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Chapter One

Introduction/Statement of the Problem

Daniel (pseudonym), a nine year old, sat down at the dining room table ready to begin the reading record with me. Immediately he grabbed the book from my hand and turned to the back page, examining the number of pages. He then looked at how many words were on each page and exclaimed “this has a lot of words in this book!” I reassured him that he would be fine and it would not take too long to read. Daniel asked what he would get if he read the book with me; I was lost for an answer. It was clear he wanted a reward for reading which I was unprepared for. Finally he opened the book and jumped right in, reading each page with expression, but ignoring periods and rushing through the text. It was evident that Daniel merely wanted to get the task done so he could watch TV, play games on his Wii, or build with Legos.

One of the greatest strengths exhibited by Daniel was his creativity when building with Legos. He was able to construct complex structures based off picture instructions. After he completed a structure, he would proudly show off his creation. When provided the opportunity, Daniel would build and play contentedly for hours with his Legos; however, I was bewildered at his pride and confidence exhibited with these toys that was not observed with his reading tasks. Verhoeven and Snow (2001) explain how attitudes toward reading tend to worsen over time, as children have many other activities competing for their interests as they mature, and decline more rapidly with poor readers. This was evident with Daniel, as he had a hard time focusing on his homework at night, preferring to watch TV or play.

Daniel loves to build with Legos, play outside, and explore nature outside of school. When given a choice with reading, he preferred non-fiction texts and loves science. Daniel could understand when concepts are modeled with a hands-on activity. Science allows him the
opportunity to share his background knowledge with books he had previously read, which contributed to his positive attitude toward science class.

Attitudes toward reading are defined by Alexander and Filler as “a system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation (Verhoeven & Snow, 2001, p. 136). When given an Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Johns & Lenski, 2000), using Garfield figures to indicate interest in reading, Daniel’s attitude toward reading had a negative connotation and he would prefer to do anything else other than reading or school work. He did not mind going to the library under the condition that he could pick out a Lego book or Star Wars book to browse the pictures. When asked how he felt about reading books during the summer, he answered with the angry Garfield picture. He also chose the angry Garfield picture when asked how he felt about reading instead of playing and when asked how he felt about reading in school and answering questions about what he read. As a reader, Daniel viewed himself as “stupid” and “dumb,” feeling as if he was not good at anything school related.

When at a grocery store on a Friday night picking out a movie, the cashier asked Daniel if he picked out a good one for the weekend.

Daniel- “We are watching Diary of a Wimpy Kid”
Cashier-“Oh that should be a good one!”
Daniel-“I like the weekends because I can watch movies and play my Wii”
Cashier-“Well lucky for you it is the weekend and you have two days off!”
Daniel-“But I don’t want to go back to school.”
Cashier-“Well at least you can enjoy your two days off.”
Daniel-“No I mean I don’t ever want to go back to school”

These comments were not uncommon with Daniel and showed his inability to see himself as academically successful. It was clear when working with Daniel that he needed to revalue himself as a reader, which could be done using Retrospective Miscues Analysis (RMA). Moore
and Brantingham (2003) expand on how RMA builds on students’ strengths to help them revalue their reading and build self-confidence and supports their reading strengths.

My relationship with Daniel began when he was a year old as I babysat for the family and then I tutor Daniel during the summers. Since Kindergarten, Daniel has been pulled out for intensive services, following the Leveled Literacy Intervention program (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009), used by the school district, due to his struggles with reading and writing. His most recent report card showed he was not meeting standards; he was currently reading below grade level and his sight word vocabulary and fluency were also below grade level. A consultant teacher worked in the room with him throughout the day to assist when his processing broke down. Daniel did not see himself as a good reader because he could not “read all of the words right.” He needed to understand that reading was not about decoding words to accurately reproduce the text, but that it is a meaning making process (Martens, 1998). Daniel’s focus on decoding individual words was preventing him from seeing the big picture in the books he read.

Students’ beliefs about themselves as readers influence their literacy development (Goodman, 1996). It was clear that Daniel was not convinced in his ability to learn and needed to build self-confidence in order to be more effective in school. When Daniel could not read a word correctly, he often tried to sound it out or make up a word that looked similar as a placeholder so he could continue reading. Placeholders give the student the ability to move on with the reading, thus empowering them as readers (Moore & Gilles, 2005). I helped Daniel become aware of his strengths as a reader through RMA, and he built a realistic view on how readers read and revalued himself as a reader.
Significance of the Problem

As a teacher, I believe that every child has the ability to learn and succeed in school. Daniel’s perception of school, especially reading, made me realize that some students need much more support to build their confidence. Children can become life-long learners and through guidance from their teacher, can be involved in authentic and meaningful assignments. When Daniel referred to himself as “stupid” and “dumb” while working on his homework, I couldn’t help but wonder what caused him to think this. He often hit his head with his hand when he made a mistake and was easily frustrated. Goodman (1996) describes mistakes as merely a natural part of our learning. RMA helps to show how the miscues we make are clues to what we were thinking while reading the text, rather than mistakes (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Daniel received literacy support at home from his mother and me and at school, but we remained at a loss regarding his attitude towards reading. Although Daniel was the focus participant in this study, many teachers face the same sort of students as Daniel in their classes; students lacking self-confidence and motivation to learn. Our willingness as teachers to meet the needs of our individual students does not stop with their academic success, but their desire to see themselves as successful.

Through RMA, Daniel was able to revalue himself as a reader and reflect on his own reading process. He began to understand the types of miscues he made and how he could use what he already knew to determine if the miscues he was making were affecting the meaning of the text or adding to his understanding. By involving students in the conversation about reading, we can lead children to a greater understanding of literacy and help them become confident in their reading strategies (Moore & Gilles, 2005). When referring to miscues, they can be either a high or low level miscue. A high-level miscue does not interfere with making sense of the text.
whereas low-level miscues create a barrier of comprehension (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). RMA helps students realize that miscues are repeated attempts to predict meaning and making sense of the text (Moore & Aspegren, 2001).

**Purpose of the Study**

By using retrospective miscue analysis, I helped Daniel understand the miscues he made and helped him recognize that reading is a meaning making process. Retrospective miscue analysis (RMA) is defined as “an instructional strategy that invites readers to reflect on their own reading process” (Goodman, 1996, p. 600). By building on students’ strengths, teachers can help them revalue their thoughts on the reading process. Discussing their reasoning during word solving enhances their insight on the miscues they are making and enables them to make smart miscues that do not affect the meaning. When reading a text, students can bring experience, attitude, concepts, and cognitive schemes to express meaning of the text (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Daniel always tried to make connections with the text based on his own life experiences, which was one of his strengths. He used background knowledge when reading and stopped when something reminded him of a previous experience. I encouraged Daniel’s thought process during the reading, as this did not negatively affect the meaning of the text, but actually enhanced his understanding through these connections.

When giving a student a reading record, we conduct a miscue analysis to determine patterns being used as well as strategies used or ignored by the reader. This method of miscue analysis does not involve the student in a discussion of their own miscues (Vaccaro, 2012). Moore and Brantingham (2003) explain that readers use a combination of semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cueing systems to gain meaning from the text. Thus, when we include students
in understanding their miscues, it will help them see their attempts at constructing meaning and to understand which strategies are effective and which are not. Daniel often focused on the graphophonic cueing system and did not recognize when meaning broke down. The primary goal of the reading records I conducted prior to this study was to see patterns evolve and to inform my instructional choices, and did not include him in a discussion of his reading. I thought that perhaps making him aware of the types of miscues he made would help him see the strengths he had as a reader and his thought process while reading.

Daniel’s inability to see himself as a good reader led to my research question: How might retrospective miscue analysis influence the reader’s perception of himself as a reader? And: How might retrospective miscue analysis contribute to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process? And: What strategies can I use to help students make meaning while reading? From here, I delved into the various strategies to use with Daniel during our lessons to provide evidence of how RMA contributed and influenced his learning.

**Study Approach**

At the time of the study, Daniel, the participant for the study, was a third grade male who struggled to view reading as a meaning making process. He has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and receives services in an inclusive classroom for reading and writing. Daniel is diagnosed with a learning disability for processing difficulties. Daniel has received intensive services since Kindergarten and continues to read below grade level. He attends a suburban school with his twin sister, who is reading above grade level. Previous reading records given by Daniel’s teacher portrayed similar attributes to the ones I had given; his comprehension score was high and he was able to self-correct when visual cues did not match up; however, when meaning broke down, he continued reading. It was apparent he understood what was being read
as shown by his comprehension score, but he was unable to construct meaning efficiently as portrayed from his miscues (Martens, 1998). Daniel needed to increase his use of effective strategies to refine his understanding of stories.

I gathered my data through observations, field notes, running records, audio-recordings and interviews with Daniel and his mother. I then expanded my knowledge of Daniel as a reader through the use of the Burke Reading Interview (Goodman & Marek, 1996). The questions related to various actions and strategies used as a reader and explained what makes someone a good reader. The interview asked the question of who is a good reader you know and what made them a good reader as well as how he would go about helping a struggling reader.

During each RMA session, I conducted a running record to identify patterns in miscues that could be significant to bring up during our lesson. The running records showed me his strengths and needs in reading and strategies he relied on, based on the three cueing system (semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic). I then conducted a miscue analysis in order to visually see the patterns in his reading.

Each RMA session included an audio-recording of Daniel’s reading as well as the discussion we had about the miscues following his reading on the second day. Without the audio-recording, Daniel would not have been able to reflect on the strategies he was using or revalue his thought process. The audio-recording was useful to point out his strengths as a reader and build confidence.

I then re-administered the Burke Reading Interview (Goodman & Marek, 1996) in order to reevaluate Daniel’s attitude toward reading during the sixth week. This assessment tool provided invaluable information regarding how Daniel felt about reading and how he viewed himself as a reader.
Prior to conducting the first RMA session, I administered the Burke Reading Interview (Goodman & Marek, 1996) to gain insight on the reading strategies he used and was comfortable with. As the questions focused on how he approached unknown words, this information was vital when structuring my focus for each lesson. This interview was used at the conclusion of the six-week study in order to view the changes in his perception of himself as a reader as well as effective strategy use.

Observation notes were taken during each RMA session and reflected on at the conclusion of the lesson. I observed various behaviors in reading, such as his reading strategies and use of the three cueing system. I reflected on whether his strategy use was effective or ineffective and how it was impacting his reading abilities.

Rationale

My in-depth study of one student showed Daniel’s growth and the positive impact of using RMA. When working with Daniel, I preselected the miscues in order to highlight his abilities and build from his strengths. Determining whether the miscues were high or low-level also showed what discussions to hold during each session. Research previously conducted on this topic permitted me to determine the best approach and form effective instruction when working with Daniel (Goodman, 1996, Goodman & Marek, 1996, Moore & Brantingham, 2003, Vaccaro, 2012). By using RMA with an individual student, I was able to determine how the strategy influenced Daniel’s attitude toward reading and himself as a reader. This was achieved through the Burke Reading Interview compared from the beginning of the study and the end. Helping to move Daniel toward understanding and valuing his own knowledge of the language avoided him giving up on ever being able to read proficiently (Moore & Aspegren, 2001). Working with Daniel and conducting observations, anecdotal notes, and audio recordings gave insight as to
how we could use it in the classroom with our small guided reading groups. I recorded his reading in order to identify the miscues for our discussions as well as recording our conversations of miscues. Often times miscue analysis inform the decisions we make while teaching small group instruction, but we do not hold discussions with students about their particular miscues. Aspergren and Moore (2001) comment on how dialogue during the RMA session is designed to empower learners to define themselves as readers and invite the reader to reflectively examine and value miscues as evidence of their thinking and attempts to make sense from the text. Through this study, I worked with Daniel on this technique and then implemented this strategy in the classroom. Other teachers would benefit from this research, as it does not take much time and effort to hold a discussion with a student on their miscues. Although RMA requires prior planning, teachers will realize the benefits gained with their students. Depending on the age of the student and the confidence they portray towards reading, teachers will either preselect the miscues after being analyzed or students can choose their own miscues for discussion (Goodman, 1996).

**Summary**

It was clear that the participant was not only a reluctant reader, but a struggling reader who disliked reading during school and at home. He did not view himself as a good reader due to his inability to read the words correctly. In addition, Daniel focused an excessive amount of time on decoding to form each word and that caused him to miss the big picture of the text. Retrospective miscue analysis was a strategy that worked with Daniel to help him realize that reading was not only about reading the words correctly, but that it is a meaning making process and helped guide him to revalue his reading abilities. Building on his strengths gave him the
confidence he lacked while reading and helped him see what he already could do. Once I found texts that he could read fluently with teacher guidance, Daniel saw how the quality of miscues that he made was far more important than how many he made (Wilde, 2000). Through the discussions of his miscues, Daniel came to recognize the smart choices he made while reading and how he could continue to make smart miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text, but in fact enhanced it.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Research Questions:

1. How might retrospective miscues analysis influence the student’s perception of himself as a reader?

2. How might retrospective miscue analysis contribute to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process?

3. What strategies can I use to help students make meaning while reading?

Many research articles, studies and books review the significance of retrospective miscue analysis with teachers and students taking part in the method. In my review of the literature, I explored the reading process in terms of the work of Goodman and Marek (1996). I then explored miscue analysis and discovered strategies that can contribute to students’ reading and the impact various techniques have when working with students. Following miscue analysis, I explored the history of Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) as well as strategies to use with students. Looking at students’ perception of themselves as readers can identify their feelings on reading and what they view as a good reader. Through the amount of research conducted on the topic, it was clear that RMA contributes to the students’ self-perception of themselves as readers.

Reading Process

Learning to read is not a simple process. Students value the reading processes they develop and use them to further expand reading strategies to make meaning of the text (Martens, 1998). The goal of reading instruction is to move students toward understanding and valuing their own knowledge rather than feeling defeated and deeming themselves as illiterate (Moore & Aspegren, 2001). Goodman and Marek (1996) note how in the process of reading and constructing meaning, all readers make miscues. In the reading process, knowledge of the semantic system, or meaning of the text, is necessary to comprehend the text (Wilde, 2000).
Goodman (1996) extended on Rosenblatt’s theory of the reading process and came to recognize the reader as an active participant in the construction of meaning, rather than the meaning lying on the page waiting to be found (Davenport, 2002). Children must actively search for the meaning of the text. My participant, Daniel, often read and focused on decoding strategies, rather than reading for meaning. He viewed good reading as reading all of the words accurately.

Goodman (1996) notes how we learn about the reading process in our discussions about the text, thus understanding the text is critical. Miscue analysis provides a schema for analyzing oral reading behaviors and offering a window on the reading process (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Goodman and Marek (1996) chose the term miscue in order to avoid the negative connotations of terms, like error or mistake and to emphasize the belief that reading is cued by language and personal experience. Daniel viewed himself as dumb and stupid and would constantly call his miscues mistakes. RMA allowed him to alter his perception of reading by viewing them as miscues and understanding how they affected his reading in a positive way. The importance of the reader’s background and previous experiences play a role in the reader’s decisions and problem solving as they read (Goodman, 1996).

It is apparent that while reading, readers draw on the three cueing systems, focusing on graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic cues (Goodman & Marek, 1996). The graphophonic cueing system relates to the visual appearance of the word in the text and what the brain sees when it looks at the letters on the page (Davenport, 2002). Goodman (1996) explains that the graphophonic cue calls for ambiguity for the information that could be interpreted in more than one way. The syntactic cue gives us information about words and the grammatical structure of the text (Davenport, 2002). According to Goodman (1996), the semantic cue is the use of meaning to read an unknown word (Davenport, 2002). The use of the three cueing systems
shows strategies that children are developing as well as the in-the-head reading strategies that they can use. It is evident that students are not merely sounding out words, but using a balance of the three cueing systems to create meaning from a text (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

**Miscue Analysis**

Miscue analysis was first developed by Kenneth Goodman (Goodman, 1996). Miscues are readers’ variations from print, or something that does not match the text (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Determining patterns emerging in readers’ miscues can inform teachers of support or scaffolds that need to be provided to the student. Conducting a miscue analysis reveals strategies students are using while reading by analyzing the miscues made by the student as recorded on the running record or miscue analysis forms (Vaccaro, 2012). When working with my participant, I found that he drew on the visual or graphophonic cueing system when we began working together. As we continued on with our RMA sessions, my participant was able to make miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text and he developed strategies to use when coming to an unknown word. During the process of reading, we draw on the three cueing systems; graphophonic cues, semantic cues, and syntactic cues (Goodman, 1996). The goal of reading is to use a balance of the three cueing systems, but if a child is focusing primarily on one source of information, then the teacher can observe this in the patterns marked on the miscue analysis (Goodman & Marek, 1996). When using miscue analysis, teachers can see strategies students are using, but also determine if they are using those strategies effectively. The use of a miscue analysis can help determine which strategies the student is using or ignoring. According to Goodman (1996), miscue analysis can show the students control over the reading strategies and readers’ use of the three cueing systems to make meaning of the text. Patterns may emerge on the miscue analysis that will inform instruction for future lessons for the teacher. It is important for teachers to
recognize the types of miscues students are making as well as their ability to self-correct when meaning breaks down (Wilde, 2000). In my observation notes, I kept track of the amount of miscues Daniel made pertaining to the three cueing system and when the shift occurred from focusing primarily on graphophonic to semantic and syntactic, and graphophonic miscues.

Miscue analysis forms a base for teachers to construct theories about how reading works, how students read and view readers’ knowledge of language (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Miscue analysis does not include the reader in a discussion of their reading, but is conducted mainly to determine strategic actions and strengths and needs of the student (Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

Martens (1998) explains that miscues are not random or evidence of carelessness, but often predictions based on background knowledge, experiences, and what students know about language structure. This background knowledge plays a significant role when reading due to the affect it has on the student’s perception or interpretation of the text (Goodman, 1996). When focusing primarily on visual miscues, the oral reading will look visually similar to the print in the text. The teacher can then view if the miscue affected the meaning of the text or was syntactically correct on the miscue analysis.

**History and Use of Retrospective Miscue Analysis**

RMA is defined as an instructional strategy that invites readers to reflect on their own reading process (Goodman, 1996). It was originally developed in 1970 by Chris Worsnop, a secondary reading specialist (Goodman & Marek, 1996). For two decades, RMA has engaged readers in an exploration of their own reading strategies, which can result in readers’ metacognitive awareness (Black, 2004). RMA helps students not only revalue their thinking, but it empowers readers to see miscues as repeated attempts to make meaning and sense of the text.
they are reading (Almazroui, 2007). Readers must revalue themselves as language users and cast off the labels they have been given if they are to construct meaning of the text (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Goodman (1996) expands on this by describing the realistic view readers must form of themselves in order to develop a constructive process. RMA encourages students to talk about the miscues they make and it helps teachers see the thought process and expanding on students understanding of text (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Readers are encouraged to work closely with the teacher and “look through the window” (Martens, 1998, p.177) to examine their own reading process and to evaluate, understand, and learn from it. Thinking metacognitively enables students to activate new strategies, such as self-correcting and rereading, leading to proficient readers (Black, 2004).

Through RMA sessions, students begin to value themselves as learners and question authors to make sense of the reading. RMA helps readers become more aware of the reading strategies in their repertoire and to value their knowledge of the language systems that they control as they read a text (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Students begin to understand that reading is more than word calling and decoding words, but a meaning making process (Goodman, 1996). Martens (1998) contrasts the process of word calling (accurately reproducing text), with reading to construct meaning and recognizing the big picture conveyed by the text.

This emphasizes the value of miscues as evidence of reader’s thinking and making sense of the text, thus thinking metacognitively. My participant often continued reading if something did not make sense and missed the big picture of the story as he read. He focused so much on decoding the words that he struggled with fluency and his main strategy was to sound out the unknown word. Through our RMA sessions, Daniel was able to revalue his thinking and view
reading as a meaning making process, rather than continuing to look at good reading as accurately decoding words.

A case study completed on a third grader, Salem, examines how Salem lacks confidence and views himself as a failure, needing to revalue his thought process to understand the miscues he is making and recognize his attempts at constructing meaning (Almazroui, 2007). Another case study on Michael, a third grade student, shows evidence of his strengths and use of the three cueing systems with the miscues he makes (Martens, 1998). Through the use of audio recordings, Michael was able to recognize the types of miscues he was making; high or low-level. A high-level miscue does not interfere with making sense of the text whereas low-level miscues create a barrier of comprehension (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). When working with my participant, I brought attention to high-level miscues to show how they did not affect the meaning of the text and I exemplified his strengths in reading. I then gradually introduced him to the low-level miscues and came up with strategies that would help make meaning of the text. RMA guides students to realize that miscues are repeated attempts to predict meaning and making sense of the text (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). This instructional strategy will validate students’ worth and potential as readers (Moore & Aspegren, 2001).

RMA includes a discussion of miscues following the reading with the student. Students are encouraged to discuss the reasoning behind their own miscues in a risk-free setting that will lead to rich discussions of language structure and word solving strategies (Vaccaro, 2012). This kind of talk prompts readers to “become more metacognitive throughout the reading process (Moore & Gilles, 2005, p. 5). Holding discussions with students can enable them to see the miscues they made and think about why they might have made the miscue. This then leads to readers understanding how reading is a meaning making process (Black, 2004). By encouraging
my participant to go back and think about his miscues, it drew attention to the strategies he was using and brought his attention to ones he could use. My participant began with a single strategy of sounding it out and through our RMA sessions, he gathered strategies that would help him make meaning of the text, including re-reading, using picture clues, and skipping the word to decide what would make sense. The strategic dialogue that we use empowers readers to become capable of learning and developing strategic actions (Moore & Aspegren, 2001).

**Reading Strategies**

Students who struggle with reading have their own process of constructing text that is placed in front of them. Often times, the strategies they use are ineffective, focusing on decoding the individual words in fear of getting something wrong or being corrected by their teacher or another student. Students need to view reading as a meaning making process, rather than a decoding process (Almazroui, 2007). It is not always easy to convince students to use other reading strategies; however, through scaffolding and modeling, teachers can enable students with flexible word solving strategies. Through the use of a strategy bookmark, I was able to scaffold Daniel with strategies he could use to make meaning while reading. Fountas and Pinnell (2009) explain the strategies used by readers for word solving and thinking within the text include monitoring and correcting, searching for and using information, summarizing, and maintaining fluency. Readers then move to thinking beyond the text and about the text through predicting, making connections, synthesizing, inferring, analyzing and critiquing (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). These strategies help students become proficient readers and develop strategic actions.

Struggling readers view themselves as fundamentally different from those they describe as good readers (Goodman & Marek, 1996). They view reading as making sure all of the words
are correctly pronounced and see miscues as mistakes (Theurer & Leikam, 2006). Students need to realize that even proficient readers make miscues while reading. Proficient readers’ miscues often show a variation of effective strategies to preserve meaning and portray self-corrections when meaning breaks down (Wilde, 2000). My participant had a negative connotation towards reading and figured himself as dumb because he could not read all of the words correctly. He viewed “good” reading as reading all of the words correctly. Through the use of RMA, we can gain insight on students learning, which is important for developing lessons for students and identifying strategies used or ignored (Goodman, 1996). I was able to gain insight into the strategies my participant used and also the ones he was ignoring, in order to help him realize that the purpose of reading was to make meaning.

RMA allows for audio-recordings of the reading as well as a discussion about particular miscues made. The reader can examine if the miscue made sense, was corrected, or if it needed to be corrected. This leads the reader to the ultimate goal of making meaning of the text (Moore & Aspegren, 2001). However, during each RMA session, teachers must be flexible in their interactions and willing to alter the lesson based on the discussion (Theurer & Leikam, 2006). When working with my participant, I found that he enjoyed listening to his audio recordings and was able to recognize when he heard himself say a nonsense word. He was unaware of this nonsense word as he was reading, but hearing it a second time, he realized how silly it sounded and made frequent comments. The audio recording also allowed me to work with him on what strategies we could have used to make meaning of the text we were reading. Oftentimes, his sole strategy of sounding it out did not work, so we would need to look at his strategy bookmark for more ideas. Daniel focused his attention on decoding strategies from the start and I redirected his
choice in suggesting a meaning strategy. Some strategies teachers use with their students are the used during shared reading and a read aloud.

By using shared readings, students can view various genres of text, thus enabling them to become more proficient readers. It can also encourage inferring and predicting from the student which aids in making sense of the text (Almazroui, 2007). Using various genres of text with the student draws attention to the text patterns used by authors. This was shown in the case study on Salem which used a read-aloud to introduce the lesson to the student, engaging him and guiding his thoughts with prompts (Almazroui, 2007). Through engagement, students can learn in an authentic and meaningful manner. Teachers need to engage students in learning through expanding on existing schemes (Verhoeven & Snow, 2001). Proficient readers activate their schemata by creating meaningful connections to the text (Lanning, 2009). When working with Daniel, I found that he enjoyed learning from a text, so I often had non-fiction texts for him to read. I also found that he enjoyed having a choice in the text we read, so I would usually bring two or three texts for him to choose from.

RMA sessions can encourage students to take risks and try alternative strategies when they come to an unknown word. The explicit modeling through shared reading can help students’ understand how to use these strategies during independent reading. RMA helps students recognize why they miscued and what reading strategies were effective when trying to solve the word, thus leading to self-monitoring (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Using the three cueing systems (semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic), teachers can encourage students to build in-the-head reading strategies in order to decode words on the go (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009).
Self-Perceptions

Students’ beliefs about themselves as readers can influence literacy development (Goodman, 1996). Before conducting miscue analysis, a Burke Reading Interview can be used to explore the learners understanding of what reading is (Almazroui, 2007). The questions asked target how students feel about themselves as readers as well as what good readers do when they read. The answers to the questions can guide the teacher in deciding the best approach to work with students.

Negative attitudes toward reading can hinder a student's ability to read, as well as motivation to read. My participant had a negative attitude towards reading because he felt stupid when he could not say all of the words correctly. He viewed his miscues as mistakes, showing how he messed up and didn’t read correctly, ignoring the fact that the miscue may not have affected the meaning of the text. An interview completed by Theurer and Leikam (2006) with a student revealed her having a negative attitude toward reading, because she was often corrected in front of the class by the teacher when she made a miscue, gaining the idea that a miscue was bad. Daniel had a negative connotation towards reading due to his view that good reading is reading all of the words correctly. I tried to focus our beginning sessions on high-level miscues in order to help Daniel gain confidence in himself as a reader. Once I knew he would not shut down or become frustrated, I then shifted our sessions to low level miscue discussions in order to discuss strategies to help make meaning of the text.

Teachers can help students revalue their thinking and perceptions of themselves as readers through RMA sessions, determining that miscues show that students are thinking and reveal strengths and awareness of themselves as readers (Almazroui, 2007). When using RMA,
students reflect on the reading process that they have developed and understand when they make
smart miscues, which when analyzed, do not affect the meaning of the text (Goodman, 1996). As
my participant lacked self-confidence, I preselected miscues in order to draw on his strengths as
a reader to help him recognize the smart miscues he made. Directing his attention to the reading
strategies he was using effectively boosted his confidence as a reader (Moore & Brantingham,
2003). By creating these topics for the student, the outcomes of the RMA sessions are clear,
focused, organized and more accessible for the student, building on his strengths (Moore &
Aspegren, 2001).

RMA changes the way students view the reading process as readers are invited to
discover their own miscues and talk about why they made them (Moore & Gilles, 2005).
Students become more confident when talking about their miscues, as there is no right or wrong
answers and the student is in charge, leading a discussion of what they could have done to solve
the word. I noticed Daniel continuously mentioned how he didn’t realize he said a “silly” word
as he was reading. When we listened to the audio recording, he would hear this nonsense word
and be just as shocked. This was when Daniel and I began composing a list of strategies to use to
help make meaning of the text, rather than continuing to use the ineffective strategy of sounding
out.

Summary

Retrospective miscue analysis helps deepen students’ understanding of miscues as
repeated attempts at making meaning and sense of the text. A student’s goal is to use a balance
of the three cueing systems as they read; graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic cues. Teachers
can observe reading behaviors, such as which cues students are primarily using through the use
of miscue analysis.
Goodman (1996) discusses how students’ background knowledge and experiences influence reading decisions based on predictions and explains how reading is a meaning making process. RMA is an instructional strategy that can help students value the reading process, while building confidence as readers. RMA guides students through a discussion of their own miscues with the use of audio recordings. The discussion helps students recognize the type of miscues they are making, high level or low level; whether they affect the meaning of the text or not. RMA enables students to revalue themselves as readers as well as their thoughts of the reading process.
Chapter 3
Methods and Procedures

The purpose of my study was to examine the influence Retrospective Miscue Analysis has on a reader’s perception of himself as a reader.

Research Questions

During my six-week study with an individual participant, I explored the following research questions:

1. How might retrospective miscues analysis influence the student's perception of himself as a reader?
2. How might retrospective miscue analysis contribute to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process?
3. What strategies can I use to help students make meaning while reading?

Participant

Daniel was the sole participant of the study. At the time of the study, he was nine years old and was currently in a third grade inclusive classroom. He had an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for a learning disability for processing delays. Since Kindergarten, Daniel has received intervention services, including pull-out and push-in support as well as the Leveled Literacy Intervention program (Fountas & Pinnell, 2013). His teachers have noted concern with his focus issues and the fact that he is not meeting standards in reading, writing, math, and social studies. At the time of the study, he was currently reading at a Level K in the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessment. His writing and fluency were also below grade level, as reported by his teacher.

Daniel was chosen as the participant because I have worked with the family for eight years. I babysat for Daniel and his twin sister twice a week and tutored Daniel during the
summers. Daniel’s home literacy contributed to his learning as his mother provided him with books of his choice, which were usually above his reading level and were read to him before bedtime. The leveled books sent home from his teachers were read every night by Daniel as part of his homework, if time allowed. Due to his focus issues, his homework normally took him twice as long as it should and reading was done only if time permits. His attitude toward school regarding reading was negative and he did not see himself as a good reader, thus lacking confidence. When asked what makes someone a good reader, Daniel mentioned being able to read all of the words correctly and sounding out unknown words. For this reason, RMA helped Daniel revalue his thinking and identify more effective strategies than those he was currently using (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Daniel was extremely active outdoors and enjoyed participating in Nature Club through his school. He played soccer during the summer and spent most of his time in a pool, playing with his friends, or building with his Legos. Daniel loved making forts outside and having Nerf gun wars with his neighbors, who also attend the same school. He gets along pretty well with his sister and she encourages him when reading, exclaiming how well he has done when reading a book and how much better he has gotten, which may hinder or support his perception of himself as a reader.

**Context of Study**

I worked with Daniel at his house in the evenings twice a week. I conducted the RMA sessions at the dining room table, which was where he usually worked on his homework. For this reason, I thought that this particular environment would be beneficial due to his mindset of this room being his work zone and comfortableness in the setting. The dining room had little distraction as there are no televisions, no games and no toys. Daniel’s home environment
provided the tools he needed to succeed with his schoolwork. His mother had requested that books at his level be sent home as well as work she can do with him to enhance his reading abilities. The sessions lasted about twenty to thirty minutes each as they were done after his homework completion.

While I worked with Daniel, his twin sister was completing her homework at this time, which had not proven to be a distraction to him. The environment did not have any pets, so the noise level was sufficient for Daniel to work. He often complained that it was too noisy in school with the other classes walking by in the hallway, which affected his concentration and focus. He described the ideal reading surrounding as one that was quiet with no one around who could possibly interfere with his concentration or the noise level.

**My Positionality as the Researcher**

I am a 24 year old Caucasian female working as a substitute teacher in varied districts in Western New York. I am currently obtaining my masters at The College at Brockport in Literacy Education. Prior to this I attended The College at Brockport for my undergraduate degree in childhood inclusive education. My certification includes Students with Disabilities, grades Birth-6 and Childhood Education, grades Birth-6. I am also currently obtaining my certificate in Students with Disabilities, grades 7-12. At the time of the study, I was a substitute teacher, and had the ability to work with students from Kindergarten through twelfth grade. I had worked in an 8:1:1 classroom numerous times by request which has given me the opportunity to work with students with varying needs, including severe Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and behavioral problems. These opportunities have allowed me a chance to determine effective strategies for
students with focus issues. I had a long-term substitute teaching position in a Kindergarten classroom beginning April 2013 and ending June 2013.

My relationship to Daniel formed as I began babysitting for the family when the children turned one. Daniel and his twin sister live down the street from me and I watched the children twice a week as the mother was at work. Daniel’s mom is the primary care taker of the children and the father has the children on the weekends. Daniel’s mom’s work schedule consisted of night hours as well as day hours, so my time with the children was usually in the evenings after school until the mother returned home. I helped Daniel and his sister with the completion of their homework and tried to stress how important it is to read when working with Daniel. Daniel and I had been reading the Captain Underpants series (Pilkey, 1997) before bed as this was a high interest area for him, but above his reading level. He enjoyed listening to the read aloud as well as participating in the comics inserted throughout the text.

During the summer, I tutored Daniel every day in order to help him with his everyday subjects. His mother was concerned that without the tutoring, he would lose everything he learned in the past year and fall further behind. I worked with Daniel on reading, writing, and math through interactive activities that allow Daniel to remain engaged. As Daniel loves playing outside, I tried to incorporate this into the activities. For example, we used chalk outside to work on math and writing and we built a reading fort in his backyard in the past summer. We began a comic strip activity last summer as Daniel preferred to use pictures and comics to express his writing, which he has continued through the school year due to his excitement of sharing his comics with his friends and teachers. Another activity I worked with Daniel on was identifying sight words to enhance his vocabulary. As Daniel loves building with Legos, I put sight words on each of his Lego pieces in order to build sight word towers, cars, and houses. Using Daniel’s
interests really aided his ability to focus on tasks for a certain amount of time, especially during the summer months.

I am passionate about literacy and although it is not possible to help every child in the world, I do want to help all of the children I work with. Being a part of the Literacy program at Brockport has opened my eyes to many strategies we can use for our students. Fountas and Pinnell (2009) has been a source that I have drawn on in the past and continue to use in my literacy teaching. When working with struggling readers, it is crucial to get to know the individual students in order to gain significant insight on their interests, background knowledge, and strengths I can build upon.

I believe that every child has the aptitude to learn and it is the teacher’s responsibility to alter teaching methods if the child is not learning. Scaffolding provides teachers the ability to modify instruction based on the student’s individual needs. My time is devoted to creating authentic, engaging lessons that allow students at varying levels the opportunity to learn. I believe that constant praise and immediate feedback should be given when working with children. Creating meaningful and authentic lessons enable students to engage and become active learners, thus creating life-long learners.

**Data Collection**

I gathered data through the use of interviews with Daniel and his mother, including the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, and the Burke Reading Interview. I also used audio recording sessions from our RMA sessions and observational notes recorded in a research journal as well as samples of Daniel’s work. I conducted a miscue analysis on each running record given throughout the study and used this data to aid my research.
**Interviews:**

Interviews were used as a means of gaining an understanding of Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader. The Burke Reading Interview (Goodman & Marek, 1996) allowed me to develop an understanding of his perception of himself as a reader and the reading process. It looked at strategies he used as a reader and what he did well, while noting how others have taught him to read. The questions related to his use of strategic actions as well as comprehension strategies he used to help remember what was read. I administered the interview to Daniel and read the questions to him in the first week of the study and again at the end of the six-week sessions. Daniel responded orally and I recorded his answers to each question. The Burke Reading Interview helped to answer the research question stating his ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process as well as the strategies he was already using. The interview protocol is attached as an appendix.

Interviewing his mother provided background information that was not known as I was not working in the school. The questions aided in my understanding of the strengths she sees in Daniel as a reader, along with her concerns with Daniel as a reader. It also focused on the strategies he used when coming to an unknown word while reading at home in order to build the lessons on his strengths. The interview with Daniel’s mother helped to answer my research question of how he viewed reading as a meaning making process. I administered the interview and asked Daniel’s mother questions and recorded her oral responses to the questions. The interview took place in the second week of my study and is attached as an appendix.

**Surveys:**

The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Kear, 1990) focused on his attitude, likes, and dislikes with reading. The survey helped to answer the research question relating to his
perception of himself as a reader. The attitude survey was administered by me in the first week of the study in order to help me gauge his beginning attitude of reading. I read the questions to Daniel and had him circle the Garfield figure that described how he felt about that particular question. I chose to read the questions to Daniel in order to relieve the stress and frustration reading the questions may have caused. I figured the point of the survey was to understand his responses and was not testing his reading ability. The survey aided in my research to determine his attitude and perception prior to the RMA sessions and is attached as an appendix.

**Observations of RMA sessions:**

Observations were collected to determine Daniel’s reading behaviors during RMA sessions. I recorded them in a research journal in the form of field notes throughout the entirety of the study. I observed Daniel while reading and noted his focus, attitude and perception of each reading task. His reaction to each reading task gave me insight into his attitude and the amount of participation aided in my view of his perception and focus during the lesson. The observations helped to answer all three of the research questions. The observations showed how his perception was changing while conducting RMA sessions as well as the effective strategy use he was using. The observation notes were recorded in a research journal, but the protocol is attached as an appendix.

**Oral Reading:**

I used an audio-recording device during our RMA sessions in order to help Daniel revalue his thoughts on reading. I audio-recorded his oral reading of selected texts and then also recorded the discussion we had about his miscues to determine whether they were high or low-level miscues. The audio recordings took place throughout the whole study. RMA allows the child to become
aware of his/her own reading strategies and to value his/her knowledge of the linguistic systems he/she controls (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

**Samples of work:**

I collected writing samples of his work as well as additional work we completed, such as graphic organizers throughout the study. When Daniel completed a writing activity for comprehension of the story, I kept these to view growth and development. I compiled his work in a folder and documented my findings in my research journal. These findings helped to inform my instruction.

**Running Records:**

I conducted a running record on a selected text during each RMA session in order to view reading behaviors as well as Daniel’s use of the three cueing systems. The running records helped answer the research question relating to strategies the student used while reading. I was able to document growth as well as reading behaviors, such as fluency, confidence, and use of graphophonic cues, semantic cues, and syntactic cues. I documented the miscues on a miscue analysis form and used this form to tally the amount of semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cues. I audio-recorded his oral reading and used the audio recording to determine the type of miscues he made (high or low-level).

**Data Analysis**

**Interviews:**

I looked at Daniel’s responses to the attitude survey and Burke Reading interview to determine his perception of himself as a reader, as well as his likes and dislikes. I used this information to guide my beginning lessons in order to work from his strengths. I also saw his confidence as a reader and what he viewed as good reading. After the six-weeks, I re-administered the Burke
Reading interview to see his change in perception. Using constant comparison, I was able view how his perceptions and attitudes had changed (Mertler, 2008).

**Observations:**

The observations were recorded in a research journal and used to guide my decisions on each lesson with Daniel. I collected field notes on his behaviors and attitudes during each session with him. Reflection played a key role in the observations, as I reflected on each RMA lesson in order to make adjustments for future ones. I then looked across the field notes to identify patterns and used constant comparison to identify changes in perceptions of himself as a reader (Mertler, 2008). Looking across the field notes and using constant comparison helped to determine the influence of RMA.

**Oral Reading:**

I listened to the audio recordings of Daniel’s oral reading sessions to guide my decisions for each RMA session. I then decided which miscues to bring up for a discussion after transcribing each audio recording. I first transcribed the audio recording of Daniel’s oral reading then the audio recording of our discussion of miscues and whether the miscue was a high-level or low-level. Our first few weeks focused on high level miscues in order to show Daniel that he was making meaning while reading. Once I knew he would not shut down or become frustrated, I shifted to discussing low level miscues and strategies to make meaning when reading.

**Running Records:**

I coded the running records to show his use of the three cueing systems and noticed when Daniel preferred to use one cue over another. Each miscue was marked on the running record form and then analyzed using miscue analysis. I coded self-corrections on the miscue analysis as well as inserts and omissions, which showed whether they affected the meaning of the text.
When analyzing the running records, I used a miscue analysis form and tallied semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cues. During our RMA sessions, Daniel’s goal was to focus on constructing meaning in the text so the semantic cues were the ones I was looking for on the form. The tally allowed me to notice changes or patterns that emerged in his reading. I also noted on the miscue analysis form reading behaviors I was noticing, such as excitement, annoyance, or various behaviors that showed changes in his self-perception of himself as a reader.

**Samples of work:**

The samples of work showed Daniel’s literacy growth and development. I analyzed the samples of work by viewing his understanding of the text through the graphic organizers. Although comprehension was not the main focus during the RMA sessions, it proved useful when choosing books for him. If the text was easy, but his comprehension was struggling, then I chose to incorporate this into future lessons.

The multiple sources of data analysis provided triangulation of data through the samples, observations and interviews. I looked across the data by using constant comparison and was able to view changes that occurred (Mertler, 2008).

**Procedures**

I worked with Daniel twice a week in the evenings in his own home.

**Week 1**

- I administered the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey to Daniel
- I gave the Burke Reading Interview
- I conducted reading records to determine current instructional level
• I took field notes on reading behaviors during new book

Week 2

• I interviewed Daniel’s mother

• I conducted our first RMA session. We read a new book and audio recorded Daniel’s oral reading. I pulled out specific miscues I wanted to discuss and then audio recorded our discussion of these particular miscues, focusing on whether the miscue affected the meaning of the text or not. I first pulled out miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text in order to build on Daniel’s strengths and enable confidence as a reader

• Observations and field notes were collected and reflected on in my research journal

• I analyzed previous interest and attitude surveys

Week 3

• I conducted our second and third RMA sessions, noting smart miscues he made in the new texts. I guided the discussion of the miscues and built on Daniel’s strengths

• During the third RMA session, I began to discuss miscues that affected the meaning of the text

• I recorded observations in my research journal, reflecting on how the sessions were going

• I identified patterns emerging

Week 4

• I conducted our fourth and fifth RMA sessions, recognizing when he made a smart miscue while reading and identified strengths as a reader in order to help him revalue himself as a reader

• I took observational notes and analyzed and reflected on these in my research journal
• I identified patterns and changes in perceptions-determined if he was revaluing himself as a reader and using proficient reading strategies. Helped him to understand the importance of self-evaluation

*Week 5*

• I conducted our sixth RMA session
• I identified smart miscues he was making and recognized these in order to revalue thinking and showing proficient reading strategies
• We began discussing low-level miscues and strategies we could use

*Week 6*

• I conducted our seventh RMA session, bringing our discussions to a close
• I re-administered the Burke Reading Interview
• I then compared results to first one given during our first week
• I recorded comparisons in my research journal

*Criteria for Trustworthiness*

As a teacher-researcher, I conducted the six-week study in an ethical and unbiased manner. I remained objective during the study and recorded observations as seen, and the audio-recordings were analyzed through transcription. The use of multiple data collection such as interviews, observational field notes, and RMA audio-recordings ensured triangulation, and helped to gather evidence of the influence of RMA towards the child’s perception of himself as a reader. The persistent observations took place twice a week for twenty to thirty minutes and were recorded in a research journal. Additionally the observations were documented through field notes and reflection and constant comparison was used.
In order to assure dependability, I recorded my notes in the research journal during each session making sure to include as much detail as possible. I engaged in constant comparison and recorded patterns emerging as well as evidence of Daniel’s revaluing and self-evaluation of himself as a reader. Using past research on RMA, I developed my lessons with Daniel using techniques, such as the audio-recordings and thinking in terms of his strengths, which helped to revalue his thoughts of himself as a reader (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

Summary

The prolonged engagement of the study expanded out through the six-weeks, and I conducted six RMA sessions with Daniel and continued the data collection and analysis. By using RMA, I was able to view the influence it had on Daniel as a reader and I was able to determine how his view of himself as a reader had altered to look at reading as a meaning making process rather than reading all of the words on the page correctly. Through the use of active participation and member checks, Daniel and I communicated and discussed what I was noticing and what he was noticing about himself as a reader.
Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) has on a student’s perception of himself as a reader. The study took place in the home of the participant two or three times a week for six weeks. My research questions that I explored throughout the six-week study were:

4. How might retrospective miscue analysis influence the student’s perception of himself as a reader?
5. How might retrospective miscue analysis contribute to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process?
6. What strategies can I use to help students make meaning while reading?

Throughout the six-week study, I used many different tools to examine the growth and impact RMA had on the student. I began by administering an Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Appendix F) with the participant on the first day in order to determine his current attitude toward reading. I then used observations and interviews with the participant, including a Modified Burke Reading Interview (Appendix E) and an Observation Protocol (Appendix G).

The sole participant in this study is a third grade boy who is currently reading below grade level. He is a disengaged reader who would prefer to play outside and has a negative perception of himself as a reader. The analysis of the data collected through the tools used for the research on the influence of RMA is discussed below.

The following sections discuss the data collected during this six-week study and an analysis of the growth the participant made. I worked with the participant, Daniel, twice a week, for six weeks. We began our RMA sessions with a survey so that I could grasp his attitude toward reading along with an interview to gain a sense of the current strategies Daniel uses while
reading. We then moved into our RMA sessions and audio recorded Daniel’s oral reading and discussed his miscues.

Findings

Throughout the weeks of working with Daniel, he not only gained confidence in his reading ability, but a new array of strategies to use to make meaning when coming to an unknown word. Daniel began our sessions with reluctance and hesitancy and dreaded each day I walked in the door. Through interviews and surveys, I gained a sense of Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader as well as his attitude toward reading from the beginning of the study and how these were altered by week six. I documented Daniel’s progress throughout the six-week study and his alteration in his perception of himself as a reader.

Week One: May 22, 2013 & May 24, 2013

Daniel began our RMA sessions with reluctance and annoyance. He dreaded the days when I would come to work with him. Over the first couple of weeks, Daniel would groan when I walked in the door, knowing he would be working on reading. He also made frequent comments including, “Why do I have to learn? It’s almost the summertime” and “I already did reading in school today, why do I have to do more?”

Our first session began with an introduction to why we would be working together. He assumed he was stupid and his mom wanted him to get extra help, which was not the case at all. As I have babysat for the family for many years, I was close with Daniel and his twin sister. Daniel has always been uninterested in school and would always comment on how he wished he didn’t have to attend. I attempted to make the first day enjoyable for Daniel in the hope that he would look at our sessions in a more positive light. As I pulled out a sight word game, Daniel continued to groan and note how he would rather play outside.
Me: Daniel, I thought maybe we could start by playing a game! Would you like that?

Daniel: I guess so.

Me: We start by rolling a dice and you move to that spot. If you read the word correctly, you get to pick a card and do what the card says.

Daniel: It sounds like Candyland.

Me: It is a lot like Candyland, but it will be a fun way to learn our sight words!

Daniel: Can I go first?

Me: Yes! Go ahead and roll.

*We begin playing the game and Daniel ends up winning the two games we play.

Dialogue Box 1 Week one conversation, May 22, 2013

I found once we began the sight word game, Daniel forgot about playing outside and actually seemed like he enjoyed it! He really liked winning the two games, and made sure he pointed out that he won both games! After our sight word game, I chose to give Daniel the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Johns & Lenski, 2000) (Appendix F) to gauge his current attitude toward reading. We then continued our session with a shared reading of a new text and I gave him his own writing notebook. His assignment for the night was to decorate it with his favorite stickers.

The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey located in Appendix F was administered during week one of working with Daniel. The survey helped me assess his attitude toward reading and gave me an inside look into his negative connotation toward reading. The survey consists of twenty questions which are answered with an excited Garfield figure, a slightly happy Garfield figure, a slightly angry Garfield figure, and a very angry Garfield figure. As I read the questions to Daniel, I had him circle the figure that best represented how the question made him feel,
making sure to emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers. I chose to read the questions to Daniel in order to relieve some frustration that the reading may have produced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Excited Garfield</th>
<th>Slightly Happy Garfield</th>
<th>Slightly Angry Garfield</th>
<th>Angry Garfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: How do you feel when you read a book on a rainy Saturday?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: How do you feel when you read a book in school during free time?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: How do you feel about reading for fun at home?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: How do you feel about getting a book for a present?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: How do you feel about spending free time reading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: How do you feel about starting a new book?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: How do you feel about reading during summer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: How do you feel about reading instead of playing?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: How do you feel about going to a bookstore?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: How do you feel about reading different kinds of books?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: How do you feel when the teacher asks you questions about what you read?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: How do you feel about doing reading workbook pages and worksheets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: How do you feel about reading in school?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: How do you feel about reading your school books?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: How do you feel about learning from a book?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: How do you feel when it’s time for reading in class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: How do you feel about the stories you read in reading class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: How do you feel when you read out loud in class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: How do you feel about using a dictionary?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: How do you feel about taking a reading test?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Elementary Reading Attitude Survey Results
Daniel answered with the very excited Garfield for two questions in the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey. The first one asked how he feels about learning from a book and the second one asked how he feels about using a dictionary. It is clear that Daniel enjoys learning from a book and learning new vocabulary through the use of the dictionary.

Daniel answered with the slightly happy Garfield for six of the questions. When asked how he feels about reading a book on a rainy Saturday or at home, he chose the slightly happy Garfield, which shows that he does not mind reading when at home. He then chose the slightly happy Garfield when asked how he feels when answering questions about the book and reading out loud. I was surprised by these two responses, as I assumed Daniel would be more self-conscious with reading in school, as he constantly makes comments about how his teacher “makes me read too much in school” and complains that his teacher, “always has me read books to her.” He again chose the slightly happy Garfield when asked how he feels about starting a new book. Daniel is more willing to read a new book with me than re-read an old one. Daniel constantly asked why he had to read the book again when he “read it already and knows what is going to happen.”

When asked how he feels about getting a book for a present, Daniel responded with the slightly angry Garfield. He then went on to explain that he would much rather have toys or a new game for his Wii than a book. When asked how he feels about reading different kinds of books and reading his school books, he answered with the slightly angry Garfield. This response contradicted his response to how he feels about learning from a book because he enjoys learning from a new book, but does not enjoy reading different kinds of books. I asked Daniel for clarification as to why he did not like reading his school books or different kinds of books, and he explained that his teacher always picked the books for him and he was not given a choice in
the selection. This response made me realize how choice has an effect on a student’s interest in the book and reading in general. The next question asks how he feels about doing reading worksheets and workbook pages. He again chose the slightly angry Garfield. This response matches his feeling about taking a reading test.

Daniel answered with the very angry Garfield for eight questions during the survey. When asked how he feels when it’s time for reading in class, Daniel answered with the very angry Garfield and again when asked how he feels about reading for free time, during the summer, and instead of playing. It is clear that he does not enjoy reading during school or during the summer and especially not during his free time. He expanded on these responses by explaining how he would rather play with his friends during free time than read, because free time is meant for playing. However, Daniel does mention how he slightly enjoys reading out loud in class, which makes me wonder if some types of reading in school are okay for him.

The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey gave me insight into Daniel’s attitude toward reading. Daniel did not dislike every aspect of reading; however, for many of the questions relating to reading versus playing, Daniel answered negatively. It is evident that Daniel would prefer to play rather than read; however, he does enjoy learning from a text. This observation gave me the idea to work with Daniel using non-fiction texts so he would have plenty of opportunities to learn from books. I was surprised with Daniel’s responses to reading out loud and answering questions from a book, as he chose the slightly happy Garfield figures. Daniel responded that he enjoyed learning from a book and answering questions, which I assumed he would dislike due to his negative connotation toward reading.
During week one, day two (May 24, 2013), I administered the Modified Burke Reading Interview to gain a sense of how he sees himself as a reader and the current strategies he uses and to hopefully clear up some contradictions with the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey.

The Modified Burke Reading Interview (BRI) located in Appendix E is used to help teachers understand how a student feels about himself/herself as a reader and how he/she thinks about reading (Goodman, 1996). I administered the interview in both week one and in week six in order to view possible changes in Daniel’s perception.
Modified Burke Reading Interview

Me Q1: When you’re reading a book or magazine you are interested in and come to something you don’t know, what do you do?

Daniel: I stop, think, and then sound it out.

Me: What else do you try?

Daniel: Um, I don’t know, I just sound it out.

Me Q2: What about when you’re reading your science or Social Studies textbooks and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do?

Daniel: I stop and write the word down and take half of it to see if I know the word then I sound it out.

Me Q3: What kinds of things give you trouble in reading?

Daniel: I see things around me and get distracted and I get tired reading.

Me Q4: When you get ready to read a book for school, what do you usually do?

Daniel: I usually look at how many pages there are and how easy the words are. I also look at how short the sentences are and then I will read it if it is easy and the pictures are good.

Me Q5: When you finish reading a book, how do you help yourself remember what you read?

Daniel: By going through the book again and looking at the pictures again.

Me Q6: Who do you know that you think is a good reader? What makes that person a good reader?

Daniel: I think you are a good reader because you sound good when you read a story. You make the story interesting when you read.

Me Q7: Do you think I ever come to something I don’t know when I am reading? What do you think I do?

Daniel: Yes. I think you find parts you know and cover up half the word to see if you know any of the words.

Me: Q8: Have you ever helped a friend or brother or sister when they came to something they don’t know when reading? How did you help them?

Daniel: Yes, I tell them to sound it out.
Me Q9: How does your teacher help kids who are having difficulty reading?
Daniel: She says the same strategies I use: to sound it out.

Me Q10: Do you remember how you learned to read? Tell me about it.
Daniel: You taught me by telling me to look at the pictures and mommy tells me to use the pictures and sound it out and my teachers tell me to sound it out.

Me Q11: Are you a good reader outside of school? Why do you think so? What makes you a good reader or not?
Daniel: Kind of but not really. I don’t get all the words right when I read.

Me Q12: Is there anything you would like to do better as a reader?
Daniel: No.

**Dialogue Box 2 Modified Burke Reading Interview**

Question four in the BRI asks what you do as a reader when you get ready to start a new book, to which Daniel responded, “I usually look at how many pages there are and how easy the words are. I also look at how short the sentences are and then I will read it if it is easy and the pictures are good.” This response showed Daniel’s disinterest in reading and his preference to read easy books with fewer words, in order to get through the book quicker. Questions one, two, eight and nine all ask about a strategy when coming to an unknown word to which Daniel responded with “I sound it out. Daniel overuses the sounding out strategy when reading, which often leads to his ineffective decoding of the word and leads to challenges with meaning making.

When asked in question eleven if Daniel sees himself as a good reader, he was hesitant and finally answered with “kind of, but not really.” Daniel then expanded on his response by explaining that he does not think he is a good reader because he cannot read all of the words correctly. Daniel’s impression of a good reader is someone who reads all of the words correctly.
and can read quickly. This is misleading because he views reading as merely reading words accurately at a rapid pace, rather than reading fluently and understanding the text.

When looking over the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey and BRI, I found that Daniel has a negative connotation toward reading. He prefers to read at home; however, he was reluctant when I first began my session. The Garfield figures show Daniel’s preferences and gave me insight into how choice plays a role in whether Daniel enjoys reading or not. I was able to view what is tolerable for him with reading and what Daniel highly dislikes through the figures. He then answered many of the strategy questions in the BRI with the same response: “I sound it out.” Daniel notes how his mother and teachers have taught him how to use this strategy when he comes to a word he does not know. Daniel is unable to see beyond this strategy, which often leads to low level miscues, or miscues affecting the meaning of the text.

The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey and BRI helped me gain a sense of Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader. He was hesitant and lacking confidence in his ability as a reader, which affected his reading skills. Daniel often read quickly just to get through the text and sees a good reader as someone who reads all of the words correctly. He highly dislikes reading in school, during the summer, for free time, and instead of playing. Daniel’s negative connotation toward reading continued to grow as his one ineffective strategy of sounding words out does not get him the results he wants.

Understanding the responses to the interview and survey played a role with the way I approached each RMA session. I chose to give Daniel a choice in the text, making sure to bring two different books for him to choose from, and allowing Daniel to expand his strategies through a strategies bookmark. For the second day of week one (May 24, 2013), I brought two texts for Daniel to choose from, *All about Koalas* (Ciapriano, 2008) and *All about Sharks* (Ciapriano,
I chose non-fiction texts with new and interesting facts because Daniel also mentioned from the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey that he enjoys learning from a book. Daniel noted how he had read a shark book before, so he would read the koala one. He then asked if I had any books on dogs, to which I told him I would look for some for our next session.

Daniel was aware of the routine of the sessions and how they would run. I walked into his house and said hello, seeing him ready to go at the dining room table. He had his writing notebook I had given him, which was covered in Lego and star wars stickers, a pencil and the book we read during week one, day one as a shared reading. I asked Daniel how he was doing today, to which he responded, “I would be better if I could play outside.” Clearly the reluctance had not subsided over night. I told Daniel that we had an exciting book to read today and I chose an interesting animal to read about, koalas. I began a book introduction with Daniel and was unable to finish due to Daniel grabbing the book from my hand and quickly rushing through the book, and then asked to go play once again. I recorded my observations of Daniel’s behavior and visited these notes the following week to see if I could incorporate enjoyable aspects into our sessions. Due to his enjoyment with the first day sight word game, I chose to end our session with this game, in which he won both games again.

During our second session together during week one (May 24, 2013), I assessed Daniel’s oral reading using a running record form. I found that Daniel’s miscues were typically visual and when meaning broke down, he continued reading on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: All About Koalas</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low Level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1:3.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Miscue Analysis of All about Koalas (Cipriano, 2008)
The table identifies the number of miscues made, with his self-correction rate at 1:3.8. The text was at his instructional level, scoring at 94% for accuracy rate. Of the fourteen miscues, 16 of the miscues were visual. Daniel’s main strategy of sounding it out resulted in the miscues looking visually similar, but affecting the meaning of the text.

The table identifies high and low level miscues in order to grasp when meaning was disrupted. Daniel read the sentence “The little koala stays in its mother’s special pouch” as “The little koala stays in its mother’s spiles puch,” self-correcting “puch” for the correct word. Daniel did not self-correct the word “spiles,” which did affect the meaning of the text, thus making it a low level miscue. He then goes on to read “The joey travels on its mother’s back” as “The joey traves on its mother’s back.” This again portrays a low level miscue as it does not make sense in the text and identifying his need to self-monitor when reading.

Daniel began reading the text with great expression, but slowly began to rush through the remainder of the text, ignoring punctuation. Daniel would pause when he came to an unknown word, but quickly made up a word as a place holder in order to continue reading. Daniel assumed if he could read through the book as quickly as possible, then he would be able to go play with his friends. When he realized this was not the case, he would always look at how many pages the book included and groan when he saw the ending page number and the amount of words on each page. Daniel knew once we finished reading the text, we were not done discussing it, but instead would then discuss particular miscues that I picked out in the following sessions. When Daniel looked at how many words were on each page, he did not view himself capable of reading a book with more than simple sentences. Daniel would often complain the book had too many pages because in school, he only read books with ten pages. I tried to make him realize that he
could read this book, even though it was a bit longer than the ones at school by helping him to realize that just because a book has a lot of pages, does not mean the words are harder.

Daniel’s main strategy when reading this text was to sound out unknown words. However, when Daniel read “Koalas have thick fur and white chests” as “Koalas have thick fur and while chests,” I noted that he self-corrected by looking at the picture. Using the picture clue to help decide the unknown word resulted in a self-correction and marked a strength in his reading. I realized that Daniel did know other strategies for reading, but was not as likely to use them because sounding it out was what he was most familiar with and it was easiest for him. He used the picture one other time, which also resulted in a self-correction. Daniel read the sentence “Mothers and babies make soft sounds” as “Mothers and bab eyes make soft sounds.” Daniel went back and self-corrected the word “babies” after looking at the picture.

Daniel also made high level miscues, which I made sure to point out first in our discussion. Daniel read the sentence “Some people are cutting down trees to make room for houses” as “Some people are cutting down trees to make room for homes.” When Daniel read “homes” for “houses,” it did not disrupt the meaning and it still made sense. When discussing this with Daniel, I asked him if what he read sounded okay. He told me that “houses and homes is the same thing, so it makes sense. I don’t know why I read homes instead, but maybe that’s just what I was thinking when I saw the word.” I pulled this out as a strength, seeing Daniel capable of identifying when something still made sense to him, rather than shutting down completely, like I was worried was going to happen.

When discussing the text after the first reading, Daniel was very brief with his responses.
Me: So tell me some things that you learned about in this book.

Daniel: I learned about koalas.

Me: What types of things did you learn about koalas?

Daniel: They have sharp claws.

Me: Did you learn anything else or what do they need sharp claws for?

Daniel: Well they use them to climb trees cus it sticks their paws in the tree better. I also learned that the mom carries the baby in a pouch.

Me: Does the koala remind you of any other animal?

Daniel: *Looks back at pictures. It reminds me of a dog.

Me: How come it reminds you of a dog?

Daniel: Well this baby picture (points to the picture) reminds me of a dog when it is a baby.

Me: Why are trees so important to a koala? What do you think?

Daniel: They have food and water.

Me: Can you tell me more about why trees are important?

Daniel: No.

Me: Well it sounds like you learned some interesting things about koalas. When you read, you also taught me new things that I didn’t know about koalas either!

Daniel: I guess so.

Dialogue Box 3 Comprehension discussion of *All about Koalas* (Cipriano, 2008)

Our discussion following the reading required many prompts to get Daniel to expand on his responses. Daniel’s answers to the questions were brief and did not give much detail from the text. He was able to discuss things within the text, but struggled to take his responses beyond the text.
Summary

Week one brought many surprises that helped shape the remainder of my sessions with Daniel. When looking over the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey and the BRI, I found key responses that would help me understand Daniel as a reader. Daniel enjoyed having a choice in the text he would read and also gave his own suggestions for things he wanted to read about. I took these into consideration as I chose books for our sessions and always made sure I had at least two texts for Daniel to choose from. Based on Daniel’s responses to the BRI, I found his “go to” strategy was sounding it out; however, once reading a text with me, I noticed Daniel was able to use the picture clues, which resulted in self-corrections. My observation notes helped me gauge where Daniel was as a reader and what he viewed as his own strengths. Although Daniel looked at reading as merely reading all of the words accurately, he made high level miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text, which I would bring out as a strength to Daniel.

During the second week, Daniel and I really looked at his high level miscues in order to help him recognize his own strength in reading.


Week two began our first RMA sessions. Daniel welcomed me with the same resistance and disinterest in our lessons. Walking into the dining room, I found Daniel sitting at the dining room table, grumbling about how he couldn’t play with his friends outside until he was all done. I brought my audio recorder to this session and Daniel was intrigued, asking what it was and how it worked. I told Daniel we would be using the recorder while he read a story aloud and if he wanted, he could push the start button. This gained Daniel’s interest instantly, and after our book introduction, Daniel was able to push start. I gave Daniel a choice between two texts I had
chosen and he chose to read the text *All about Sharks* (Cipriano, 2008) because it included one of his favorite animals and he enjoyed reading non-fiction texts that could teach him new facts, as seen in the BRI. When reading, Daniel read with great expression and commented on particular parts. I commented in my observation notes how when Daniel read a fact he already knew he would stop and exclaim, “Duh! I already knew that!” He then made text-self connections, mentioning how he saw a shark at the aquarium in Myrtle Beach last summer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: All About Sharks</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Miscue Analysis of *All about Sharks* (Cipriano, 2008)

When looking over the miscues, I noticed once again that Daniel relied heavily on the visual cueing system. When meaning broke down, Daniel continued to read and created a place holder word that looked similar to the one on the page, but did not make sense in the text. Daniel did make structurally acceptable miscues at times along with high level miscues. When Daniel read, “Sharks have many rows of teeth,” as “sharks have many row of teeth,” the miscue did not disrupt the meaning of the text. Daniel was able to continue reading and identify the word through the use of picture clues. He left off the ending of a second miscue, reading the word “harder” as “hard.” I observed Daniel using picture clues during this reading, which showed me that he does have strategies to help him make meaning of the text, he is just not using them consistently.

Daniel made five low level miscues, affecting the meaning of the text, but continued reading. Daniel read the sentence “Sharks have great balance” as “Sharks have great bananas.” This clearly does not make sense, but Daniel continued reading on without self-correcting. It
visually looks similar to the word on the page, but makes no sense in the context. He again made a low level miscue when reading the sentence “Sharks swim fast, swinging their tails back and forth” as “Sharks swim fast, singing their tails back and forth.” The miscue is again visually similar; however, it affects the meaning of the text.

During the reading, Daniel self-corrected one time for meaning. He read the sentence “There are many different kinds of sharks found in the ocean” as “There are many different kinds of sharks fund in the ocean,” self-correcting the word “fund” with the correct word. Daniel did not re-read the whole sentence, but he re-read the word “fund” twice before self-correcting. He also made six high level miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text. Daniel read the sentence “Many people are afraid of sharks” as “Many people are scared of sharks,” which did not affect the meaning of the text, thus making it a high level miscue. When discussing this miscue with him, Daniel noted how the two words mean the same thing and understood that because they mean the same thing, it made sense in the text.

When I arrived for day two during week two (May 29, 2013), I chose to focus the first RMA session on the high level miscues from the reading of All About Sharks (Cipriano, 2008) in order to help Daniel gain confidence in his reading. We began by replaying his oral reading and focusing on the miscue, scared. Daniel read the sentence “Many people are afraid of sharks” as “Many people are scared of sharks,” which did not affect the meaning of the text or the structural aspect.
Me: When you read the word scared as afraid, did it still make sense?

Daniel: Yea, I guess so. But it was still a mistake.

Me: The miscue that you made did still make sense and it also sounded right in the text! That was excellent!

Daniel: I don’t know why I said scared. I mean, I see that it starts with an “a” so it can’t be scared.

Me: Yes, but it did not affect the meaning of the text and it still sounded right.

**Dialogue Box 4 RMA discussion of *All about Sharks* (Cipriano, 2008)**

Daniel said that his miscue was a mistake. I tried to use the language of it being a miscue, rather than a mistake, emphasizing that it still made sense and sounded right. I chose this miscue to discuss because it was a good starting point to build up his confidence with this high level miscue.

I talked with Daniel about strategies he uses when he comes to an unknown word in the BRI and he mentioned sounding out as his primary strategy.
Me: So when you come to a word that you don’t know, what do you do?

Daniel: I sound it out.

Me: Do you try anything else?

Daniel: Not really. I mean I look at the pictures to see if that helps, like my teacher told me to do.

Me: Well that is another good strategy! And you know what? I noticed that you used the pictures to help you when reading and you corrected a word when reading because of this strategy!

Daniel: Yea.

Me: *References to previous session-When you used the picture in the koala book, you saw that the koala’s chest was white and you were able to read the word correctly and make a self-correction!*

Me: I have something for you that I think may be useful for you when you read. I made this bookmark for you and you can use it to help you when you come to a word you don’t know.

*I then go over each of the strategies on the bookmark that will help Daniel when he comes to a word he does not know or when he reads a word that does not make sense.*

**Dialogue Box 5 RMA discussion of strategies when coming to an unknown word**

I presented Daniel with a reading strategy bookmark and highlighted the *look to the pictures strategy* and *re-reading strategy*. Daniel noted how his reading teacher at school also used a bookmark, but it looked a little different than this one. He said it helped him remember what strategy to use because he couldn’t remember any of the other strategies, other than sounding it out. I mentioned how he had previously used the picture clue strategy which led to a self-correction during our discussion of *All about Koalas* (Cipriano, 2008).

As our first RMA session came to a close, I wondered if this was how the remainder of the sessions would go; Daniel proving to be annoyed and short with his responses. As much as I tried to push his strengths and positive aspects of his reading, he did not seem to notice that he was doing great things while reading. Daniel’s mindset was stuck on the negatives and the fact that he continued to make “mistakes” while reading. Daniel did enjoy listening to his oral
reading and he enjoyed being able to push “play”; however, when discussing the high level
miscues, he did not seem interested. I explained to Daniel that he made some smart miscues
when reading and he used a great strategy when he looked to the picture, but Daniel continued to
groan as the discussion went on.

The third day we met during the second week, (May 31, 2013) Daniel read the text,
Edwin’s Haircut (McCloskey, 2008). Daniel’s mom asked if I would meet with him three days
this week, which I agreed to do. It also gave me a chance to discuss his progress with his mom
and interview her to gain insight on Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader.

Following the reading of Edwin’s Haircut, (McCloskey, 2008) Daniel and I discussed the
text and he seemed extremely short with his responses, ending with “Can we be done? I want to
go play.” As this was ending week two, his annoyance still held strong and Daniel still viewed
reading as a chore.
Me: What was the problem in the story Edwin’s Haircut?

Daniel: He got a bad haircut

Me: Tell me more about this bad haircut

Daniel: Well, his mom and dad gave him one and it looked really bad.

Me: How did they solve this problem?

Daniel: They got him a wig hat to wear.

Me: How did this make Edwin feel?

Daniel: He felt annoyed.

Me: How do you think Edwin felt when he first saw his haircut?

Daniel: Ahhhh!!!!!

Me: Tell me more about why he would scream like that?

Daniel: He was angry at how bad his hair looked.

Me: How was the beginning and ending of the story similar?

Daniel: I don’t know. Can we be done? I want to go play.

**Dialogue Box 6 Comprehension discussion of Edwin’s Haircut (McCloskey, 2008)**

Daniel’s comprehension of the text was mainly within the text and only briefly went beyond the text. He understood the main point in the text, but was prompted to go further with his responses. As he was getting frustrated with our discussion, I chose to end it when he asked to be done. We then moved into playing sight word bingo and making our sight words with chalk outside. I found that Daniel enjoyed being able to do things outside, so I tried to incorporate our word work with going outside and with playing games.
As I audio recorded Daniel’s oral reading and took a running record, I noticed he self-corrected two of the eleven miscues. When Daniel self-corrected, he self-corrected for meaning, going back and re-reading what he previously read. I made sure to point this out as a strength, showing Daniel how when something did not make sense, he re-read for meaning. Daniel again commented on how many mistakes he made while reading, but at least some of them sounded okay. This was a push in the right direction, as Daniel was finally recognizing his strength, even if it was a small comment. Daniel read the sentence “Good morning, Ruff, he said to his shaggy son” as “Good morning, Ruff, he said to his shungy son,” but then went back and re-read to self-correct for meaning. When replaying this in the recording during the next session, (see table 3, Week three, day one, June 3, 2013), Daniel noted “I don’t know why I said that word. It’s not even a real word!” His observation that this was not a real word helped me emphasize on his use of re-reading. I then highlighted this strategy on his bookmark.

I noticed that Daniel was beginning to use the three cuing system during this reading. Although he only made two miscues, more of his miscues were high level and did not disrupt the meaning while reading. During the reading, Daniel read the sentence “Mom put some newspapers on the floor and sat Edwin in a chair,” as “Mom put some newspapers on the floor and sat Edwin in the chair.” Replacing the word “a” for “the” still makes sense in the text and it works structurally. He then read the sentence “It doesn’t look right,” said Dad,” as “It doesn’t look right, Dad said,” which again is a high level miscue, as it does not affect the meaning of the text and structurally works in the text.
The recording of our RMA sessions also helped me gain a sense of Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader. Although he enjoyed listening to himself read, when I discussed a particular miscue with him during week two, he commented how he “read the word wrong again.” In my observation notes, I commented on Daniel’s response to reading words wrong. He exclaimed “It’s because the book was too hard!” The book was at his independent level, indicating that when he did not read the word correctly, he created the excuse that the book was too hard. Daniel made frequent comments about the level of the text, deciding before even reading a book that it would be too difficult due to its Fountas and Pinnell level. Daniel would often look to the level of the text, exclaiming that the level was too high because he was only at a level K at school. Daniel’s school uses the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark system, and I had access to these books as well. Labeling himself as a level K made him feel defeated when he read books above this level. He would immediately become frustrated with me for choosing a level L, even though I knew his background knowledge would benefit his reading in this text. He had also read numerous level K books at an independent level, but because his teacher had not assessed him at a new level, he still believed himself at a K. The level he was placed at influenced his perception of himself as a reader because he did not believe himself capable of anything above a K.

Daniel viewed the miscues as mistakes and considered himself dumb because he could not read all of the words correctly. This conveys the same perception when giving the Modified Burke Reading Interview when Daniel told me that he was not a good reader because he “could not read all the words right.” Daniel also looked over my shoulder as I conducted the running record. He noted how many miscues he had made and grumbled when he saw another one written out of the corner of his eye.
I ended day three by interviewing Daniel’s mom while Daniel played outside with his sister.

Me: I have really enjoyed working with Daniel these last few days! I do want to hear from you in order to grasp more of how Daniel views himself as a reader and things that you notice when working with him. What strengths in reading do you see in your son?

Mom: He really gets into a book when reading and always has great expression. He makes things sound silly when they are meant to and changes his voice when he sees bold print or exclamation points.

Me: What strengths in writing do you see in Daniel?

Mom: He is really creative! I love when he makes up his own comic strips and thinks up these crazy characters. He doesn’t enjoy writing a paper or a paragraph, but give him a comic strip and he can’t stop writing!

Me: How do you help your son when he comes to an unknown word when reading?

Mom: Well, he tries to sound the word out and when he can’t get it or if he gets it wrong, I’ll tell him the correct word. I’ll ask him to look at the pictures to help him, but I don’t want him to become so frustrated that he quits, so I’ll often just tell him the word so he can keep reading.

Me: What do you notice about Daniel’s attitude while reading? What about during writing?

Mom: Well when reading, it is like pulling teeth. He hates to read and when he has to read at night for homework, he groans and complains. It’s quite a hassle to get him to read, especially if he has already completed math homework because then he is frustrated and tired out. Writing is a little bit better, but he only writes one sentence to answer each question. If I ask him to write more, he will tell me that he already wrote enough for that question. But like I said before with comics, he makes those up on his own, mainly drawing pictures and adding some dialogue.

Me: What concerns do you have for Daniel in reading and writing?

Mom: I fear that he will become so frustrated with reading that he will just give up and quit. I also fear that when he is asked to write an essay for school, he won’t be able to write more than one sentence, because that is all he feels capable of. I honestly don’t see Daniel as a confident reader or writer and I know he is capable of so much more than he gives off! I just wish he would put more effort into reading and writing and take them more seriously in school.

Dialogue Box 7 Interview with Daniel’s mother

Concluding the interview with Daniel’s mom, I realized that it had given me insight into various aspects of Daniel’s reading. As Daniel spends the majority of his time with mom, she is
ultimately the one who works on homework with him. When Daniel has the homework assignment to read for twenty minutes a night, she sits with him and reads with him. Understanding the strategies she used with Daniel helped me see the additional reading support he has at home.

Daniel’s mom stated that when he comes to an unknown word, she listens to him sound out the word and before he becomes too frustrated, she tells him the word. She does have him look to the pictures for assistance; however, she also has a limited amount of strategies to use with Daniel when reading. By suggesting that he sound out words or merely telling Daniel the word so he “does not become too frustrated and quit,” she is hindering his reading growth. Allowing Daniel the chance to solve the words himself would be more beneficial than his mom telling him each unknown word.

Summary

Daniel continued to view miscues as mistakes, discouraging him as he sees the amount of miscues noted on each running record. I noted how when he became frustrated, he would hit his hand against his head and exclaim how dumb or stupid he was because he couldn’t read all of the words correctly. Daniel viewed reading as merely reading all of the words correctly, and not focusing on the strengths he does exhibit, as seen in his responses to the BRI during week one. As I observed and recorded Daniel during the RMA sessions, I noticed that he was mainly using visual cues during the first running record, but then began using the three cueing systems in the second running record. When Daniel used the three cueing systems, he focused on the amount of miscues he made, rather than the high level miscues he made. Daniel continued to focus on his main strategy of sounding out when he came to an unknown word. He also used re-reading to self-correct when something did not make sense or sound right, in which I complimented him on
during our discussions. I focused our miscue discussions around his high-level miscues because I did not want Daniel to shut down or become frustrated and discouraged. I also chose to focus on the high level miscues to help make Daniel aware of the meaning and structural cues he was using when reading.

This second week helped me view not only Daniel’s strategies, but how his mother helped him with his homework. After conducting an interview with Daniel’s mom, I realized that she also had a limited amount of strategies to use when Daniel came to an unknown word. She stated how “he tries to sound the word out and when he can’t get it or if he gets it wrong, I’ll tell him the correct word. I’ll ask him to look at the pictures to help him, but I don’t want him to become so frustrated that he quits, so I’ll often just tell him the word so he can keep reading.” This help from his mom is actually hindering his growth as a reader; as she is merely telling him the correct word and not helping him solve the word correctly or use the three cueing systems.

**Week Three June 3, 5, and 7, 2013**

Week three day one (June 3, 2013), we went back to the text *Edwin’s Haircut* (McCloskey, 2008) in order to review the high level miscues in his oral reading. I had picked out the miscues we would discuss and again focused on the ones that did not break down the meaning.
Me: Let’s listen to part of your reading when we read the book Edwin’s Haircut last time.

*Listens to miscue when he reads “Mom put some newspapers on the floor and sat Edwin in a chair” as “Mom put some newspapers on the floor and sat Edwin in the chair”

Me: Did you notice how you read the word a as the?

Daniel: Yea

Me: Did that still make sense? *I play the sentence again for him to hear

Daniel: Yes, it makes sense and it sounds right there. I mean “a” and “the” kinda mean the same thing and a chair or the chair both sound right.

Me: Excellent! Yes they do sound right! This miscue that you made did not affect the meaning of the text which was great!

Daniel: The words don’t look anything alike.

Me: Yes, but they make sense and sound right!

*Listens to second sentence in recording when Daniel reads “If we don’t, he’s not going to have any hair left!” as “If we didn’t, he’s not going to have any hair left!”

Me: After listening to the recording, did the miscue that you made still make sense?

Daniel: Yes it did! The whole sentence still makes sense and it the words basically mean the same thing. That was a smart one wasn’t it?

Me: Yes, that was a very smart miscue!

Dialogue Box 8 RMA discussion of the text Edwin’s Haircut (McCloskey, 2008)

Our discussion during this RMA session helped Daniel recognize that a miscue can show that he is truly thinking about reading. I highlighted his strength of recognizing that his miscue did not disrupt the meaning of the text and that it still sounded right. When Daniel exclaimed that the “whole sentence still made sense,” he was able to see the smart miscue that he made. This also identified a shift in Daniel’s perception of reading. Daniel previously referenced miscues as “mistakes” and looked at himself as dumb because of these mistakes. However, Daniel finally realized that the miscues he made were smart due to them making sense in the text. When Daniel
exclaimed, “That was a smart one wasn’t it?” he shifted his perception in order to see how even though he made a miscue, it did not affect the meaning of the text.

In session two during this week (June 5, 2013), I saw a brief alteration in his perception of himself as a reader. The lesson began with word work and creating a comic strip together on the book we read during the previous session. I then had Daniel push play on the audio recorder as we read the new book *More than a Pet* (Latham, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: More than a Pet</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Miscue analysis of *More than a Pet* (Latham, 2008)

I observed in my notes after reviewing our discussion of the miscues that Daniel self-corrected two of the three miscues for meaning and he was continuing to use the three cuing systems. He was focusing on meaning, structural and visual cues when reading and re-read when meaning broke down. Daniel read the sentence “Do you know anyone who has a pet dog” as “Do you know anyyoung who has a pet dog,” re-reading the whole sentence and self-correcting the word “anyyoung” with the correct word. As I introduced the strategy bookmark to Daniel, I reviewed various strategies that he would be able to use when he came to an unknown word. Daniel chose to use the re-reading strategy, resulting in a self-correction for meaning, which I made sure to point out during our discussion. He again self-corrected for meaning when he read the sentence “Therapy dogs cheer people up when they are sad because they are not feeling well” as “Therapy dogs shear people up when they are sad because they are not feeling well,” self-correcting “sheer” for the correct word. Daniel noted when he was reading that “sheer” did not
sound right because it was not a real word. He then went back and re-read, self-correcting for meaning.

I noticed a shift in Daniel’s reading habits during this session as Daniel was beginning to recognize when something did not sound right or make sense. He was also able to identify that he created a nonsense word when he read the word sheer. Daniel continued to make high level miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text. In the text, *More than a Pet*, (Latham, 2008) Daniel read the sentence, “Sometimes people can not stay at home because they are not well,” as “Sometimes people can’t stay at home because they are not well.” This miscue does not affect the meaning of the text and it is also visually similar. Daniel again does this when he reads the word “are not” as “aren’t.”

I again worked with Daniel a third time this week on his mother’s request (June 7, 2013). I began our discussion on day three with high level miscues and then introduced a low level miscue to identify strategies that we could use to help make the miscue make sense. Below is the conversation following the reading of the text, discussing his miscues.
*I chose to begin by discussing a high-level miscue, and then moving on to a low-level miscue.

Me: I noticed when you were reading today, you were really thinking what made sense and if something sounded right! I also noticed that you self-corrected when something did not make sense by re-reading the whole sentence. That was excellent!

Me: Let’s look at when you read the sentence “Service dogs go to the special school where they are trained to help their owner” as “Service dogs go to a special school where they are trained to help their owners.” Did it make sense when you read the word “the” for “a?”

*Listens to audio recording of oral reading*

Daniel: Yea, it still makes sense and it sounds right when I hear it again. I didn’t notice it was a mistake until I followed along with my finger and heard myself say it wrong.

Me: Well that was great that it still sounds right and makes sense! That means you made a smart miscue!

Daniel: It doesn’t look anything like the word.

Me: How can we fix that next time?

Daniel: I could look at the word to see if it matches up and also check my reading more carefully.

Me: Those would be wonderful strategies to use! I also noticed you used a strategy we have on our bookmark. You went back and re-read and self-corrected when something did not make sense. *Listens to recording- You did that when you read the word “sheer” for “cheer.”

Daniel: Yea, sheer doesn’t sound like a real word and it doesn’t make sense. But I fixed it.

Me: Yes you did! Let’s look at another miscue that didn’t make as much sense when you read it and talk about what you could have done.

Listen to replaying of reading. Daniel reads sentence “Addie is a gentle pup” as “Addie is a grettle pup.”

Me: I noticed you said the word “grettle” when the word was actually “gentle.”

Daniel: Yea that doesn’t sound right. It’s a made up word I think.

Me: What could you have done since that word doesn’t sound right or make sense?

Daniel: I could have used one of the strategies on my bookmark, like finding a chunk I know, cus I do know gen and then I could have just said tle!
Daniel was beginning to recognize when something did not make sense or sound right. He was also beginning to understand the significance of having an array of strategies and using them on his bookmark. Looking back at session one, Daniel’s sole strategy was to sound out when it did not make sense and in this week he was re-reading and monitoring his reading, as seen in the discussion above.

When asked what he could have done when he came to that unknown word, Daniel mentioned that he could have used the chunking strategy, which focuses solely on decoding the word. However, he also could have skipped the word and gone back, which would help Daniel on using meaning cues to guide him in understanding the unknown word.

When reviewing the Modified Burke Reading Interview (BRI), I took a close look at question five, asking what Daniel does to remember what he had read. During the first week, Daniel responded that he looks back at the pictures to try to remember what was happening on each page. I reviewed the running records for the first two weeks and noticed how his comprehension fell under the literal category. Daniel rarely went beyond the text and stayed within the text when answering comprehension questions. During our RMA sessions, I conducted running records on Daniel’s reading. The comprehension portion included questions within the text, beyond the text, and about the text. Daniel scored high on the within the text and about the text questions, scoring a three out of three on each running record. However, Daniel often scored a two out of three, and on one running record, a one out of three, when answering beyond the text questions. He responded with yes or no answers and did not go into much detail. For example, when reading *All about Koalas*, (Cipriano, 2008) Daniel responded that koalas also
remind him of dogs, but did not explain his reasoning. He noted how if all the trees are cut down, it would be bad for the koalas, not explaining how. Daniel needed many prompts in order to expand on his responses. We began week one with this new book and Daniel was excited to learn about Koalas, but rushed ahead to read rather than waiting for the book introduction to be complete.

When viewing the running record during week three, I noticed a gain in his comprehension in comparison to the first two weeks. Daniel scored a six on the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark text out of a possible seven. Daniel’s responses to within the text questions scored the highest at a three out of three, similar to the first few weeks of reading. The change I noticed came in the beyond the text questions. Daniel began adding details and explanations to his reasons, which was not occurring in week one and two. When asked “Why do you think dogs can be so helpful?” Daniel responded with “Because they are big animals and they can help keep people safe and do things for them, and a cat is small so they are not as helpful.” This response not only answers the question, but he then continues on to make the comparison to a cat. I made sure to praise Daniel for this response, emphasizing the fact that he didn’t merely answer with a yes or no, but expanded on his response. When asked what he learned about service and therapy dogs, Daniel responded with “They help cheer people up and help people get things. They also help some people walk and make sure it’s okay to walk.” This response again requires few prompts and goes into detail on how the two types of dogs can be helpful.

Summary

Week three brought alterations in Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader, and also gains in specific areas. Daniel began to recognize his strengths and use them while reading. He understood the importance of using more than the sounding it out strategy and was monitoring
his reading more carefully, self-correcting miscues that affected the meaning of the text. Daniel began to re-read when something did not make sense, which almost always led to a self-correction. When discussing low level and high level miscues, Daniel saw what he could have done and understood if it was a smart miscue and how he could make his miscues smart in the future. Daniel also began to expand on his responses when discussing the text and continued to make text-self connections.

**Week Four June 12, 2013 and June 14, 2013**

Entering week four, Daniel showed a continued shift in perception of himself as a reader. I began week four, day one (June 12, 2013) with a new text for Daniel to read. I again gave Daniel a choice in the text as I found this had an impact on his willingness to read with me. Daniel chose the text *Dog Stories*, (Latham, 2008) and explained that the dog on the front cover reminded him of his past dog that he used to have because they were both yellow labs. The text was at his instructional level and he continued using the three cueing system, as seen in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: Dog Stories</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low Level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 Miscue Analysis of Dog Stories (Latham, 2008)*

When listening to Daniel read, I noticed that his bored tone of voice became full of expression as he read more of the text. He began with reluctance; however, compared to the previous weeks, he was much more willing to work with me now and I was seeing a difference in his attitude. Daniel used his strategy bookmark as he re-read for a self-correction and actually skipped a word he did not know and went back to it, which helped him decide what word would make sense. Daniel made three self-corrections, which were all self-corrected for meaning.
When Daniel read the sentence, “I have a lab named Golden Boy,” as “I have a lap named Golden Boy,” Daniel re-read the whole sentence which resulted in the self-correction. When reading the sentence, “Her voice got more excited as she read the last few lines,” as “Here voice got more excited as she read the last few lines,” Daniel went back and re-read, but he skipped the first word, reading on and going back to decide what word would make sense. I noted in the margins how Daniel exclaimed that here looks the same, but didn’t make sense, so he knew the correct word was her, because that made sense. As Daniel read, he used what we had discussed in previous RMA sessions to help him with this new story. Daniel also continued to use the three cueing systems and made high and low level miscues that were brought up for discussion on the second day (June 14, 2013).

Following our reading of the text, I asked Daniel questions and he again scored a six out of seven with within the text and beyond the text questions.
Me: So what happened in this story?

Daniel: The girl was reading to her dog and it made her want to write to the author about her dog.

Me: Then what happened?

Daniel: She wrote to the author and really wanted an answer back.

Me: Why do you think she wanted an answer so bad?

Daniel: Well she put a picture of her dog in the envelope too because she wanted the author to write a story about her dog. But then she decided to write her own story about her dog.

Me: Why did April want the author to write a story about Golden Boy?

Daniel: Because he was her favorite dog and when she was reading the story, it reminded her of Golden Boy and she thought it would be cool if the author wrote a story about her dog.

Me: What do you think April learned about being a writer?

Daniel: Well she was starting her own story, so she probably realized that it will be a lot of work. Writers write a lot of pages in each book, like this one that I read! So if April wants to write her own book, she needs to have a lot to write about. You also have to know a lot of stuff to be a writer.

**Dialogue Box 10 Comprehension discussion of the text, *Dog Stories* (Latham, 2008)**

Daniel went into detail about the questions he was asked. When working with Daniel during week one and week two, Daniel’s responses were brief and mainly yes or no answers. Here, Daniel went into detail and explained his thinking. I enjoyed the comment about being a writer, knowing that “writers write a lot of pages in each book.” Although Daniel gained confidence in his reading ability, he still looked at books as the amount of pages.

The second day we met this week (June 14, 2013), I conducted an RMA session to discuss *Dog Stories* (Latham, 2008). I chose to focus on low-level miscues as Daniel continued to comment on his own miscues during reading. I chose to shift to a discussion of low-level miscues because Daniel was beginning to understand how his miscues made sense and were
structurally accurate. This shift allowed Daniel to implement the strategies he had been learning to continue making sense of the text as he read.

After listening to his miscue “April put a photograph of Golden Boy in the envelope, along with the letter” as “April put a photograph of Golden Boy in the envolded, along with the letter.”

Daniel: That word should be envelope.

Me: Yes, you’re right! How did you know that?

Daniel: Well envolded isn’t a real word and it doesn’t make sense. I don’t know why I said that. Plus you put a letter in an envelope.

Me: Yes! Exactly, so next time, you can make sure the word makes sense and use the other words to help you decide what makes sense.

Daniel: Yea, like the word letter would have given me the idea that it was an envelope, but I don’t know what I was thinking when I read that.

Dialogue Box 11 RMA discussion of the text Dog Stories (Latham, 2008)

This discussion helped Daniel use the strategy of context clues to help in deciding what word made sense. Daniel recognized that the word he read did not make sense during our RMA session and did not get discouraged, but rather wondered why he said the word incorrectly. I then chose a second low level miscue to focus on during this session, seeing Daniel’s ability to recognize how to make sense the next time. Daniel read the sentence, “Find your leash, Boy” as “Find your lash, Boy.” After replaying the audio-recording, we discussed the low level miscue.

Daniel: That word should be leash.

Me: Yes it should be. What could you have done with this miscue to make sure it made sense?

Daniel: The picture shows her putting a leash on her dog, so I guess I didn’t look at the picture, cus that would have been a good way to figure out that word.

Me: That would have been a good strategy. You have used that strategy before and it helped you make sense of the word!

Daniel: I also could have stopped when I heard myself say the wrong word, cus last time I also went back and you told me how I re-read it, which was a good thing.

Dialogue Box 12 RMA discussion of the text Dog Stories (Latham, 2008)
During this conversation, Daniel commented on a past strategy that was suggested to him. Daniel noted how he could have gone back and re-read when he said the word incorrectly. He also mentioned how he could have looked to the picture, again using a strategy for meaning. This showed Daniel’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process and his use of the three cueing systems.

I noticed a shift in not only Daniel’s attitude, but also his confidence in himself as a reader. As Daniel became more familiar with strategies to help make meaning, he was more willing to use these in his reading and suggest them during our RMA conversations. Daniel began our sessions exclaiming that he did not know the word and mentioned that he did not know what to do when he came to an unknown word. Now, as Daniel was learning new strategies, he was able to implement these as he read. Daniel was recognizing nonsense words and often exclaimed that he didn’t even realize he said the “silly word.” This contributed to Daniel’s increased confidence in himself as a reader.

Summary

This fourth week brought many new insights into Daniel as a reader. I chose to focus our RMA session on low level miscues because he was beginning to understand how his miscues still made sense and were structurally accurate in the text and because he was beginning to use the three cueing systems. Daniel proved to not become frustrated during these conversations, as I was afraid would happen, shifting from our discussion of high level to low level miscues. When replaying a low level miscue, I discussed with Daniel what he could have done to make sense. Daniel automatically replied with the correct word, and commented on the fact that the word he read did not make sense and he did “not know why he said that.”
Daniel noted how he could look to the pictures or he could have re-read the sentence in order to make sense of the reading. Both of these strategies suggested that he was using meaning to help understand the unknown word. This shift made me realize that what we had previously discussed in RMA sessions was transferring over to each new session.

**Week Five June 19, 2013 and June 21, 2013**

I began week five with a sight word game that was played with Daniel’s sister and me. We played sight word Bingo and reviewed the common words on which we had been working. Daniel enjoyed the games we could play together and also liked including his sister. Daniel enjoyed showing his sister what he had been working on and especially liked beating her at Bingo! Following the game, I had Daniel re-read a book from our previous session before reading the new book, *Surprising Animal Senses* (Ruby, 2008). This text was at Daniel’s instructional level and he read with expression and interest in his voice. When Daniel built background knowledge, he became excited that he was continuing to learn new things about animals, because in the other book, he was able to learn about dogs. When asked what he thought this text would be about, he made a connection to a previous text read. Daniel commented that “it may talk about the sense of smell and sight like in the shark book I read. I don’t see any sharks in the pictures, but maybe it will talk about other animals, like butterflies, cuz they are in the pictures.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: Surprising Animal Senses</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low Level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1:3.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7 Miscue Analysis of Surprising Animal Senses (Ruby, 2008)*
Daniel self-corrected five times during this reading, all five for meaning. I noted in the margins and on the observation template that Daniel re-read which led to self-corrections and also re-read when he became confused during reading. Daniel read the sentence “When butterflies land on flowers, they use taste buds on their feet to know if the flowers are good to eat,” as “When butterflies land on flowers, they use taste bugs on their feet to know if the flowers are good to eat.” Daniel went back and re-read the whole sentence, but actually commented how the word “bugs” did not sound right or make sense. Daniel was able to self-monitor his reading and he identified when something did not make sense. He did this a second time when he read the sentence, “You use your sense of sight,” as “You use your sense of senet.” Daniel commented how he knew something sounded funny because he didn’t think “senet” was a word. He then went back and re-read to self-correct with the word that made sense. Daniel identified when he read a silly word and used his strategy of re-reading to self-correct his miscue.

Daniel continued to use the three cueing systems as his miscues made sense, were structurally accurate, and visually similar. Daniel also made eight high level miscues, which did not affect the meaning of the text. After analyzing the running record, I observed the percentage of high-level and low-level miscues. Daniel was beginning to shift to having more high level miscues, which clearly showed his use of meaning and structural cues. This shift made me aware that Daniel was beginning to understand reading as a meaning making process. When discussing the miscues during our RMA session, I focused once again on the low level miscues. Daniel read the sentence “Instead of sniffing, they flick their tongues to bring smells into their mouths” as “Instead of sniffing, they through their tongues to bring smells into their mouths.” Reading the word “flick” as “through” was not visually similar, nor did it make sense or sound right in the text. Below I will discuss another low-level miscue with Daniel.
After listening to the miscue “If your eyes are closed, how can you tell the difference between a soft chick and rough sandpaper?” as “If your eyes are closed, how can you tell the difference between a soft chick and rough sanerapper?”

Daniel: Points to the word—that first word is sand.

Me: Yes, it is! Now what can we do to figure what word would make sense there?

Daniel: I can use the pictures, but this picture doesn’t really help.

Me: Well if you tried one strategy and it doesn’t work, then we can go on to the text. Let’s try rereading and skipping the word to see what would make sense.

*Re-reads the sentence and fixes the miscue.

Me: Now you read the word as “sandpaper.” Does that make sense in the text?

Daniel: Yea it makes sense cuz sandpaper is rough I have some downstairs on the workbench and it has a rough feeling and hurts your hand.

Me: Yes! So you were able to use the context to help you figure out that unknown word! Nice job using your strategies to make sense of the text!

**Dialogue Box 13 RMA discussion of the text *Surprising Animal Senses* (Ruby, 2008)**

When we discussed the low level miscue, Daniel identified the strategy of using picture clues to help with the unknown word. This strategy would allow Daniel to make meaning of the text and he also identified that this strategy would not work, due to the pictures not “really helping.” I then prompted Daniel to use a second strategy we have been working on in order to help him understand that if one strategy does not work, he can still try again rather than giving up on the word. The discussions brought his strategy use to a conscious level which was a significant gain in his understanding of the reading process. Daniel became aware of the strategies he was using, such as rereading or skipping the word and using context clues to determine the unknown word and how they contributed to making meaning of the text. It is clear that what we had worked on is continuing to transfer over to each new session.
Summary

Week five brought many new insights when working with Daniel. I noticed not only a change in his attitude toward reading, but a continued change in his perception of himself as a reader. Daniel became confident when discussing strategies with me, something that did not occur in previous week’s sessions. By discussing low level miscues, Daniel recognized when he read a word that did not make sense and it gave him the opportunity to decide what he could have done while reading to make sense of the text. By immersing Daniel in the language of miscues and strategies, he began to recognize how they applied to his reading.

Week five also gave me the chance to discuss using multiple strategies if one did not work. When Daniel mentioned that the pictures were not helpful, I was able to ask him what we could do next and suggest a strategy to use that he was already familiar with. It also brought Daniel’s strategy use to a conscious level. He began to understand his strategy use and how it contributed to making meaning of the text.

Week Six June 26, 2013 and June 28, 2013

I began week six, our last week, with a new book about Monarch butterflies. I continued on with the non-fiction texts as Daniel seemed to really enjoy reading them. I once again gave Daniel a choice, and he chose the text, *The Life of a Monarch Butterfly* (Ruby, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text: The Life of a Monarch Butterfly</th>
<th>Accuracy Rate</th>
<th>Self-Correction Rate</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Self-Corrections</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>High Level Miscues</th>
<th>Low level Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1:2.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Miscue Analysis of *The Life of a Monarch Butterfly* (Ruby, 2008)
Daniel made great gains in reading during this reading. He monitored his own reading and self-corrected seven times. Five of the seven self-corrections were for meaning and the other two were for visual. Daniel used the three cueing systems together and his miscues were meaningful as well as structurally and visually accurate. Daniel made eight high level miscues and four low level miscues, which we discussed on the second day during our final RMA session.

When Daniel read the sentence, “A newborn caterpillar is so small you can hardly see it,” as “A newborn caterpillar is so small you can herde see it,” Daniel recognized that the word he read did not sound right or make sense. Daniel then went back and re-read the sentence, self-correcting for the correct word. He then used context clues when reading “A monarch butterfly laid the eggs,” as “The monera butterfly laid the eggs.” Daniel recognized that what he read did not make sense and knew that the word had to be monarch because “that is a type of a butterfly that I have seen before!” Daniel was able to determine the word “monarch” based on context clues of a butterfly and his own background knowledge.

The second day I met with Daniel this week (June 28, 2013), we had a discussion around his low level miscues. I continued to have Daniel listen to his oral reading and determine what strategy he could have used when coming to that unknown word.
After listening to the miscue “The caterpillars skin starts to get tight, like a pair of pants that are too small” as “The caterpillars skin starts to get tarne, like a pair of pants that are too small.”

Daniel: That word should be tight. Tight like a pair of pants that are too small.

Me: Yes, you are correct! That word is tight. Now what do you think you could have done to figure that out when you were reading?

Daniel: I could have looked at the whole sentence and figured out what would make sense.

Me: Yes, that would be a good strategy, to use the context clues to help you.

Daniel: I also could have read the sentence again when I heard the silly word come out.

Me: That is a great idea! Re-reading is a great strategy to use that has helped you in the past.

**Dialogue Box 14 RMA discussion for the text *The Life of a Monarch Butterfly***

During the RMA discussion, Daniel was able to recognize strategies to use to make meaning of the text. When Daniel read the nonsense word, he determined that he could have skipped it and used the context clues to help, along with re-reading when he heard the “silly word come out.”

I chose to remind Daniel of how he has used the strategies in the past in order to help him realize their effectiveness. Looking back to the first sessions, Daniel was unable to verbalize a strategy to use, nor did he know how to go about solving the miscue. Ending this week, I am confident that Daniel has made great gains in reading and that RMA had an impact on his perception of himself as a reader. Daniel read confidently and his tone during our discussion suggested that he felt comfortable using various strategies to help him. Daniel was able to recognize that the purpose of reading was to make meaning, and through his understanding of his “silly words,” Daniel applied this knowledge to reading.

I ended the sixth week by re-administering the Burke Reading Interview. Below are Daniel’s responses, which clearly show a change in perception of himself as a reader and also a gain in self-confidence.
Modified Burke Reading Interview

Me Q1: When you’re reading a book or magazine you are interested in and come to something you don’t know, what do you do?

Daniel: I could look at the pictures to help me with the word.

Me: What else do you try?

Daniel: I could also skip the word and see what would make sense and if I read a silly word, I could go and re-read it again.

Me Q2: What about when you’re reading your science or Social Studies textbooks and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do?

Daniel: I look at the pictures—my books in school have pictures that help me with the words and also thinking of a word that would make sense.

Me Q3: What kinds of things give you trouble in reading?

Daniel: Well sometimes I don’t always know every word, but you taught me that’s okay cus now I have my strategy bookmark to use.

Me Q4: When you get ready to read a book for school, what do you usually do?

Daniel: I look at the pictures to see if it is interesting and I also read the first page to see if I would like it and if it will be okay for me to read, like not too hard.

Me Q5: When you finish reading a book, how do you help yourself remember what you read?

Daniel: I write down my ideas in a graphic organizer that we used before.

Me Q6: Who do you know that you think is a good reader? What makes that person a good reader?

Daniel: I think you are a good reader because you taught what to do when I don’t know a word. You taught me how to use the pictures and also skip the word and keep reading, and then you taught me how to use other words in the sentence to help me. I like the bookmark you gave me cus it helps me remember, but I don’t need to have it in front of me anymore cus I know the strategies in my mind now!

Me Q7: Do you think I ever come to something I don’t know when I am reading? What do you think I do?
Daniel: Yes you do! You would do the same things you taught me to do.

Me: Q8: Have you ever helped a friend or brother or sister when they came to something they don’t know when reading? How did you help them?

Daniel: Yes, I help my sister when she is reading, even though she is still a better reader than me. I tell her to use the pictures and also make sure that it makes sense and is not a silly word.

Me Q9: How does your teacher help kids who are having difficulty reading?

Daniel: She still tells me to sound it out and use the pictures and she has a strategy bookmark a little different than yours.

Me Q10: Do you remember how you learned to read? Tell me about it.

Daniel: You taught me before but also taught me a lot now. My mom also taught me-she tells me to sound out words and look at the pictures.

Me Q11: Are you a good reader outside of school? Why do you think so? What makes you a good reader or not?

Daniel: I think I am. I mean I’m definitely a better reader now because I know that when I read a word and it sounds silly, then it must not be making sense. And now if it doesn’t make sense, I know what to do!

Me Q12: Is there anything you would like to do better as a reader?

Daniel: I want to be able to read longer books-like chapter books.

Dialogue Box 15 Modified Burke Reading Interview, Week Six

After conducting the BRI in week six, I noticed a shift in Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader as well as a shift in his understanding of reading as a meaning making process. When asked in question one what he does when he comes to something he does not know, Daniel responded with looking to the pictures and skipping ahead to see what would make sense if he said a “silly word.” Daniel recognized various strategies that relate to meaning, compared to his response in week one of “sound it out.”
When asked in question four what he does when beginning a new book, Daniel responded with looking at the pictures to see if it is interesting along with reading the first page to see if it is a just right book. This was a change in Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader because during week one, he responded with “I usually look at how many pages there are and how easy it is.” Daniel viewed reading during week six as finding that just right book and gained self-confidence, not just searching for the easy text with few pages. Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader also changed when he answered question twelve about what he wanted to do better as a reader with wanting to read longer books, like chapter books. After my first session with Daniel during week one, I never would have guessed he would want to read longer books, like chapter books, because of his annoyance and reluctance.

Question eleven asked if Daniel views himself as a good reader and he responded with “I think I am.” Daniel then goes into detail of knowing what to do when he comes to a word that does not make sense. Not only did this response show a change in perception, but a boost in his self-confidence as a reader. Daniel began our sessions hitting his hand on his head and exclaimed how he was dumb or stupid, and now he identified himself as a good reader.

Summary

As we entered week six, I looked back at the growth he had made with reading since the beginning and entering his house to work with him that first day. Daniel greeted me with reluctance and annoyance for the first three weeks, but I began to notice a shift in his attitude entering week four. Daniel surprised me in many ways and I was pleased with how much progress he made.

When re-administering the Burke Reading Inventory, I noticed Daniel had gained more confidence in himself as a reader. Daniel responded to the questions and noted how he thought
he was a good reader and he now knows what to do if he doesn’t know a word. This is a huge growth for Daniel because from the first weeks, Daniel would create a nonsense word and use it as a placeholder, rather than attempting the unknown word. When I viewed prior observation notes from the start, I never would have guessed that Daniel would suggest wanting to read longer texts, which again shows his gain in confidence. Daniel worked really hard during our lessons and it was clear that his work helped him achieve great gains in reading.

Summary of Chapter

Daniel not only recognized his own strengths as a reader through RMA, but also he began to understand that reading is a meaning making process. Through the data collection of interviews with Daniel and his mother, miscue analysis, and observational notes, I was able to see how his strategy use was brought to his conscious level and how this influenced the types of miscues he made. Towards the end of our RMA sessions, Daniel began making more high-level miscues than low, which indicated his use of meaning making strategies. Daniel also began to talk about the nature and quality of his miscues and was able to discuss strategies he could use to solve words using all three cueing systems. Based on the results of the study, it was evident that the student’s perception of himself as a reader was positively impacted by RMA.
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

Throughout the six-week study, I worked with a third grade student using Retrospective Miscue Analysis. The study consisted of three research questions.

7. How might retrospective miscues analysis influence the student’s perception of himself as a reader?

8. How might retrospective miscue analysis contribute to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process?

9. What strategies can I use to help students make meaning while reading?

The results of the study showed that using RMA with a third grade student positively impacted his understanding of the reading process. I came to this conclusion through my analysis of the data collected throughout the six-week study. Data included interviews with Daniel and his mother, running records and miscue analysis, and observational notes from each session. In this chapter, I will discuss conclusions I made based on the research and findings from my study, implications for students and the teacher, and recommendations for future research.

Conclusions

How retrospective miscue analysis influenced a student’s perception of himself as a reader

During week one, I administered an Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Kear, 1996) which allowed me to view my participant’s attitude toward reading. Daniel’s responses indicated that he preferred to play rather than read. He had a negative connotation toward reading and did not have self-confidence in himself as a reader. Daniel began the study with resistance and annoyance when I walked into his house for our RMA sessions. I observed him frequently making comments on his reading ability and how he considered himself stupid and dumb
because he could not read all of the words correctly and constantly made “mistakes” during our first week.

RMA is an instructional strategy that can help students value the reading process, while building confidence as readers (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Through RMA, Daniel began building confidence in himself as a reader because he was able to see the repertoire of strategies he could use and his ability to view his miscues as miscues, and not as mistakes. With each new RMA session, Daniel slowly began to see strengths in himself as a reader. Moore and Gilles (2005) explain how RMA changes the way students view the reading process as readers are invited to discover their own miscues and talk about why they made them. Through conversations during each session, Daniel recognized his own strengths and made comments regarding his use of a “silly word.” These silly words were used as placeholders when Daniel did not know a word. Through each new RMA session, Daniel began to understand the significance of using strategies to make meaning while reading, such as rereading or skipping the word and using context clues to determine the unknown word.

Daniel’s school used the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark system for assessments (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). The way his teacher used the assessment in school defined Daniel as a specific level. Daniel was unable to see past the level he was assigned and viewed himself as incapable of reading anything above a Level K. Knowing his reading level limited Daniel to books within the Level K shelf in his classroom. The leveled books placed on a shelf in Daniel’s classroom portrayed everyone’s levels as they searched their leveled basket for a book to read. This negatively affected Daniel’s view of himself as a reader as many of his friends read at levels above him, while he was forced to read from the Level K basket.
When given a level L to read in the first week, Daniel made excuses, exclaiming the text was too difficult for him and he could not read anything above a level K. As I worked with Daniel, I used texts above his current reading level and realized they were at his independent and instructional levels. Goodman and Marek (1996) explain how readers must revalue themselves as language users and cast off the labels they have been given if they are to construct meaning of the text. RMA helps students revalue themselves as readers, and teachers can use RMA to determine how miscues impact students’ thoughts and reveal strengths and awareness of themselves as readers (Almazroui, 2007). I was able to use RMA to help make Daniel aware of his strengths as a reader. Based on our discussion in the first weeks, I identified what Daniel could do as a reader and what he could do with assistance. Working within Daniel’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) allowed me to scaffold his learning in order to not overwhelm him and cause him to shut down (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Moore and Aspergren (2001) explain how using RMA can validate a student’s worth and potential as a reader. This was evident when working with Daniel as he began to see himself as a better reader when strategies were brought to his conscious level. Through audio recorded discussions, Daniel was able to express his understandings of his own miscues and became aware of the meaning making he was creating with the high-level miscues. By casting off the levels they are given and focusing on their skills and strengths, we can use RMA to help students revalue themselves as readers.

How retrospective miscue analysis contributed to a student’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process

At the beginning of the study, Daniel viewed good reading as “reading all of the words correctly.” Almazroui (2007) explains how students need to view reading as a meaning making
process, rather than a decoding process. Through RMA, Daniel was able to revalue himself as a reader and recognize that reading was a meaning making process. This shift occurred as Daniel discussed high-level miscues and recognized how his miscues were structurally correct and made sense in the text. RMA guides students to realize that miscues are repeated attempts to predict meaning and making sense of the text (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). Our first three weeks of discussions focused around high-level miscues, or miscues that did not affect the meaning of the text. The decision to focus on high-level miscues was made in order to build his confidence and also make Daniel aware of the types of miscues he was making, ones that were structurally and semantically correct.

Moore and Aspegren (2001) explain how the goal of reading instruction is to move students toward understanding and valuing their own knowledge rather than feeling defeated and deeming themselves as illiterate. As I made the shift in discussing high-level to low-level miscues, Daniel was able to recognize his strengths as a reader and determine what strategies he could have used in our discussions around low-level miscues, or miscues that affected the meaning of the text. Our discussions included listening to the audio recording and talking about what strategies would help him make meaning while reading. Daniel often commented on how he could “go back and re-read,” or “skip the word and keep reading and then see what makes sense.” These comments indicated that Daniel was beginning to understand that reading was a meaning making process because his strategies pertained to meaning making. This was a huge shift in Daniel’s ability to recognize reading as a meaning making process because he began our sessions believing reading was about accurately decoding the words.

In the reading process, knowledge of the semantic system, or meaning of the text, is necessary to comprehend the text (Wilde, 2000). Daniel began reading using his known strategy
of sounding it out. Daniel relied heavily on this strategy which often led to his ineffective decoding of the word. When Daniel became frustrated, he would hit his hand against his head and exclaim how he made another mistake. Through our discussions, Daniel was able to understand the high-level miscues he was making and this led to the shift in his understanding of the reading process as a meaning making process. By engaging Daniel in the discussions about the strategies he was using, it allowed him to become more metacognitive about the reading process (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

**The strategies I used to help a student make meaning while reading**

During week one, I administered the Modified Burke Reading Interview (Goodman, 1996) to determine what strategies Daniel used as a reader. Before conducting miscue analysis, a Burke Reading Interview can be used to explore the learner’s understanding of what reading is (Almazroui, 2007). The questions asked target how students felt about themselves as readers as well as what good readers do when they read. The answers to the questions helped guide my decisions in determining the best approach to use with Daniel. I recognized that Daniel viewed reading as a decoding process and considered good reading as “reading all of the words correctly.” It is not always easy to convince students to use other reading strategies; however, through scaffolding and modeling, teachers can enable students with flexible word solving strategies.

Struggling readers view themselves as fundamentally different from those they describe as good readers (Goodman & Marek, 1996). They view reading as making sure all of the words are correctly pronounced and see miscues as mistakes (Theurer & Leikam, 2006). Through the use of a strategy bookmark, I was able to scaffold Daniel’s learning with strategies he could use to make meaning while reading. Fountas and Pinnell (2009) explain the strategies used by
readers for word solving and thinking within the text include monitoring and correcting, searching for and using information, summarizing, and maintaining fluency. Through RMA, students begin to understand that reading is more than word calling and decoding words, but a meaning making process (Goodman, 1996). This was evident in my six-week study as Daniel began recognizing how his miscues still made sense and were structurally accurate in the text.

RMA helps readers become more aware of the reading strategies in their repertoire and teaches them to value their knowledge of the language systems that they control as they read a text (Goodman & Marek, 1996). As I used scaffolding to help Daniel recognize strategies to use when he came to an unknown word, he became aware of the strategies that were already in his repertoire and was able to use more effective strategies to make meaning when reading. I guided Daniel through scaffolding in order to bring his strategies to a conscious level and helped him recognize the syntactic and semantic miscues he made.

I chose to focus our first three weeks on high-level miscues to build confidence in his reading ability and to help him recognize the meaning and structural miscues he was making. A high-level miscue does not interfere with making sense of the text, whereas low-level miscues create a barrier of comprehension (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). Once I viewed the shift in Daniel’s understanding of the reading process, I chose to point out low-level miscues and engage Daniel in a conversation to determine what strategies would have been beneficial. The conversations allowed Daniel to understand the miscue he made and how it contributed to his reading.

Implications for Student Learning

By conducting this study, it was evident that the student’s perception of himself as a reader and his understanding of the reading process benefitted from using RMA. The
instructional strategy of RMA allowed Daniel to become a more strategic reader by examining the reading process. The discussions we had made Daniel aware of the strategies he was currently using in reading and brought other strategies to his conscious level. RMA would benefit many students, especially when perceptions of themselves as readers are getting in the way of their reading. Daniel viewed himself as stupid because he could not read all of the words correctly. RMA allowed him to see his strengths and build on them. When working with discouraged students, RMA can help them recognize their high-level miscues and how they are using the three cueing systems. Goodman and Marek (1996) describe how readers draw on the three cueing systems, focusing on semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cues.

RMA would benefit many students because it allows them to understand the reading process and the three cueing systems. Daniel often hit his hand against his head claiming he made another “mistake.” As students’ perceptions of themselves are impacted by their miscues, it would be beneficial for students to be involved in a conversation to recognize how they are making meaning while reading and how the miscue is not a negative thing. Goodman (1996) extended on Rosenblatt’s theory of the reading process and came to recognize the reader as an active participant in the construction of meaning, rather than the meaning lying on the page waiting to be found (Davenport, 2002). By involving students in the conversation, we enable them to construct meaning during reading, thus helping them understand the reading process.

Implications for My Teaching using RMA

This study allowed me to see many implications for my current and future teaching. It has shown me the significance of using RMA with students and how it can impact their perception of themselves as readers and their understanding of the reading process.
A student’s focus on his reading level

Having the opportunity to work with an individual student during this study gave me the chance to get to know my participant through many means of data collection. I observed his negative connotation towards reading from the very beginning and confirmed my assumptions when giving the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Kear, 1996). Daniel’s annoyance stemmed from his inability to see himself as a good reader, because his impression of a good reader was someone who “read all the words correctly.”

As Daniel’s school used the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark system for assessments, Daniel was often assessed with various texts. The students were given their level and shown the shelf with their basket of books in the classroom. When students were asked to read throughout the day, Daniel knew he had to choose from the Level K basket, deeming himself incapable of reading anything higher. Within the first week, I assessed Daniel in order to determine his instructional level using the same system. Daniel scored higher than a Level K, but made excuses that the book was too challenging when he came to unknown words. As teachers, we need to be aware of the perceptions we are giving students of their reading ability. Rather than portraying their levels on a shelf for the whole class to see, we need to show students what their strengths are as readers and focus on these, rather than focusing on their levels. When working with students, we also need to focus on their interest when choosing a text along with their prior background knowledge.

From working with Daniel and viewing his focus on his individual level, I have now created a system in my own classroom where students are not choosing a letter, but rather using a color dot. Students are unaware of what the color dots stand for and they are often given two
colors to choose from when selecting a book. This has decreased competition between students and their urge to make fun of others reading at a lower level.

Allowing students to engage in miscue analysis through discussion

RMA has engaged readers in an exploration of their own reading strategies, which can result in readers’ metacognitive awareness (Black, 2004). As Daniel and I discussed his high-level miscues, Daniel became aware of how they did not affect the meaning of the text. This then brought out his strengths as a reader, which helped him revalue himself as a reader.

Goodman and Marek (1996) explain how miscue analysis provides a schema for analyzing oral reading behaviors and offers a window to the reading process. Daniel became more aware of the strategies he was using and was able to view the purpose of reading as making meaning, rather than a decoding process. The discussions were beneficial because Daniel first viewed miscues as mistakes, but with each new week, he eventually saw how they were repeated attempts to make meaning of the text (Almazroui, 2007).

Significance of using assessment to see what students are doing when reading, what is getting in the way, and how we can use assessment to guide instruction

When assessing a student, we often assess to gain the child’s instructional reading level. Fountas and Pinnell (2009) have a benchmark assessment that is used by many schools; however, not all teachers are using it correctly. Assessing to obtain a level will not tell you very much about a student. In order to gain access to their strategy use, we must analyze using miscue analysis to determine if the three cueing systems are being used or if one cue is favored over another. The type of miscues a student makes can tell you a lot about his/her understanding of the reading process. When using miscue analysis with Daniel, I found that his miscues focused primarily around the graphophonetic cue. This showed me that his miscues were visually similar to
the word on the page, but often did not make sense or sound right. I was able to view patterns in his reading, including self-corrections he made along with high and low-level miscues.

When using assessments with students in our classroom, we must see past the level and view what they can do on their own and what they can do with assistance. Vygotsky (as cited in Au, et.al, 2001) speaks about the significance of working within a student’s Zone of Proximal Development, or ZPD. The ZPD is the zone where students are able to construct new learning with the assistance of a teacher. Understanding what students can do independently will guide our instruction to work within their ZPD.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The results of the study showed that the student’s perception of himself as a reader and his understanding of the reading process were positively impacted from using RMA. Future research on this instructional strategy would be beneficial to students in the classroom and it will also help myself and others continue learning the positive impact of using RMA.

*Using retrospective miscue analysis in small guided reading groups*

At the conclusion of this study, I was able to see the positive impact RMA had on the student’s perception of himself as a reader and his ability to see reading as a meaning making process. When using this instructional strategy, I would be interested to see how it could impact students’ reading when used in a small guided reading group setting. It does not take much time to hold a conversation about a miscue a student makes. By allowing the students to listen to their miscues and involving them in the discussion, students may be able to view their strategy use and understand their high and low-level miscues. With a discussion of high-level miscues, teachers could point out the students’ strengths and make them aware of the semantic and
syntactic miscues they were making. Students can then become conscious of their strategy use and implement this when solving unknown words.

*Working with students with a positive attitude towards reading*

I conducted my six-week study with a student who viewed reading as a chore, something he had to do. Daniel did not enjoy reading, nor did he see the point of it. As a struggling reader, Daniel found it difficult because of his one ineffective strategy of sounding it out. He became frustrated with himself because he could not read all of the words correctly, and that was what he thought reading was all about.

If I were to work with another student or a group of students in the future, it would be interesting to see the impact RMA has on students who have a positive attitude toward reading and a positive perception of themselves as readers. Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader greatly impacted his desire to read. When working with a student with a positive perception of themself as a reader, I would not have to spend so much time building up their confidence.

*Understanding the RMA process versus learning with the student*

For future research, I would familiarize myself with RMA in order to fully understand the process to help students revalue themselves as readers. As this was the first time I had conducted RMA sessions, I was learning along with my participant. This made it difficult at times as I was constantly referring back to research to determine various aspects of our RMA sessions. When discussing Daniel’s high-level miscues, I often referred back to research in order to fully understand how to appropriately discuss each miscue. I also found myself looking at other case studies where RMA was used to determine what I could do differently in order to have a greater impact on Daniel’s perception of himself as a reader.
Final Thoughts

Overall, based on this six-week study, the student’s perception of himself as a reader along with his ability to see reading as a meaning making process was impacted. When I began my study, I was nervous as to how it would play out, as Daniel was so resistant and annoyed at reading from the start. Daniel showed a true dislike towards reading and would have preferred to do anything but read. As the weeks went on and we delved into our RMA discussions, Daniel’s strategy use was brought to the conscious level and he was able to see himself as a strategic reader.

The audio recorded discussions of his miscues played a major role in the shift from believing reading was about decoding the individual words to seeing it as a meaning making process. As Daniel became more confident in his reading ability, I noticed a shift in his attitude towards reading. He no longer dreaded reading the books I brought; rather, he actually made suggestions of books he would like to read. When re-administering the BRI, Daniel actually commented how he would like to be able to “read longer books.” Prior to our RMA sessions, Daniel would look to the back of the book to determine the amount of pages and he would grunt and groan about how long the text was and how many words were on each page. As Daniel became more confident in himself, he was able to take risks and accept the challenges a longer text would bring.

This study has allowed me to see the benefits of using RMA with a student. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see how RMA can be used with a small guided reading instruction group. Seeing Daniel’s gains in reading and his ability to see himself as more than just a level has made me realize the impact it can have on our students in the classroom.
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Appendix A: Cover Letter for Parent Consent Form

May, XX, 2013

Dear Mrs. Morgan,

I am a graduate student in the department of Education and Human Development at The College at Brockport. I am conducting a research study that examines the influence Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) has on a student’s perception of himself as a reader. RMA helps students revalue their thought process on reading and helps them to understand that reading is a meaning making processes. RMA sessions will include a running record on your son’s reading, where I will make markings on a form to see patterns emerging in his reading and strategies he uses while reading. During the running record, I will use an audio-recorder to record his reading and then record the discussions we have about his reading following the session.

As part of my study, with your consent, I will observe your child to understand how he views himself as a reader. I plan on interviewing your child to gain insight on how he views the reading process and how he sees himself as a reader. With your consent for your child to participate in this study, I will observe him during our tutoring sessions twice a week. I will focus my observations on the reading behaviors your child uses and behaviors and patterns I notice throughout each session. I will interview your child at the beginning of the study and again at the completion of our RMA sessions. The interview questions will focus on his perception of himself as a reader as well as strategies he uses while reading, like rereading, self-correcting and the types of miscues he makes.

I will be collecting data for a period of six weeks including note taking and audio-recordings. The audio recordings will be used for his reading and then for the discussions held after each reading. The data will be used to view possible changes in your child’s perceptions of reading and himself as a reader. Prior to the sessions, I plan on conducting a Burke Reading Interview as well as an Elementary Attitude Survey to your son.

With your consent, I plan on interviewing you as well to gain insight on your son’s strengths and needs as a reader. The feedback you provide will be significant to my research study as it will inform my instruction and guide my understanding of past interventions completed in school and current concerns in his education.

I have enclosed an informed consent form that includes information about your child’s rights as a study participant, including how I will protect his privacy. Please read through the forms carefully. If you are willing to allow your child to participate, please sign the attached forms and return them to me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Danielle DeLeo
Graduate Student
The College at Brockport
Ddele1@brockport.edu
585-489-9078

Sue Robb
Thesis Advisor
The College at Brockport
srobb@brockport.edu
585-395-5935
Appendix B: Parent Consent Form

CONSENT FOR PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

The purpose of this research study is to examine the influence of Retrospective Miscue Analysis on a student’s perception of himself as a reader. The person conducting this research is a graduate student at The College at Brockport. If you agree to participate in this research study, you will be interviewed to help guide my understanding of your child. You will be interviewed in the beginning of the study. In order for you to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to participate in the study. If you would like to participate in the form of an interview, and agree with the statements below, please sign your name in the space provided at the end. You may change your mind at any time, even after the study has begun.

I understand that:

a. My participation is voluntary and I have the right to refuse to answer any questions.
b. My confidentiality is protected. My name will not be recorded in observation notes in the interview. There will be no way to connect me to the interview. If any publication results from this research, I would not be identified by name. Results will be given through the use of pseudonyms, so that I cannot be identified.
c. There will be no anticipated personal risks or benefits because of participation in this study.
d. My participation involves participating in an interview with questions focusing on my child’s strengths and needs as a reader.
e. The researcher will interview me in the beginning of the study.
f. The results will be used for the completion of a thesis paper by the primary researcher.
g. My participation will involve answering questions relating to my child.
h. All data will be kept in a locked drawer in my home. Only the primary researcher will have access to the interview answers. The interview questions and answers will be destroyed at the completion of the research study by shredding.

I understand the information provided in this form and agree to participate in this study.

I am 18 years of age or older. I have read and understand the above statements. If you have any questions, you may contact:

Danielle DeLeo        Sue Robb
Primary Researcher, Graduate Student    Thesis Advisor
The College at Brockport    The College at Brockport
Ddele1@brockport.edu    srobb@brockport.edu
585-489-9078        585-395-5935

I give my consent to participate in this research project, including the interview.

Parent Signature______________________________  Date___________________
Appendix C: Child Consent Form

CONSENT FOR OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEW OF STUDENT

The purpose of this research study is to examine the influence of Retrospective Miscue Analysis on a student’s perception of himself as a reader. The person conducting this research is a graduate student at The College at Brockport. If you agree to have your child participate in this research study, your child will be observed during his tutoring sessions twice a week. Your child will be interviewed in the beginning of the study and again at the completion of the study. In order for your child to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to allow your child to participate in the study. If you would like for your child to participate, and agree with the statements below, please sign your name in the space provided at the end. You may change your mind at any time and your child may leave the study without penalty, even after the study has begun. Your child can decline participation in the study even with your consent to participate.

I understand that:

a. My child’s participation is voluntary and he has the right to refuse to answer any questions.
b. My child’s confidentiality is protected. His name will not be recorded in observation notes. There will be no way to connect my child to the observation. If any publication results from this research, he would not be identified by name. Results will be given through the use of pseudonyms, so the participant cannot be identified.
c. There will be no anticipated personal risks or benefits because of participation in this study.
d. My child’s participation involves participating in scheduled tutoring sessions in his home.
e. The researcher will observe my child during each tutoring session for six weeks.
f. The results will be used for the completion of a thesis paper by the primary researcher.
g. My child’s participation will involve being audio-recorded during each RMA session in order to allow him to reflect on his own reading. The study would not be possible without the audio-recordings.
h. My child will complete a Burke Reading interview in the beginning of the sessions and then again at the completion of our sessions.
i. My child will complete an Elementary Reading attitude survey, in which he can choose not to answer any of the questions.
j. All data will be kept in a locked drawer in my home. Only the primary researcher will have access to the notes, tapes and corresponding materials. Data, audio tapes, notes and consent forms will be destroyed by shredding or deletion when the research has been accepted and approved.

I understand the information provided in this form and agree to allow my child to participate as a participant in this study.

I am 18 years of age or older. I have read and understand the above statements. All my questions about my child’s participation in this study have been answered to my satisfaction. If you have any questions, you may contact:

Danielle DeLeo  
Primary Researcher, Graduate Student  
The College at Brockport  
Ddele1@brockport.edu  
585-489-9078  
Sue Robb  
Thesis Advisor  
The College at Brockport  
srobb@brockport.edu  
585-395-5935

I give consent for my child to participate in this research project, including audio-recording
Parent Signature______________________________  Date___________________
Appendix D: Statement of Assent for child

Statement of Assent for Observation

To be read to the participant:

I am your babysitter, but I am also a student at The College at Brockport. I am working on a project to learn more about how students view themselves as readers and how you use different strategies while reading. I will write in a notebook while we are working together because that will show me what you are doing as a reader. I will also audio-record some of our tutoring sessions together so we can hear our reading! You will complete an interview with questions talking about your reading in the beginning and end of our sessions. You will also complete a survey using Garfield figures to tell me how you feel about reading! If you decide to let me learn more about you as a reader, no one else will know your name or know who you are in my project. When I talk about your reading, I will do just that and not say who you are. Your mom has given permission for you to be part of my study, but now you can also decide if you want to work with me. If you change your mind later on, that is okay because you can change your mind at any time. If you are willing to let me learn more about you as a reader, I would like you to sign your name on the first line and then write the date.

Thank you very much!

Danielle

Name: _________________________________________
Date: _________________________________________
Witness (over the age of 18):
_____________________________________________
Appendix E: Modified Burke Reading Interview

MODIFIED BURKE READING INTERVIEW

Name ___________________________  Date________________

1. When you’re reading a book or magazine you are interested in and come to something you don’t know, what do you do?
   
   What else do you try?

2. What about when you’re reading your science or social studies textbooks and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do?
   
   What else do you try?

3. What kinds of things give you trouble in your textbooks?
   
   What kinds of things go well when you read a textbook?

4. When you get ready to read a book for school, do you usually
   - Start at the beginning and read straight through?
   - Make a list of questions you want to answer?
   - Look over the pictures or charts and the subheadings?
   - I don’t read it.
   - Other?

5. When you finish reading a book or a chapter for school, how do you help yourself remember what you read?

6. Who do you know that you think is a good reader? What makes that person a good reader?

7. Do you think _____________ ever comes to something she/he doesn’t know when she/he is reading?

What do you think __________ does?

8. Have you ever helped someone when they came to something they didn’t know when they were reading? How did you help them?

Or, imagine that a friend asked you to help him/her with reading. How would you go about helping?

9. How does your teacher help kids who are having difficulty reading the science or social studies books?

10. Do you remember how you learned to read? Tell me about it.

11. Are you a good reader outside of school? Why do you think so? What makes you a good reader (or not)?

What about in school? Why?

12. Is there anything you’d like to do better as a reader? What?

Appendix F: Elementary Reading Attitude Survey

Elementary Reading Attitude Survey

School ___________ Grade ___________ Name ___________

Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.

1. How do you feel when you read a book on a rainy Saturday?

2. How do you feel when you read a book in school during free time?

3. How do you feel about reading for fun at home?

4. How do you feel about getting a book for a present?
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Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.

5. How do you feel about spending free time reading a book?

6. How do you feel about starting a new book?

7. How do you feel about reading during summer vacation?

8. How do you feel about reading instead of playing?
Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How do you feel about going to a bookstore?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How do you feel about reading different kinds of books?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How do you feel when a teacher asks you questions about what you read?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How do you feel about reading workbook pages and worksheets?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>How do you feel about reading in school?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><strong>How do you feel about reading your school books?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>How do you feel about learning from a book?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><strong>How do you feel when it's time for reading in class?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.

17. How do you feel about stories you read in reading class?

18. How do you feel when you read out loud in class?

19. How do you feel about using a dictionary?

20. How do you feel about taking a reading test?
Observational Notes Protocol

| Observations | Reflection/Questions
|              | Ideas/Thoughts |

Date __________
Appendix H: RMA Organizer

RMA Organizer

Name: Date:

Name of text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line in text</th>
<th>Word in text</th>
<th>Word read</th>
<th>Self-corrected?</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>Graphophonetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions to think about:
- Did the miscue make sense?
- Did the miscue change the meaning of the text?
- Why do you think the reader miscued?
- Why do you think the reader self-corrected?
- Did the miscue look similar to the word?

Some topics for discussion:

### Appendix I: Running Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Running Record Sheet</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Information Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin’s Haircut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“Good morning, Edwin,” Dad said. He was talking to Edwin’s dog, Ruff. 

Then he turned to Edwin. “Good morning, Ruff,” he said to his shaggy son.

He could tell that his dad was only joking, but Edwin did not laugh or smile. Instead, he pushed his hair off his face and said,

“I’m not Ruff. I’m EDWIN! See? Ruff is the only one with a tail.”

“Why, I think you are right,” answered Dad. “I don’t know how I could have mixed you up with Ruff.”

“I know how,” said Mom. “It’s time for a haircut!”

Mom put some newspapers on the floor and sat Edwin in a chair.

Then she was ready to cut Edwin’s hair.

Snip! Mom took a little off the top.

Snip! She took some off the back.

Then she cut a lot off the sides. “It doesn’t look right,” said Dad.
“One side is too long. Let me try.”

Snip! Went Dad.

“Now the other side is too long,” Mom complained.

“Let’s see if I can fix it.”

Snip! Snip!

“It’s still not right,” said Dad. “Let me take a bit more off this side.”

Edwin’s mom and dad took turns snipping and trimming, but the more they snipped, the worse things got. Edwin’s hair got more and more crooked.

“We’d better quit,” said Mom.

Dad agreed. “If we don’t, he’s not going to have any hair left!” he said.

Appendix J: Parent Interview

Interview Questions

1. What strengths in reading do you see in your son?

2. What strengths in writing do you see in your son?

3. How do you help your son when he comes to an unknown word while reading?

4. What do you notice about your son’s attitude while reading a book? What about while writing?

5. What concerns do you have for your son in reading and writing?