

Analysis of Miscues

Clay: Consider only the behaviour up to the error.

Others: Consider the miscue at the sentence level / whole text level.

Meaning

Does the miscue maintain meaning?

Does it make sense, even though it is inaccurate?

Syntax

Does the miscue maintain syntax?

Is what the child said possible in an English sentence?

Is what the child said possible in her/his oral language?

If it is, oral language is probably influencing the response.

If it is not:

- his language skill is limited and his personal 'grammar' does not contain the structures used in the text being read
- he may be allowing attention to detail, or word-by-word reading, to control his English syntax and influence his choices.

Visual Information

Is the miscue visually similar to the word in the text?

Does the child use visual information from the letters and words or the layout of the print?

Word Memory

Does he read word by word as if recalling each word from a memory bank, unrelated to what has gone before?

He may not realise that reading is like speaking, and that his language behaviour is a rich source of help in choosing correct reading responses.

Analysis of Self-Corrections

A two-step process:

1. What kind of information was the child using up to the time when the miscue occurred? Use the miscue analysis questions above.
2. What else did the child use to notice there was a miscue and fix it up? What extra information did the child use to make the self-corrections? What extra information is in the self-correction that is not in the miscue?

Note: Self-corrections often occur less frequently for older readers. Their self-correction behaviours have often gone "underground".

*Kemp 1987: Self-corrections should be 25% or more.
(ie at least one SC in every four miscues)*

*We cannot know what the child actually did;
we can only make inferences.*

% ACCURACY

M Clay	Others	
95% +	98%+	INDEPENDENT level
90 - 94%	90 - 97%	INSTRUCTIONAL level
< 90%	< 90%	FRUSTRATION level

When determining “easy”, “instructional” or “difficult” reading levels, you need to consider several factors: percentage accuracy, strategy use, comprehension, child’s experiential background, recent teaching program, and so on. Using only percentage accuracy to determine reading level is unreliable.

Clay’s figures are widely adopted.

- When text is at independent level, it ensures that children are practising appropriate behaviours.
- Instruction-level text provides enough challenge for teaching opportunities to arise.
- Children who read below 90% accuracy are not picking up enough meaning to keep an efficient check on their own reading. As a result, they are less likely to be able to detect miscues and correct them when necessary.

SELF-CORRECTION RATE

- Progress in reading depends upon ability to self-correct.
- Readers who self-correct at least one in five errors (those miscues which destroy meaning; not those which are meaning-preserving) are doing well.
- One-in-five self-corrections is achievable only when children are reading above 90% accuracy. Thus, self-correction rate and percentage accuracy are closely linked.

If the reader, with an introduction and support, cannot read about 90% of the words accurately, the text is too difficult. The accuracy analysis is NOT a test of the reader, but a test of the teacher’s selection and introduction of the text.

Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, p. 6

Kemp (1987, 147-8) suggests that two important counts are:

1. the total, unrecovered word errors which generally speaking should not be greater than 10% of the total words;
2. the number of self-corrections, which should be somewhere near 25% of the total errors.

Fountas & Pinnell 1999

MATCHING BOOKS TO READERS

Page 33:

Benchmark books are used to help in initial placement. Take a running record on UNSEEN text for the purpose of periodic interval assessment.

For the purpose of this assignment, you are asked to take a running record on UNSEEN text.

Continuous running records are used to capture progress over time.

Take these running records on any book that the child HAS READ in the guided reading groups. They are an effective tool for assessing what children can do in reading without teacher support.

Continuous running records are more appropriate when you are monitoring the effect of your teaching over a significant period of time.

PALS Book Level Equivalencies

<http://pals.virginia.edu/Instructional-Resources/PALS-instructionalresources-book-levels.asp>

		↓		↓	
USA Grade Level	Fountas & Pinnell	Reading Recovery	Developmental Rdg (DRA)	Rigby PM Benchmark	Lexile Framework
K	A	1	1	1	NA
K	B	2	2	2	NA
K / 1	C	3 & 4	3	3 & 4	NA
1	D	5 & 6	4	5 & 6	NA
1	E	7 & 8	6 & 8	7 & 8	NA
1	F	9 & 10	10	9 & 10	200L-400L
1	G	11 & 12	12	11	200L-400L
1 / 2	H	13 & 14	14	15	200L-400L
1 / 2	I	15, 16, 17	16	16	200L-400L
2	J	18, 19, 20	18	17	300L-500L
2	K	NA	20	18	300L-500L
2 / 3	L & M	NA	24 - 28	21 & 22	300L-500L
3 / 4	N, O, P	NA	30, 34, 38	23, 24, 25	500L-700L
4	Q, R, S	NA	NA	26, 27, 28	650L-850L

Note:

It is important to realise that the levels on the PM Benchmark books commonly used in schools are NOT Reading Recovery levels.

(Fortunately, the match is quite good up to level 10 or 11, but after that, there are serious deviations.)

Also, teachers are discovering that kids simply don't like most of the texts in the Benchmark Kit. Many are inappropriate (some have 'old-fashioned' language, some are about unfamiliar topics, and some are simply boring). Kids read better when they actually like the book!