusions were drawn:

(1) Several errors and deficiencies were found to be common among the students studied.

(2) The most common error found for these twenty students was improper phrasing. This usually resulted from a student repeating a word or a phrase or by stopping to decode a word.

(3) Fluency is very important for the student to maintain

the stream of thought. When a student had a high amount of improper phrasing along with repetition and/or misreading, his comprehension was usually low.

(4) There were three other common errors. These were substitution, omission, and insertion. Usually these errors made little difference in student comprehension.

(5) Half of the twenty students were found still to be in stage I phonics skills. These students needed the most practice in double consonants and short vowel sounds. Without the skills to discriminate short vowel sounds the students can experience a great deal of trouble in reading. This is evidenced by the fact that five of the ten students in stage I phonics skills were reading below fourth grade level.

(6) Students did not read material of interest to them at a higher difficulty level than regularly chosen material.

Recommendations

Although this investigation was limited in scope and subject to the limitations cited, the writer has drawn these recommendations:

(1) It is recommended that both informal reading inventories and diagnostic phonics tests be used by teachers for diagnosing reading deficiencies for all students in

their reading.

(2) Material of interest to students should be selected and used. The results of this study did not indicate that students read at a higher grade level in material consistent with their interest, but there was some evidence that interest helps in motivation and attitude.

(3) It is the recommendation of the investigator that more research be done concerning the subject of common student errors in reading. A study with a much larger population may provide more conclusive results.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

GINN 360 INFORMAL READING
INVNETORY CHECK SHEET

Name _____ Functional Reading Level _____ Grade ____ Date _____

ORAL READING

TYPES OF ERRORS	Number of errors per level											
WORD RECOGNITION	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Basic Errors												
Hesitation												
Misreading												
Omissions												
Substitutions												
2. Other Recorded Behaviors												
Insertions												
Repetitions												
Intonation Errors												
Uses Improper Phrasing												
Ignores Punctuation												
COMPREHENSION												
1. Literal Questions Missed												
2. Inferential Questions Missed												
3. Success Criterion (%)												

APPENDIX A (continued)

Name _____ Functional Reading Level _____ Grade ____ Date _____

SILENT READING

TYPES OF ERRORS	Number of Errors per level											
COMPREHENSION	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Literal Questions Missed												
2. Inferential Questions Missed												
3. Success Criterion (%)												
OTHER RECORDED BEHAVIORS												
1. Vocalization												
Lip Movements												
Whispering												
2. Uses Finger or Marker to Keep His Place												
3. Visual Problems Adjusts Book to Accomodate Vision												
Tilts Head												
Squints												
Complains of Physical Problem												
Closes One Eye While Reading												

APPENDIX B

THE KALEIDOSCOPE READERS
INFORMAL READING INVENTORY CHECK SHEET

Name_____ Functional Reading Level_____ Grade ____ Date_____

ORAL READING

TYPES OF ERRORS	Number of errors per grade					
WORD RECOGNITION	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Basic Errors						
Hesitation						
Misreading						
Omission						
Substitutions						
2. Other Recorded Behaviors						
Insertions						
Repetitions						
Intonation Errors						
Uses Improper Phrasing						
Ignores Punctuation						
COMPREHENSION						
1. Literal Questions Missed						
2. Inferential Questions Missed						
3. Success Criterion (%)						

APPENDIX B (continued)

Name_____ Functional Reading Level_____ Grade ____ Date _____

SILENT READING

TYPES OF ERRORS	Number of errors per grade					
COMPREHENSION	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Literal Questions Missed						
2. Inferential Questions Missed						
3. Success Criterion (%)						
OTHER RECORDED BEHAVIORS						
1. Vocalization						
Lip Movement						
Whispering						
2. Uses Finger or Marker to Keep His Place						
3. Visual Problems						
Adjusts Book to Accomodate Vision						
Tilts Head						
Squints						
Complains of Physical Problem						
Closes One Eye While Reading						

APPENDIX C

PHONICS CHECK SHEET

Name _____ Date _____ Grade _____

Stage I - One Syllable Words	% of Errors
Vowel Principles	
Initial and Ending Consonants	
A. Changing the first letter of a word.	
B. Changing the last letter of a word.	
C. Writing the letter with which a word begins.	
D. Writing the two letters with which a word begins.	
E. Writing the letter with which a word ends.	
F. Writing the two letters with which a word ends.	
Short Vowels	
Beginning Blends	
A. Writing the two letters with which a word begins.	
B. Writing consonant blends you hear.	
C. Pointing to beginning consonants in words.	
D. Writing the two letters with which a word ends.	
Understanding Endings	
A. Pronounce the word "play" with the three endings "s," "ed," and "ing."	
B. Pronounce the word "work" with the three endings "s," "ed," and "ing."	
C. Pronounce the word "jump" with the three endings "s," "ed," and "ing."	
D. Pronounce the word "help" with the three endings "s," "ed," and "ing.'	

APPENDIX C (continued)

Stage II - Multi-syllable Words	% of Errors
A. Prefixes	
B. Suffixes	
Stage III - Accent or Stress	
A. Division of words into syllables.	
B. Pronunciation of words	

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avery, Paul J. "The Obligations of School Administrators to the Reading Program," Administrators and Reading ed. T. R. Carlson (New York; Harcort Brace Jonavich, Inc. 1972) p.7.

Balow, Bruce. "The Long Term Effect of Remedial Reading Instruction," The Reading Teacher, 18, No. 7 (April, 1965) 581-586.

Belden, Bernard and Henry A. Bamman, Seven is a Handy Figure (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 78-80 and 94-96.

Bernstein, Margery R. "Relationship Between Interest and Reading Comprehension," Journal of Educational Research, 49, No. 4 (December, 1955) 173-178.

Berretta, Shirley, "Self-concept Development in the Reading Program," The Reading Teacher, 24, No. 3 (December, 1970) 232-238.

Betts, Emmet Albert, Foundations of Reading Instruction (New York: American Book Co., 1946) pp. 438-450.

Bliesmer, Emery P. "Informal Testing in Reading," The Reading Teacher, 26, No. 3 (December, 1972) 268-272.

Bliesmer, Emery P. and Betty Yarborough. "A Comparison of Ten Different Beginning Reading Problems in First Grade," Phi Delta Kappa, 46, No. 10 (June, 1965) 500-504.

Bormuth, John R. "Reading Literacy: Its Definition and Assessment," Reading Research Quarterly, 9, No. 1, (1973-1974) 7-66.

Bothel, Morton. "A Proposed Staff Organization for Reading-Language Arts," Administrators and Reading, ed. T. R. Carlson (New York: Harcort Brace Jonavich, Inc. 1972) p. 46.

Boyd, Rachel M. "Differences Underlying Multiple-Choice Items in A Reading Comprehension Test," Journal of Reading, 14, No. 3, (December, 1970) 173-178.

Brittain, Mary M. "Informal Reading Procedures: Some Motivational Considerations," Reading Teacher, 24, No. 3, (December, 1970) 216-220.

Campbell, Evelyn C., ERIC, "Mastering Decoding Skills: English, Reading," (Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools, 1971) pp. 1-36.

Carmichael, Carolyn W., ERIC, "Meeting the Needs of Teen-agers," (May, 1973) pp. 1-28.

Chall, Jeanne, Learning to Read - The Great Debate, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967) pp. 1-372.

Clymer, Theodore, Jr., and Virginia (Dr. Roger W. Shuy and Dr. E. Paul Torrance, Consultants), Reading 360 (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1969)

Daniel, John E. "The Effectiveness of Various Procedures in Reading Level Placement," Elementary English, 39, No. 6, (October, 1962) 590-600.

Dawson, Mildred A., Robert A. Gardiner, Geroge R. Gardner, and Henry A. Bamman, Five Words Long (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 25-28 and 54-56.

Early, Margaret J. "Taking Stock: Secondary School Reading in the 70's," Journal of Reading, 16, No. 5 (February, 1973) 364-373.

Elkind, David, "Cognitive Development and Reading," Claremont Reading Conference 38th Yearbook, ed. M. P. Douglas (Claremont, California: Claremont Reading Conference, 1974) pp. 10-20.

Estes, Thomas H. and Joseph L. Vaughan, Jr. "Reading Interests and Comprehension: Implications," The Reading Teacher, 27, No. 2, (November, 1973) 149-153.

Froese, Victor. "Word Recognition Tests: Are They Useful Beyond Grade Three?," The Reading Teacher, 24, No. 5, (February, 1971) 432-438.

Goetze, Henry J., ERIC, "Reading Interests of Junior High School Students," (May 12, 1971) pp. 1-49.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Reading, A Psycholinguistic Approach," Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6, (May, 1967) 126-135.

Gray, William S., On Their Own in Reading (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1960) pp. 34-53.

Gross, Susan, Martha Luke Carr, Allan Dornseif, and Sally Mittsrouse. "Behavioral Objectives in a Reading Skills Program, Grades 4-8," The Reading Teacher, 27, No. 8, (May, 1974) 782-789.

Harker, W. John. "Materials for Problem Readers: Why Aren't They Working?," Journal of Reading, 18, No. 6, (March, 1975) 451-461.

Hislop, Margaret J. and Ethel M. King. "Application of Phonic Generalizations by Beginning Readers," The Journal of Educational Research, 66, No. 9, (May-June, 1973) 405-412.

Hittleman, Daniel R. "Seeking A Psycholinguistic Definition of Reading," The Reading Teacher, 26, No. 8, (May, 1973) 783-789.

Kender, Joseph P. "How Useful Are Informal Reading Procedures?," Journal of Reading, 11, No. 5, (February, 1968) 337-342.

Kender, Joseph P. "Informal Reading Invnetories," The Reading Teacher, 24, No. 2, (Noverber, 1970) 165 + 167.

Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program," The Reading Teacher, 24, No. 2, (November, 1970) 159-162 + 167.

Livingston, Harold R. "What the Reading Test Doesn't Test - Reading," Journal of Reading, 15, No. 6, (March, 1972) 402-410.

Mocker, Donald W. "Cooperative Learning Process: Shared Learning Experience in Teaching Adults to Read," Journal of Reading, 18, No. 6, (March, 1975) 440-444.

Ojala, William T. and Marda McNeill, ERIC, "A Survey of Adolescent Interests in Three Schools," Adolescent Literature, Adolescent Reading and the English Class, ed. K. Donelson, (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona English Bulletin, 14, No. 3, April, 1972).

Pilgrim, Geneve Hanna and Mariana K. McAllister, Books Young People and Reading Guidance (New York: Harper and Row, 1968) pp. 1-241.

Shuman, R. Baird. "The Teen-Aged Nonreader," Educational Digest, 40, No. 1, (September, 1974) 47-49.

Smith, Helen K. and Helen M. Robinson. "Reading Clinic Clients - Ten Years After," The Elementary School Journal, 63, No. 1, (October, 1962) 22-27.

Spache, George D., The Teaching of Reading (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1972) pp. 1-157.

Spache, George D. and Evelyn B. Spache, Reading in the Elementary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973) 4-5.

Stowe, Elaine, Elenore Kirkland, Elizabeth Schwartz, and Henry A. Bamman, Four Corners of the Sky (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 10-11, 63-65, 67-69, 77-78, 89-90, and 129-132.

Stowe, Elaine, Elenore Kirkland, Elizabeth Schwartz, and Henry A. Bamman, Three O'Clock Courage (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 3-4, 13-15, 63-66, and 82-85.

Wyatt, Nita M., Mary Jane Dingman, and Henry A. Bamman, One Thing at Once (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 3-5, 13-15, and 27-28.

Wyatt, Nita M., Mary Jane Dingman, and Henry A. Bamman, Two Blades of Grass (San Francisco: Field Educational Publications, Inc., 1969) pp. 3-6, 29-32, 42-44, 63-66, and 106-108.

Zintz, Miles V., Corrective Reading (Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1972) pp. 1-449.