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Abstract

This case-study focused on a sixth grade female student who attended a suburban school district in Western New York. The student participated in Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) for a period of eight weeks. She was identified as at-risk for failure in reading in fourth grade and received pull-out support at school for almost three years. She experience many perceived failures at school and did not enjoy reading. As a result of participating in RMA she improved her ability to monitor fluency and comprehension and revalued reading. She realized that reading was an interactive process and miscues in oral reading are not always bad. By engaging in conversations about high-quality and low-quality miscues she improved her awareness of the three cueing systems, Meaning, Syntax and Visual (MSV), used when reading. As the study progressed she began integrating all three cueing systems while she read. Her fluency and comprehension improved and she revalued reading and herself as a reader. She began reading for pleasure; she was excited about reading and gained confidence in reading. This research shows that Retrospective Miscue Analysis is a powerful tool to use with adolescent students who have been identified as at-risk for failure in reading.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the problem

A sixth grade student sits in her regular class watching the clock. She is watching the clock because she knows soon she will be pulled out of her regular class to meet in a small group of students who need additional support with reading. She doesn’t like leaving her class and wonders what her friends think about the group that gets pulled out to work with Mrs. Young (all names are pseudonyms). This group of students needs additional support to successfully complete assignments, but does the benefit of pulling her out of a regular class outweigh the risk? It is also important to consider the student’s perception of reading and of herself as a reader.

When students are expected to read through material that is difficult for them on their own, it has an emotional impact. It is important to support these students in reading authentic text, but frequently the instructional support they receive focuses on lower level tasks in isolation (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Wilde, 2000). These tasks and activities do not help them become better readers if they focus only on decoding instead of understanding what they are reading (Wilde, 2000). Students need to learn to recognize when meaning is breaking down so that they can monitor comprehension. Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) can help students realize that reading is a process of making meaning. They need to learn to trust their understanding of how language works (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Significance of the problem

The practice of “pull-out” is common across the country in many schools. Students who are already behind their peers are pulled out of their regular classes to receive support. How much does this benefit the student? Frequently this time is with instructional assistants, not
teachers. They are missing valuable classroom time and may be perceived by peers, or perceive themselves, as “stupid” or “slow.” These students miss additional information and instruction, often higher level thinking activities and discussions. Then they are expected to pick up where the group left off. They already feel embarrassed that they have been “pulled out” and upon returning to class they are further behind because they missed learning opportunities while they were gone.

In addition, frequently when students do not show growth with these programs, more time is provided at the expense of other subjects or activities. This is a critical mistake. Reading is a process of gaining information and making meaning (Goodman & Marek 1996). Repeated exercises and activities that isolate skills do not provide the student with opportunities to be successful readers and make meaningful connections. Many exercises, like worksheets, flashcards, skill drills and remedial exercises, only sustain the reader’s feeling of inadequacy (Moore & Seeger, 2010; Goodman & Marek, 1996). At school students need to learn about the function of reading instead of emphasizing phonics and rules. It is more important for students to have the opportunity for choice reading than it is to practice skills and drills.

Regarding pull-out in schools, Goodman & Marek (1996) stated:

Meanwhile, back in the class, the remedial student is missing important learning opportunities; the time spent on remediation is the time classmates are spending on building concepts, reading, writing, doing. So the learner in trouble, in the name of building basic skill competence is deprived of rich school experience. Ironically, the reader who rebels and acts out may be showing a healthier reaction than the one who withdraws or submits meekly to all this. At least such a rebel is showing a resistance to accepting full responsibility for failure. (p. 17)
I agree wholeheartedly with this statement. In my opinion, acting out, or showing resistance, is a healthier response than the students who conform and do not question meaningless activities. In many classrooms, when students receive additional support in reading, they receive supplementary support using a program designed to focus on drills and skills that may or may not be appropriate for all the students in the group. As previously stated, frequently the person running these groups is not a trained teacher. A better use of this time would be to allow students to read material that interests them while providing support through meaningful discussions and vocabulary development activities.

Reading is a complex process. While students are reading, they are also constructing meaning from the text. The linguistic and pragmatic language systems are active and can be observed through miscues (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Wilde, 2000). The linguistic system includes semantics (meaning), syntactic (syntax structure or grammar) and graphophonic (visual or sound/symbol relationship). Pragmatic systems, or language in use, include awareness of context, background knowledge and culture (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Miscues are defined as instances in oral reading when a reader reads a text in a way that the person listening would not expect. By analyzing student miscues, teachers have a “window” into the reading process (Almazroui, 2007; Goodman & Marek; 1996; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Wilson, 2005). It is important to consider both linguistic and pragmatic systems (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

The teaching of reading, and reading assessments, have a long history of assuming that mistakes and errors should be avoided; but a central idea of miscue analysis is that miscues vary in quality; some miscues are actually signs of a strong reader (Wilde, 2000). Educators who have studied and used Miscue Analysis are aware that reading is not error free reproduction of text
(Goodman & Marek, 1996; Wilde, 2000). Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) aims to help students revalue reading and themselves as readers. By involving the students in the process of miscue analysis, RMA helps students become aware of what they are (or are not) doing as they read. Through discussions about their miscues, readers discover for themselves that reading is a process of predicting, inferring, sampling, confirming and correcting (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

The goal of RMA is not to eliminate miscues, but to help students develop a wider range of strategies to use when they are stuck (Wilde, 2000). Miscues are discussed as “high-quality” and “low-quality,” or “smart” and “okay” miscues (Moore & Seeger, 2010). High-quality (smart) miscues sound right and do not disrupt meaning (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Seeger, 2010). The reader is actively processing what they are reading and making predictions. Low-quality (okay) miscues do not sound right (syntax) and/or do not make sense (meaning) and should be corrected (Wilde, 2000; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Seeger, 2010). Correction of errors that do not change the meaning of the text is referred to as overcorrection (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

When discussing miscues, it is important to consider: Did the miscue make sense? Did it sound right? Was it corrected? Should it have been? Why was the miscue made? Did it affect my understanding of the text? (Almazroui, 2007; Goodman & Marek; 1996; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Wilson, 2005). Through RMA the student becomes more aware of the reading process and the strategies he/she can use when reading. He/she realizes that not all miscues are bad; even proficient readers make miscues. Miscues only need to be corrected if they interfere with the meaning (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010; Wilde, 2000). The goal of RMA is to help students fill in the gaps and develop new strategies to use when reading (Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010).
Students begin to realize that “reading is not just pronouncing words correctly; it is creating meaning by integrating the author’s text with their own background knowledge and experiences” (Moore and Gilles, 2005, p 3). Reading is not just error free reproduction of text. It is more important to understand what is read than read it without miscues (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010; Wilde, 2000).

Purpose of the study

I chose Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) because RMA provides a window into how a reader uses his/her knowledge of language to construct meaning while he/she reads. I believe that “Reading is an ongoing, cognitive process that develops over time based on knowledge and experiences rather than a discrete set of skills to be mastered” (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 4). Miscues made in oral reading provide valuable information about the student’s strengths and weaknesses. The process of talking about his/her own oral reading miscues and text retellings with peers, teachers, or both helps children and adolescents gain a greater understanding of reading and what good readers do. “Readers feel empowered and revalued as they gain control of their reading” (Moore & Gilles, 2005, p. 3).

In this study, I worked with a family member who had been identified as “at-risk” for failure in reading and was receiving additional support at school. In sixth grade she was pulled out of her regular classes 4 times per week for 30 minutes to work with a small group. We used RMA to help her identify her strengths and weaknesses as a reader. The guiding questions for my research were:

- How might using RMA influence a student’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension?
- How might RMA influence how a student views herself/himself as a reader?
Study Approach

During this research, I worked with this student in a 1:1 setting, usually in her home. When we began our RMA sessions I used models of myself reading to introduce miscue analysis. I introduced vocabulary and during the early sessions we reviewed vocabulary associated with MA and RMA (discussed in detail in Chapter 3). Throughout the study I reminded her to ask questions if she did not understand a word or phrase used in our discussions. During each session, we evaluated and discussed miscues in a positive way. We discussed strategies that were used and additional strategies that could have been used. We used teacher selected and student-selected text.

Retrospective Miscue Analysis is a two-part process. At least the first part needs to be recorded, but many researchers suggest recording all conversations after the initial recording to increase value of research (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Moore & Gilles 2005). During the first session, the student reads instructional level text independently while the teacher listens and records miscues. Then the student retells, or gives a summary, of what was read. Ideally, the retelling is unaided. The teacher may say: Tell me everything you remember about the story; Tell me more; Do you remember anything else? Were there other characters? (Wilde, 2000). The teacher can also probe for more information about the student’s understanding by asking questions like: What happened when...? Why do you think…? How did the character feel when…? What about…? (Wilde, 2000). At the next session, the student and teacher listen to the reading and the retell and discuss miscues. Common questions for discussion are:

1) Did the miscue make sense?

2) Did it sound right?

3) Was it corrected?
4) Should it have been?

5) Why was the miscue made?

6) Did it affect my understanding of the text?


Through the use of RMA, I hoped that she would begin reflecting and monitoring for comprehension independently and revalue reading.

Rationale

Courtney (pseudonym) shared with me that she did not like to go with the reading tutor because she was embarrassed. I chose to work with her because I know that she has been identified by her school as “at-risk” for failure in reading. On state tests that measure performance in ELA (English Language Arts) she scored a NYS Level 2: “Students performing at this level are below proficient in standards for their grade. They demonstrate knowledge, skills, and practices embodied by the New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy that are considered partial but insufficient for the expectations at this grade” (Common Core, 2015).

Courtney was diagnosed with Celiac Disease and started a gluten-free diet in October 2013. She was always easily distracted, which can be a symptom of Celiac Disease. Her mother was optimistic that a change in diet and her motivation to improve in reading would result in an improvement in her overall attitude about and experiences at school. I hoped that by using RMA she would increase her ability to self-monitor fluency and comprehension and revalue reading.
Summary

It is important to provide struggling students additional support, but a pull-out model isolates and embarrasses students. What are the other alternatives? I believe Retrospective Miscue Analysis is a powerful tool for students who have obstacles they need to overcome in reading. By being involved in listening to her own reading and reflecting on her miscues, I hoped that this student would reflect on and make adjustments to her reading. For example, she would begin to think about why she uses certain strategies, what strategies work, and what strategies don’t work. My goal was to help her recognize her strengths and develop her weaknesses by increasing her awareness of the reading process. I hoped she would make connections between her use of cueing systems and active reading strategies and how these influence comprehension.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

As I began to look for research on Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA), I found that much of the research that addressed RMA specifically was from the late 1990s and early 2000s. This research had shown there were benefits to using RMA with readers of all ages (primary, elementary and secondary school age children). Most recently there has been a shift in research to using RMA with students with identified disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), adults who spoke two languages, and one study suggested involving families in the process of RMA (Almazroui, 2007; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wurr, Theurer, & Kim, 2008).

The overarching theme regarding Retrospective Miscue Analysis involves revaluing reading, both reading as a process and revaluing the student as a reader (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wohlwend, 2012; and Wurr, et al., 2008). Common themes throughout the research regarding Miscue Analysis include:

- readers are individuals
- miscues give valuable information about the reader
- involving the student in miscue analysis has a strong impact
- miscue analysis needs to focus on building on strengths and developing weaknesses

(Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wurr, et al., 2008).

There are many reasons to assess literacy skills. In addition to measuring students’ reading abilities assessments can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses, to gain information about programs, measure the effectiveness of an intervention, and to guide staff
development (Davenport, 2002). Principles of literacy assessment include: assess authentic reading and writing in a variety of contexts; assess the literacy environment, instruction, and students; evaluate processes as well as products; and analyze patterns in errors or miscues (Davenport, 2002). Assessment tools should be reliable and results should be easily interpreted and used for the intended purpose, usually to guide instruction.

Miscue Analysis (MA), Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) and Collaborative Retrospective Miscue Analysis (CRMA) (discussed in detail in the following sections) are assessment and instructional tools that provide a series of teachable moments using authentic text and can help the students become more aware of the reading process (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012). By identifying strengths and discussing alternative strategies, teachers/researchers can help students revalue reading and gain confidence in their ability to read (Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

In the following sections I will discuss the process of reading, Miscue Analysis (MA), different types of Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA), and steps for MA and RMA. In addition, I will discuss research that supports RMA with diverse student populations.

**Reading Process**

In order to understand text, readers must apply several cognitive strategies. Goodman and Marek (1996) described these strategies as:

- Initiation or task recognition: there is something to be read in the environment, and the decision is made to begin reading
- Sampling and selection: scanning parts of the text and using background knowledge to process information
• Inference: using what is known (from text or background knowledge) to guess the unknown

• Prediction: anticipate what will come next

• Confirming and disconfirming: self-monitoring to decide if predictions and inferences were accurate or confirmed

• Correction: the ability to fix predictions and inferences when they were not accurate

• Termination: deciding to stop reading

All of these strategies work together to help readers construct meaning. Reading proficiency depends on how the reader controls these processes, not on which process they use (Goodman & Marek, 1996). The most important factors in reading proficiency are the reader’s control over semantic and syntactic information; there is little variation regarding the level of control of graphophonic information (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

Reading is a process of constructing meaning. Miscues give valuable information about what the reader is doing (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). Readers use a combination of cuing systems simultaneously to construct meaning from text. Effective readers read for meaning. When readers come to a word they don’t know they have choices. Teaching strategies such as substitutions, or placeholders, can help readers (Black, 2004). As long as the reader understands the text, these strategies are better than getting stuck and losing meaning (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009). All readers make miscues; good readers self-correct if something doesn’t make sense (Black, 2004; Goodman and Marek, 1996; Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

Learning the difference between high-quality miscues (miscues that do not impact meaning and sound right) and low-quality miscues (miscues that do impact meaning or do not sound right) empowers readers. Ideally, students will realize that it is only important to correct
miscues when the miscue changes the meaning of the text (Black, 2004; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

Kucer (2009, 2011) found that four interrelated processing behaviors were consistently linked to comprehension demonstrated by quality retellings. These behaviors were paraphrasing, making cross-sentence connections, monitoring for understanding, and resolving problems when there were encountered. These behaviors did not operate alone (Kucer, 2009). Efficient readers are able to combine all cueing systems, realize the author is giving cohesive information, and use his/her background knowledge to make sense of what he/she is reading (Kucer, 2009).

“Tunnel-vision” occurs when readers focus more on one cue than others (Kabuto, 2009). For example, a student may try too hard to sound out the word using visual information, or sound out while neglecting to consider meaning. This negatively impacts comprehension (Kabuto, 2009). Frequently, readers rely too heavily on the Graphophonic (visual) cue. Often, this is because readers have learned to “sound it out” (Kabuto, 2009). Readers may be so focused on sounding out the word that they lose meaning and read something that is not a word (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Kucer, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

**Miscue Analysis (MA) and Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA)**

*Miscue Analysis (MA)*

Miscue Analysis stems from the early work of Kenneth Goodman. Miscue Analysis involves the reader’s oral reading and retelling of an unfamiliar text. A miscue is defined as when a reader reads something other than what is written. Goodman described MA as a “window” into the reader’s mind (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Compton-Lily, 2005; Kucer, 2009, 2011; Wurr, et al., 2008). Miscue analysis is also described as a window into the reader’s “on the fly” problem solving as they read in context (Wohlwend, 2012).
Dean (2010) called MA “a detailed forensic picture of the strategies and cognitive understanding students employ to read” (p. 8). When used together, the teacher/researcher is able to determine what reading strategies the student has control of, and what strategies the student needs to develop. From a student’s pattern of miscues, a skilled teacher can determine which systems of language the reader is using or neglecting when interacting with text (Kucer, 2009, 2011).

Another important part of miscue analysis is the unaided retelling of the text. The retelling indicates the reader’s level of comprehension of the text. The teacher can use probing questions to elicit additional information about the child’s understanding of the text (Dean, 2010). The additional prompts do not lead a student to an answer, but activate his/her recall of events or details from the text.

*Retro*sp*ective Miscue Analysis (RMA)*

RMA is a process in which the reader is involved in analyzing his/her own miscues with a teacher. RMA takes place in two different sessions. First, the oral reading and retelling are recorded. Then miscues are coded (described later in this section) and the teacher chooses high-quality miscues that show the reader’s strengths and a low quality miscue that shows where the reader needs to develop strategies. During the second session, the discussion of miscues help the student realize what he/she is doing well, and what he/she can do to become a better reader. Through the use of RMA, students learn a variety of strategies to use instead of just sounding out words.

The goal of RMA is to help readers become aware of what strategies they are using when reading and help them develop a wider range of skills (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Compton-Lily, 2005; Kucer, 2009, 2011; Wurr, et al., 2008). Questions students ask themselves include:
Does this make sense, given what I know so far? Does this sound like language I use? Does this look or sound like other words I know? (Wohlwend, 2012). Students are involved in thinking about reading as an active process with a purpose. Becoming aware of the process of reading and the objective of constructing meaning helps students revalue reading. Becoming aware of high-quality miscues helps students realize what they do well as readers, and, as a result, revalue themselves as readers. Revaluing reading and self as a reader are the primary goals of RMA (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012).

As students are involved in the process of using RMA, they become aware of what strategies they are using, what strategies work, and also learn new strategies. Teachers are able to focus on student strengths in order to help develop weaknesses. Students learn about reading and language by discussing miscues in meaningful ways (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012).

**Collaborative Retrospective Miscue Analysis (CRMA)**

CRMA involves more than one student/participant in discussions about miscues. This occurs in a small group setting, typically 3 to 4 students (Black, 2004; Moore & Seeger, 2010). During CRMA sessions, the focus is on one student’s reading. The reader’s miscues are analyzed and discussed. Students are always present during sessions involving their miscues (Moore & Seeger, 2010). One benefit of CRMA is that it provides more exposure to thinking about and analyzing miscues (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009). Black (2004) stated that activities analyzing other readers’ miscues had a positive impact.

Another type of CRMA is Family RMA. Kabuto (2009) combined the use of RMA and family literacy. Different family members were recorded reading and miscues were discussed.
When children saw that adults made miscues and adults realized the difference between high-quality and low-quality miscues, the adults were better able to support the students in reading (Kabuto, 2009). Family RMA helped parents and children realize that everyone miscues and that the most important part of reading is drawing meaning from the text (Kabuto, 2009). Collaborative RMA has been successful in classroom and alternative settings. Participants of CRMA sessions become experts at miscue analysis and realize that all readers miscue (Kabuto, 2009). Again, a positive climate is necessary to provide a meaningful setting where growth can occur. All participants are involved in reading and discussing miscues. Participants become aware of new strategies and develop an understanding of reading as a process of constructing meaning as opposed to accurate reproduction of text (Black, 2004; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Kabuto, 2011). As participants become familiar with the format of CRMA, they can begin to lead discussions about miscues (Black, 2004).

**Steps for Miscue Analysis**

*Selecting a text:* Text used for miscue analysis should be at least 250-500 words, organized, interesting, and challenging (Moore & Gilles, 2006). It is important for a text to be unfamiliar and challenging because if the passage is too easy or familiar there won’t be any miscues to analyze (Moore & Gilles, 2006). Some researchers suggest beginning with a student’s instructional level, but it is good to have a range of texts above and below that level so that they are accessible if the first text is not a good fit for miscue analysis (Moore & Gilles, 2006).

*Create a typescript:* Before the session the teacher must create a typescript of the text selected. It is necessary to have space between the lines to record miscues. If possible, text can be photocopied and enlarged. Copyright laws permit one copy for educational purposes (Moore & Gilles, 2006). After creating a typescript, lines are numbered using a four digit format. The
first two numbers are the numbers of the page, and the second 2 numbers are the lines on the page (Moore & Gilles, 2006; Moore & Seeger, 2010). For example, the fifth line on page 54 would be labeled as 5405.

**Coding Miscues:** The purpose of coding is to make it easier to find patterns in students’ reading strategies. The most common miscue notations for the oral reading are:

- substitution (substituted word hand written above the text)
- insertion (use a caret and wrote word above where insertion occurred)
- omission (skipped word crossed out with single line)
- repetition (coded with circled r and underline repeated word or phrase)
- successful correction (SC)
- unsuccessful correction (all unsuccessful attempts written above text)

Miscues are then coded using the three primary cuing systems used in reading: semantic (meaning), syntactic (grammar) and graphophonic/visual (sound/symbol) (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). These cueing systems are commonly referred to as MSV: M (Meaning/semantic), S (Syntax/syntactic) and V (Visual/graphophonic) (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wohlwend, 2012; Wurr, et al., 2008). Miscues are coded with ALL cues that the reader used up to the point where the miscue occurred.

Signs that a reader is using semantic cues (M) include: making a substitution, omission or insertion miscue that retains the meaning of the sentence (even if the miscue does not look or sound like the original words); or self-corrects miscues that do not make sense (Wohlwend, 2012). Signs that a user is using syntactic (S) cues include: the reader makes substitutions, omissions, or insertion miscues that fit conventional word order; or substitutes the same part of
speech (noun for a noun, verb for a verb etc.); or substitutes words that fit the child’s current developmental understanding of rules for language and grammar (Wohlwend, 2012). Signs that a reader is using graphophonic cues include: the reader makes a miscue that looks and/or sounds similar to the word in the text (Wohlwend, 2012).

When students read, their miscues show what processes they are using, and which processes they are neglecting (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Goodman and Marek (1996) developed a form to code miscues. For each miscue, the researcher rates the following categories:

- **Syntactic acceptability (Does it sound right?)**
  Y (Yes); P (Partial); and N (None)

- **Semantic acceptability (Does it make sense?)**
  Y (Yes); P (Partial); and N (None)

- **Meaning change (Did miscue change meaning?)**
  Y (Yes); P (Partial); and N (None)

- **Correction (did student self-correct miscue?)**
  Y (yes) or N (no)

- **Graphic Similarity (does it look similar?)**
  H (High), S (Some), or N (No) similarity

- **Sound Similarity (does it sound similar?)**
  H (High), S (Some), or N (No) similarity

*(see Appendix A-Tables 1 and 2)*
**Steps for Retrospective Miscue Analysis**

In addition to the steps for Miscue Analysis, Retrospective Miscue Analysis includes the student in analyzing his/her miscues. The oral reading and retelling are recorded in one session, then reviewed by the teacher/researcher (who chooses miscues to discuss), and finally discussed in another session with the reader. Involving students in discussions about what effective readers do helps the student develop strategies and confidence (Goodman & Marek, 1996).

Goodman & Marek (1996) also emphasize that it is important to help readers understand what their strengths are and build on them. It is also important to help students realize that some texts are more difficult than others and appreciate why. For example, some texts are poorly written, while others may be difficult because they contain new information or unfamiliar language (Goodman & Marek, 1996). There are several different problem-solving strategies that effective readers use. Effective readers reread the current sentence, reread the prior sentence, read ahead, use prior knowledge, sounds out word, ask for assistance, and/or ignore the problem (Kucer, 2009). Teachers can introduce strategies to use, but most importantly RMA helps the reader realize that when meaning is breaking down he/she should reread the previous sentence or page (Black, 2004).

The ultimate goal of Retrospective Miscue Analysis is for the reader to revalue reading as a process of making meaning, and revalue oneself as a reader. Teachers help students learn how to read and should also help students realize reading can be enjoyable and should always be meaningful (Compton-Lilly, 2005). By learning to recognize that high quality miscues do not change the meaning of a sentence or story, students shift from viewing reading as accurate reproduction of text to viewing reading as an activity for gaining information. Tools
Burke Reading Interview. (Appendix B) (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 134) An interview used with a student to find out his/her perception of reading and of himself/herself as a reader (Dean, 2010). The Burke Reading Interview is used before and after conducting RMA sessions. The pre and post interviews are compared in hopes of finding changes in the student’s perception of reading, and/or of himself/herself as a reader.

Recordings

Recorded reading and retelling. During RMA sessions, first, students are audio and/or video recorded during a reading and retelling of unfamiliar instructional level text.

Recorded discussion. Following the reading and retelling session, the student and teacher discuss miscues, focusing on high-quality miscues that show the reader's strengths.

Observation Protocol. (Appendix C) The observation protocol is a format for the teacher/researcher to use to collect field notes. During each session, the teacher can write down notes regarding student’s reading and/or behavior may not be evident in recordings.

Reproducible Miscue Organizer. (Appendix D) This form is used to organize miscues for discussion sessions.

RMA Session Organizer. (Appendix E) This form is used to look for patterns in the reader’s miscues and keep track of high-quality and low-quality miscues.

Research supports RMA

Dean (2010) reported that students who engage in RMA became aware of what readers do to make meaning and became more selective in what strategies they chose to use. They were more willing to predict and substitute unknown words once they knew this was a strategy that good readers use. One student stated effective strategies he learned during RMA: “‘go back and take a running start, read it again, or skip it and go on’” (Moore & Brantingham, 2003, p. 8). The
same student began rereading, looking for familiar chunks in words and using placeholders as strategies when he read (Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

RMA has proven effective with students from bilingual families and adults learning English as a second language (L2). Two case studies focused on school age students who were learning English. One student who spoke English as a second language became more independent and showed improvement in all academic areas after one year of RMA sessions. He was encouraged to see that his miscues were not a sign of failure, but of him making attempts to understand what he was reading (Almazroui, 2007). His confidence in reading and writing increased (Almazroui, 2007). The process of RMA also helped him understand that reading and writing should be organized and make sense (Almazroui, 2007). Similarly, the study of three adult L2 readers, found that the three readers relied too much on the surface features (letter/sound) relationships of the text. Through Retrospective Miscue Analysis, they developed different strategies and used them along with the visual cue (Wurr, et al., 2009). Through meaningful discussions about language and literacy, adult readers experienced an increase in confidence and developed a deeper understanding of language (Wurr, et al., 2009).

Another case study focused on a student who lived with his mother, who was monolingual, (Arabic) and his father (who was bi-lingual, Arabic and English). Some challenges the researcher reported had to do with names and dialect patterns. The researcher was able to adapt the RMA sessions and analysis of miscues to focus paying attention to different text patterns. She also carefully selected text for RMA sessions based on her knowledge of the student (Almazroui, 2007). Another study using RMA also explored the relationship between reading proficiency and cultural relevance of text (Ebe, 2010). She compared reading performance on same level texts, along with the Cultural Relevance Rubric, to look for possible
relationships regarding reading proficiency of text read by third-grade ELL students (Ebe, 2010). Each of nine participants were asked to read and retell two stories that were identified as being at the same level (student’s instructional or independent reading level), along with completing the Cultural Relevance Rubric with the researcher. Analyses of the miscues show that all nine students were more proficient in the text that was more culturally relevant. The miscues on the culturally relevant texts were high quality, and showed strengths of constructing meaning and grammatical relationships. They also scored higher on the retelling of culturally relevant text (Ebe, 2010).

The study using Family RMA focused on how RMA could help parents help their children. In this study, both parents and children were recorded reading texts and their miscues are analyzed (Kabuto, 2009). By increasing parents’ and children’s awareness through RMA, both realized reading is not only reproducing text accurately and that miscues can be used to identify strengths (Kabuto, 2009).

**Considerations for MA and RMA**

Using models for Retrospective Miscue Analysis can provide a good model for fluency and grammar. This is especially beneficial for students who speak other languages, non-standard dialects of English, and students who have learning disabilities. Many studies suggested using models of fluent reading as a part of RMA. Black (2004) used recordings of adults who were proficient readers making high-quality miscues that were then analyzed. She suggested introducing RMA in this way to establish the positive nature of analyzing miscues.

Written language is different from spoken language. “While all children’s spoken language differs from the language of books, our challenge is intensified when children bring with them language patterns that are significantly different from the language forms they
experience in texts” (Compton-Lilly, 2005, p. 50). This is especially true for students who speak languages other than English or African-American Vernacular English (AAVE), and other non-standard dialects of English. Not only are they working to decode and comprehend, but frequently the language structure is unfamiliar. If a student says a word the way they would in speech, it is not a miscue (Wilde, 2000). When analyzing miscues, it the student has used syntax they would use in speech, it is not considered a miscue.

Reading is learned through experiencing print and understanding it that its purpose is to provide information. Oral language is learned best when it is whole, relevant, real, in context and functional for the user; the same is true for the written language (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Educators know that when students can make personal connections to what they are reading they have better comprehension (Ebe, 2010).

**Positive Climate.** It is imperative that the climate of an RMA session is positive. Students need to feel safe so that they can take risks. Kabuto (2009) discussed how Family RMA creates an emotionally safe place for children. Students are able to talk about reading, away from their own experiences and struggles, and listen to their parents’ experiences. By doing this, positive experiences and relationships are created with each other and with reading (Kabuto, 2009).

Compton-Lilly (2005) discussed why it is important to maintain respect for AAVE and help students develop an awareness of language that will help them be successful in mainstream society. Teachers create a negative association for students when they constantly correct AAVE or refer to it as inappropriate. Students pick up on teacher’s attitudes of English as being superior over AAVE and this can create a resistance to school (Compton-Lilly, 2005). Instead, the teacher could acknowledge differences between AAVE and academic language, or the language in
books, in order helped the students make connections and improve their awareness of book language.

**Theoretical Framework**

In 1971, Piaget wrote about disequilibrium as point in learning when the learner has unresolved conflicts and has not yet accepted or generalized the learning (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Students who struggle with reading, or any academic skill, are experiencing disequilibrium. They need instruction and practice in order to gain control of the skill. RMA provides an opportunity for this to occur.

The most important tool for RMA is the teacher’s brain (Moore & Gilles, 2005). The teacher is able to guide thinking by taking advantage of teachable moments. RMA involves responsive teaching, which is directly related to Vygotsky’s theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The ZPD stretches beyond what the child can do independently to what the child can do with help (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Effective teachers can individualize instruction and focus on the reader’s strengths and weaknesses. Students are involved in meaningful discussions about language and literacy and become more aware of the reading process (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012).

Readers bring experience, attitudes, knowledge of concepts and more to make sense of what they read. Through meaningful discussions about reading students learn about what makes a reader proficient. They learn new strategies and they learn how to evaluate strategies to determine what works and what doesn’t. By listening to themselves read and discussing miscues, they learn to focus on meaning and become better readers (Goodman & Marek, 1996.)

RMA is directly related to metacognitive experiences and knowledge (Black, 2004). When miscues maintain meaning the reader has basically stated the same idea in an alternate
way (Kucer, 2009). In order to produce a miscue that maintains meaning, the reader has demonstrated his/her understanding of the text being processed (Kucer, 2009). When a reader miscues in a way that is syntactically acceptable, the reader has processed the text and created an alternative way to state the information presented using appropriate grammar (Black, 2004; Kucer, 2009).

Metacognitive processes involved in reading include: procedural knowledge, conditional knowledge, and declarative knowledge. Black (2004) analyzes the metacognitive processes in a reader while he participated in RMA sessions. This study focused on one fourth-grade male student who was identified as a struggling reader who needed additional support.

According to Black (2004), procedural knowledge involves: specifying the task, selecting the most appropriate strategy and performing the steps to apply the strategy. Conditional knowledge involves: understanding reasons strategies are helpful and knowing in specific contexts what strategy would be helpful. Declarative knowledge is the most complex. It involves: task awareness, task analysis, strategy awareness and performance awareness.

Task awareness refers to the student’s ability to: respond to information, know about different types of text, understand text structure, set goals, and identify their own beliefs about text (Black, 2004). Task analysis involves the student’s ability to: consider the task at hand, realize certain strategies are needed, determine level of importance of information presented, and pay extra attention to the information that is believed to be important (Black, 2004). Strategy awareness, addressed in task awareness and analysis, and means being aware of strategies and when they are helpful (Black, 2004). Performance awareness is the student’s ability to realize when they have been successful in understanding information and learning (Black, 2004).
Conclusion

Research shows that the children who benefit the most from Retrospective Miscue Analysis are students who need to re-conceptualize reading as a process of making meaning from text (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Factors that influence the extent of the outcomes RMA or CRMA are: trust, age and maturity, motivation, interests, perceptions of learning, level of responsibility, cultural background, language background and reading ability (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

It is important that the RMA sessions are conducted by someone who is knowledgeable about RMA and the reading process. Teachers who are evaluating the miscues bring their own knowledge and concepts of language to the evaluation process (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Teachers need to be able to decide quickly what strategy or technique would be most beneficial for the student (Moore & Gilles, 2005). The teacher needs to be flexible and listen to the responses given by the students in order to appreciate what connections the student is making about how they read.
Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures

Introduction

The intent of this research is to explore how using Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA), can support a student to revalue the process of reading and herself as a reader. Students in middle school and junior high are aware of their performance of reading. By working with the student to evaluate miscues and the process of reading, teachers can empower the student (Wilde, 2000). RMA uses conversations about reading to help students deepen their understanding of reading as a process of constructing meaning (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Participants

I completed a case study of a relative, Courtney (pseudonym), who is eleven and in sixth grade. She is Caucasian and lives with her mother, step-father and two younger siblings (sister, age 4, and brother, age 1). She spends every other weekend with father, step-mother and step-sister, who is 10. Courtney is a wonderful person and a lot of fun to be around. I know that she does not like to read, but reads because she has to. I believe that she has had so many negative and unsuccessful experiences reading that she does not feel like she can be independent and successful in school.

Courtney is a sixth grade student in a suburban school district in Western New York. She moved into this school district during the summer before third grade, after her family moved from Arizona to New York. Her mother knew that she might have a difficult adjustment. She also realized that the academic expectations at the new school would be higher than the school Courtney had attended for K-2. Courtney adjusted well, although she was below her peers academically. She was identified by her new school as at-risk for failure in reading and has received pullout support from 4th to 6th grades.
In Arizona (grades K-2), Courtney attended an urban school in North Phoenix. The school was a Title 1 school (more than 50% of the population receive free or reduced lunches), and a large portion of the population spoke English as a second language. Her mother reports that in Kindergarten and first grade, Courtney was in the high groups in all academic areas. When she entered second grade she was in the high-middle range of her class in North Phoenix.

Her mother, who is an accountant, has always done bedtime stories with her children. In the past, with Courtney, she read to them with little interaction or discussion about the books. She says she remembers Courtney’s teacher sending home discussion topics to use when reading with your child, but admits that she did not do that regularly. She would like to see her daughter improve in reading, but she doesn’t want to put additional pressure on her. She did not show Courtney her scores on standardized tests because she didn’t want her to feel bad about herself or that she is “not as smart,” or does not do as well other students her age.

After researching the performance of the school Courtney attended in Arizona, I noticed that her weak areas are the same areas that her former school is focusing on in their Continuous Improvement Plan. On their website, the school identified the root cause as “Higher level questioning was not emphasized.” Courtney was able to decode sixth grade level text, but she did not draw conclusions or make inferences. She relied on what is in the text with little higher-level thinking.

After moving into the suburban district in Western New York, Courtney scored below average on the NYS ELA (New York State English Language Arts) third grade assessments. In fourth grade she also scored low and was targeted for reading and math, receiving tutoring and attending intersessions during school breaks. On the NYS test at the end of fourth grade, she did not meet the standards in the area of reading. She scored below the 25th percentile on the fifth
grade TerraNova tests last year, and scored a 2 on NYS ELA test. She started receiving additional support at the beginning of fifth grade. In fifth grade she met 1:1 with an Instructional Assistant for 30 minutes each day. Together, they worked on lessons and activities planned by her teacher. The focus during the sessions was on decoding, annotating text and making inferences. Courtney received small group tutoring every other day. Pullout schedules were staggered during the day so she did not miss the same time period each time.

In October of 2013 she was diagnosed with Celiac Disease and started a gluten-free diet. Courtney has never acted out at school, but she has always been quiet and a daydreamer. She has had trouble attending to tasks, which can be a symptom of Celiac. The timing of this study, her diagnosis, changes in her diet, and her attitude of viewing RMA as an opportunity to improve probably worked together to heighten her results.

Context of the study

This study took place outside of school. I worked with Courtney during evenings and weekends. For the recordings and analysis of her oral readings, we worked in a 1:1 setting in her home or in a private room at the public library. We sat together at a table and I recorded the session from a chair or shelf near the table. Originally, I had planned on both being seen on screen, but she was not comfortable with that. I used a Kindle Fire to record, and at Courtney’s request, pointed it at the wall so that neither of us would be on video.

We worked out a schedule around our families’ activities and commitments. While she was not always excited about working with me, she participated in all sessions. Initially we decided that the easiest place for us to meet was in their home. We met twice the first week and 3 times for during the following 4 weeks. We worked at their dining room table if her younger siblings were not home and in her bedroom if they were there. Her room was recently
redecorated. She was proud of her room and when we worked there she was comfortable. We sat in chairs and always started with informal conversation.

For the last two weeks I was able to reserve a room in the basement of our public library. The sessions at the library were more focused and candid. We sat at tables instead of chairs. It was also later in the research so we were both becoming more comfortable and natural with RMA discussions.

**Positionality as the Researcher**

I am a graduate student at State University of New York at Brockport. I am Caucasian and have 3 children. I have over 3 years of classroom teaching experience in a special education setting, and have worked as a substitute teacher in all educational settings for 2 years. I have known Courtney since she was born; her mother and I were pregnant at the same time. She has grown up with my children and is in the same grade as one of my daughters. My goal was to provide support and structure without causing her to shut down. She has a low frustration level and does not like to be wrong. We remained positive and relaxed during all sessions.

When I substitute taught for Courtney’s Science teacher in fifth grade, I was surprised when her group put “no info” as the answer to three questions on a short worksheet that the teacher had left for them to complete. The questions were about a subcategory of a main topic. In the subcategory, the answer was not mentioned. In the paragraphs above a statement was made that addressed the questions. This happened in three out of six questions on the sheet. I showed them one, and then helped them figure out the other two. When I reviewed the assigned reading with them, they realized the question was answered in the reading. They were using the subheadings to locate where information should be, but didn’t search very hard to find the
answer. I was surprised that they had given up so easily, but this gave me insight into her
performance at school.

I had an emotional investment in this research. Courtney was embarrassed that she was
being pulled out of class to receive support in reading. She did not want to attend summer
school, which was offered as an option by her school. As a teacher of literacy, I knew that she
would only become a better reader by reading, but she didn’t enjoy reading. She did not read for
pleasure and she does not reread for clarification. Reading is an important skill, and I wanted to
help her find that it is a great way to learn, grow and experience things she wouldn’t otherwise
experience.

My hope was that by participating in RMA she would improve her reading skills and
realize that reading is fun and important. My goals were to help her revalue reading and help her
improve her ability to self-monitor. I wanted to help her develop techniques and strategies that
would help her be successful as she entered junior high and high school. I also hoped that she
would become empowered as she improved her reading skills and understood what she read.

Data Collection

During the course of the study I collected data to examine if there was a change in her
ability, confidence or view of reading. During each session, we evaluated and discussed previous
readings and miscues. I recorded the reading, retelling and discussions of the text with the
student.

I used my own reflective journal and provided the opportunity for the student to also
write in a journal to be used for the research. I used an Observation Protocol (Appendix F,
adapted) form during our discussions about prerecorded sessions. I recorded my observations in
field notes while she read and at the end of each session. My journal will include these field
notes. These observations gave me insight into how she behaved (non-verbal communication like body language, posture, etc.) during reading, how she interacted with text (level of engagement), and her effort.

I used the Burke Reading Interview (Appendix B) (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 134) to gain insight into her beliefs and perceptions about reading. I interviewed the student before the research started, and after the research ended. I audio recorded both interviews, and made notes in my research journal. As I reflected on my research, reflections were also recorded in my journal. Wonderings, themes, and any other pertinent information were recorded in my journal.

After the Courtney’s initial reading and retelling, I used Reproducible Simplified Miscue Organizer: RMA Session Organizer (Appendix D) (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 133) to analyze and select miscues to discuss at the following session. After our 7th session, I created a document, RMA Session Organizer, (Appendix E) to use with the student during the RMA Discussion session. My goal was to create a simple and meaningful way to display the miscues that was consistent with other coding forms, and helpful in guiding discussions with Courtney. Together at each session we listened to readings and discussed miscues. We determined if they were high or low quality miscues.

At the conclusion of the study, in addition to the Burke Reading Interview (Appendix B), I conducted an Interview Protocol I created, The RMA Participation Interview (Appendix F). This interview provided additional information about her perception and experience with Retrospective Miscue Analysis.

I kept all video and electronic data collected on my personal computer with password protection. Any hand written notes were locked in a secure drawer. All data was deleted and destroyed after data analysis.
Procedures

I audio-recorded all reading and discussion sessions. I used a model of recorded readings to introduce miscue analysis in a positive and helpful way. Initially, we listened to and looked at miscues I made when reading a text. By modeling my own miscues and miscue analysis, she saw that all readers miscue. The purpose was to help her realize that when we look at miscues, we are looking to see what the reader was doing well, and also consider what the reader could have done differently. Miscue analysis is a way for us to find out what we are doing well, and improve what needs improvement.

Introducing RMA

In our first session, I used a recording of myself reading aloud from *Harry Potter* (Rowling, 1998). I selected this text because I knew I would miscue naturally. I explained that miscues give us clues about what a reader is thinking as they read. I explained that a miscue is something that is an unexpected response from the text. I modeled discussion of miscues in terms of high-quality and low-quality miscues. High-quality miscues do not change the meaning and sound right and do not need to be corrected. Low-quality miscues change the meaning, or do not sound like speech and should be corrected. I used my miscues and explained my thinking as I was reading.

As I read, I knew that I had miscued in a sentence; however, I knew the meaning had not changed so I did not self-correct. In another sentence I changed the syntax of the sentence in two places so it matched, and did not self-correct because it sounded right and didn’t change the meaning. In another sentence, I read the sentence in past tense but it was written in present tense. I did self-correct because I wasn’t sure if time would be an important detail. We discussed my
miscues and I could tell that she was engaged and understood the vocabulary I used and connections I made. She started using the words meaning, syntax and visual in context.

We worked together in a comfortable setting. In our first session I determined her independent reading level by using the Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Kit. She read a Q level text with 98% accuracy, a fluency score of 1 and a comprehension Score of 6/10, which translates to around a 700 Lexile Level. In our initial sessions I selected texts that would interest her. She had indicated that she was interested in reading about extreme weather, natural disasters and the Holocaust.

It is important for the researcher to code in a way that is meaningful to him/her (Moore & Seeger, 2010). My background knowledge of running records influenced how I coded miscues. Before each session I created a typescript of the text. I followed along while Courtney read, made notes in the margins of my typescript, and then went to back code and score using the rubrics for fluency and comprehension adapted from Fountas and Pinnell (discussed later in this chapter).

After determining which cues MSV she used during previous readings, I tried to find ways to build on these skills and introduce strategies that could help develop cues that she was neglecting. Throughout the study I paid attention to which strategies and techniques she used without prompting, and considered what new strategy could provide support. I continuously looked at her performance and analyzed what strategies she was developing and incorporating into her reading as a result of RMA.

**RMA Sessions**

I am going to discuss the research in three phases. Phase 1 included sessions 1-5, Phase 2 was sessions 6-11, and Phase 3 was sessions 12-15. During Phase 1, I found narrative and
informational texts online that were at her instructional reading level and consisted of 250-300 words. During the 2nd phase, sessions 6-11, we used passages from *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000). We stopped every page and a half or so to discuss the events. During the 3rd Phase we used a photo autobiography, *Looking back* (Lowry, 1998). The Lexile levels over the course of the study varied, but the passages during each phase were consistent; Phase 1 levels were around a 700, Phase 2 were 590, and Phase 3 were 900.

My original plan was to follow the suggestions of previous research, which indicated each session should use one continuous text which was 250-300 words. The initial texts fit the requirements for traditional RMA. However, she was not making many miscues and she was not interested in the material. Even though the Lexile levels from Phases 1 to 2 decreased, the miscues in Phase 2 gave us better information and allowed for better discussions.

During our 6th session, she told me about a book she was reading in school and asked if we could use that for our session. I agreed to try it and was able to scan a copy of the text. The book was *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000). After our session when I went home I realized that the lexile level of the book was only 590, but her miscues gave me a window into her thinking. We used that book for the next 5 sessions. Her interest in the book was high, her fluency was good, and she was making miscues that gave me a window into her thinking.

During Phase 3, we used a book I borrowed from the Library. It was an autobiographical photo memoir written by Lois Lowry (Lowry, 1998). The book lent itself to RMA. Each photograph included a written section in which Lowry told a story and/or gave background information and explained what happened before or what happened after the photograph was taken. There were also photographs of her mother in which Lowry made guesses as to what
might have happened to the people in the pictures before and/or after the picture was taken. This text was definitely the most difficult, and it was also the most appealing to Courtney.

After each reading, I selected miscues that emphasized her strengths and then discussed these with her. Recording the readings was essential because she read an average of 120 words per minute. Sometimes when coding I had to replay parts of her reading several times to make sure I coded the miscues accurately. In each session we evaluated miscues together to determine if they were high or low quality, and also if they should have been corrected.

Week 1: (2 sessions)
1. Burke Interview; Introduce cueing systems and miscue analysis. Play a recorded reading and retelling, discuss coding miscues and analyze with the student.
2. Continue discussion, or discuss new recorded reading and retelling

Week 2: (2 sessions)
1. Record student reading and retelling.
2. Guided discussion of teacher selected miscues
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring

Week 3: (2 sessions)
1. Record student reading and retelling.
2. Guided discussion of teacher selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring

Week 4: (2 sessions)
1. Record student reading and retelling of Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000).
2. Discussion of student selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring

Week 5: (2 sessions)
1. Record student reading and retelling of Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000).
2. Discussion of student and/or teacher selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring

Week 6: (2 sessions)
2. Discussion of student and/or teacher selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring
Week 7: (1 session)
1. Record student reading and retelling from *Looking Back* (Lowry, 1998).
2. Discussion of student and/or teacher selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; introduce a strategy to try; progress monitoring

Week 8: (2 sessions)
1. Record student reading and retelling from *Looking Back* (Lowry, 1998).
2. Discussion of student and/or teacher selected miscues and/or misunderstandings
3. Continue discussion/reflection; Burke Interview (Appendix B), Participation Interview (Appendix F)

After recording readings, I listened to recordings to code and analyze miscues. I used the RMA Miscue Organizer (Appendix D) (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 133) to plan for discussions. After the 8th session, I developed the RMA Session Organizer (Appendix E) (created based on Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010) to look for patterns and guide discussions. This gave me a way to organize the data and look for patterns in all cueing systems, as well as show the frequency of high and low quality miscues and changes over time. During the following session we listened to the reading and discussed miscues together. We focused on her strengths and weaknesses. We discussed reasons for miscues, and their significance for comprehension.

**Coding miscues**

It is important for the researcher to code in a way that is meaningful to him/her. My background knowledge of running records influenced how I coded miscues. Before each session I created a typescript of the text to use, as described in chapter 2. Here is how I coded miscues:

- substitution (substituted word hand written above the text)
- insertion (a caret and wrote word above where insertion occurred)
- omission (skipped word crossed out with single line)
- repetition (coded with circled r and underline repeated word or phrase)
- successful correction (SC)
unsuccessful correction (all unsuccessful attempts written above text)

In our initial session I found passages that fit the suggested criteria and that I thought would interest her. She had indicated that she was interested in learning more about the Holocaust, weather, and natural disasters. I tried to find interesting narratives and informational texts with these themes.

I followed along while Courtney read, made notes in the margins of my typescript, and filled out the Observation Protocol each session (Appendix C). I used the fluency and comprehension rubrics I created based on Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Kit (Tables 3 & 4 in Appendix A), and coded miscues on the typescript. Recording the readings was essential because she read an average of 120 words per minute. Sometimes when coding I had to replay parts of her reading several times to make sure I coded the miscues accurately.

After scoring fluency and comprehension, I transferred all miscues to a coding form (Appendix D) to organize them for our discussions in the following session. Beginning in our 8th session, we used a new form that I created (Appendix E) to discuss miscues and determine if the miscues were high or low quality. We discussed her thoughts while she was reading, and what she did well, and what may help in the future. I tried to find ways to build on her skills and introduce strategies that could develop cues that she was neglecting. Throughout the study, I paid attention to which strategies and techniques she used without prompting, and considered what new strategy could provide support. I continuously looked at her performance and analyzed what strategies she was developing and incorporating into her reading as a result of RMA.

Data Analysis

In order to effectively analyze data Hubbard and Power (1999) suggest these methods:
audit check: I worked closely with a research group and my thesis advisor to check, or confirm, findings in my research.

constant comparison: I developed a way to categorize patterns in data over time and use my data to build theories.

thick description: I included strong descriptions and details about the research setting and techniques so that my research can be compared to other research. I used data (excerpts from sessions and our journals) to create thick descriptions and show changes over time.

semantic domain analysis: I created a constant way to compare, code and analyze data (described below).

Triangulation: I used multiple sources, methods and theories to confirm my findings.

Data analysis occurred continuously and in many phases throughout the study. Throughout the study I looked for and coded patterns in her oral readings and retellings. Did she rely heavily on one cue? Did she neglect any cuing systems? What was the most important cue to focus on developing? I coded miscues using MSV and used the coding form to analyze miscues and look for patterns. After the recorded reading and retelling RMA session, first I listened to and coded miscues on the typescript then transferred them to the Reproducible Miscue Organizer (Appendix D). Then I transferred all sessions on onto the Miscue Analysis Coding Form (Appendix E). Finally, I selected high quality miscues to analyze with Courtney at our next RMA session. In the following session we listened to her reading together and discussed miscues in oral reading and retellings. These sessions were also recorded.
We focused on several reading strategies, especially predicting, inferring, self-correction, and confirming/disconfirming. In the Observation Protocol, I kept notes of which strategies she used. I circled strategies we had discussed in sessions in blue, and strategies we had not discussed in red. Over time, I was able to see if she was more likely to incorporate strategies we discussed in previous sessions into her reading.

Criteria for Trustworthiness

This study took place over eight weeks. To ensure the validity of my research, I:

- met with the student at least twice a week for the duration of the study (with the exception of one week we were only able to meet once due to family commitments);
- used the same vocabulary, regarding miscue analysis, for the duration of the study and ensure that the student understands terms and concept;
- chose reliable data and detailed descriptions of processes used to analyze the data.

Through triangulation across multiple sources, I hoped to find patterns and relationships that lead to Courtney’s improved perception of reading. I hoped that through our RMA sessions that she would be able to revalue the process of reading and herself as a reader. In order to answer my research questions, I looked for patterns or themes that occurred in miscue analysis data, RMA session data, progress monitoring material, field notes, journals and interviews. I color coded across multiple sources. Using a highlighter or marker, I coded:

1) evidence of self-monitoring (green)

2) evidence of Courtney’s perception of reading or perception of herself as a reader (orange)

3) evidence of using strategies discussed in previous RMA sessions (blue)
I sorted and categorized the collected data. This happened continuously and in phases. Throughout the study I looked for patterns and relationships across all collected data. During RMA sessions with the student, I specifically monitored and coded for evidence of strategies, self-monitoring and engagement. At the conclusion of the study I was able to go back into my own notes and her journal, as well as the Burke Interviews and the RMA Participation Interview to find and code specific examples and evidence of these occurrences.

From the beginning of data collection, in my own field notes I used the codes for personal notes (PN), methodological notes (MN), and theoretical notes (TN) (Hubbard & Power, 1999). Personal notes include details about what was going on before the session that could influence events during the session or quality of notes. For example, if Courtney was arguing with her mother or friend, or if something else happened that could have influence her performance or my notes, including my own experiences or concerns. Methodological notes involve the methods of data collection. For example, if I realized “I should get information about…” or, “Next time we___, I should try____.” Theoretical notes make connections between what occurred, and possible reasons why. For example, making connections between her performance or behavior, and what is the reason or purpose. Within my observation protocol recording sheet, I will code these with the codes (PN, MN or TN) circled next to where the note is. The purpose of coding notes in this way was to help make sense of notes, and when looking at the notes reorient myself to what was happening when the notes were taken (Hubbard & Power, 1999).

When I began to see patterns, I designed a semantic domain analysis system for coding and analyzing data across different sources (Hubbard & Power, 1999). Repeated themes provided direction for additional analysis. I reread notes, and use multiple sources of data to
show evidence for each theme. As needed, I transcribed recorded RMA sessions and interviews where a shift in Courtney’s reading ability and/or attitude were shown.

What I found through analyzing the data I had collected was that RMA sessions had improved her reading performance. By the end of our sessions she had significantly improved her ability to monitor her own fluency and comprehension. She had also revalued reading as a process and herself as a reader. Her fluency, comprehension and attitude towards reading all improved. These findings will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis

Introduction

When I began my research into RMA, I was excited about helping Courtney improve her reading. I hoped that I could help her better understand what she read and improve her performance in school. She was identified as an at-risk reader and was embarrassed and discouraged. I was excited that she had agreed to work with me, and she was motivated.

At the conclusion of the study I was impressed by how much Courtney’s reading performance had improved, but I was fascinated by how much her view of reading had grown. As I looked at the data I had collected, I could see that her reading improved and that her view of reading had changed. This was evident in her responses to the Burke Interviews, in her journal entries, my journal entries and throughout discussions in our RMA sessions. The first question related to self-monitoring; both fluency and of comprehension. The second question related to revaluing reading; both as a process and self as reader. I want to show the importance of the balance of these two parts as used by a proficient reader.
Guiding questions for my research were:

1. How might using RMA influence the student’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension?

2. How might using RMA influence how the student views reading and herself as a reader?

Over the course of the sessions there was an obvious relationship between Courtney’s improvement of self-monitoring and improved opinion of reading. As she began to revalue reading, and herself as a reader, her ability to monitor her comprehension and fluency improved. As she started to monitor her own fluency and comprehension she realized reading was valuable, and that she was a good reader. These two things, valuing reading and self-monitoring, are the balance of reading. To become independent readers, students need to value reading and be successful. To be successful readers, students need to be interested in what they read, and monitor their comprehension.

This chapter is organized into two sections: the first explores the improvement in Courtney’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension; the second shows how she improved as a result of revaluing reading. Together, these sections show that by participating in RMA sessions, a middle school student’s reading performance, and attitude toward reading, can improve as she increases her ability to self-monitor and revalue reading.

**Self-monitoring Fluency and Comprehension**

**Question 1: How might RMA influence a student’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension?**

Using RMA with this student increased both her fluency and comprehension. In our early sessions, Courtney’s accuracy was very high, her fluency was mostly appropriate for the text, but her comprehension of the text was very literal. Courtney was a slow and careful reader. She
focused on accuracy, not on fluency. As a result her reading was not always fluent and sometimes sounded choppy. She also did not always use punctuation to help in her reading. She frequently read over periods and commas without pausing, and sometimes from one paragraph to the next without pausing.

Initially she read for accuracy and overcorrected (corrected every miscue), even if it was a high-quality miscue. Over the course of the study her fluency and comprehension improved and she realized that comprehension is more important than accuracy. By our final sessions she had adjusted her oral reading so that she did not overcorrect.

In the following sections I will refer to her fluency and comprehension scores. For each text, I used a scale of 0-3 to rate her fluency and comprehension. To evaluate her fluency and comprehension, I used the Fluency and Comprehension Scoring Keys (Tables 3 & 4 from Appendix A) (Fountas, I., & Portsmouth, N., 2010).

**Self-monitoring fluency**

In my journal, after the 7th session I wrote, “It has only been a couple of weeks since we started working together, but I can tell that she is becoming more comfortable with being recorded. She really didn’t like to hear herself at first. Now, she seems to me reading more fluently and with more expression. I think a large part of this is because she has been listening to the recordings” (January 29, 2014). After hearing herself read on the recordings she paid more attention to and adjusted her fluency.

The largest improvement related to fluency was her ability to use punctuation when she read. In our initial sessions, she frequently read over punctuation or did not use it appropriately. She did not pause at commas and periods. In three different texts she did not read a question correctly; she read the sentences as statements instead of questions. The following excerpt from
the RMA Participation Interview, 3/8/2014 shows that she made changes to how she read based on listening to her recordings.

Me: How did you feel about being recorded while reading?

Courtney: It made me nervous. I don’t like being recorded.

M: Did it get easier?

C: Yes, It got easier and I kind of warmed up to it.

M: What was it like listening to yourself read?

C: I thought I made a lot of mistakes and sounded kind of ridiculous. I had no enthusiasm.

M: Did it get easier?

C: I guess so. I got used to it.

As a result of listening to her recorded readings, she realized that she did not demonstrate expression while she read. Her fluency and comprehension both improved because she heard herself read and was able to adjust her self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension. As discussed previously in Chapter 3, sessions 3-6 were Phase 1, the sessions in which she read continuous text around 700L (Lexile level); sessions 7-12 were Phase 2, readings from Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000), around a 590L; and the final 3 sessions were readings from Looking Back (Lowry, 1998) which was a 900L. Below is a graph of her fluency scores over the course of the study, and in the following section I show change in comprehension over time.
Her fluency showed steady improvement. In the early sessions, she demonstrated mostly word-by-word reading with little attention to punctuation or and almost no expressive interpretation or pausing. As her awareness of punctuation and expression increased, her fluency improved. She began reading using all the cueing systems instead of relying so heavily on the Visual cue. As she started integrating the Meaning and Syntax cues along with the Visual cue, her fluency and comprehension increased. By our final sessions, she was reading primarily in meaningful phrases with expression and intonation, also using pausing guided by author’s meaning and punctuation. She was integrating and using all of the cues during her oral reading which allowed her to focus more on meaning instead of accuracy.

You can see by looking at the graph that during Phase 1, her fluency improved. Most likely this was a result of listening to her recorded readings and making adjustments based on her awareness. During Phase 2, even though the Lexile level was slightly lower, initially she had some regression in fluency. I attributed this to more complex text structure (more dialogue, increase is use of punctuation for action) in addition to some unfamiliar vocabulary words. I was
pleased that I had found text that was challenging enough to give me a window into her thinking. She had a lot of background knowledge about making inferences, using context clues to figure words out and the importance of building background knowledge; however, she was not integrating all of this into her reading. In Phase 3, the Lexile level of the text was around 900. Even though this text was more complicated, she had become more aware of using all of the cues together, so her fluency and comprehension improved.

During her first few recorded readings, her reading was not fluent. She did not show expressive interpretation, she paused at unfamiliar words and/or self corrects, she made many repetitions to self-correct, and she didn’t use punctuation as intended by the author. In many of these miscues she was paying more attention to the visual cue than meaning or syntax.

During Session 4 (January 18, 2014), the text said, “sipping drinks by the pool.” and she read, “slipping drinks by the pool.” In our discussion of this text, when I asked what she was thinking about when she read this, or if she had noticed the miscue, she said she didn’t notice the miscue and, “that was stupid” (January 18, 2014). We discussed this miscue as a “low-quality” miscue because it did impact the meaning. One of the benefits of RMA is helping students see how miscues are a window into their thinking and it is important to use all three cues (MSV) together to understand what we read. Miscues aren’t “stupid” and the student isn’t “stupid.” Students feel embarrassed, but through RMA discussions about what they are doing well and what they need to improve, they gain confidence and learn about what good readers do when they read.

After our 5th session I wrote, “Her accuracy was high, but she didn’t use punctuation appropriately. She read over 3 periods, and didn’t read a question as a question-” (Bulmahn Journal, January 23, 2014). Her fluency was impacted because she didn’t use punctuation to
guide her oral reading. She read over periods without pausing, as if the period was not there. This lack of attention/awareness of punctuation impacted her fluency and comprehension, especially the sentence she read as a statement instead of a question.

In the following session, Session 6 (January 26, 2014), she read a text about a young girl who was exploring with a friend. She read fluently with excellent comprehension. I wrote in my journal, “She did a great job reading today. Her interest level was high and she read more fluently than she has in past sessions. Her comprehension was high and she retold all events in the correct sequence. She hardly miscued in oral reading and her comprehension was literal, but appropriate for the text. This text was probably too easy” (Bulmahn Journal, January 26, 2014). For the next session, I selected a text which had some questions that required inferences. We never used it, however, because we were about to begin Phase 2.

In the following session, Session 7 (January 29, 2014), she asked if we could use a text she was reading for school. She was excited about the new book she was reading, *Stargirl* by Jerry Spinelli, and gave me some background information about the characters and events. I looked over the chapter and selected a section of about 250 words that had events we could use to analyze miscues in oral reading and comprehension. She did well and she was highly engaged during this session. In the following session, Session 8 (February 1, 2014), her fluency decreased significantly as she read a difficult section of *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000). Her comprehension was also very low. I believe this was due to the use of unfamiliar punctuation. She struggled to make sense of a passage that had a lot of dialogue and action. There were hyphens, commas, ellipses and question marks. As mentioned previously, she did not use punctuation appropriately during oral reading and this impacted comprehension. Later in this chapter I will discuss this session in detail.
During Phase 3, the sentence structure and vocabulary did not get in the way of her fluency. She read fluently, without stopping to correct “smart” miscues and was able to focus on comprehension. She was interested in the text and Lowry’s (1998) use of language and punctuation made it fun to read aloud.

**Self-monitoring comprehension**

To evaluate her level of understanding of the text (comprehension) I used a scoring key based on the Fountas and Pinnell Comprehension Scoring Key (Table 4 in Appendix A) (Fountas, & Pinnell, 2010). Below is a graph which shows her comprehension scores over the course of the study. It is important to consider the changes in the level of texts used over the course of the study. In the early sessions, Phase 1, we used short continuous texts which left little room for inferences or higher level thinking. The middle sessions, Phase 2, used *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000) which contained unfamiliar vocabulary and punctuation. During Phase 3, she read passages which were around 900 Lexile level in *Looking Back* (Lowry, 1998).
In our early and middle sessions she was not monitoring her comprehension. Some miscues did not sound right and did not make sense. Moore & Seeger (2010) state that pronouncing words that look like what is written in the text indicates the reader is relying heavily on visual cues. This can result in patterns of the reader substituting words that are graphophonically (visually) similar and/or reading non-words. Courtney showed evidence of both. In Appendix A, Table 5, I paired the text with Courtney’s miscues (both real words and non-words). In will discuss these miscue in the following paragraphs.

The miscues I selected show that she was paying a lot of attention to the visual cue. The miscues had high grapho-phonie similarities to the text. Almost always the initial sound and the final sound of her miscues were correct. Her miscues frequently involved phonemes (sounds) that were present in the text, however sometimes the middle sounds were reversed, had a phoneme omitted or inserted. These miscues happened only during Phases 1 and 2, and significantly decreased in frequency during Phase 2.

Frequently, but not always, the words she miscued were words she was not familiar with. For example, in a passage during Phase 1, she read “dested” for “detested.” When we discussed this miscue she said she did not know either word and didn’t realize the “dested” was not a word. Similarly, during Phase 2, she did not know the words conveyor, inquisition, or elated. With elated, she successfully inferred meaning; she thought that “eliated” meant happy. When we discussed the section where she read “juros” for “jurors,” she said she knew what “jurors” were but didn’t think about it when she was reading. The conversations we had in these sessions helped her realize: 1) that she is good at using context clues to determine meaning; and 2) she has a lot of background knowledge that can be helpful while she is reading.
She continued to demonstrate this awareness in the following sessions. She discussed miscues as “smart” and “okay” and realized that meaning was the most important aspect of reading. After our 6th session, she wrote, “I can tell the difference from last year to this year that I am at a higher level in reading” (Courtney’s journal, January 26, 2014). In this journal entry she was referring to her ability to understand what she read which was result of integrating all of the cues (MSV) while reading. During session 10, as we discussed a high-quality miscue she said, “I changed this part to be right” (Session 10, January 8, 2015). She was referring to a section in which she initially read “into” instead of “intro,” and self-corrected because it impacted the meaning. Additionally, after our 11th session, she wrote “I noticed that I made a few mistakes but nothing too bad. I think I should be a little more careful when I read” (Courtney’s Journal, February 12, 2014). Her awareness was increasing and she was revaluing herself as a reader (discussed in detail later in this chapter).

In our 7th session (1/29/2014), she read a section of Stargirl and the meaning broke down. She realized it, and so did I. In the section she omitted two difficult, but important, words. The words she skipped were “maestro” and “pantomime.” Both of these words were critical for the understanding of the section. During the retell, she said, “I don’t really get that. I don’t know what happened. She went crazy.” We went back and read the section together. We discussed the words and she said she did not know what a “maestro” or “pantomime” was. I told her what the words meant, and she said she had heard the words before, or could have figured out what they meant. She had heard “maestro” for teacher somewhere, and she said she knew what a “mime” was in the park and made the connection to pantomime and silently acting. We reread the section together and she was able to use her understanding of the words to understand the text.
In my notes from this session, I wrote “Today she really struggled with the text. She didn’t know many of the words. Her reading was not fluent. I think it was partly due to unfamiliar punctuation and fast paced action. I wonder if it would have been different for her if she were reading it silently. I wonder if her teacher discussed the meanings of these words” (Bulmahn Journal, 1/29/2014). I believed she omitted the words during oral reading on purpose because didn’t recognize them. This shows that she was not monitoring her comprehension and instead of using strategies to figure out the meaning of unknown words, she skipped the words. In our discussion she realized that she had some background knowledge about the words, and she realized that the words were essential in understanding the section. Our discussion raised her awareness about actively using all cueing systems during reading. She realized that by integrating prior knowledge and using meaning and syntax cues along with the visual cue, she could figure out words.

Misunderstanding resolved through conversation

During Session 10 (February 8, 2015) she made three miscues in one sentence and we were able to resolve the misunderstanding by rereading the section and discussing the author’s use of punctuation in *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The host and victim were each fitted with a thimble-size clip-n mike; the jury passed around a hand mike. Opposite the stage was the glassed-in control room, sound-insulated from the rest of the studio.”</td>
<td>“The host and victim were each fitted with a thimble-size clip-n mike; jury passed around a hand mike. Opposite the stage was the glassed-in control room. Sound-insulated from the rest of the studio.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I noticed that she stumbled over the semi-colon. She omitted “the” after the semi-colon, and then read other punctuation incorrectly. She noticed too. In our discussion following this session, we talked more about punctuation and complex sentences. We listened to how she read
the section and I asked her if she wanted to try again or if she wanted me to read the part. She said she wanted me to so I did. I asked if she noticed a difference and she said that she did. Also, I noticed that she didn’t seem to understand how the events played out, or what was being described. In this section it did not make that much difference to the meaning of the text, but it was a window into her thinking. Her difficulty with this section was due to some unfamiliar terms. She was not familiar with “thimble-size” or “clip-n mike.” Also, she had not heard the term “glassed-in.” This session helped me realize the importance of anticipating where students may have trouble, and pre-teaching new or difficult vocabulary or sentence structure.

Not only did the conversation help her comprehension of the text, it helped me understand her thought process. After our 10th session, (February 8, 2014) I wrote:

I noticed that when Courtney speaks, she makes connections which are sometimes difficult to follow. Her ideas flow, although she doesn’t always articulate how she got from point A to point B. This is evident in conversations, retelling and writing. Through discussions of what she read or was thinking about, she is able to guide me through her thinking. When I listen to her I am able to monitor and adjust to prompt her to include important points or missing details. In recent sessions we have started incorporating her written homework assignments into our sessions. She has had writing prompts and a writing notebook to record her questions and thoughts about the book. I would also like to help her increase her ability to read and revise her writing. I think that if she were able to go back and reread her writing as a reader (someone who is reading her writing for the first time) it would help her make sure she has included important information to convey meaning to the reader (Bulmahn Journal, February 8, 2014).
I realized how RMA could be used to help adolescent students grow as readers and writers while supporting them with “independent” reading and writing assignments. This is discussed in detail in the following chapter.

Below is an excerpt from our discussion from the February 12 (Spinelli, 2000):

Courtney: “My prediction was kinda right. He was getting worried because Stargirl was kinda going out and nobody was going to pay attention to her anymore. So he was trying to think of what to do.”

Me: “So why did he say, ‘I had a secret. I wished no one would watch’.”

Courtney: “He realized that Stargirl’s popularity had dropped, maybe, and he didn’t want anybody to bring that up to him. He was hoping that maybe that could rise her popularity.”

Me: “Okay. So what do you think he’s thinking now, it would be good or bad for her if people watch?”

Courtney: “It would be bad for her because he doesn’t want to hurt her. And he’s worried that she might not be as popular anymore so people will stop watch Hotseat. They’ll think that he isn’t finding people that are popular or something.”

During this session, I noticed that she misunderstood the reason why the character said he “wished no one would watch” (Spinelli, 2000, p. 57). At first she thought he was concerned about the popularity of the show or of Stargirl’s popularity. Really though, he didn’t want Stargirl to embarrass herself or to give other students a reason to think she was strange. We were able to resolve this misunderstanding through conversation. This miscue in her understanding of the text was crucial to her understanding of the chapter and the characters. RMA discussions provide a natural framework to ensure student comprehension of text.
High-quality and low-quality miscues: indicators of comprehension.

Below is a graph that compares her high-quality and low-quality miscues over the course of the study. In this graph it is evident that the frequency of high-quality miscues increased while the frequency of low-quality miscues decreased. This was a result of her realizing the difference between the two, and improving her monitoring of fluency and comprehension. In her initial sessions she overcorrected, but by the last sessions she was only correcting for meaning and syntax. The graph below shows the frequency of high-quality miscues increased and the frequency of low-quality miscues decreased over the course of the study.

![Graph showing frequency of high-quality and low-quality miscues over time](image)

Frequency of high-quality and low-quality miscues over time

Additionally, as the incidence of low-quality miscues decreased and high-quality miscues increased, the percentage of high-quality miscues showed an interesting trend. The following graph shows the percentage of high quality miscues during each session. The graph shows that during the first half of the study her miscues were high quality less than 50 percent of the time. While in the second half of the study, her miscues were around 60-80% high quality miscues. After February 5 she always had a higher frequency of high-quality miscues. This shows that she
was monitoring her own fluency and comprehension because she didn’t correct every miscue, and she was paying more attention to comprehension than fluency. She started to realize that high-quality, or smart miscues, were evidence of her strengths as a reader. When she became less focused on accuracy and more focused on meaning she increased high quality miscues and decreased low-quality miscues (Martens, 1998).

In this graph it is evident how the percentage of high-quality miscues improved over the course of the study. As she became aware of the difference between high-quality and low-quality miscues, she was able to monitor her fluency and comprehension which resulted in the decreased incidence of low-quality miscues and an increase in high-quality miscues. During the last 4 sessions, no more than 30% were low-quality miscues, while on January 23 and February 1 she had sessions with no high-quality miscues. There was also a decreased incidence of self-corrections and pausing.


**Repetitions decreased as she used self-correction for comprehension instead of accuracy.**

As the study progressed, she decreased her self-corrections for accuracy. In the early sessions she overcorrected: she corrected every miscue whether it impacted meaning or not. For example, in our 3rd session, she read “could not” as “couldn’t” and repeated it to self-correct. Also, in early sessions frequently she would slow down, reread the sentence and say, “er, yeah” before completing the sentence. Her attention to accuracy limited her attention to details and comprehension.

Again in our fourth session (January 18, 2014), on a different text, she self-corrected “could not” for “couldn’t.” In our discussion following this reading I asked her why she self-corrected there, because “couldn’t” meant the same thing as “could not.” She said “I felt like it,” then added, “It wasn’t right, I read the wrong word.” She said she thought “it would be better to read what the author wrote because it could make a big difference” (January 18, 2014). She is aware that it is important for the reader to pay attention to what the author writes, but she has overgeneralized this. This self-correction was clearly for accuracy and not for meaning. We discussed why it was a high-quality miscue, and that it did not need to be corrected. The meaning was not influenced because her first attempt meant exactly the same thing as the correction; therefore, it was overcorrection and wasted effort.

This was also demonstrated in our 7th session (January 29, 2014) when she was reading a section from Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000). She was reading a sentence about a “conveyor belt.” She first sounded the word out as “con-vee-or” then read it as “caviar.” She was focusing too much on the visual cue. She was focusing on the word, and not the meaning or syntax. When we discussed this miscue, I asked her what she was thinking about when she read this. She said she was thinking about food because they were in the cafeteria, even though she didn’t really think
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they would eat caviar in a school cafeteria. While “conveyor” and “caviar” do each have a c, v and r, caviar did not make sense in the sentence and did not have any connection to the text. This shows she was using the meaning cue along with the visual cue; but her reliance on the visual cue is what led to this miscue.

In our 10th session, we discussed five miscues she had while reading a passage from Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000) during the previous session. In the oral reading during the 9th session, she demonstrated self-correction of two high-quality miscues and did not correct a low quality miscues. In the table below I show the text, miscue, indicate yes (Y) or no (N) if she self-corrected and also indicate if the miscue was high-quality (HQ) or low-quality (LQ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>text</th>
<th>miscue</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>HQ/LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“This was where the jury sat.”</td>
<td>“This was where they sat.”</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“And why would anyone want to be the victim?”</td>
<td>“And why would anyone want to be the victim.”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>But not mean or hurtful questions.”</td>
<td>But not mean or harmful questions.”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opposite the stage was the glassed-in control room, sound-insulated from the rest of the studio.”</td>
<td>Opposite the stage was the glassed-in control room, Sound-insulated from the rest of the studio.” (read comma as period)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“We filmed the show afterschool, then (and) broadcast them that night-prime time- on local cable.”</td>
<td>“We filmed the show afterschool, then (insert and) broadcast them that night- prime time- on local cable.”</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>LQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We discussed the 1st and 5th miscues are examples of overcorrection. She was able to identify that these miscues were overcorrection because they did not influence the meaning and therefore did not need to be corrected. When we discussed the 2nd miscue, she respectfully disagreed that it was a miscue because she read all the words correctly. This was not a “miscue” in the sense that she read a word incorrectly. She did, however, read the sentence incorrectly.
which impacted the meaning, which is why I marked it as a miscue. We discussed the difference in the punctuation, and how that impacted the meaning in the 2nd and 4th miscues.

We determined that 2nd miscue was a low-quality miscue because the meaning changed. She didn’t realize that it was a rhetorical question, which was then answered. She missed some of the author’s meaning, therefore it was a low-quality miscue. We discussed the 4th miscue as a high-quality miscue because the meaning of the sentence was not changed, and did not need to be corrected. The miscue influenced fluency more than comprehension. For the 3rd miscue, she read “harmful” in place of “hurtful.” She didn’t realize that she had miscued on the word, they were graphically similar and had similar meanings. She identified this as a high-quality miscue because the meaning did not change.

After I started the RMA sessions with Courtney, and as I continued my research, I found a section that called high-quality miscues “smart miscues,” and low-quality miscues “okay miscues” (Moore & Seeger, 2010). We started talking about them that way. In my notes from our 7th session I wrote,

I know that she is becoming more familiar with the terms high-quality and low-quality miscues. She definitely understands the difference between the two. Today I told her about learning that some teachers call the high-quality miscues “smart” miscues and low-quality miscues “okay” miscues. She smiled when we were talking about them being “smart” versus “okay” miscues. I could tell that she liked it. It makes sense because I believe that students would be less intimidated or embarrassed by an “okay miscue” than a “low-quality miscue,” and would feel better about a “smart miscue” than a “high-quality miscue” (Bulmahn Journal, January 29, 2014).
She preferred talking about miscues as “smart” and “okay” miscues instead of “high-quality” and “low-quality.” This came at a time that she was becoming more interested and engaged in RMA sessions. I think the combination of her growing understanding of RMA and calling them “smart” and “okay” miscues helped improve her confidence and comfort with discussing miscues.

**Adjustments to reading as a result of RMA sessions**

In addition to her RMA Participation Interview, her journal entries also documented her growing understanding of reading and RMA. In her early entries, her view of reading is about accuracy. In her first entry she wrote, “I like this because I might get good grades and not have to get pulled out of class anymore” (Courtney’s Journal, January 15, 2014). When she started the RMA sessions, she read for accuracy. As demonstrated by the data in the previous sections, improvement in fluency and comprehension scores, and comparison of high-quality and low-quality miscues, Courtney showed a shift in focus from emphasis on accuracy to an emphasis on comprehension. This resulted in her adjusting her reading and increasing her ability to self-monitor fluency and comprehension.

By our 5th session (January 23, 2013) she was using the terms meaning, syntax and visual in her journal. In her reading she was using more meaning and syntax cues. During the sessions she was able to answer the questions, “Does it look right?” (visual) “Does it sound right?” (syntax) and “Does it mean the same thing?” (meaning). In the 3rd entry she wrote, “As I was listening to my recordings I realized that I messed up a couple times but I still had the same meaning, sintax (sic) and visual” (Courtney’s journal, January 23, 2014). This showed that she was becoming comfortable and familiar with the terms we were using in our sessions. Also, she was beginning to analyze her reading and retelling miscues. In addition, she was increasing her
awareness of strategies and using new vocabulary as she discussed her own miscues and retellings of texts.

In her 7th journal entry (Session 11, February 12, 2014) she wrote, “I noticed that I made a few mistakes, but nothing too bad. I think I should be little more careful when I read.” This shows she realized that she needed to pay more attention as she was reading. In the 7th entry she referred to miscues as “mistakes,” but in the following entry she referred to them as “miscues.” In Session 12 (February 15, 2014) she wrote her 8th journal entry. She wrote, “I realized that I did make a lot of misques (sic) but it didn’t really change the meaning” (Courtney’s Journal, February 15, 2014). These entries show that she was analyzing her own performance. She realized that she needed to be more careful when she read and that she only had to correct if the meaning was changed by the miscue.

In the 7th session, on 1/29/2014, she read a sentence “As the jury members straggled in, they were not clowning around or tap-dancing on the stage as jurors(juros) usually did.” As she read this line, she paused to check “straggled” and said, “er-yeah” and then continued. As she completed the sentence she miscued on jurors. Whether or not it was the pause she took to think about the accuracy of the word “straggled,” or that she wasn’t engaged, she read “jurors” as “juros.” Later in the same passage she again read “jurors” as “juros.” While this miscue did not impact comprehension, in our discussion of this miscue in the following session, she stated that she knew what jurors were, and she didn’t know that “juros” was not a word.

In the same session, she read a sentence “We filmed the shows after school, (insert “and” then repeated to self-correct) then broadcast them that night- prime time- on local cable.” This is another example of overcorrection. When we discussed this she said she thought it was better to read exactly what the author wrote in case it made a difference. I asked her if it made a
difference in this case and she acknowledged that it did not. She recognized this miscue as 
overcorrection because it was a high quality miscue that did not need to be corrected in oral 
reading.

In Session 13 (February 22, 2014) she read a passage from *Looking Back* (Lowry, 1998). 
This passage described a photograph and discussed the thoughts of the people in the photograph.
There were many wonderings and questions in the text and Courtney read all of the questions 
with expression. She read a sentence with a reversal of two words “The little girl’s mother, the 
slender woman in the long black skirt, was named Helen.” Instead of reading “long black skirt” 
she read “black long skirt.” She did not go back to correct! Her reading was fluent and her 
comprehension was wonderful. In her retelling she offered a prediction of what may have 
happened with the family after the picture was taken. She thought they may have turned and 
walked the other way and then the younger child tripped over a stone or a root in the path and 
ripped her tights. The quality of the text, her increasing awareness of using what she knows and 
what is in the text to make inferences, and an improvement in her confidence all contributed to a 
deeper understanding and a higher level of thinking about the text.

In our early sessions (Phase 1), we read short passages that did not allow a lot of room for 
sightful conclusions or analysis of author’s craft. She read and summarized accurately. During 
the middle sessions (Phase 2), we engaged in conversations about how Jerry Spinelli used 
punctuation, characters, dialogue and word choice to help the reader and move the story along.
She enjoyed the book and was more engaged in discussions than she had been during Phase 1. In 
our final sessions (Phase 3) she read from the photo memoir written by Lois Lowry. The 
combination of these three stages and types of texts benefitted Courtney. She improved her 
ability to think about texts and think beyond texts. We discussed strategies to help solve words,
monitor and correct, predict and confirm, maintain fluency and the importance of adjusting while reading. Additionally, she realized that readers need to be aware of what type of text they are reading, because we read different types of texts differently.

The evidence presented here shows how Courtney was able to improve her ability to self-monitor comprehension and fluency while reading. Her focus shifted from accuracy to comprehension as she realized what good readers do and started to use new strategies. She developed self-monitoring strategies and she began to revalue reading and gain confidence in her ability to read. In the next section I will show evidence that Courtney revalued reading and herself as a reader.

**Revaluing Reading and Reader**

**Question 2: How might using RMA influence how the student views reading and herself as a reader?**

The evidence presented in the previous section of this chapter could not have occurred apart from Courtney’s shift in her view of reading, and of how she viewed herself as a reader. In this section I will focus on how Courtney’s view of reading shifted. I will use evidence from the Burke Interviews, the RMA Participation Interview, my field notes, my journal and her journal to show the progression of how she revalued reading and herself as a reader.

**Revaluing Reading**

By using RMA, Courtney realized that comprehension, not accuracy, was vital to success in reading. Courtney also made the connection that her friend who is a good reader is also a good writer. She also improved her awareness of reading and writing as reciprocal processes.

Courtney’s view of reading shifted from reading for accuracy to reading for meaning. What struck me most when I went back to compare her responses from the initial and final Burke
Interviews was the improvement in the nature of her responses regarding the reading process. In our initial interview, her responses were short and her view of reading focused on decoding and accuracy. By the final interview, and also evidenced in our sessions, her view of reading shifted from being concentrated on decoding and accuracy to focusing on reading as a process of constructing meaning and gaining information.

Throughout this section, I will refer to the two Burke Interviews. Each question will be displayed side by side. The left side is from our initial Burke Interview, which took place 1/12/14. The right side shows her answers from our final Burke Interview, from 3/8/2014. Each question is centered, numbered and highlighted. I will refer to the question numbers throughout this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burke Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Interview: 1/12/2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. When you are reading and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I might reread the sentence. Sometimes I guess and try to match the meaning. I’ll try to read with one meaning, then try again with another meaning. I might look it up or ask someone else. Or I put a sticky note there and ask my mom or teacher.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes I skip it.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtney’s responses to this first question of the Burke Interview demonstrate that her view of reading shifted from viewing the primary purpose of reading as accuracy to reading for meaning. Her initial response showed that she didn’t try many things before she would go on, and that her main concern was decoding and accuracy. She said that she might reread, read out loud or skip the part she didn’t know. Her response in the second interview shows that her view
of reading had shifted to understanding what she was reading. In the final interview she identified ways of using context clues, looking up words she didn’t know, or marking the text so that she could ask questions later. The shift in her view of reading was also evidenced in the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Interview: 1/12/2014</th>
<th>Final Interview: 3/8/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Who is a good reader you know?</td>
<td>Beth (pseudonym)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May (pseudonym)</strong></td>
<td><strong>She knows a lot of words and definitions. So I ask her if I don’t know. She’s also a good writer and gives me tips for improving my writing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What makes her a good reader?</td>
<td><strong>She can read and not make mistakes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think he or she ever comes to something he or she doesn’t know when he or she is reading?</td>
<td><strong>Yes, maybe. I don’t know, she never asked me.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. not really. She seems to know a lot of stuff.</strong></td>
<td><strong>If she didn’t know something she would probably try to reread or ask someone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If the answer is yes: When he or she does come to something he or she doesn’t know, what do you think he or she does about it?</td>
<td><strong>Look it up or ask someone like a friend or teacher for help.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is no: Suppose _____ comes to something he or she doesn’t know. What do you think he or she would do?</td>
<td><strong>If she didn’t know something she would probably try to reread or ask someone.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Burke Interviews, in questions 2 and 3, she identified two different girls who she thought were good readers. In the first interview, she said that May was a good reader because “she can read and not make mistakes.” This is consistent with initial view of reading as focused on accuracy instead of comprehension. By the last interview, she named a different friend, Beth, who was a good reader because “she knows a lot of words and definitions.”

Additionally, in the 4th and 5th questions, in her first interview she said that she thought her friend was a good reader and never had trouble. In the second interview she said, “Yes,
maybe. I don’t know. She never asked me.” In the second interview she acknowledged that Beth probably would come to things that she didn’t know, and would ask a friend or teacher for help. The next two questions relate to how she would help someone who is having difficulty reading and how a teacher would respond. Again, her shift in view of reading from accuracy to meaning is evident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Interview: 1/12/2014</th>
<th>Final Interview: 3/8/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. If you knew that someone was having difficulty reading, how would you help that person?</td>
<td>I would help them if I knew the word I would describe it to them. Or tell them what they could do. Like read it with a different meaning. If that doesn’t make sense then read it with a different meaning. Look for hints like related words; look for clues about what is happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct them. Probably tell them the right way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What would anyone else or your teacher do to help that person?</td>
<td>Tell them to reread it, or maybe explain it. Maybe a teacher would answer questions, or tell them she’ll find out and get back to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They would tell the person. Maybe tell them the definition and tell them what the words mean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Her responses to both of these questions demonstrate the shift of her view of reading. In the initial interview she said she would correct the person; consistent with her view of reading for accuracy. In the final interview she said she would help them figure out the meaning and offer them suggestions to understand what they are reading. Similarly, at first she thought the teacher might tell the person the word and/or tell them what the word meant. In her final interview she said the teacher might encourage them to reread it, or explain the word. She also realized that a teacher may not have all the answers and may need time to find an answer to the student’s question. This, along with her previous responses about her friend who was a good reader, shows that Courtney had revalued reading and herself as a reader. She realized that
reading was a process of making meaning from text, and she realized that no one, not even a teacher, has all the answers.

Her responses to these questions show the growth that occurred in her view of reading over the course of the study. Over the course of the study she realized that “helping” someone doesn’t mean just giving them the answer or telling them the right way. It is important for everyone to develop strategies to try when they are stuck. She also realized that no one has all the answers and everyone comes to things they may not know, but good readers use resources and strategies to figure things out.

**Revaluing Reader**

In the initial interview, she said, “I’ve started a lot of books, but never finish them.” This was discouraging for her. During many sessions we talked about why people read, text features, types of text and we discussed “good fit” books (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). Different books have different purposes and readers should choose books that interest them. We don’t read a fictional story the same way we were read informational text. Similarly, different types of books have different text features. In addition to style of text, if we select a book that is about a topic we are not familiar with, or not interested in, it will be harder for us to understand. She realized that some of the books she had attempted were not “good-fit” books.

When I asked her if RMA changed how she viewed herself as a reader, she said, “I would say I am a better reader now than I was last year. I used to only read a few pages of a book” (RMA Participation Interview, 3/8/2014). She elaborated and talked about meaning, syntax and visual cues. She said these were new discussions for her, “I never really thought about meaning or syntax when I was reading. I just tried to sound out words. Sometime I would read a whole
page but not know what I read. It would never enter my mind” (RMA Participation Interview, 3/8/2014).

The following questions from the Burke Interviews reflect Courtney’s shift in how she viewed herself as a reader and the process of reading. In the initial interview Courtney said she learned how to read by learning letters and sounding out words. In her final interview she stated that she learned to read by practicing reading and learning and using new words. Her responses to question eight (below) also show how her view shifted from thinking about reading primarily phonetically to reading for meaning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Initial Interview: 1/12/2014</strong></th>
<th><strong>Final Interview: 3/8/2014</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. How did you learn to read?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final Interview: 3/8/2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did your teacher or someone else do to help you learn?</td>
<td><strong>Teachers, mom, letter books, read to me, practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know. Some people helped me learn letters. They showed me the letters and told me the sound.</td>
<td><strong>Learn words, patterns, sounds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Do you think you are a good reader? Why or why not?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learn new words and use words in sentences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes. It depends on level of the book. I don’t like grown up books, like about business. I don’t like to read books that are over 300 pages. I’ve started a lot of books, but never finish them.</td>
<td><strong>Sometimes. It depends on the book. If it’s about something I like. If it’s harder, like about things I don’t understand, or if it’s boring, then I don’t really try. If it’s a book about something I don’t understand then it is really boring.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. What makes a good reader?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sometimes. It depends on the book. If it’s about something I like. If it’s harder, like about things I don’t understand, or if it’s boring, then I don’t really try. If it’s a book about something I don’t understand then it is really boring.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they practice a lot. They look up words they don’t know and write down the definition to help them remember.</td>
<td>Somebody who pays attention when they’re reading and has a lot of background information about stuff. They understand what they read. If they don’t know what something means they try to find out and don’t give up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. What does reading mean to you?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Getting information and details</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes it can take you to different places. You can experience things that you wouldn’t normally because they happen to the character.</td>
<td><strong>Summarizing and understanding. Coding thoughts and feelings, telling facts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to summarize what I read. Sometimes people read for facts, and sometimes people read about thoughts and feelings. Sometimes it’s meaningful and sometimes it isn’t. Some books aren’t good because they author’s didn’t write them well. I found a mistake in a book and I wrote it down, I was so proud. Sometimes it can take you to different places. You can experience things that you wouldn’t normally because they happen to the character.</td>
<td><strong>It’s important to understand what you read.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting information: easy to find books that are about things you are interested. Hard to get information if they didn’t word it well or put it in the right order.</td>
<td><strong>I like to summarize what I read. Sometimes people read for facts, and sometimes people read about thoughts and feelings. Sometimes it’s meaningful and sometimes it isn’t. Some books aren’t good because they author’s didn’t write them well. I found a mistake in a book and I wrote it down, I was so proud. Sometimes it can take you to different places. You can experience things that you wouldn’t normally because they happen to the character.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courtney’s responses to question nine, ten and eleven show that she realized several things influence a reader’s interest in and comprehension of a text. Primarily, she realized that good readers read for meaning and use many tools and strategies to understand what they read. She realized that by using background knowledge and finding out what words mean, that she could read for meaning. All readers come to things they don’t know, but good readers take the time, and put effort into understanding what they read.

Her answers to question nine show that she revalued reading and herself as a reader. In both the initial and final interviews for question 9, “Do you think you are a good reader?” she stated that topic, type of text and prior knowledge related to her interest and whether or not she understood what she read. In the first interview, her response showed a feeling of defeat about reading. She said she didn’t like reading grown up books and was intimidated by long books. She stated “I’ve started a lot of books, but never finish them.” However, her answer in the final interview showed her awareness of her interest in the book not the level being the reason she “didn’t try” or wasn’t successful.

In question 10, her initial response show that she realized good readers practice a lot and pay attention to learning what words mean; two things she did not consistently do. At the conclusion of the RMA sessions she realized that good readers read for meaning and are perseverant. In the final interview, she stated that “They understand what they read. If they don’t know what something means they try to find out and don’t give up.” This was an important realization for Courtney. She realized that part of the reason she hadn’t been a highly effective reader was because she didn’t try, not because she wasn’t capable.

Wow, question eleven. Her initial interview answers were short and sweet. She understood that reading was to get information, for pleasure, and it was important for authors to
grab readers’ attention. At the final interview, her answers showed how much she had deepened her understanding and appreciation for reading. By participating in RMA sessions, she developed an understanding of the reader’s role, the author’s role and how they work together to help the reader construct meaning. After all, writers write to communicate, and good readers read for meaning.

**Her opinion of RMA**

In our final session, when I asked Courtney if she would recommend using RMA to other students she said, “Probably, because it tells you where you can improve. It’s not telling you you’re bad. It tells the kids that what they’re doing is okay. It helps them look at the results and decide if they want to change what they’re doing” (RMA Participation Rubric, 3/8/2014).

This was a profound statement on her part. I don’t think she understood the depth of this response. This is exactly what RMA is designed to do. It helps students improve how they read! RMA encourages students by looking at what they’re doing well and what they could do better. It provides opportunities for collaboration and instruction. *Students deepen their understanding of reading as a process of learning!*

RMA is effective because students are involved in meaningful discussion about texts and what good readers do. All participants are engaged in meaningful conversations about reading. RMA does not involve just labeling and categorizing, but listening and understanding (Goodman & Marek, 1996) Readers’ beliefs about reading constrain or liberate them; as a result of participating in RMA students make peace with reading and gain confidence (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Participants revalue themselves as readers, learners, and language users (Almazroui, 2007; Goodman & Marek; 1996; Davenport, 2002; Kabuto, 2009; Martens, 1998; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Moore & Gilles, 2005; Wilson, 2005).
When I look back over our RMA session notes, journal entries and Courtney’s pre and post interviews, I see that the most significant outcome of this study was the improvement in her awareness. She became aware that reading was valuable, and she became aware that she was able to read well when she monitored her own fluency and comprehension. Discussing miscues in oral reading and retellings helps students realize that what they read aloud is important, but it is not the most important part of reading. It is more important to understand what you are reading; accurate comprehension is more important than accurate decoding.

**In Conclusion**

Using RMA with Courtney truly did help her revalue reading and herself as a reader and improve her ability to self-monitor fluency and comprehension. Her reading and her confidence improved. Not only did she become more aware of strategies and purposes for reading, but she began to enjoy reading. Before this study she did not read for pleasure, and she admitted that she hardly read books that were assigned in school. By the end of the study she was excited about reading and was interested in reading the books that were the basis of a television show that she liked, *Gossip Girl* (2008).

Even though the content was slightly mature for a sixth grader, Courtney’s mother was thrilled that she was reading. Her mother read some of the books and discussed the content with Courtney. They were both familiar with some of the story lines and events in the show. Courtney liked the books and was motivated to read them. I think part of her motivation was because it was familiar, she knew background about stories and the characters, and she enjoyed discussing the books with her friends. She gained confidence because she was successful.

In our RMA Participation Interview (3/8/2014), when I asked her if her view of reading changed, she said “It doesn’t take me as long to read and I have a better understanding. I am
reading a new series and I am on the third book. I read more. I just found some books I liked.”

This statement and her excitement over reading showed that she believed she was a better reader.

For two years Courtney had received pull-out services which aimed to help her improve her reading skills. Her reading did not improve enough to discontinue pullout services, and her view of reading did not change. She didn’t like being pulled out of her classes and felt like she missed out on things while she was gone. Most of the time in these sessions Courtney was not sure what the purpose was, was not interested in the text, and she was not highly motivated to complete the work. She was embarrassed and frustrated.

As a result of RMA, and the shift in her view of reading, she started reading for pleasure. Once she found a series of books that interested her, she chose to read and discussed these books with friends. She was motivated and she was successful. She became a true reader.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to answer two research questions regarding using Retrospective Miscue Analysis with a 6th grade student. The research questions were:

1. How might using RMA influence the student’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension?

2. How might using RMA influence how the student views reading and herself as a reader?

In this section I will discuss conclusion I have made based upon the findings of my research. I will discuss how participation in RMA sessions benefitted the student who participated in the study and how I benefitted from the experience. Recommendations for future research as well as my final thoughts will also be included.

Conclusions

RMA improved the student’s self-monitoring of fluency and comprehension.

When students listen to themselves read they become aware of their own fluency and as a result, Courtney began reading with more expression. She improved her ability to use punctuation to help with fluency which also helped her comprehension. She was not only focused on sounding words out accurately, but reading more fluently which aided with comprehension. As discussed in chapter 4, in our initial sessions she stopped to correct all miscues. By the last sessions, she was able to use strategies to continue reading even when it was difficult, or she came to an unfamiliar word.

All of the research on RMA discussed the importance of miscues in oral reading and retellings as giving a “window” into the reader’s thinking. Fountas and Pinnell (2009) recognize the importance of self-correction, and how the relationship between self-correction and the
reading process changes as children get older and read more complex texts. Although I didn’t find any of their work that specifically discussed RMA, they state that proficient readers self-regulate both oral and silent reading, and therefore should ignore small errors in oral (and silent) reading. The RMA discussion questions about meaning and syntax help reinforce that not all miscues need to be corrected.

Adolescent students are capable of evaluating their own reading and by recording reading and retellings, teachers are able to use evidence and analyze the student’s strengths and weaknesses regarding the reading process. When students are reading fluently they may read over 100 words per minute. For this reason, it is necessary to record a student’s reading and retelling. It is not possible to record all miscues during one read, but with a recording the researcher can go back to replay readings and accurately code miscues. In addition to this, it is beneficial for the student to hear himself/herself read so that he/she can evaluate and adjust his/her performance. A primary reason Courtney was able to revalue reading and self-monitoring during this study was because she was able to hear herself read and discuss texts, and then she made adjustments based on her own reflections.

Not only did Courtney begin to read more fluently, but she improved her ability to read for meaning. In each RMA session, through discussions about miscues in oral reading and comprehension, she was able to build on her understanding of reading as a process of constructing meaning. She engaged in discussions about texts and the process of reading and was able to build on her understanding of reading. She had a lot of background knowledge about decoding, punctuation and text structure, but she hadn’t made the connection that reading is an interactive process. The reader needs to be engaged and thinking about constructing meaning from the words that are on the page, not just decoding them correctly.
Courtney needed to re-conceptualize reading as a process of making meaning. Similar to the studies that involved individuals who were learning English as a second language, or the participants in CRMA, she relied heavily on the letter/sound relationship, or visual cue (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003). By participating in RMA sessions she became aware of the importance of integrating other cueing systems when she read. Through RMA she was able to see what she was doing well and she realized that high-quality miscues indicate strengths in reading.

**RMA improved the student’s perception of reading, and self as reader.**

“Everything readers hear or say is filtered through their own language and cultural experiences” (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 14). Up to this point in school, Courtney had experienced a lot of perceived failure related to reading. She did not read books for pleasure, and admitted that she did not always read assigned material. She wasn’t reading for meaning, and she saw reading as an unpleasant event. Her view of reading changed.

RMA works because the students revalue reading and revalue themselves as readers. Miscues are seen as a “window” into their minds. It is a way to look at what the student is doing well, and what could improve. By discussing “smart” and “okay” miscues they become aware of what they are and are not doing. Students are able to reflect on and adjust their reading based on discussions about their miscues.

I found many similarities between my observations and previous research on RMA. Many struggling readers just need to gain confidence in their reading abilities, and become aware of reading as process of learning. Students get trapped in believing that the primary purpose of reading is for accuracy and fail to understand that reading is supposed to make sense (Almazroui, 2007; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Moore & Gilles,
2005; Theurer, 2002; Wilson, 2005; Wurr, et.al, 2008). As students develop an understanding of reading for meaning, and an awareness of reading strategies, they are able to incorporate new strategies to help them understand what they read. This, in turn, boosts their confidence and opinion of reading because they view reading as purposeful and themselves as proficient readers.

**RMA improved the student’s awareness of reading and writing as reciprocal processes.**

There is not just one way to read or write successfully. Teachers need to help students realize this and help them figure out what works for them. Through RMA, students are empowered by being involved in discussions about texts and reading strategies (Moore & Seeger, 2010). Engaging in discussions about reading strategies, author’s craft, author’s purpose and how they are used in different texts improved how Courtney approached texts. She began to read as a writer, and write as a reader.

Effective teachers realize where the student is and how to move them to next level in reading and writing. This happens naturally when teachers listen to students and use their performance to guide instruction. In RMA, teachers are able to have a window into the student’s thinking and understanding about reading. I was able to see how the discussions during RMA were helping her understand the processes of reading and writing. By developing this awareness, she improved her ability to access texts. She became aware of how authors write, how readers read and how they work together.

RMA helped her increase her awareness of important literacy skills by discussing miscues in terms of her own experiences and her own miscues. Vocabulary and word choice, author’s style, punctuation, and their own background knowledge are linked to the miscue in oral reading or retelling. It is up to the teacher to guide students in discussions to clarify the author’s intent and help students use text effectively. Students become experts on analyzing miscues and
this growth in critical thinking helps their comprehension, and fluency. RMA also leads to clarifying conversations about texts (Moore & Seeger, 2010). As discussed in the previous chapter, our RMA discussions led to clarifying conversations about events in *Stargirl* (Spinelli, 2000).

**RMA aligns to Common Core**

RMA increases critical thinking skills and therefore aligns to “Common Core Standards.” RMA requires students to *think about texts* and *think about reading*. It is student driven, flexible and engaging. Common themes throughout the research regarding Miscue Analysis include the thoughts that readers are individuals and miscues give valuable information about the reader. Research regarding RMA is based on these principles, and that involving the student in miscue analysis has a strong impact and miscue analysis needs to focus on *building on strengths* and *developing weaknesses* (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wurr, et al., 2008).

In addition to reading and writing, speaking and listening are also important literacy skills. Adolescent students like to have control over learning activities and discussions. By crossing over into content areas, RMA can provide meaningful opportunities to discuss texts in content areas to clarify meaning. Moore and Seeger (2010) discuss the potential of using RMA across curriculum content areas:

Using RMA helps students better understand the reading process and become better, more confident readers. Moreover, the use of RMA to integrate content across the curriculum is powerful...Through RMA conversations, readers will then begin to make connections between a variety of texts and content in authentic and meaningful ways that involve inquiry into their own understanding of the reading process situated in...
a variety of contexts both as individuals and collectively as a classroom community (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p.6).

Teachers can use RMA sessions in content areas to reinforce important concepts while improving student reading skills. Students are engaged in instruction while receiving support in a small group. Once students are comfortable with the content and framework of RMA, teachers can gradually release responsibility of the discussion and analysis of miscues over to the students.

**Implications for student learning**

“Reading is an ongoing, cognitive process that develops over time based on knowledge and experiences rather than a discrete set of skills to be mastered” (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 4).

**RMA increases metacognition.**

Students become aware of the importance of self-monitoring fluency and comprehension and this increases their metacognition. By using RMA students and teachers engage in conversations to increase their understanding of how the student uses these processes and how they might improve. Students are made aware of the many strategies and thinking processes that occur when reading. By increasing their awareness they are able to try new strategies and become increasingly able to monitor their own comprehension while reading. “Everything people hear, say, read or write is filtered through and represents language and cultural experiences (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 14).

Students discuss vocabulary and word choice, author’s style, punctuation, and their own background knowledge and see how these components are linked to the miscue in oral reading or retelling. It is up to the teacher to guide students in discussions to clarify the author’s intent and help students use text effectively. As students continue to engage in RMA, they become experts
on analyzing miscues. This growth in critical thinking helps improve their comprehension and fluency because they see how their own actions influence reading (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

**RMA can be adapted to meet the needs of students.**

Not only can RMA be used in a variety of ways, with any text to support a wide range of reading abilities, but more importantly, it can be used to support and reinforce texts being used in the students’ regular classrooms. Over the course of my research, I realized just how flexible RMA can be. It can be adjusted to meet the needs of the student in many ways. While methods and topics may change, the goal of RMA is always to help students expand their understanding of reading and gain confidence as readers.

Successful readers understand that reading is a process and there are many strategies that support comprehension (Moore & Seeger, 2010). RMA offers authentic experiences to develop proficient readers and also engages the reader in thinking about reading. Discussions are guided by teachers, but focused on reading performance and therefore increases the readers’ awareness of reading miscues and retellings (Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010).

RMA is flexible, student driven, and instructional. It is imperative that teachers engage readers with interesting and relevant texts. Each student has different interests, strengths, weaknesses and background knowledge (Moore & Gilles, 2005; Moore & Seeger, 2010). While it may not always be possible to use a student selected text, it is important to know students and allow opportunities for students to choose topics for material. Students are more likely to be engaged if they are interested in texts.

**RMA helps build a trusting relationship between students and teachers.**

The most important element in so many aspects of life is communication. RMA opens the lines of communication between students and teachers. Students understand what is being asked
of them, and why. Teachers provide meaningful activities and engage their students in reading texts that interest them. Finding ways to engage students in reading is not always easy, especially when working with adolescent students.

One of the most impressive things I found while using RMA was that the student’s learning was guided by conversation and engagement. We started talking about books: not only books we read during RMA sessions, but she was excited about things she read outside of our session. Students learn avoidance strategies and ways to compensate for missing skills. RMA gives students and teachers ways to talk about reading. Students are capable of, and they want to, make meaningful connections. RMA also allows the opportunity for gradual release of responsibility. When student independence increases, so does engagement (Fischer & Frey, 2012).

RMA is directly related to Vygotsky’s theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The ZPD stretches beyond what the child can do independently to what the child can do with help (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Effective teachers can individualize instruction and focus on individual strengths and needs. As students discuss miscues in a safe way, they become more aware of the reading process and are more likely to incorporate new strategies into their reading. (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012).

**Pull-out support creates more problems for adolescent students than it solves.**

One of my greatest “aha moments” during this research came when I realized how much I dislike pull-out models of reading intervention. There is a stigma associated with this model, and students in middle-school are highly aware of this (Moore & Seeger, 2010). Early in our RMA sessions, Courtney shared with me how much she disliked being pulled out of her classes to attend ELA lab/support sessions. She said that she felt stupid and felt like she was lost when
she reentered the class. I started to think about how difficult it must be for children who feel “lost” in school.

A student who has had a difficult time comprehending material in class is now removed from the regular classroom to work on a different text, with a different teacher, and sometimes a different objective. Then, when they return to class they feel even more lost because they missed valuable instructional time working on another lesson or activity. How is this student expected to “catch-up” when the “AIS” support is making them fall further behind and feel less competent? As previously stated, this is a critical mistake. Many districts use programs that involve repeated exercises and activities that isolate skills do not provide the student with authentic reading experiences. Activities like worksheets, flashcards, skill drills and remedial exercises, can discourage readers and enhance feelings of inadequacy (Moore & Seeger, 2010; Goodman & Marek, 1996). At school students need to learn about the function of reading instead of emphasizing phonics and rules. It is more important for students to have the opportunity for enriching activities or choice reading than it is to practice skills and drills.

Meanwhile, back in the class, the remedial student is missing important learning opportunities; the time spent on remediation is the time classmates are spending on building concepts, reading, writing, doing. So the learner in trouble, in the name of building basic skill competence is deprived of rich school experience. Ironically, the reader who rebels and acts out may be showing a healthier reaction than the one who withdraws or submits meekly to all this. At least such a rebel is showing a resistance to accepting full responsibility for failure (Goodman & Marek, 1996, p. 17).

When I asked Courtney if they worked on the text the class was working on, she said “No, it’s different.” I do not know exactly what her group was doing, or if it was or was not the
same skill, or a previous skill. I do know that she did not realize what the connection was; therein lies the problem. After discussing her concerns with her mother, they decided to let the school know they no longer wanted Courtney to participate in the pull-out groups. For the remainder of our time working together she remained in her regular classes. Her grades improved and she started to like school more.

I wish I could say RMA was the reason for her improvement; however, there were many unique factors that played into this case study. In addition to being diagnosed with Celiac Disease and starting a gluten-free diet two months before we started RMA, near the end of our sessions Courtney discontinued pull-out support at school and attended all of her classes. I am confident that RMA played an important role in her improved effort and attitude towards reading. The timing of all of this was ideal. She improved her awareness of reading strategies, revalued reading, gained confidence and started reading for meaning and monitoring her comprehension. For Courtney, it was a fresh start.

**Implications for my teaching**

As a result of this research and experience, my understanding of students as individuals was reinforced. Students do not learn the same things at the same pace in the same way. Students are individuals and have individual abilities, skills and interests. My goal is to support my students in ways that are meaningful and helpful for them. I want them to enjoy reading and feel successful. Some students develop effective reading strategies naturally, and others need to be taught these skills and supported while learning them (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

**I learned the importance of helping students revaluing reading.**

After participating in RMA sessions, Courtney became a more confident reader. It took a lot of time and effort on both our parts. This time and effort was necessary for Courtney to
revalue reading and realize the importance of self-monitoring. As a result of participating in RMA sessions, she revalued reading, revalued herself as a reader, improved self-monitoring of fluency, and improved self-monitoring of comprehension. This happened because we were both engaged in the process.

As a result of revaluing reading (and herself as a reader) she improved her monitoring of fluency and comprehension. As a result of monitoring her own fluency and comprehension, she was a successful reader. As a result of being a successful reader, she read for understanding. As a result of reading for understanding she was a successful reader. As a result of being a successful reader, she revalued reading and gained confidence. As a result of gaining confidence, she enjoyed reading. As a result of enjoying reading, she selected books to read outside of school. Hopefully she will continue to enjoy reading, and as a result, will continue to read and improve.

Through my experience working with Courtney, I learned about the importance of helping students revalue reading. Prior to this research, I knew that comprehension was as important as decoding; however, I didn’t realize the importance of the students’ views or previous experiences. In order to help students revalue reading, I need to understand that reading is a valuable process, that readers come to me with skills and deficits, and struggling readers have experienced many perceived failures (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Gallagher & Allington, 2009).

**I can empower students as readers, leaders and learners.**

By helping students revalue reading and self-as-reader, I can empower students. By middle school, most students have learned how to read and are independently reading to learn. As students get older, text becomes more complex and some students need more support than others (Fountas & Pinnell, 2009). As a result of this research and experience, my understanding
of students as individuals was reinforced. Students do not learn the same things at the same pace in the same way. Students are individuals and have individual abilities, skills and interests. My goal is to support students in ways that are meaningful and helpful for them. I want them to enjoy reading and feel successful. Some students develop effective reading strategies naturally, and others need to be taught these skills and supported while learning them (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

As students enter middle school, they seek independence. They want to be successful and they do not want to be embarrassed. In RMA, students are empowered by being involved in discussions about texts and reading strategies. Teachers are able to have a window into the student’s thinking and understanding about reading; both reading of a specific text, and reading as a process. No matter what a student’s ability or previous experiences, by engaging students RMA I can empower them (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

RMA provides a framework to hold meaningful discussions in a safe environment (Moore & Gilles, 2005). The RMA conversations help students realize how miscues impact comprehension and why it is important to monitor comprehension. During these interactive discussions I can introduce and model strategies and help raise a reader’s awareness of the reading process (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

I will always use RTI (Response to Intervention) for aligning skills.

As I supported her with Stargirl (Spinelli, 2000), I realized that at times she did not understand the important parts of the chapter. She needed support on the “independent” reading assignments. I wondered why her school did not run a small group for independent reading assignments for students who needed additional support; this seemed logical. In any case, I
realized that for my own teaching I would always use any RTI support to reinforce previous activities with previous texts, or to introduce upcoming concepts to give students a “head-start.”

As mentioned previously, I dislike the pull-out model of RTI. Especially when students are pulled out of a regular class to focus on isolated skills or concepts that are not related to other classwork. My opinion is that it is better to provide support for students in the classroom, or at least use the same material if working outside of the classroom. Using RMA is one way to do this. By engaging students in RMA sessions on required readings, students are engaged in reading and discussion of a text they may need support in reading. The four interrelated processing behaviors involved during reading that increase comprehension are paraphrasing, making cross-sentence connections, monitoring for understanding, and resolving problems when there were encountered (Kucer, 2009, 2011). This may not happen for at-risk for failure in reading students during independent reading assignments. Efficient readers combine all cueing systems, realize the author is giving cohesive information, and use his/her background knowledge to make sense of what he/she is reading (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Kucer, 2009, 2011; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wilson, 2005; Wurr, et al., 2008). Adolescent students at risk for failure in reading may benefit from additional support on assigned independent reading. By providing the framework of RMA in RTI, students can receive support on current tasks while developing skills that will help them in future reading assignments. We need to improve adolescents’ views of reading and provide opportunities to be successful thinkers, not provide a series of mind-numbing activities with lower level thinking tasks (Gallager, 2009).
Recommendations for future research

Most of the research regarding RMA was done in the late 1990s and early 2000s. All of the research show that participants improved their awareness and attitude towards reading. As a result of RMA, participants are able to revalue reading and themselves as readers.

As discussed in chapter 2, written language is different from spoken language. Students who speak languages other than English, or non-standard dialects of English, have a disadvantage when reading English. Not only are they working to decode and comprehend, but frequently the language structure is unfamiliar. If a student says a word the way he/she would while speaking, it not a considered miscue (Wilde, 2000). Also, when analyzing miscues, if the student has used syntax they would use in speech, it is not considered a miscue. Students who speak languages other than English, or non-standards dialects of English, can revalue reading by learning the difference between high-quality and low-quality miscues and realizing their strengths as readers.

RMA is a valuable tool to use with adolescents, and yet there is not a lot of research on using RMA with adolescents. I did not find any research focused on using RMA or CRMA with students who speak AAVE (African American Vernacular English). I would like to continue to research the influence of RMA and CRMA on adolescent readers, specifically students who use AAVE. Possible research future topics include:

- How might using RMA or CRMA influence views of reading for students who speak non-traditional dialects of English (i.e. AAVE)?
- How might student led, vs. teacher led, discussions influence student engagement during RMA/CRMA?
• How might using CRMA in content area courses influence students’ understanding of concepts?

Final thoughts

Reader’s beliefs influence reading.

Goodman & Marek (1996) discussed how readers’ beliefs about reading constrain or liberate them, and RMA is a way to demystify the reading process. As a result of participating in RMA students make peace with reading and gain confidence (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Participants revalue themselves as readers, learners, and language users (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Davenport, 2002),

RMA is flexible. RMA can be used in a variety of ways, with any text to support a wide range of reading abilities. Successful readers understand that reading is a process and there are many strategies that support comprehension (Moore & Seeger, 2010). The purpose of RMA is to develop proficient readers and to enrich the readers’ awareness of reading miscues and retellings. Our job as teachers is to show students that reading is all about understanding what one reads (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

Listening and understanding

When teachers use RMA, they are not just labeling and categorizing students, but they are listening and understanding (Goodman & Marek, 1996). By listening to and understanding what the student is doing as they read, the teacher is able to help the student build on their understanding of reading. By listening and understanding what the teacher says, the student is able to repair misunderstandings and improve his/her use of reading strategies.

“Readers use all of the linguistic and pragmatic features as they read. Dorothy Watson (1988) explains, ‘Within the complexly organized systems of language there are subsystems that
work in concert to help humans organize their experiences and mediate meaning’ (p. 5). All of these systems work together, not in isolations, to help readers construct meaning (Moore & Seeger, 2010, p. 11). This explains why RMA provides a “window” into the mind of the reader. Teachers and students engage in meaningful conversations about the texts and reading processes. By having conversations about the student’s reading behaviors and understandings, both teachers and students can determine the readers’ strengths and weaknesses. Teachers can use this information to guide instruction, and students can use the information to adjust and improve their use of reading strategies.

**Revaluing vs. remediation**

Goodman & Marek (1996) discussed the difference between revaluing and remediation. Ironically, remediation efforts often put students more behind (Gallagher & Allington, 2009; Moore & Seeger, 2010). In *Readicide*, (2003) Gallagher and Allington talk about the “Vicious Cycle” which results in widening the gap between struggling readers and their peers:

We give struggling readers treatment that does not work, and worse, a treatment that turns them off to reading. When they perform poorly on mandated exams, we respond by giving them an intensified does of an ineffective treatment. And before we know it, we find ourselves in the middle of the Paige Paradox. The result: students enter high school behind in reading, and leave even farther behind in reading. Worse, many leave our schools hating reading, arguable the single most important skill we want our students to value as they head into adulthood (p. 23).

This statement seems like common sense, but so many schools are following this cycle. Courtney was on track to follow this cycle. She didn’t enjoy reading because she viewed most of
her experiences as failed attempts. She didn’t value reading and she didn’t value herself as a reader.

**Conclusion**

The students who benefit the most from Retrospective Miscue Analysis are students who need to re-conceptualize reading as a process of making meaning from text (Moore & Gilles, 2005). RMA and CRMA are powerful assessment and instructional tools that allow flexibility. RMA helps the student become more aware of the reading process. RMA sessions are essentially a series of teachable moments using authentic texts (Black, 2004; Kabuto, 2009; Moore & Brantingham, 2003; Wohlwend, 2012). By identifying individual strengths and weaknesses, and introducing alternative strategies, teachers can help students revalue reading and gain confidence in their ability to read (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). The difference between remediation and revaluing is epic. Gallagher and Allington (2003) go on to say:

> Let’s see if we have this straight: we immerse students in a curriculum that drives the love of reading out of them, prevents them from developing into deeper thinkers, ensures the achievement gap will remain, reduce their college readiness, and guarantees that the result will be that our schools will fail. We have lost our way. It is time to stop the madness. (p. 23).

I agree. It *is* time to stop the madness.
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Appendix A

Table 1: adapted from Goodman & Marek (1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic (Syntax) Acceptability</th>
<th>Semantic (Meaning) Acceptability</th>
<th>Meaning Change</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Miscue occurs in a structure that is completely syntactically acceptable within the sentence <em>and</em> within the text</td>
<td>Miscue occurs in a structure that is completely semantically acceptable within the sentence <em>and</em> within the text</td>
<td>Miscue results in inconsistency, loss or change of meaning of a major idea, incident, character, fact, sequence or concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Miscue is either:</td>
<td>Miscue is either:</td>
<td>Miscue results in inconsistency, loss or change of meaning of a minor idea, incident, character, fact, sequence or concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Syntactically acceptable with first <em>or</em> last part of the sentence</td>
<td>• semantically acceptable with first <em>or</em> last part of the sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Miscue is syntactically acceptable within the sentence, but not within the complete text</td>
<td>• Miscue is semantically acceptable within the sentence, but not within the complete text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Miscue is not syntactically acceptable</td>
<td>Miscue is not semantically acceptable</td>
<td>Within the context of the passage, no change in meaning occurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: adapted from Goodman & Marek (1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphic Similarity (Does it look similar?)</th>
<th>Sound Similarity (Does it sound similar?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>High degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Some degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Adapted from Fountas & Pinnell (2010).

Fluency Scoring Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reads primarily word-by-word with occasional but infrequent or inappropriate phrasing; no smooth or expressive interpretation, irregular pausing, and no attention to author’s meaning or punctuation; no stress or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reads primarily in two-word phrases with some three-and four-word groups and some word-by-word reading; almost no smooth, expressive interpretation or pausing guided by author’s meaning and punctuation; almost no stress or inappropriate stress, with slow rate most of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reads primarily in three- or four-word phrase groups; some smooth, expressive interpretation and pausing guided by author’s meaning and punctuation; mostly appropriate stress and rate with some slowdowns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reads primarily in larger, meaningful phrases or word groups; mostly smooth, expressive interpretation and pausing guided by author’s meaning and punctuation; appropriate stress and rate with only a few slowdowns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Adapted from Fountas & Pinnell (2010).

Comprehension Scoring Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No understanding</td>
<td>either does not respond or talks off the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td>mentions a few facts or ideas but misses important information or ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partial Understanding</td>
<td>includes important information and ideas but leaves out other important details or understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>includes almost all important information and ideas and makes connections to real world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Courtney’s Miscues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courtney’s Miscues</th>
<th>(Non-words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(words that are graphically similar)</td>
<td>(Non-words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Miscue as read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invading</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferociously</td>
<td>furiously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conveyor</td>
<td>caviar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unraveled</td>
<td>untraveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dived</td>
<td>divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>launching</td>
<td>flaunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intro</td>
<td>into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sipping</td>
<td>slipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Burke Reading Interview

(From Moore & Seeger, 2010, p 134)

1. When you are reading and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do?
   
   Do you ever do anything else?

2. Who is a good reader you know?

3. What makes __________ a good reader?

4. Do you think he or she ever comes to something he or she doesn’t know when he or she is reading?

5. If the answer is yes: When he or she does come to something he or she doesn’t know, what do you think he or she does about it?
   
   If the answer is no: Suppose _____ comes to something he or she doesn’t know.
   
   What do you think he or she would do?

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

7. What would anyone else or your teacher do to help that person?

8. How did you learn to read? What did your teacher or someone else do to help you learn?

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

10. Do you think you are a good reader? Why or why not?

11. What makes a good reader?

12. What does reading mean to you?
Appendix C

Observation Protocol

Observation Date and Time: ________ Length of Observation: ______________
RMA Recorded Session
Reading or Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Activities (teacher and student)</th>
<th>Reflective Field notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closing:

I truly appreciate your participation and willingness to participate in this study. As indicated in your consent letter, your identity will be kept confidential.
Appendix D

Reproducible Simplified Miscue Organizer
RMA Session Organizer I: Simplified Version
(From Moore & Seeger, 2010, p 133)

Reader ________________________________________________________________

Date____________________________________________________________________

Name of text______________________________________________________________

Directions: Write the number of the line of text, exact text, and the miscue read. Put a C beside the miscue read if it was self-corrected. Circle a yes or no if the miscue changed the meaning of the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of text</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Miscue as Read/C</th>
<th>Did the miscue change the meaning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions to think about:
- Does the miscue make sense?
- Does the miscue change the meaning of the sentence?
- Why do you think the reader miscued?
- What connections to other text or life experiences does the reader make in the retelling?

Some topics for discussion:
### Appendix E

**RMA Session Organizer**

Created 2/1/2014 based on Moore & Gilles (2005) and Moore & Seeger (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of text</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Miscue as read</th>
<th>Grapho-phonics (sound like language?)</th>
<th>Syntactic (make sense?)</th>
<th>Semantic (make sense?)</th>
<th>Meaning change?</th>
<th>C (Self-corrected?)</th>
<th>HQ/LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Appendix F

Interview Protocol
(to be used at the conclusion of study)

Participant: (pseudonym) __________________________ Date of Interview and Time: __________________________

Purpose Statement: **Start audio recording-Identify participant by pseudonym, the date, and time** The reason I want to interview you is because I want to find out what you thought about using RMA. I am going to ask you some questions and I want you to answer them the best that you can. Please be honest; don’t be afraid to share your thoughts. There is no right or wrong answers and you will not be graded for how you answer. Your answers are helping me learn about RMA. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a question I ask, please know that you have the choice not to respond. You may stop doing the interview at any time. Our interview will last about 15 minutes. I will be recording our conversation, if you have given assent.

Questions to be used after RMA sessions:

How did you feel about being recorded while reading?

What was it like listening to yourself read?

Did it get easier?

Do you think using RMA helped you to understand what ‘good’ reading is? If so, how? If not, why?

Has RMA changed how you view reading? If yes, how? If no, why do you think it hasn’t?

Has RMA changed how you view yourself as a reader? If so, how? If no, why do you think it has not?

Would you recommend using RMA to other students? Please explain your response.

Closing:
I truly appreciate your participation and willingness to share your thoughts with me. Your participation and insights will help me understand whether or not RMA was helpful to you as a reader. As noted in your consent letter, I will keep your identity confidential. In the event that I need clarification after transcribing this interview, may I request a follow-up discussion?