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Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Within the realm of literacy, there are a range of instructional strategies. Teachers are continuously researching and trying to find new and innovative ways to reach the readers or learners in their classrooms. Not only do these reading teachers want to motivate their students to read, but they want all learners to believe that proficient reading is attainable and that everyone, even themselves, can be good readers. One instructional strategy I came across throughout my research was Retrospective miscue analysis (RMA). I found that this strategy helps to motivate students, enhance their repertoire of reading strategies, and increase their self-confidence. I hope to help other teachers recognize the advantages of using RMA in their own classrooms.

RMA was developed by a Canadian secondary school remedial reading teacher, Chris Worsnop in the 1970s. He felt as though the reading miscue inventory gave him more insight into the process of reading than did any other assessment tool he had used before. Worsnop began to involve students in a conversation about their miscues and that is when he came up with the idea of the retrospective miscue analysis (Goodman & Marek, 1996). He worked with individual students as well as pairs of seventh and ninth graders. Worsnop would have the students listen to their tape recorded readings and have them record miscues as they heard them. For each miscue, the students, with the help of Mr.
Worsnop, would answer a hierarchy of questions pertaining to the three cueing systems. Through his sessions, he made sure to place the greatest emphasis on meaning within the hierarchy of questions. If the students answered “yes” to the question of whether or not the miscue made sense, they would then move onto the next miscue due to the previous miscue’s semantic acceptability within the text. Chris found that this instructional strategy gave his students the ability to handle more difficult texts as the year progressed. He also felt as though his readers became more confident and believed they could “make it in reading after all” (Weaver, 2002, p. 226).

Although first introduced and created by Chris Worsnop, RMA was popularized by Yetta Goodman and Ann Marek (Goodman & Marek, 1996). RMA is both a research tool and an instructional tool. The RMA is seen as an effective assessment and instructional strategy for use with elementary, middle, and secondary students, and is especially beneficial when used with those readers who lack confidence in their own reading abilities (Moore & Gilles, 2005). RMA gives readers an insight into their own thinking. It gives the students the opportunity to self-evaluate their reading as they transact with the text. Teachers are also able to use results from the RMA to plan instructional components of a reading program (Goodman & Marek, 1996). On the other hand, RMA is also a useful tool for researchers. It reveals for researchers how readers respond to their own miscues as they read. It also provides insight into how the conscious awareness of reading miscues influences reading development across all age levels. According to Yetta
Goodman, “the RMA process helps readers become aware that they are better readers than they think they are,” (Y. Goodman, 1996, p. 602). This process of readers becoming aware of their ability to read is termed revaluing. Ken and Yetta Goodman believe that readers who revalue themselves become more confident and willing to take risks.

**Research Questions**

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

How might Retrospective Miscue Analysis impact a child’s understanding of the reading process?

1. How might RMA impact a student’s perceptions of himself/herself as a reader?
2. How might the student’s definition of reading change throughout the process?
3. How might the student’s comprehension of text be impacted by the implementation of multiple RMA sessions?
4. What strategies and language might the child begin to use as he/she progresses through the RMA sessions?

**Rationale**

There are a number of benefits that will come from the investigation of the stated research questions. The insights into the reading process that the student and I will gain may encourage other teachers to take on this instructional strategy in their own classrooms. Classroom teachers will be able to see how easy is it for
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a teacher to apply this strategy within the classroom setting in order to help with strategy instruction. The more teachers who try this strategy out in their classrooms and report positive results, the more convinced the skeptics will be that this instructional strategy is truly beneficial for students’ reading abilities and self-perceptions.

Within the classroom, this instructional strategy has the potential to improve students’ self-perceptions of themselves as readers, as well as, support the instruction of the fundamental reading comprehension strategies. This study is important for teachers who may want to replicate the study within their own classrooms. There are a lot of teachers who use miscue analysis within their classroom but do not take it a step further and include the student in the conversation. Seeing how one teacher tried out RMA for the first time with a student may encourage another teacher to do the same.

Definitions

Miscue analysis is based on the early work of Ken and Yetta Goodman. This particular assessment has a long history of helping teachers develop a rich understanding of the reading process (Moore & Brantingham, 2003). A miscue analysis does not involve the reader in the process the way that the retrospective miscue analysis does, but is a piece of the RMA sessions. A miscue is an unexpected response that occurs when the reader’s knowledge of language and concepts of the world may not match up with the text. Readers use a number of cueing systems: semantic (meaning), syntactic (grammar), and grapho-phonic
(sound/symbol), simultaneously to construct meaning as they transact with text.

By viewing patterns of miscues within a text (miscue analysis), the teacher and reader are able to see what cueing systems are being used to solve words and construct meaning. Two terms that students will become familiar with as they are engaged in RMA sessions are the different types of miscues. A *high level miscue* is a miscue that does not interfere with the meaning of the text, while a *low level miscue* is a miscue that gets in the way of full comprehension of a text. By discussing their miscues within these two categories, the reader will be able to find value within each miscue and realize that miscues are a part of the reading process (Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

**Study Approach**

The research questions were explored as one student took part in an eight-week process with me acting as the participant observer. Each week the child and I engaged in two sessions ranging from 25-45 minutes in length. Through the use of interviews, informal conversation, miscue analysis, observed behavior, comprehension assessments, and written reflection, data was collected for analysis. This data was analyzed qualitatively through the constant comparative method. By using this method, each research question was answered by analyzing multiple data sources, therefore creating triangulation.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

While reviewing literature for this study, I came across a number of encouraging research articles, books, and previous studies that supported the idea of Retrospective Miscue Analysis and its benefits for teachers, researchers, and especially the readers who take part in the process. As I made my way through the content, questions began to arise, as well as obvious trends within the literature. In regard to my current study, I was interested in how a reader’s definition of reading, comprehension, use of strategies, and self-perceptions might be affected by his/her engagement in RMA sessions. I have specifically explored how reading is defined within the RMA process, reading strategies proficient readers use, self-perceptions in regard to reading, as well as the history and development of Retrospective Miscue Analysis. All of the research has proved valuable to my own study and supports the idea that RMA is a beneficial instructional and assessment tool for teachers, researcher, and readers.

Definition of Reading

Students who struggle with reading oftentimes rely on similar, ineffective strategies to help them read. The instructional programs struggling readers are often placed in have a focus in skill and phonics instruction (Moore & Gilles, 2005). These students “become victims of too much skill use” and therefore rely on these strategies to help them while reading (Moore & Gilles, 2005, p. 72). The process of reading for these struggling readers becomes more about getting words
right rather than making sense of the text (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Through research and interviews with struggling readers, it has been revealed that these students believe that it is cheating to skip words. They also believe that if you read slowly, you are a poor reader, and good readers are able to remember everything they read (Y. Goodman, 1996). Oftentimes this misconception that every word needs to be read correctly comes from the philosophy of reading being presented within the classroom. Some students have shared experiences of times when the teacher would correct every word they read inaccurately in front of the entire class. This experience can lead a reader to focus so much on correct word calling that all meaning is lost.

In my own experience as a substitute teacher, I have observed students correcting a classmate’s miscue almost instantaneously before the reader has a chance to problem solve and use his/her strategies to solve the word independently. One pre-service teacher, Sophie, shared her experience of having to read every word correctly within her classroom for fear of being corrected in front of her entire class. She discusses how she began to focus more on accurate word calling rather than the meaning of the text and carried this belief and strategy into adulthood (Theurer, 2002). This belief in a text reproduction model of reading is all too common for struggling readers. Retrospective miscue analysis is one way that these beliefs about reading can be dispelled and a shift toward a meaning making process of reading can be achieved.
Retrospective miscue analysis helps readers to see reading as a meaning making process. Not only do the words the author has placed onto the page matter, but what each reader brings to the text is important as well. One theory that grounds the idea of retrospective miscue analysis, as well as my own research, is Rosenblatt’s transactional theory or more specifically, Kenneth Goodman’s sociopsycholinguistic transactional theory. Rosenblatt and Kenneth Goodman both propose that the meaning of the text is derived from a transaction between the text and the reader. The text is not controlling a passive reader; the reader is active in the process as much as the text (Liontas, 2002). Within this theory, the reader is just as important in the process as the text he/she is reading. Each reader brings a different set of opinions and experiences to a text. This background knowledge effects how the reader perceives or interprets the text. Ken Goodman (1973) believes that exact agreement of the expected responses (text) and observed responses (oral) is highly unlikely due to the differences in attitudes and background knowledge of the reader and the author. Due to this idea of background knowledge of the reader, he also touches on the idea that a teacher should not expect his or her students to understand a text exactly as they do. Critical thinking should be encouraged in the classroom and meaning of the text should not be viewed as an absolute entity (Goodman, 1973). Every reader is bringing a different set of attitudes to the reading process and therefore, meaning will be interpreted in different ways.
During RMA, the teacher is able to infer the background knowledge that a child may or may not be bringing to the text and is able to see this transaction between text and reader taking place. As the teacher listens to and records the students' miscues, inferences are able to be made about what the student is getting out of the text and what the student is bringing to the text. Once the retelling part of the session takes place, the teacher can see what the child understood from the text and even compare it with their own understanding of the text. Although the two outcomes may vary, both of the understandings are valuable in RMA. Once the teacher and student look back at the miscues in retrospect, the teacher is able to see into the mind of the reader and what the student was thinking while he/she was reading. The idea behind the transactional theory can also help the teacher to get to know his/her reader. Knowing that each reader is different and brings something different to the text is the first step in finding out more about the readers in any given classroom. When a teacher is working with a student through the RMA process, the teacher considers all aspects of that student. Each time a miscue inventory is taken and analyzed, a conversation with the child is crucial in order gain as much insight into that particular reader's strategic actions and meaning-making process. Although a teacher can infer about a particular reader, having a conversation is the most effective way to find out what is going on in the mind of a reader and how the reader interprets the meaning of a text. Retrospective Miscue Analysis is grounded in Goodman and Rosenblatt's theories in that it is an instructional strategy that does not assume every reader is the same.
This strategy values each student and what he or she brings to the reading process (Church, 1997).

In the last forty years, reading instruction has been primarily word oriented. There have been numerous arguments about the benefits of phonics instruction versus whole language. The analysis of miscues has led some theorists, researchers, and teachers from a word focus to a comprehension focus when thinking about reading instruction. After three decades of research with miscue analysis, it has become apparent that three sources of information are available to a reader (Goodman, K., 2003). During the process of reading, a reader is drawing upon three sources of information: the visual information (grapho-phonic), the meaning of the text (semantic), and the language structure (syntactic) (Johnson, 2006). After thirty years of research, it has become evident that readers are not just sounding words out while reading. Sounding out is no longer seen as the only strategy a reader can use to problem solve an unknown word. Proficient readers can read fluently not only because they recognize words quickly, but the meaning and structure of the text is continually driving them (Johnson, 2006).

The goal of readers is to have a balance of the three sources of information when reading and have the three cueing systems simultaneously working together to generate meaning from a text. A teacher is able to determine when the cueing systems are not balanced through the use of miscue analysis. If a student is relying on one source of information, the visual for example, then the teacher will be able to observe this in the pattern of miscues the student has in his/her reading.
How Retrospective Miscue Analysis Might Impact a Child’s Understanding of the Reading Process (Goodman & Marek, 1996). When a reader is relying heavily on the visual cue, their oral response will look visually similar to the expected response but may not make sense or sound grammatically correct in the sentence. An example of this would be when a child reads, “The horse had three bedrooms and two bathrooms,” instead of, “The house had three bedrooms and two bathrooms.” Substituting “horse” for “house” resulted in a sentence that did not make sense, but the two words are visually similar. A reader who is using all of his/her cueing systems might read “horse” for “house” and determine that it did not make sense, forcing the reader to revisit the word and correct it (Johnson, 2006). The three cueing systems are always at work and the teacher must be able to recognize this in his/her readers in order to help the readers become more strategic and achieve balance within the three cueing systems.

Reading Strategies

When students are using the three cueing systems within the reading process, a number of in-the-head reading strategies are taking place (Johnson, 2006). Miscue analysis can help a teacher or researcher begin to determine what in-the-head strategies a student may be using while reading a text. Even more effective in finding out what in-the-head strategies a reader is using is retrospective miscue analysis. RMA is helpful because a conversation can take place between the reader and teacher, and this conversation can give insight into what strategies the child is using while working through a text. If teachers are able
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to obtain a view into a student’s thinking, then they will achieve the ability to help their students become strategic readers.

Struggling readers need teachers who understand the reading process and the strategies good readers use to making meaning from a text. According to Fountas and Pinnell (2001), the set of strategies readers use for basic comprehension and word solving are “sustaining reading strategies” (as cited in Johnson, 2006, p. 17). This set of strategies include: searching and gathering, predicting, checking/confirming, self-monitoring, maintaining fluency, and adjusting. As the reader confronts an unknown text, he/she searches for information from the letters and pictures while using background knowledge and the context of the story to help interpret the meaning of the text. The reader can also link parts of unknown words with words he/she already knows in order to predict what a word might be. It is also important for readers to cross-check their cueing systems in order to confirm a prediction. For example, if the child is relying on the grapho-phonic cueing system to determine that the text “house” is house, he/she should simultaneously crosscheck this prediction by considering if it makes sense in the story and sounds right in the sentence, therefore confirming or refuting the prediction. This view of the reading process that underlies RMA is outlined in more detail in the “definition of reading” section above. A reader is constantly self-monitoring her or his reading by asking three questions: Does my prediction sound right? Look right? Make sense? (Johnson, 2006)
The second set of reading strategies as referred to by Fountas and Pinnell are “expanding reading strategies” (Johnson, 2006, p. 18). This set of strategies include: making connections, visualizing, summarizing, synthesizing, evaluating, questioning, inferring, and determining importance. These strategies help the reader to go beyond the literal meaning of the text and pave the way for inferential comprehension of a text. Although all of the expanding strategies are not used simultaneously, it is important that readers have this set of strategies to pull from when reading. Researchers (e.g., Clay, 1991; Johnson, 2006; Pearson, 1983; Tomkins, 2010) have different viewpoints on whether or not these strategies can be taught, but teachers can encourage readers to be strategic in the way they teach reading (Johnson, 2006). By analyzing miscues, teachers are able to determine what strategies their students are using, therefore being able to prompt the students to use strategies that may be more efficient or useful for particular genres. Understanding the reading process and this network of strategies is imperative for a teacher to effectively help a child who is struggling with reading (Johnson, 2006).

Fountas and Pinnell have defined specific reading strategies they believe readers use each time they pick up a book; Goodman, Watson, and Burke also discuss reading strategies that have some similarities to Fountas and Pinnell’s thought process but do differ slightly (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1996). Like other theorists in the field of reading, Goodman et al. (1996) consider reading as a problem solving, meaning making process. Each reader uses language, thoughts,
and his or her own view of the world to understand the author’s meaning. Reading can never be an exact process because of differences between the author and reader. The reading strategies that align with the theory behind retrospective miscue analysis occur without conscious awareness from the reader when the text is at the reader’s independent reading level. During retrospective miscue analysis, the teacher is able to slow down the process for the student to make the reader aware of this unconscious strategic process. Sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating are the significant strategies in the reading process according to Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1996). The strategy of sampling is the process of selecting information from the available print or information from the text in order to make an inference or prediction to solve the unknown word. Inferring is coming to an understanding based on information presented in the text. Predicting is making an educated guess and then confirming or refuting that guess with the information available to you within the text. To test predictions, the reader can ask two questions: Does this make sense? Does this sound like language? The reader then takes the appropriate steps if the answer to either of those questions is “no”. Finally, integrating is the strategic process of combining the strategies of sampling, inferring, predicting, and confirming into an integral, cyclical process. The natural reading strategies are used to transact with the cueing systems and the process occurs so rapidly that the strategies seem to appear simultaneously. The process results in comprehension of the text (Goodman et al, 1996).
Ken Goodman believes that the best help a teacher can give to his/her student is instruction that builds confidence and independence. A student who is dependent has not been taught the strategies he/she needs to become successful in the reading process. Teachers need to help their students build these sets of strategies and positive reading experiences will be the end result. In order to have successful strategy instruction, a teacher must base it on observation and evaluation of specific students in the classroom. Miscue research shows that proficient readers use the strategies of sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating (process outlined above according to Goodman, Watson, and Burke (1996)). By examining a reader's miscues a teacher is able to evaluate the reader's use of strategies and knowledge of the cueing systems. With the conversation that takes place during retrospective miscue analysis, a teacher and student are able to analyze miscues and determine what strategies a reader is using or neglecting. Through the use of reading strategy instruction, a teacher is able to strengthen the cueing systems already in use and encourage talk about reading and the reading process.

Self Perceptions

Research has brought many teachers and researchers to the conclusion that “an early reading difficulty is one of the strongest predictors of eventual school failure,” (Hogsten & Peregoy, 1999, p. 4). Within the definition of school failure is lowered motivation, decline in positive attitude, and negative self-perceptions. Teachers need to be aware of the students in their classrooms who have negative
self-perceptions about themselves as readers. The Burke Reading Interview is a tool that can be used by teachers to find out how their students feel about themselves as readers (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005). The interview contains questions that target how a student feels about themselves as a reader, what strategies they are using while reading, and the student’s definition of a “good” reader. The information that can be gained from the interview is important for all teachers to know about the readers in their classrooms from the very beginning of the school year. Researchers (e.g., Henk & Melnick, 2005) claim that students who hold positive attitudes toward reading tend to read more often and for longer periods of time. Of course, as teachers, we realize that this positive association with reading will mean superior reading achievement in the classroom (Henk & Melnick, 2005). Therefore, it is important as a teacher to get to know your students and how they feel about themselves as a reader, as well as how they feel about reading. Without this pertinent information, you will not be aware of the attitude shifts that may need to be made in the classroom in regards to reading, and the negative attitudes toward reading will persist and perhaps continue to grow.

As students progress through the grades, self-perceptions generally decrease because they become more conscious of the abilities of their peers and begin to make comparisons to their own capabilities. When these negative attitudes persist, students will continue to have unsuccessful experiences with reading, causing an even further decline in attitude. A stumbling block for older students is that they feel as though their ability is becoming a stable entity. With
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This, come feelings of hopelessness and helplessness that there is no chance for becoming a better reader. Also, with these lowered self-perceptions, researchers have found that students begin to see reading activities as less useful and important, and avoidance by the student sets in causing reading experiences to deteriorate. With this information in mind, it is important for teachers to have early reading experiences that leave students feeling successful, while also conveying to them the value of the process of reading (Hogsten & Peregoy, 1999). RMA sessions are one way that students receive feedback about strategy use and will begin to revalue the process of reading while simultaneously influencing how they view themselves as readers.

RMA is an instructional strategy that can help students come to value the process of reading while also feeling successful in their transactions with texts. Students who receive feedback about their use of strategies are able to see that effortful application of those strategies can cause successful outcomes within the reading process (Chapman & Tumner, 2003). When a teacher engages a struggling reader in the process of RMA, the child is able to see that he/she has control over the process of reading and there are tools he/she can use to help him/her become a better reader. Yetta Goodman (2008) talks about how, through RMA, readers become aware that all readers, even “good” readers make miscues while reading. This realization is a turning point for struggling readers in the RMA process. Before beginning this process, many struggling readers believe a proficient reader is someone who reads all of the words correctly, reads fast, and
understands and remembers everything he/she reads (Goodman Y.M., 1996). This misconception that struggling readers have is transformed through the process of RMA while it helps the reader to build a more realistic view of how readers read. The process supports readers in overcoming personal opinions they have about themselves as readers as well as the reading process itself (Moore & Gilles, 2005). As readers learn that reading word for word is not the goal of reading and begin to reflect on their own reading process, the readers begin to discover that they are better readers than they think they are. Ken Goodman termed this process “revaluing” (Goodman Y.M. 1996, p. 602). As readers “revalue” themselves they become more confident and take more risks (Goodman Y.M., 1996). This in turn leads them on the road to become proficient, lifelong readers.

One of the uses of retrospective miscue analysis is to increase a reader’s self perceptions. In one case study developed and implemented by Almazroui, significant gains were seen in one child’s self-perceptions in regard to reading. Salem was a third grade student whose home language was Arabic. He came to the United States three years before this case study took place. Salem was placed into special classes due to his performance in reading and writing. It was a concern of Salem’s teacher and the researcher that Salem was becoming a dependent reader and would only use one strategy to solve an unknown work: sounding out. A Burke Reading Interview was administered at the beginning and end of his RMA/tutoring sessions with Karima in order to track Salem’s changes in reading attitudes, misconceptions, and self-perceptions. Salem was told about
the process of miscue analysis and its ability to reveal our strengths as readers (Almazroui, 2007). Almazroui discusses how Salem gradually began to understand that miscues were a natural part of the reading process and everyone miscues. This understanding is important for readers because miscues are inevitable due to the differences between the author and the reader. If a child believes that miscues are mistakes, then he/she will not value themselves as readers. Readers need to be in an environment where the process of miscuing is valued (Goodman, et al, 1996). According to Almazroui (2007) Salem learned that miscues reveal understanding rather than indicate failure. She talks about how he was a shy boy who developed into a new kind of reader who was not intimidated by miscues the way he was at the beginning of the process. Throughout the research process, not only did Salem revalue himself as a reader but his parent’s began to notice changes in their son at home. The meaning he was extracting from the stories he was reading began to influence his behaviors at home in a positive way. In the second Burke Reading Interview Salem describes himself as a “reader who can use several and various reading strategies rather than sticking to sounding out,” (Almazroui, 2007, p. 166). Throughout the study, Salem became more independent as a reader and less frequently asked for help when he came to an unknown word in his reading. He developed a more realistic view of the reading process and in turn became a more confident and strategic reader.
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The Development of Retrospective Miscue Analysis

Miscue analysis.

Ken Goodman determined that observed responses while reading (miscues) provide a window into how a child processes text. A teacher who looks through the “window”, by using miscue analysis, is better able to describe and evaluate a student’s control of the reading process (Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 2005). In 1965, Goodman found that children identified more words accurately in context rather than in isolation. This finding led Goodman to look further into miscues and what they meant for each reader. He realized that readers were not only looking at the letters within a word, but using clues from the story and their own background knowledge to determine what an unknown word was. The goal of miscue analysis is to detect whether the three cueing systems (syntactic, semantic, and graphophonic) are being used simultaneously by a reader in order to identify words (McKenna & Picard, 2006). Miscue analysis is a tool that allows teachers to investigate why an observed response does not match with the response we expect while a student is reading. A teacher’s comprehension of the reading process will increase through the continued use of miscue analysis.

Reading miscue inventory.

Researchers, Yetta Goodman, Carolyn Burke, and Dorothy Watson collaborated with Ken Goodman to formulate a tool for miscue analysis that they could make available for teachers (Goodman et al, 2005). The RMI, or reading miscue inventory, was developed in order to help teachers analyze the miscues within an unfamiliar reading sample. By analyzing the miscues, the teacher is able
to gain valuable information about the readers in his/her classroom. This information can then be used to plan strategy instruction for the classroom setting whether it is for whole group or individualized instruction. In the past four decades, variations have been made to the RMI in order to adapt the process based on the setting, material, purpose, and the audience for which it was meant. They decided to make three options available for teachers and researchers. Each of the procedures requires different lengths of time to complete and elicits different outcomes for the teacher and student.

*Procedure one* is the most time-consuming option. It gives the teacher the most information about the student and looks at all of the miscues within a text and how they relate to each other. A teacher, who may decide to begin using miscue analysis in the classroom, may choose to begin with the in-depth procedure in order to become more familiar with the reading process and the three cueing systems that miscue analysis relies heavily on (Goodman et al, 2005). With procedure one, each miscue is analyzed on the basis of six questions. The teacher determines the syntactic and semantic acceptability of the miscue within the sentence. She then decides how the miscue has changed the intended meaning of the author (N=no meaning change P=partial meaning change Y=meaning change), whether there was a self correction, and the graphic and sound similarity of the miscue. For each miscue all six questions are answered and recorded on a recording form developed by Ruth Davenport (Davenport, 2002). Once the information is written on the form, the teacher is then able to observe patterns in
the data and areas where the reader has strengths and weaknesses. The form helps the teacher get an overall picture of what information the reader is attending to while reading. With this procedure, individualized instruction can be developed for that particular reader.

*Over the shoulder* is another option that is less time-consuming and can be conducted at any time during the school day. Goodman and Burke kept in mind that there are only 8 hours in the school day and teachers need a miscue inventory that could be administered at points throughout the instructional day. This informal procedure is used more by teachers who find themselves proficient in identifying miscues as children read. Within this option, the teacher does not need a typescript of the text the student is reading. The teacher is able to mark the miscues on a form as the student is reading. This procedure does not require the teacher to choose a book ahead of time. The student can be reading a book of choice during independent reading time for this procedure. The teacher does not look at the overall picture of the miscues and compare miscues. Instead specific miscues are looked at in order to gage further instruction. The teacher and student can also sit down after the reading and engage in a conversation about the miscues the teacher recorded during the over the shoulder procedure (Davenport, 2002).

*Procedure three* focuses on miscues at the sentence level. Each sentence is looked at and it is determined whether or not the sentence sounds right, makes sense, or changes the author’s intended meaning. Codings for the sentences can be
recorded directly on the typescript. With this procedure, the teacher or researcher can also look at each miscue and analyze it based on three different categories as opposed to the six categories in procedure one. For each miscue, the teacher determines if the miscue was self-corrected, the extent of meaning change, and the graphic similarity of the observed response to the expected response. If the child self-corrected, no further analysis is required for the miscue. (Davenport, 2002) A form created by Davenport is useful in compiling the data collected from this procedure. The form gives the teacher a profile of the reader and helps the teacher to observe growth over time if the procedure is done more than once with any given reader (Appendix H).

**Retrospective miscue analysis.**

Soon after the development of the reading miscue inventory for classroom teachers, researchers began to look at the idea of involving students in the process of discussing their miscues. Chris Worsnop introduced the concept of retrospective miscue analysis in the 1970’s (Goodman & Mareck, 1996). The RMA process involves the reader in a conversation about his/her miscues. By analyzing their own miscues, readers discover for themselves that reading is a process that involves the use of various strategies and cueing systems. Use of this strategy can result in a shift from a skills-based view of the reading process to a more holistic view for the teacher and the student. This particular strategy is most effectively used by teachers who have a clear understanding of miscue analysis and the transactional sociopsycholinguistic theory. Kenneth Goodman’s
transactional sociopsycholinguistic theory values the active involvement of the reader in the meaning-making process. As reading is viewed under this theoretical lens, meaning is in both the reader and the author of the text. A transaction is made between the reader and the words on the page. Each reader brings a different set of experiences, attitudes, and concepts to the reading process and therefore what one reader takes away from a text may differ from what another reader takes away. Kenneth Goodman believes that readers are successful if they are able to make sense of the text. RMA can be used with all age levels and abilities but it is particularly useful for those readers who are having difficulty figuring out the reading process (Moore & Gilles, 2005). As students examine the patterns within their miscues and talk about the three cueing systems with a more capable other, they are able to delineate how they make meaning from text.

To begin the RMA process, the teacher needs to choose a text that is slightly challenging for the reader she or he is working with. The section of text should have between 300 and 500 words in order to ensure 30 to 40 miscues to analyze (Davenport, 2002). The text should be typed up before the child reads to the teacher. It is helpful to double space the text and to maintain the same line breaks as the original text to make room for the recording of miscues directly on the typescript. Before the initial reading with the child, the teacher will also want to construct a retelling guide that lists main characters, events, and ideas of the text. Each of the items should be assigned points allowing up to 100 points if all items are stated in the child’s retelling (Davenport, 2002). In the first session, the
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reader’s job is to read the text and retell what he/she recalls from the story. The teacher can ask probing questions if necessary. The teacher’s job in the first session is to mark miscues and listen to the retelling and assign points for the information the child recalls. After the session, the teacher can go back and listen to the tape recording to double check the miscues and retelling. In between sessions, the miscues are analyzed and five to ten are chosen for discussion with the child during the RMA session. During the RMA session, the teacher and child talk about the miscues and what they mean for the reading. For a reader who is new to the process, the teacher would choose miscues that were considered high quality. This will help the reader to feel good about his/her miscues and realize that not all miscues are “bad” miscues. If the session was tape recorded, the teacher can replay the tape in order for the child to hear the miscues. This would not be done until the reader has gained confidence and understands that miscues are not mistakes (Goodman & Marek, 1996). The process would repeat again starting with the reading of a selection of text, retelling, and then discussion of miscues with the reader. If used over a length of time, progress might be seen in the child’s self-confidence, reading strategies, and comprehension (Moore & Brantingham, 2003).

While the understanding of the reading process within RMA is grounded in Goodman and Rosenblatt’s transactional theories, the social aspect of this instructional strategy is balanced by Vygotsky’s theory of social cognitive development. Within this theory, it is believed that full cognitive development
requires social interaction. Social interaction is taking place within the RMA process, and more specifically it is taking place with a more knowledgeable counterpart. This being said, it also lines up appropriately with Vygotsky’s idea of the zone of proximal development, in which a child can learn more when the proper amount of support is provided. The social interaction and discussion in the RMA sessions are the primary pieces that truly ground this research and the process that takes place between the teacher and student (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

Another important aspect of Vygotsky’s theory is “that instruction is most efficient when students engage in activities within a supportive learning environment and when they receive appropriate guidance that is mediated by tools” (Patsula, Vygotsky’s theory of social cognitive development section, para. 3, 1999). By tools, they are particularly speaking of cognitive strategies, a mentor, or peers, which are all provided in some way throughout the RMA process. Cognitive strategies are gained through the sessions as students talk about their miscues. The mentor in this case is the teacher, and peers can be brought into the process as it is deemed appropriate for each case.

Since the 1970’s, when the concept of retrospective miscue analysis was first introduced by Chris Worsnop, a number of researchers and teachers (e.g.; Burke, 2005; Brantingham, 2003; Gilles, 2005; Goodman, K., 2003; Goodman, Y., 1996; Marek, 1996; Moore, 2003; Watson, 2005) have jumped on board to attempt this instructional strategy in the classroom. With each attempt came success in
changing readers’ attitudes and an increase in strategic behaviors while reading. Many of the researchers focused on middle and high school students within their studies and that is why I thought it would be helpful to take a look at a student in fifth grade for my own research study.

Theurer (2002) was one researcher who looked at how a pre-service teacher could benefit from her own experience with retrospective miscue analysis. This study is different from others in that it worked with a reader who was already seen as proficient. Joan Theurer began the study with the Burke Reading Interview Modified for Older Readers (Theurer, 2002). This reader was taking college courses and perceived she was a good reader. From the results of the BRI it was apparent that this pre-service teacher (Sophie) held a strong belief in a text-reproduction model of reading. By carrying this belief it in turn meant Sophie felt reading was getting all of the words correct. Taking part in the process of RMA helped Sophie to come to the realization that efficient and effective reading does not result when a reader is focused on the accurate reproduction of the text. Sophie began to realize even after one session of RMA that all readers bring something to the text that can result in miscues. At first, Sophie did not realize the value of these miscues in the reading process and what they can reveal for the reader, along with that reader’s teacher. Because of Sophie’s experiences in school, she had always felt as though a good reader was able to get every word correct. A teacher’s experience with reading throughout schooling can affect the way that teacher is going to teach reading to her own students. After the RMA
process, this pre-service teacher was able to recognize that she did not possess an accurate view of the reading process. At the conclusion of this research study, Theurer determined that this process with Sophie encouraged an already proficient reader to revalue herself as a reader while also valuing the transactive nature of the reading process. This study demonstrated how valuable RMA is for pre-service teachers and teachers already in classrooms. It can help to aid teachers in understanding the process of reading to benefit themselves, as well as their future students (Theurer, 2002).

Moore and Brantingham (2003) implemented a case study on one student that helped to frame my own work. The young boy Nathan within their study received services for reading since the first grade and had little success with traditional approaches to reading instruction. Nathan had even told his teacher that he felt “bad” when he had to read aloud to his classmates (Moore & Brantingham, 2003, p. 466). He felt that his not knowing the words was negatively affecting the other students in his classroom. This negative attitude, low self confidence, and lack of progress in reading concerned his teachers. The researcher and teacher (Moore & Brantingham) decided that Retrospective miscue analysis had the potential of helping this reader revalue the reading process and himself as a reader. The researcher’s questions are similar to my own study, but the materials used differed slightly. These two researchers found success in their study, and one reader came out of their study with improved comprehension and a set of strategies that would guide him while reading independently. I was hoping to use pieces of
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their study within my own and see if the same positive results could be found with my own struggling reader.

Moore and Gilles (2005) write about a teacher who chose to try out RMA with two seventh grade students (Matt and Devon) labeled learning disabled. The two young boys in this study spent most of their time in special education classrooms, experienced numerous academic failures, and had even been told that they were not smart. Like most struggling students who have similar experiences to Devon and Matt, they began to avoid situations that might lead to more failure. Due to this fear of failure and apparent cycle of failure, Devon and Matt were turned off by reading. By administering the Burke Reading Interview, Jennifer (the teacher in this study), was able to find out the strategies the two boys relied on while reading as well as their perceptions about their reading ability. While the Burke Reading Interview revealed much about the two boys, the sessions that followed revealed even more than Jennifer could imagine. As Jennifer began to reflect on her process, she felt as though the boys would benefit from a different form of RMA in which they could have discussions about miscues with a peer instead of a teacher. This modified form of RMA was termed CRMA, or collaborative retrospective miscue analysis.

Due to the fact that the researcher wanted to place more responsibilities on the boys in her RMA sessions, CRMA seemed to be the reasonable choice. Originally, she was leading the discussion and evaluations, but wanted her students
to take more of a role in the process. Wilson made sure before beginning CRMA with Devon and Matt, that she built their confidence within individual RMA sessions. Without this step, the CRMA sessions would not have been as successful. Wilson establishes that the CRMA sessions were awkward at first for the boys but as time went on, the boys began to take control of the process. This engagement and sharing of strategy use proved to be very effective for the two struggling readers in Wilson’s study (Moore & Gilles, 2005). The CRMA process is not one that all teachers should use with their students. Considerations of the amount of time needed to successfully implement these sessions and the types of students involved, is an extremely important step to take before CRMA should be implemented in the classroom setting.

Commonalities are seen throughout the studies involving the process of RMA. One similarity observed is that many struggling readers believe that reading means that you must read every word accurately (e.g.; Almazroui, 2007; Gilles, 2005; Moore, 2005; Theurer, 2002). Through the use of Retrospective Miscue Analysis, readers begin to see that miscues are a part of reading and all readers make miscues. As students work through and discuss miscues, they begin to formulate strategies that will help them to make meaning when a more-skilled counterpart is not present during the process of reading. Another commonality seen across research studies is a reader’s lack of strategies for solving words and making meaning of text. Many of the unsuccessful experiences for readers seen in these studies were when they were relying on the strategy of sounding out for all
of the unknown words they encountered (e.g.; Almazrouri; Brantingham, 2003; Gilles, 2005; Moore, 2003 & 2005). Through RMA these readers developed and discovered other strategies they could use when trying to solve unknown words. The more extensive use of strategies in the reading process allowed for more meaningful reading experiences. A final common trend throughout the research studies is the ability of RMA to increase self-perceptions of the students who take part in the process (e.g.; Theurer, Moore, Brantingham, & Almazrouri). The case studies of Salem, Nathan, Sophie, Devon, and Matt help teachers to realize that a struggling reader who takes part in the process of RMA will develop a new and more affirming realization about their skills as a reader. This increasingly positive self perception in turn results in more positive reading experiences, more success in the reading process, and therefore more successful readers overall.
Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to find out how the use of retrospective miscue analysis (RMA) might impact a child’s understanding of the reading process. Through a series of RMA sessions, I anticipated that the student might show changes in regard to self-perceptions, the child’s definition of reading, comprehension, strategy use, and the child’s overall understanding of the reading process. I implemented a comprehensive plan that took approximately sixteen sessions for completion.

This study sought answers to the following questions:

How might Retrospective Miscue Analysis impact a child’s understanding of the reading process?

1. How might RMA impact a student’s perceptions of himself/herself as a reader?

2. How might the student’s definition of reading change throughout the process?

3. How might the student’s comprehension of text be impacted by the implementation of multiple RMA sessions?

4. What strategies and language might the child begin to use as he/she progresses through the RMA sessions?
Participants

The study took place within my own home. The child who took part in the study attends a school district with approximately 5,000 students in grades K-12. The demographics of the school district are as follows: 75 percent Caucasian, 15 percent African American, 5 percent Hispanic or Latino, 4 percent Asian or native Hawaiian, and one percent unspecified. Twenty-eight percent of the school district’s population is eligible for free or reduced lunches, and the average class size for the district is between sixteen and twenty-one students. (Great Schools, Inc.)

Even though my study did not take place within the classroom setting, I felt it was important to know the layout of the classroom and the daily schedule that the child in this study follows throughout the day. As the researcher, I wanted to know how much and what kind of reading instruction the student participates in on a daily basis. It was important to know the classroom setting and daily schedule because I am not this student’s classroom teacher therefore, I was unaware of the instruction she was receiving and if it aligned with the philosophy behind retrospective miscue analysis. The philosophy of the classroom and school was an important aspect to consider after the initial interview with the student in order to determine how much she may already knew about miscues.

Through observation of the classroom and talking with the student, I was able to gain some insight into the structure and philosophy of the classrooms in which the child was learning. On a daily basis, the child takes part in The Daily 5
for the majority of her literacy instruction. The Daily 5 is a series of literacy tasks students complete on a daily basis while the teacher meets with small groups or has one-on-one conferences with individual students. The five literacy tasks are word work, work on writing, read to self, read to someone, and listen to reading. (Boushey & Moser, 2009) Although the classroom teachers whom Carolyn works with called the literacy section of their day The Daily 5, I would have to say that it was more of a revised version of the instructional program. A majority of the students focused on writing and reading rather than read to someone, word work, and listen to reading during their literacy time. There was no form to keep the students accountable for the work done during this period of literacy instruction, therefore many of the students did not engage in all of the literacy tasks outlined in The Daily 5 program. During Carolyn’s literacy block, there were small group sessions with one of the three teachers between the two classrooms. Carolyn would meet with the consultant teacher that pushes in and pulls students out of the classroom. Carolyn is not classified as one of the special education students, but the teachers thought it would be beneficial for her to meet with the consultant teacher for reading group.

Not only did Carolyn receive small group instruction during her scheduled literacy instruction in the classroom but for two hours each week she was pulled out of the classroom for AIS instruction. She began AIS reading in the middle of her fourth grade year. The AIS teacher works with Carolyn on reading strategies and had exposed her to the term “miscue” before Carolyn began meeting with me.
to talk about her miscues. The philosophy within the classroom and the philosophy Carolyn was exposed to during AIS did not do not align. During her AIS reading time, she is able to have miscues and not be corrected immediately by the teacher or other students. Miscues are something that are accepted and Carolyn is able to learn from them during AIS time. In the classroom, miscues are not something that are talked about and are not accepted during reading. Accuracy is something that seems to have more emphasis within her classroom setting. This divergence between the classroom and AIS instruction could possibly be one of the factors influencing her successes or failures for Carolyn within the reading context. Along with being pulled out for AIS reading, Carolyn also receives speech services two days a week and has been receiving this service since second grade.

As the researcher in this study, my role was as the participant observer. I completed the miscue analyses and RMA sessions, while also interviewing the child and recording my observations and reflections. I am not the teacher in this child’s classroom, so periodically Carolyn and I would engage in conversations about her classroom and how she feels about her progress in reading and overall progress and experiences within her classroom.

Due to my own schedule and the steps necessary for the RMA process, I was looking for a student with certain criteria in mind. I wanted a student who was able to stay after school or have in-home sessions twice a week for a length of
approximately eight weeks. I was interested in a student who was termed
“struggling” or who perceived his or her reading skills as less than proficient. The
final criterion for the student was to receive parental permission and consent as
well as student assent. Once the student fit all of the prior measures, a home visit
was set up with the parent in order to fully explain the research study I planned to
carry out, as well as answer any of the parent’s questions. Once this was
accomplished, I had the parent sign a consent form (Appendix B). After parental
consent was granted, I sat down with the student and read the assent form
(Appendix C) to her and answered any questions she had, making the child aware
that she had a choice to be a part of the study or not, even though her parent had
already given permission.

Throughout the study, measures were taken to ensure confidentiality. A
pseudonym was given to the child and the pseudonym appeared on all documents
used throughout the study. Teacher, school, and district names were not put onto
any of the documents used. Both the signed parent informed consent form and
signed student assent form were placed into a lock box in which only I had access
to the key. Tape recordings of RMA sessions were destroyed after the study was
concluded. Any names used in conversation were transcribed using the proper
pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality.

**Instruments**

I used a number of instruments throughout the research process to gather
data. Each of the instruments I used helped to answer one or more of the research
questions within my study. The Burke Reading Interview, transcription of texts for marking, miscue analysis coding forms, comprehension rubrics, RMA planning sheets, a double entry journal, and two tape recorders were the required materials to carry out this research study.

The Burke Reading Interview (Appendix D) is an interview created by Goodman, Watson, and Burke (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005, p 273-274). The questions within the interview assess the student’s idea of what a good reader is and who he/she may believe is a good reader. It also touches upon strategies that good readers use and if the student defines him/herself as a good reader. Using this interview once at the beginning of the sessions and again at the end, helped to answer questions pertaining to self-perceptions and the strategies and language the child used when talking about reading.

Transcriptions of the texts the child would read were important in order to mark the miscues as the child was reading. Before the sessions in which the child was to read a text, I typed the text into a word document for marking miscues. The layout of the text that the book or article followed was mirrored on the transcription of the text. I made sure to leave a double space between the lines of the text in order to ensure adequate space for marking miscues. The right side of the transcribed texts was used to analyze sentence level miscues.

After the child read the text, a comprehension assessment summary sheet was used (Appendix E). The holistic rubric used, assessed the student’s
comprehension based on multiple areas of comprehension. The following 11 areas are assessed on this rubric: literal comprehension, interpretive comprehension, critical thinking, story parts, word meaning, organizing information, visualization, questioning, summarization, reading strategies, and self-monitoring (Fiene & MacMahon, 2007). Each category helped to address a different facet of comprehension. A score of 0-4 was assigned for each part of the retelling and prompts were used to elicit conversation when needed. I felt as though this rubric was comprehensive and hit every aspect of comprehension that I could think of. It even has two sections that helped to assess how Carolyn was monitoring and adjusting during the reading process. A score was assigned for each retelling in order to help observe changes in comprehension throughout the research process.

A miscue analysis procedure three coding form produced by Ruth Davenport (Appendix F) was used to analyze the miscues from the reading of the text (Davenport, 2002). The procedure three analyses takes a look at each of the miscues made by the reader, but it also takes a look at the miscues on a sentence level. Looking at each sentence as a whole helped make sense of the reader as a whole. The analysis breaks down each of the miscues by looking at syntactic and semantic acceptability of the sentence. It also assesses whether or not the miscue has affected the author’s intended meaning. There is a miscue inventory reader profile form (Appendix G) that looks at the overall percentage of sentences and miscues that make sense in the reading. The profile is helpful for me as a
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researcher to see the overall picture in a concise way. After analysis was done, miscues could be chosen for the following RMA session.

An RMA planning sheet or session organizer (Appendix H) was used to plan for the RMA session occurring each week (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005). After analyzing the miscues, this sheet was used to choose miscues that would be discussed with the student in the RMA session. Choosing the miscues to talk about varied depending on the confidence of the student, experience discussing miscues, and the nature of the patterns I uncovered in each analysis.

For my own reflections and physical observations, I used a double entry journal to record my thoughts directly following each session. In the first column, I recorded any observations I made of the student while she was engaging in the activities for that day. Some examples of observations I recorded are: body gestures, eye contact, her comments about the process or text, and what I was thinking at that moment. In the second column, I recorded any questions I had after the sessions or thoughts about how the process was going. I also reflected on the physical observations I made and what I thought these may mean for the child as well as for subsequent sessions.

Two tape recorders were necessary to carry out the sessions. I used one tape recorder in the first session of each week in order to record the student’s reading of the text and retelling. In the following session I used another tape recorder to record the conversation between the student and me about her miscues. The
initial tape recorder was used to play the miscues for the child before discussion during certain sessions. I began to use the tape recording of Carolyn’s readings during session 4b and continued to use it after that point for all remaining sessions.

**Procedures**

Once parental consent and assent were obtained, I began the study by administering the Burke Reading Interview. During this same session, I worked with the student to find out the types of books she likes to read. I had the child read some excerpts for me in order to get a feel for her reading level. After the initial getting to know you session, the child, parent, and I talked about a schedule that would work for the upcoming weeks as well as the location of the subsequent sessions.

The schedule for the sessions was determined as follows. Each Tuesday, I had the child read a text to me as I marked her miscues on a transcribed version of the text. This first session within each week was referred to as the RMI (Reading Miscue Inventory) session. The text was anywhere between 400 and 900 running words and fell slightly above the child’s prescribed reading level in order to ensure miscues. This session was tape recorded in order to be sure that all miscues were accurately recorded. The child would then retell what occurred in the story as I took notes on a comprehension rubric. The score for the retelling rubric was not delineated until after I listened to the retelling for a second time using the tape recorded session. Each RMI session took about 25-35 minutes and concluded after the child’s retelling.
Following the RMI session, I recorded any thoughts or observations onto my double entry journal, making sure to mark the date, time, and session number. I looked over the miscues as I listened to the student’s reading for a second time. After accuracy was ensured, I began to mark the miscues on the procedure three miscue analysis coding form. Once the form was filled in, and the miscues were analyzed, I was able to choose miscues that could be discussed with the child during the Friday RMA session during the same week the RMI session took place. The miscues chosen were recorded on the RMA planning sheet and the sheet was brought to the RMA session with the student.

For the RMA session, a separate tape recorder from the first one used was turned on to record the entire session. Each RMA session lasted about 40-50 minutes in length. The tape recording of the student’s original reading was played at some of the RMA sessions (Session #’s: 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b). Use of the tape recorded reading was used once the student gained confidence in the process, and was comfortable enough to listen to her own reading and miscues. During the RMA session, a conversation about the student’s miscues from the previous RMI session would take place. For the first RMA session, high level miscues were chosen in order to create an opportunity to discuss what the student has done well. Together, we discussed if the miscue makes sense within the sentence (or story), sounds right, or looks right. Based on which cueing systems were used to elicit the miscue, the student and I discussed about strategies the student may have used to come up with the word she miscued with. Miscues chosen for the first three
sessions were similar in that they will all follow the same patterns in regards to
cueing systems used or ignored for that particular oral reading. For the last four
sessions, the student was able to listen to the tape and choose miscues she noticed
and would like to discuss. Tape recording all sessions helped to ensure that data
was collected in a valid and reliable manner. I was able to listen to the sessions
after they took place and found patterns within the dialogue between myself and
the student. The tape recordings also allowed for other colleagues to listen to and
give insight into their thoughts on the process and progress of this particular
student. To record my own observations and thoughts, I used a double-entry
journal. On the left side I placed my observations and on the right side I added
reflections and questions. These journals (appendix I) were referred to during the
data analysis and coded for themes or ideas seen throughout.

After seven RMA sessions, the child was given the Burke Reading
Interview for a second time. The same questions were asked for this interview and
it was tape-recorded in case verbal answers were missed while scribing.

Limitations
Since this research study was only carried out with one student, the results cannot
be generalized to a larger population. It is also important that if a teacher or
researcher chooses to carry out a study such as this one with a student of his/her
own, the procedures and practices should be thoroughly researched and practiced
before executing the RMA process with a student. The miscues chosen for RMA
conversations can also have an impact on the effectiveness of this process.
Choosing proper miscues to be used with a child is an important part of retrospective miscue analysis. Results may vary depending on the miscues chosen for each session.

Data Analysis
The data collected throughout this study were analyzed through a constant comparison method. Data analysis began as soon as the first session was completed and continued to the end of the study. As the research progressed, themes and patterns emerged across the data. I was specifically looking for data that could answer each of my research questions. For each of the research questions, at least three methods of data collection were used. These sets of data ensured that triangulation of data would occur during the research process. I was also able to see differences and themes that cut across the various data sources. Many of the instruments used for data collection were helpful in answering more than one of the research questions. Data relevant to each question was analyzed using a color coding system.

I began by analyzing the initial Burke Reading Interview in order to better understand where the student was starting out in regards to her understanding of the reading process. More specifically the questions contained within the Burke Reading Interview (Goodman, et al., 2005) helped to reveal the child’s definition of a good reader (questions 2 and 3), strategies he/she uses (question 1,5,6, and 7), and how she perceives herself as a reader (questions 9 and 10). Analyzing this initial interview before any subsequent sessions was helpful in order to determine...
what strategies to look for within the oral readings and miscues the child was making to see if they compared to what the child thinks she does when coming to an unknown word. This initial Burke Reading Interview was also analyzed when compared to the answers in the concluding Burke Reading Interview at the close of the RMA sessions.

During each oral reading, I marked miscues on a typed transcript. After each session, the miscues were analyzed before meeting with the child again. The form that was used to analyze the miscues was the Miscue Analysis Procedure 3 Coding Form developed by Ruth Davenport (Appendix F) (Davenport, 2002). This form aids in analyzing each of the miscues by looking more closely at the semantic, syntactic, and grapho-phonetic acceptability of each miscue. With this form, I was able to identify which cueing systems the child was relying on more than others when attempting to solve unknown words. Not only did this form become helpful for each individual session analysis, but it was also helpful for an overall analysis of the sessions. I was able to see trends within the child’s miscues and optimistically observe more miscues that were semantically, syntactically, and grapho-phonically acceptable within the text as the child progressed through the sessions. Along with the Procedure 3 Coding Form, I also used the Reading Miscue Inventory Reader Profile Form (Appendix G) created by Ruth Davenport. I analyzed miscues on the sentence level directly on each typescript. The reader profile form was used to create an overall picture of the reader. It helped to give a percentage of sentences that made sense and the percentage of sentences that did
not make sense. The reader profile also looked at the miscues of the reader and the percentage that made sense as well. With the profile, I was able to organize all of the information that I obtained from each session and track progress the child was making.

In order to examine how comprehension was impacted by the RMA sessions, I analyzed the results from the seven comprehension rubrics. I began by comparing the overall comprehension scores and how those changed throughout the process. After that, I looked more closely at each facet of comprehension and looked to see if there was any improvement within the various sections as the study progressed. Based on my notes and scores, I could see how the student’s retellings evolved throughout the process.

All of the sessions throughout this research study were audio taped. Audio-taping and being able to play back all of the sessions was helpful in analysis of the data. Selected segments of the conversations that took place during the RMA sessions were transcribed based on their relevance to the study and more specifically the research questions. Using grounded theory, the pieces of the conversations that were transcribed were color-coded based on themes that emerged throughout the study as well as any data that helped to answer the specific research questions.
Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine how Retrospective Miscue Analysis would impact a child’s understanding of the reading process. The study took place in my home as the child was engaged in one-on-one instruction two days each week for an eight week period. The child who participated in the study was a fifth grader, in a suburban school district, who was receiving additional literacy instruction through academic intervention services (AIS) at her school. The research questions that were explored in this study were as follows:

How might Retrospective Miscue Analysis impact a child’s understanding of the reading process?

1. How might RMA impact a student’s perceptions of himself/herself as a reader?

2. How might the student’s definition of reading change throughout the process?

3. How might the student’s comprehension of text be impacted by the implementation of multiple RMA sessions?

4. What strategies and language might the child begin to use as he/she progresses through the RMA sessions?

After analysis of the collected data, several themes and ideas began to emerge surrounding the research questions. Data were analyzed by looking for information that could answer the ideas within the four research questions (self perceptions, definition of reading, comprehension, and strategy talk). For each of the research questions, three or more instruments were analyzed to address each
specific question. Throughout the entire research process observational notes, interviews, miscue analysis, tape recorded sessions, and comprehension rubrics were used to collect data that would answer each of the research questions. To follow, each question will be addressed separately with evidence from at least three instruments used during data collection to ensure triangulation.

**How might RMA impact a student’s perceptions of himself/herself as a reader?**

The Burke Reading Interview (BRI) located in appendix D is used by researchers and teachers to understand how a student views him or herself as a reader (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005). Questions nine and ten in the BRI ask the child what he/she could do better as a reader and if the child thinks he/she is a good reader. These two questions allowed me to see how Carolyn felt about herself as reader. In the initial interview carried out at the start of the research study, when asked what Carolyn thought she could do better as a reader, her answer was: “Sign language so I could show a deaf person what the story is about.” In the final interview after seven sessions of RMA, Carolyn’s answer to the same question was: “Listen for miscues and reread when something does not make sense.” This answer is considerably different than the one in her initial interview and shows her understanding at the conclusion of our RMA sessions that her reading needs to make sense.

Question number ten on the BRI is as follows: Do you think you are a good reader? Why? Carolyn’s answer to this question in the initial interview was “Yes,
because I read a lot.” In the final interview, Carolyn said “Yes because I have been reading a lot and learning new words every day. I am also getting better at sounding words out and breaking words apart.” She expanded much more on this question during the final interview and included a statement to show that she was making improvements in regards to her reading strategies. Instead of just saying that she was sounding the word out, she talks about how she also breaks words apart. She doesn’t touch on her understanding of text with this question. She focuses on the fact that she breaks words apart and can read words or sound words out. She neglects to talk about how she comprehends the text. Carolyn seems to associate the ability to read more words with becoming a better reader.

Through observations and field notes taken during the study, I was able to find statements made by Carolyn, as well as my own observations of her behaviors that demonstrate Carolyn’s self perceptions about herself as a reader throughout the sessions. During the first session, Carolyn was immediately comfortable with me and was not afraid to read. I attribute this easiness to the fact that I have known Carolyn for approximately three years as her summer camp counselor and her substitute teacher. One thing I noticed while Carolyn read silently is that she was twirling her bangs furiously and playing with her bracelet on her arm. She was a bit fidgety and almost seemed nervous. This nervous behavior while reading seemed to occur throughout most of the reading sessions. I would provide chips or something to snack on each session. She seemed to eat the food very quickly while she was reading, as if she always needed something else to do
during her reading. When she read aloud to me I did not notice this behavior as much as when she was reading silently, but it was still evident. With these nervous behaviors, the reading of the text in her head seemed to take a lot longer than when she read aloud. I was not sure if she was reading sections of the text over again to make sure she comprehended the text when she had to do the retelling. The realization that the retelling would occur after the reading may have made her nervous because she realized in the past that she had been termed a struggling reader and wanted to do well for me.

This nervous physical behavior did not transfer over when Carolyn and I would have conversations about her reading. Her physical demeanor during our discussions was poised and engaged; it was her verbal responses during our sessions that caused concern. While we were discussing her miscues, her verbal responses helped to reveal her perceptions about herself as a reader. During the RMA sessions, when we discussed Carolyn’s miscues, her answers to some of my questions seemed to be given without much thought as to what I was asking her. At times it seemed as though she felt she needed to give an answer even if it did not make sense because that is how she perceived teacher-student interactions were supposed to happen. The teacher asks the questions and the student must give an answer. One example of this was during RMA session 2b. I asked Carolyn about her miscue of “vittle” for the word “vital”. If a child did not know the word “vital”, I can see how visually the word could look like her pronounced word “vittle”. Her explanation for this miscue was “I was thinking about how the
alien Arc (from the story) was little, so I said “vittle”. We discussed how this word did not make sense and how we should go back when a word does not make sense. During other RMA sessions, Carolyn’s explanations for miscues were also a bit puzzling. She would tell me; “I blacked out,” “the words blurred together,” “my mind went blank,” to explain certain miscues in her reading. Once I heard these statements, Carolyn and I would talk about how if that did happen during reading, we should stop and go back to make sure it makes sense. These three statements show up a number of times as Carolyn’s response to miscues in sessions 2b, 3b, and 5b. The occurrence of these responses puzzled me and got me thinking about what they might indicate about Carolyn’s self perceptions as reader. When she did not have an explanation for a miscue that she realized did not make sense, this is when the odd responses would come up. She appeared to want to find an excuse that was beyond her control to explain her miscue. By saying she “blacked out”, the miscue no longer had anything to do with her reading ability. She did not seem to want to admit that she did not self-monitor at that particular point in the reading or that the reading process broke down for her. By using her eyes as the excuse, she was able to feel better about herself as a reader.

Carolyn talked during the sessions a lot about her own experiences with reading in school and at home. She told me about an after school book club she attended with the librarian. The book they were reading during this study was Freedom Crossing by Margaret Goff Clark (1980). This book was at a Fountas and Pinnell level “R” and she was receiving no assistance while reading this novel.
besides discussions with the librarian and a group of fifth graders that met once a week. She seemed confident in her ability to read and comprehend this text and talked about it with excitement. During Session 6b during our conversation about the book, Carolyn said “My teacher Ms. Holly (pseudonym) said it would be hard for me. But I am almost finished with it.” I asked her if she found it to be easy for her and she nodded yes. Carolyn also spoke about the reading level her teachers placed her at for reading instruction. At the beginning of the study, in a discussion with her classroom teacher, I was informed that Carolyn was at a Fountas and Pinnell level “N”. During session 6b (4/8/10) she mentioned “I went from a level “N” but now I’m a level “Q” I think, no a level “R”.” This was something I had been questioning since Carolyn’s first session because I began to see that she was far beyond the level “N” her teacher originally placed her at. She was elated by this increase in reading levels. She mentioned how she was excited that she able to pick more books from the “R” box now. It was interesting to me how this level that she was placed at led her to believe that she was only capable of reading books from the level “N” box. The level she was placed at had a direct impact on her view of herself as a reader. During the time that she was labeled an “N”, she was led to believe that she was far below most of the students in her fifth grade class. If someone is told they are a “C” student, they’re going to believe it and remain a “C” student. Carolyn was assessed well below her actual reading level and if she was not retested by her AIS teacher, or working with me through this
study, I think she would still believe she was at a third grade reading level instead of a fourth grade reading level.

When Carolyn talked about reading at home, she would mention book titles she was reading and authors that she liked. She really seemed to embrace reading and found time to read at home as well as in school. When I brought out a *Magic Tree House* book in our first session she immediately talked about the two main characters Jack and Annie and her eyes lit up because she had read many of the other books in the series. For a child labeled a “struggling reader” by her teachers, she seemed like an avid reader right from the beginning of our sessions together. This young student seemed resilient to the labels that had been placed on her by the school system. I have seen students who show an outward lack of confidence based on the fact that they must read books at much lower levels than their peers. From seeing Carolyn in the classroom and one-on-one, she doesn’t seem to show an outward lack of confidence in her reading abilities. With Carolyn it was important to dive much deeper into her thoughts because on the surface she appeared confident in her reading abilities.

Due to her outward confidence in her reading ability, I quickly decided to have her listen to her tape recorded readings during our RMA sessions. I made this decision based on my observations during RMA sessions 1 and 2. During the first RMA session, Carolyn was very interested in looking at the sheet where I had marked her miscues. She was looking over my shoulder to see what I had marked down and initiating conversation based on the miscues she was seeing. Her attitude
toward the miscues was not one of defeat. She was interested in having a conversation about the miscues and learning about high quality miscues. In session two, she tells me that she did not miscue the word “deliberately”. Even though I assured her that I had double checked the miscue, she wanted to hear the miscue on the tape. She told me that it was funny to hear her own voice and even giggled. She expressed an interest in listening to her miscues in the next RMA session. Her verbal request as well as her outward confidence in the process of hearing her miscues led to my decision to play the tapes at the rest of the RMA sessions.

During RMA sessions 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, and 7b, Carolyn sat with the transcript and marked her miscues on the paper as her tape recorded reading was playing. Without any instruction from me, she would write an “R” when she repeated, a “P” when she paused, and write the miscued word above the text. When I asked her about this and how she knew these markings, she said it was because she had been watching me and noticed what I was doing. She was not discouraged by the number of miscues in her readings. She marked down her miscues and waited to talk about them with me when we stopped the tape.

Once she began to see how many of her miscues were considered “good” miscues she became eager to discuss her miscues during each RMA session. In the first few sessions where we would listen to the tape, I would stop the tape at good miscues to discuss those first. I did not want to dwell on miscues that did not make sense in fear that Carolyn may shut down. During session 3b, after taking a look at her high quality miscues, I asked “Do you think you are a reader that makes sense?
And she replied “Yes.” By discussing the good in her miscues, she was able to begin to see that she was a good reader and she makes sense while reading. To reinforce this idea that she is a strategic and meaningful reader, in session 4b, Carolyn and I stopped at a miscue that she self-corrected. I asked Carolyn “What did you do that was good there?” And she replied, “I went back and said it right.” Through this process I was able to show Carolyn what she does right when she is reading, therefore increasing her confidence in her abilities.

**How might the student’s definition of reading change throughout the process?**

The Burke Reading Interview can also be analyzed to determine a student’s definition of reading (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005). Questions two and three in the BRI ask the child who he/she believes is a good reader and what makes that person a good reader. These two questions allowed me to see what Carolyn thought about reading and her definition of a good reader. In the first interview, Carolyn named her teacher, Mrs. Smitty (pseudonym) as a good reader she knew. She discussed how her teacher reads a lot and that is what makes her a good reader. She said, “When she is not reading, she is reading cook books.” Carolyn conveyed her feelings about reading as something that needs to be done a lot in order to be good at it. In her final interview, Carolyn chose me, her researcher/teacher, as the good reader she knows. After asking why she thought I was a good reader, Carolyn told me it was because I read a lot and do projects like this one. She also said that I listen to her tapes and pick out her miscues. In both interviews she chose an older person that she knew. Both of these people taught
reading to her at some point in her life and she has heard both of these teachers read aloud. She also knew or assumed that both of the people read often.

My own observations and reflections during my conversations with Carolyn have helped me to get an idea about her definition of reading and how it has changed throughout the process. During one of her readings, she came across the word “necessities” and could not sound the word out. Whenever she was stuck on a word like this one she would try to sound it out with multiple unsuccessful attempts. I finally stopped her and asked her to ignore the word and tell me what word she thinks should be there. She told me, “Well, I know it means something that they need.” At that point, I praised her and told her to move on. She was overly reliant on her strategy of sounding out and felt as though she had to get the word right in order to move on. If I did not stop her, I am not sure how long she would have tried to solve the word.

Carolyn seemed to be sidetracked by her belief that the text always needs to be read as is, without any diversion from the author’s words. This belief also translated when she spoke about experiences in her own classroom while reading. During one of our sessions, Carolyn began to talk about a substitute teacher and how she was reading aloud to the class and miscued. Carolyn was proud of herself when discussing how she raised her hand and corrected the teacher. By looking at dialogue box 1, you can see how the conversation with Carolyn unfolded.
C=Carolyn
E=Me

C: WE had a substitute today, like I said, we were reading another part of the Wish Giver, that’s another book we are reading together. She made about, like I don’t know how many miscues, but I was the only one who corrected them. I think about like ten, and I got ten slips for them.

E: Now one thing though, did you shout out and correct them for her?

C: No I raised my hand.

E: Oh ok

C: She called on me and I told her you said like the “tree guy” she said “guy” instead of “man”.

E: But that still made sense though didn’t it?

C: The tree guy, which it could refer to any guy

E: Yea but the tree man and the tree guy is that the same thing?

C: Yes

E: When I read with someone if they make a miscue that still makes sense I wont correct it because we know that miscues that still make sense are good, right?

C: Yes just like Arc for Aric

E: Yes! Did you notice how I did not correct you because you still knew Arc was the alien. You may have said his name differently but it was still the alien in the story.

**Dialogue Box 1: Excerpt 1 from a conversation during Session 3b**

Carolyn believes that the substituted miscue of “guy” for “man” was something she needed to bring to the substitute’s attention. After discussing this with Carolyn and determining it is actually a good miscue, she connected the miscue to one of her own miscues of “Arc” for “Aric” while reading *Aliens for Lunch* (Etra & Spinner, 1991). Even after making this connection and coming to...
the realization that "guy" for "man" was a good miscue, Carolyn continued on about a miscue her classroom teacher had. In dialogue box 2, an excerpt from this conversation is displayed. In this case, Carolyn told her teacher that she pronounced a character's name incorrectly.

C=Carolyn
E=Me

C: Ms. Smitty says “Thadius Splin” she don’t say, she doesn’t say “Thadius Splin”, she says “Thinuis Splin” so I raise my hand, she calls on me and I tell her, “You said Thinius splin instead of Thadius Splin,” and she says (hesitates) “Ok.” I can’t really remember what she said.

E: She may have said that was the way she pronounces it because it’s a name like we were just talking about. So this may have been one of those miscues you would not correct right?

C: Right.

Dialogue Box 2: Excerpt 2 from a conversation during Session 3b

During this conversation about her substitute teacher I reminded Carolyn that it was a name and it sounds similar so it is still a good miscue. Carolyn and I had a lot of talks like this one in the first three RMA sessions because she always seemed to stumble over names within the story. In session 5a, I began to see that Carolyn understood what we had been talking about. There were a lot of tricky names in Seeing the Evidence and Carolyn would attempt each of the names once or twice and move on (Fridell, 2007). This is an action that I had not seen in previous sessions. I asked her during session 5b, “Why did you just go on?” and she replied, “Because I knew it was just a person.”
From all of the sources of data that I analyzed when thinking about Carolyn’s definition of reading, I saw a gradual change in her ideas of reading as she progressed through the sessions. Her idea that the text always had to be read as is was something that she struggled with in the beginning. She refused to skip over a word that she could not sound out and would try multiple unsuccessful attempts until I finally urged her to move on. Many times, these words she was stuck on were proper nouns or names. After discussing how some miscues are okay if they still make sense, she began to struggle less with names in the text. Instead of making multiple unsuccessful attempts at a word, she would try it once or twice and then move on. As seen in the analysis above, there were still times when Carolyn overlooked that names did not always have to be said correctly or that some miscues were acceptable as long as they made sense. You see this when she corrects her substitute teacher’s miscue as well as the mispronunciation of the name the teacher was reading. Even though there were times when she forgot this, I began to see progress in sessions 5a, 6a, and 7a where there were a lot of names within the text. Names such as Holmes, Conan, Locard, and Heinrich show up multiple times throughout the text *Seeing the Evidence* (Fridell, 2007). Carolyn recognizes each of the names throughout the text and sticks with the original pronunciation for each of them, even though it was mispronounced in all cases. This is an improvement from Sessions 1a, 2a, and 3a because she would spend time trying to pronounce Ganoobian giving it four to nine unsuccessful attempts.
each time. She began to see that the text does not have to be exactly as the author intended.

How might the student’s comprehension of text be impacted by the implementation of multiple RMA sessions?

After Carolyn read the text, and I marked her miscues on a transcription of the text, she was asked to retell what she had just read. Depending on the depth of her retelling, I would ask probing questions in order to determine her literal and inferential comprehension of the text. With the Comprehension Assessment Summary sheet (Appendix E) retrieved from an article written by Fiene and MacMahon (2007), I was able to score Carolyn’s retelling on a four-point scale within each of the eleven facets of comprehension (literal comprehension, interpretive comprehension, critical thinking, story parts, word meaning, organizing information, visualization, questioning, summarization, reading strategies, and self monitoring). The results for this rubric across each of the facets throughout the study are shown in Table 1 below. In the first three sessions, Carolyn was scoring around 70-80% on her comprehension assessment. The last three sessions all had scores around ninety percent. When looking at the figure below, it can be seen that Session 4a is considerably lower than the other sessions. This particular session’s text: “Screaming for Ice-cream” (Sohn, 2005) was at least two grade levels above Carolyn’s reading level and was not an appropriate text for me to use during this research study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of comprehension</th>
<th>1a 1/27/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 1</th>
<th>2a 2/2/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 2</th>
<th>3a 2/12/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 3</th>
<th>4a 2/26/10 Screaming for Icecream</th>
<th>5a 3/16/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>6a 4/1/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>7a 4/8/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literal Comprehension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Comprehension</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Parts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Meaning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Analysis and Generation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies reading strategies in all areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and remedies comprehension breakdown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Score (%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comprehension Assessment Summary Results (broken down by each facet into each session’s results)

As I listened to Carolyn’s retellings, I wrote comments for each facet of comprehension. Specifically looking at the literal comprehension facet, I was able to see a shift in the notes I had taken. In the first three sessions, I noticed that probing was needed to get more information in her retellings. She also tended to start her retelling with what had occurred last in the chapter and there was no sequence in her retellings for sessions 1a, 2a, and 3a. When looking at the final three sessions for this facet, Carolyn needed minimal probing and made connections during her retellings. She still lacked the ability to recall what
happened first, second, and last, but this was not as essential due to the fact that it was a type of non-fiction text as opposed to the fiction text in her first three sessions. Some sections of the non-fiction text were factual and it did not matter if she talked about these factual sections in the beginning, middle, or end of her retelling session. With the fiction text, her retellings did not make sense when she retold the text out of sequential order.

With the facet of interpretive comprehension, Carolyn did not extend her thinking during her retellings. I would probe with questions about feelings and her answers would be very literal without any deeper thinking. For example, in session 2a I asked Carolyn, “How are the two characters feeling at this point?” and she replied, “Cold”. After more probing, she still had difficulty inferring the emotional feelings of the characters in the story. A time when I saw interpretive comprehension as a strong point for her was during her actual readings of Seeing the Evidence (Fridell, 2007). While she was reading, she would make predictions, connections, and inferences. In session 7a, she predicted what would be on the robber’s stocking that would lead police to an arrest. She predicted, “Dust, oil, fingerprints, hair, anything around it, bugs, skin…fingerprints on the stocking.” As she continued, she read, “When the robber pulled off his mask back in 1993, twenty five of his skin cells came off with it.” She stopped immediately and rejoiced, “Boom! Well I said skin, but skin cells, same thing.” This thinking while reading is essential for comprehension and by Carolyn doing this aloud, I was able to see the process take place and how it affected her comprehension of the text.
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Because of that prediction and confirmation of her prediction, it made it easier to remember how the burglar was caught because special attention was drawn to that fact in the story.

In regards to the facet of word meaning on the comprehension rubric, it is apparent when you look at Table 1 that this is one of her areas of weakness during the reading process. According to the rubric, word meaning is the child’s ability to use strategies to determine the meaning of new words encountered while reading (Appendix F). During the readings of Seeing the Evidence, I would ask questions during the retellings about some of the tougher concepts within the text (Fridell, 2007). For example, DNA profiling was in a small section of the reading and the text clearly described what it was. When I asked Carolyn what DNA profiling was she was unable to tell me, even though the definition was in the context of her reading. This was a much more complex idea than any of the ideas she encountered in Aliens for Lunch (Etra & Spinner, 1991). On the other hand, there were times when I noticed Carolyn using strategies to determine the meaning of new words she encountered while reading. I mentioned this specific scenario later in the chapter, but at one point in Carolyn’s reading of a text, she was stuck on the word “necessities”. Even though she was unable to solve the word, she was able to tell me the meaning of the word based on the context of the sentence. This showed me that Carolyn was strategically reading and comprehending the text because she was able to do this.
The other facet of comprehension that I wanted to look more closely at was Carolyn's ability to recognize and remedy a comprehension breakdown. In the first two sessions, I gave her a score of three because she was not rereading and correcting miscues that did not make sense as often as she should have. As she progressed through the process, I began to see great improvement in her ability to self-correct when she felt there was a comprehension breakdown. Not only was she self-correcting more, but when she encountered multiple miscues in one sentence, she would return to the beginning to read the sentence fluently in order to increase understanding. This is something that I did not see as often in the first three sessions as I did in the final three. Even though she had a high percentage of self-corrections in the first three sessions, she tended not to go back and reread to make sense of the information in the text. During the RMA sessions, I discussed with Carolyn how it is acceptable to go back and reread and that is what good readers do. As she progressed through the readings, I began to see her rereading more often to make sense of the text.

The improvement seen in Carolyn's ability to recognize and remedy a comprehension breakdown may have been impacted by the conversations we had during the RMA sessions. During the RMA sessions, I worked with Carolyn to bring the reading process to a conscious level. During each of the RMA sessions we had conversations about her miscues, which ultimately led her to think about the way that she reads and understands text. These conversations helped Carolyn to see
why some miscues are “okay miscues”, and it is important to go back when something in her reading does not make sense.

Along with the comprehension rubric, I was able to use information from the miscue analysis to determine her comprehension in progress. By coding each sentence from the typescripts, I could find the percentage of YYN, YYP, YYY, YN-, and NN- sentences. To come up with these codings, I asked three questions for each sentence: Does the sentence sound right (syntactic acceptability)? (Y, N), Does the sentence make sense (semantic acceptability)? (Y, N), Does the sentence change the author’s intended meaning (meaning change)? (Y, N, P)

By asking if the sentence sounds right, I want to know if it is still grammatically correct with the miscue or miscues that are present. An example of this is Carolyn’s observed response during Session 3a in which she read, “They were a blisted with weapons,” while the expected response is, “They were all bristling with weapons.” This is a case where the observed sentence did not sound right due to an error in grammar and would receive an “N” for syntactic acceptability. When the first question is coded as “N”, then the following two questions will be answered as “N” also, making a coding of “NN-” for that sentence. An example where the syntactic acceptability would be coded a “Y” is seen during session 6a when Carolyn’s observed response is, “Harry’s basic system is still used today,” as opposed to the expected response of, “Henry’s basic system is still used today.” Carolyn replaces one name for another name and therefore the sentence still sounds right which makes the coding for this sentence a
“Y”. When a “Y” is coded for syntactic acceptability then it is necessary to move onto the next question of semantic acceptability for that same sentence.

By asking if the sentence makes sense, I determine if the sentence makes sense as it is read. The example above which was coded as syntactically acceptable would then be looked at for semantic acceptability. By substituting “Harry’s” for “Henry’s”, Carolyn’s sentence sounded right and also still made sense because it was still a name of a person in this sentence and could carry the same meaning throughout no matter if it was Harry or Henry. An example where the semantic coding would be coded “N” was seen in session 5a as Carolyn read, “A Union Pacific fight train has been robbed,” instead of “A Union Pacific freight train has been robbed.” Although the miscue of fight for freight still sounds grammatically correct, it does not make sense within this sentence. Therefore, the coding given to this sentence would be “YN-.” Since it does not make sense, that means that it automatically changed the author’s intended meaning hence the coding of “-“ for the final question of meaning change.

By asking if the sentence changes the author’s intended meaning, it is no longer about what makes sense to me, but what makes sense within the story. A sentence can sound right and make sense, but if the miscue changes the meaning that the author intended the sentence to have, then I would code a “Y” for sentence meaning change. Here is an example of one of Carolyn’s sentences from session 1a that fits the “YYY” coding. Carolyn read, “You spent your whole allowance on it Thursday?” while the expected response was, “You spent your whole allowance
and it’s only Tuesday?” As read by Carolyn, the sentence sounds right and makes sense, but the way she said the sentence changes the meaning of the sentence, therefore changing the author’s intended meaning. The ideal coding is when the sentence sounds right, makes sense, and does not change the author’s meaning, also coded as “YYN”. In session 1a, Carolyn reads, “Especially when he’s reading,” and the expected response is “Especially when he is reading.” Carolyn makes the two words “he is” into the contraction of “he’s”. With the miscue, this sentence still sounds right, makes sense, and does not change the author’s meaning therefore receiving a coding of “YYN”.

As described above, a higher percentage of YYN sentences in a child’s reading are ideal. The higher the percentage of YYN sentences, the greater the chance that comprehension of the text will occur. When a high percentage of NN-sentences are coded, this could indicate a breakdown in comprehension.

A reader profile form was completed for each session and sentence coding percentages were recorded on this form (Appendix G). Table 2 below was created to show the percentages of sentences coded for each of the sessions that occurred during the research. In the last three sessions, an increase in the percentage of YYN sentences can be observed as it goes from 58% in session 5a to 89% in session 7a. In session 4a, we are also able to observe a sudden drop in the percentage of YYN sentences. This drop seems to correspond with the drop seen in session 4a in the comprehension rubric. Again, the text chosen for session 4a was not appropriate for the reader in this study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence coding percentage</th>
<th>Session 1a 1/27/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 1</th>
<th>Session 2a 2/2/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 2</th>
<th>Session 3a 2/12/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 3</th>
<th>Session 4a 2/26/10 Screaming for Icecream</th>
<th>Session 5a 3/11/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>Session 6a 4/1/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>Session 7a 4/8/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% YYN</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% YYP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% YYY</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% YN-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NN-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sentence Coding Percentages for Each Session

When I look at Table 2, the percentage of YYN sentences for Sessions 1a, 2a, 3a, 6a, and 7a are very similar. Although this may look as though there were no improvements in the number of sentences that make sense in Carolyn’s reading over time, the final three sessions use a text at a higher level than the text used for sessions one through three. *Seeing the Evidence* is at a Fountas and Pinnell level “T” and *Aliens for Lunch* was at a Fountas and Pinnell level “M” (Fridell, 2007, Etra & Spinner, 1991). With the higher-level text, session 5a showed a set back in the percentage of YYN sentences, but she was able to begin to make more sense out of the text in the final two sessions.

My own observations and reflections during Carolyn’s readings and RMA sessions were ones of amazement at her comprehension. When I first came into this study Carolyn’s teacher told me that she was at a Fountas and Pinnel level “N” reading level. I chose books that were on that level to try out during her first session. I was surprised by Carolyn’s strong literal comprehension because I thought she was miscuing a lot during her reading. Due to the number of miscues, I figured she might have trouble telling me about what she had read. At that point,
I had little experience with miscue analysis and was not able to analyze at the same
time that I was recording Carolyn's miscues. After her reading, I began to analyze
her miscues. I could see that a large percentage of her miscues still made sense or
were corrected leading to the reason why her literal comprehension was so strong.
As I progressed through the research and became more familiar with miscue
analysis, I was able to look at miscues differently and analyze more effectively
during her readings. Her abundance of high quality miscues clued me into how she
is always thinking while she is reading which aids in comprehension of the text.

During our RMA conversations, I brought up to Carolyn how she made
what I called "high quality" miscues and corrected miscues that do not make sense
while reading. We would talk about her miscues and how even though some of
them do not match with the text, they still made sense. I made sure to remind her
of this ability to make sense of the text during each of our RMA sessions. For
example, in session 1b, Carolyn and I talked about one of her good miscues.
Carolyn read the text, "Especially when he's reading," while the expected response
was, "Especially when he was reading." I asked her what she thought about this
miscue and she said it was "good". I asked her why and she said, "Because I just
combined the two words into one." By pointing out what Carolyn did well, it
made it easier to talk about the miscues that did not make sense and should have
been corrected during the reading process. The only time during the course of this
study that I noticed she had a really difficult time comprehending was during
session 4a which is the session I had chosen a text that was way too hard for her at
this time in her reading life. I also noticed that with this text, 47% of the sentences Carolyn read did not make sense due to her miscues. This number made it apparent to me that I had chosen a text that was too hard for Carolyn to comprehend at her current reading ability.

Not only did Carolyn’s retellings help to indicate her level of comprehension, but during the reading process I was able to gauge her level of comprehension. One particular incident that amazed me was during session 1a. I discussed this particular event in the definition of reading section, as well. Carolyn was able to use context to solve the meaning of the word “necessities” without knowing how to actually pronounce the word. This specific incident was evidence of how this young girl was always thinking during the reading process. She was predicting what would come next in her reading before actually looking at the word to follow. Not only did her ability to define unknown words based on context indicate her comprehension level, but also her thoughts and comments throughout reading made it apparent that Carolyn was always thinking about her reading.

In the final three sessions, 5a, 6a, and 7a Carolyn’s comments during reading were very prevalent. Her scores in interpretive comprehension reflect her deeper thinking during these last three sessions. In these final three sessions, the text used was a Reading A-Z non-fiction text, Seeing the Evidence by Rob Fridell (2007) at a Fountas and Pinnell level T. Carolyn had a choice between this text and a text about Barack Obama. She chose this text and expressed her interest in
television shows such as CSI and NCIS that have a forensic science background like this text. While reading this text, I began to notice an increase in comments that included connections and predictions. Each chapter in this text started out with a blurb stating the place, date, crime, and evidence. When Carolyn would read this blurb she made predictions about what would happen and how the evidence could have been used to solve the crime. During session 6a, Carolyn read about how a truck axle was the evidence for a crime. She said that the axle may have left a trail of leaking fluid. This was a plausible prediction and later she was able to refute this prediction as she read about the vehicle identification number (VIN) that is located on all truck axles. During the same reading, she read that the first crime lab was set up in 1910, she responded to this date with "holy cow that was like 100 years ago!" Comments such as these ones while reading were a frequent occurrence during her last three readings and seemed to coincide with an increase in her comprehension score as shown in Table 1 above.

There is so much more to comprehension than just being able to tell the facts or events that happened in the text. Comprehension is also about looking beyond the text, forming opinions, and evaluating a text. Carolyn started out as a student who could tell me exactly what happened in the text, but had trouble thinking beyond the literal level. During our RMA conversations, Carolyn was able to see how she was thinking while she was reading and the connections she was constantly making. By bringing this process to a conscious level, she was able to make improvements in the way she was thinking during her reading and also pay closer
attention to the connections she was making. Carolyn and I talked a lot about
miscues and which ones we should correct, as well as which ones can go
uncorrected and leave the meaning unchanged. This conversation was one of the
most important conversations in the entire research process. Her reading flowed
more smoothly when she was self-monitoring and correcting only when it was
necessary. This fluency in her reading helped her to concentrate more efficiently on
comprehension and thinking more deeply about the material in the text she was
reading.

**What strategies and language might the child begin to use as he/she
progresses through the RMA sessions?**

The Burke Reading Interview can also be analyzed to determine the
strategies a reader is using throughout the reading process (Goodman, Watson &
Burke, 2005). Questions 1, 5, 6, and 7 all question the student in regards to what
strategies he/she uses as well as strategies the good readers they know use.
Question one starts out by asking: When you are reading and you come to
something you don't know, what do you do? In the first interview with Carolyn,
she says she “sounds it out”. When asked if she does anything else, she said she
clops it out or puts the words into syllables. In the final interview, she answers the
same question with, “I would sound out the word or put my finger over the word
and find a word that is within a word, or break the word apart.” Throughout the
study, this was one strategy I did show to her because she was neglecting to look
for something she knew in the word when trying to sound out unknown words.
With this question, she only talks about the visual features of the words even in the final interview. I was happy to see that she picked up one word solving strategy, but she doesn’t seem to associate word solving with anything other than the visual strategies such as breaking the word apart or putting the word into syllables.

Question five asks, when the good reader you know does come to something she/he doesn’t know, what do you think she/he does about it? For Mrs. Smitty, Carolyn says that she sounds the word out or breaks it into syllables.

When she chose me as the good reader she knows, she said I look for the word within the word and break the word apart. Both of these answers align with the answers she gave for her own strategies within both of the interviews. She seems to use or believes she is using strategies that she thinks the good readers she knows are using.

For questions 6 and 7, Carolyn was asked what she does to help a reader who comes to an unknown word and what a teacher might do. In the first interview, she says that she would help the reader sound it out or clap it into syllables and that her teacher would tell the child the unknown word. In the final interview Carolyn states a couple of strategies she would use to help the child including: breaking the word apart, telling them to sound it out, and listening to their miscues with them. Her answer to how the teacher would help the child was that the teacher would write the word on the smart board and break the word apart for the student. This idea seems to align with the recent acquisition of a smart board in Carolyn’s classroom.
These four questions in the Burke Reading Interview helped to get at Carolyn’s reading strategies. With the exception of one of Carolyn’s comments about listening to miscues, she tends to focus on sounding out and the visual features of words. She does not mention any semantic or syntactic strategies that she uses. I think these strategies are tougher for Carolyn to verbalize at this point in the process without assistance. She has thought she relied on sounding out strategies for quite some time and did not have any other strategies. Through RMA, Carolyn and I worked on bringing the semantic and syntactic strategies to the surface so she will be able to verbalize them. Even though we had a number of discussions about these strategies, she has had one train of thought for all of her reading life and therefore verbalizing these strategies on her own in the BRI was difficult for her to do.

Through my own observations and field notes taken throughout the study, I was able to find a number of strategies that Carolyn was using while she was reading, even if she was unaware of or unable to verbalize them in the BRI. The RMA sessions were valuable in order to make Carolyn aware of what strategies she was using during her readings. In the first four reading sessions, she tended to sound words out using each individual sound instead of looking for more manageable chunks. For example, in session 1a when Carolyn came to the word “admit” she did not break it into more manageable chunks. She could have easily identified the word “ad” and the word “mit” to pronounce, “admit”. Her first three attempts for this word were, “amand”, “admind”, and “amid”. She seemed to have
all of the letters from the word in her first three attempts but they were only sounds that were misplaced. If she would have looked for the more manageable chunks in the word she would have been able to determine the word was “admit”. In her initial BRI, she said she breaks the words into syllables (claps them into syllables), but she was not actually doing this during her reading when it was possible which can be seen in the example above.

If I noticed that she was really struggling through any of her readings, I would offer guidance and place my finger on the word to show her the more manageable part. I did this in session 6a with the word “commissioner”. She started out by saying “customizer” and then “comissayson.” It was apparent to me that she was not seeing the word “mission” within commissioner. I put my fingers over parts of the word to show the word “mission”. Once she saw this word she was able to figure it out immediately. Since this worked so well, there were two other times during that same session that I provided this assistance. The words “destructive” and “iodine” were both holding her up in her reading. I enclosed the words “destruct” and “dine” with my fingers and she was able to figure the words out. In the RMA session that followed the 6a session, we were able to discuss the word within the word strategy and how it can be helpful in future readings. In session 7a, I did see her using her fingers to find a word that she knew within the word. When she came to the word “enforcement”, she started out by saying “en” and then closed in the word “force” and put it together and said “enforcement”. We also talked about how even though she is finding a word within a word, she is
also cross-checking her prediction with other cues to make sure it also makes sense. The word enforcement was directly after the word law, so this is a term that she may have heard numerous times when she was watching CSI or NCIS, making it easy to figure out once she figured out the word “enforce” in “enforcement”.

In the first four reading sessions, Carolyn had a tendency to keep reading even when the text was not making any sense at all. One example of this is from her reading in session 2a. The expected response was, “They got the correct shipment for a planet of their size a mere three thousand years ago,” and the observed response was, “They got correct shipment of a planet of their size a mere there thousand years ago,” The miscue of “there” for “three” concerned me the most because it resulted in a sentence that did not make any sense. The word “three” is one that Carolyn is able to solve if she would have stopped herself when the text did not make sense and reread. This became a good teaching point for the RMA session that followed this reading.

After a number of conversations about self-correcting and self-monitoring while reading Carolyn began rereading when the text did not make sense. According to the miscue tally form (data represented in Table 3), in the first four sessions, there was a higher occurrence of miscues that went uncorrected that changed the meaning of the text. This shows that Carolyn was reading on even when the miscue did not make any sense. During the RMA sessions Carolyn and I discussed the fact that she was not self-correcting miscues that did not make sense. Bringing this to Carolyn’s attention and talking about those “low quality” miscues
helped Carolyn to pay more attention to her reading. By self-monitoring Carolyn was able to begin to correct those miscues that did not make sense. I observed this in session 6a when Carolyn self corrects multiple miscues that did not make sense. Carolyn read, “Police searched the apartment, but could not could find, they could find no trace evidence.” The expected response was “The police searched the apartment, but they could find no trace evidence.” This is an excellent example of how Carolyn made sense of the sentence. She did not go all the way to the beginning and correct her omission of “the” because it still made sense without it. She did however realize once she read “could not could find” that is did not make sense and she had to go back and correct the miscue. By session 7a, only 8 percent of her miscues were changing the meaning of the text in comparison to the first session, which had 20 percent of miscues changing the meaning.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Session 1a 1/27/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 1</th>
<th>Session 2a 2/2/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 2</th>
<th>Session 3a 2/12/10 Aliens for Lunch Ch 3</th>
<th>Session 4a 2/26/10 Screaming for Ice Cream</th>
<th>Session 5a 3/16/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>Session 6a 4/1/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
<th>Session 7a 4/8/10 Seeing the Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Self Corrected</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uncorrected with no meaning change</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Self Corrected + Uncorrected with no meaning change</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uncorrected Partial Meaning Change</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uncorrected With Meaning Change</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Miscue Tally Form Breakdown**

By looking at Table 3, I was drawn to the data showing percentage of self-corrections plus the percentages of uncorrected miscues that did not change the meaning of the text. This statistic is showing the percentage of miscues that still made sense due to self correction, or no correction because they made sense as is. The percentage went up in the final three sessions in comparison to the first three. This shows that she was making a conscious effort in the last two sessions to self-correct when the text did not make sense and leave sentences uncorrected that did not change the meaning of the text. This contributed to greater fluency in her reading and shows how her more developed reading strategies have affected her reading.
A type of miscue we talked a lot about during our RMA sessions was the names of individuals in the readings. At times she got stuck on the author’s name choices and would continuously try to sound out the name with no success. This happened with the term “Ganoobian” from the *Aliens for Lunch* story (Etra & Spinner, 1991). This was meant to be the name of the types of aliens in the story. Each time this word showed up, Carolyn would spend at least five seconds trying to solve the word with multiple unsuccessful attempts before she decided to move on. In session 1b, we talked a lot about names and how we should not get caught up on them if we know it is supposed to be a name. The listed miscues are names that Carolyn miscued during her first reading, listing her actual response first with the expected response second: Barkerstaff, Bickerstaff, Harry/Henry, Celerta/Celia. We discussed these specific miscues in RMA session 1b and how even though she said the names incorrectly, she still understood their part in the story. During session 3a, Carolyn was reading chapter 3 of *Aliens for Lunch* and this is where the term “Ganoobian” was first introduced. She had more than seven unsuccessful attempts including: Gan-,Ganoobran, Ganoobrand, Gan-oo, Gan-oo-ben, Granooband, Granooban. I considered that she may have been trying to find a known word, but that was not going to happen since “Ganoobian” was already a nonsense word. After this session, we talked about what that word was representing and she knew it was a group of aliens. I reminded her of our other conversations about names and how we do not need to dwell on them as long as we realize their part in the story. In the final three sessions, I noticed that she
moved on quickly when she came to a name she could not pronounce. She attempted the name once and moved on. The last names, Watson, Holmes, and Locard were all mispronounced during Carolyn’s reading in session 5a, but she did not stop and try multiple attempts, she read each once, and then moved on. At the RMA session 5b, Carolyn and I discussed these miscues and I asked her, “Why did you just go on?” and she replied, “Because I knew it was just a person.”

In regards to the language Carolyn picked up throughout this process, she was able to talk about the strategies with me, but when prompted to verbalize these strategies on her own she had trouble. The analysis of the BRI questions 1, 5, 6, and 7 help to show what I mean by Carolyn’s inability to verbalize the strategies she uses. She focused on strategies such as sounding out and breaking the words apart in the BRI but did not discuss syntactic and semantic strategies. During our RMA conversations we talked a lot about what led Carolyn to self correct certain miscues. In session 5b we discuss one of Carolyn’s miscues from session 5a. She miscued the non-word “incested” for “insisted” in the sentence “When the police questioned the man, he insisted he was innocent”. When I asked her why she corrected the word she said “it would not have made sense”. She is able to talk about how she uses meaning to solve words and correct words while we are having a discussion but it not able to independently use the language.

**Summary**

Based on the results of the study, I observed growth and change in Carolyn in regards to self-perceptions, her definition of reading, comprehension, strategies,
and language used to talk about reading and the reading process. Although my observations of growth and change were more evident in some areas than others, Carolyn still showed development throughout this research process. These differences in growth will be explored further in chapter five.

Based on interviews, miscue analyses, observations of Carolyn, and comprehension assessments, I came to the conclusion that RMA did impact Carolyn’s overall understanding of the reading process.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Summary and Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that overall a fifth grade student’s understanding of the reading process was impacted by the participation in the instructional strategy of retrospective miscue analysis (RMA). I was able to come to this conclusion after thorough analysis of the data collected throughout the course of the study. Data included interviews, miscue analyses, observational notes of Carolyn, and comprehension assessments administered during the study.

According to Moore and Gilles (2005) RMA experiences help students to revalue themselves as readers. Ken Goodman also believes that this idea of revaluing during the RMA process helps readers to appreciate their strengths and recognize the productive strategies they are already using (Moore & Gilles, 2005). During each RMA session, Carolyn was able to bring her strategies to a conscious level as I guided her to notice her strengths as a reader. Carolyn became aware of many of the strategies she was using during the reading process that she may have not been aware of prior to our RMA sessions. I was able to show her what she was doing well during the reading process and by doing so it allowed her to value herself as a reader.

One topic that came up during conversations with Carolyn was the idea of “reading levels”. For the past two years in Carolyn’s school, they adopted the Fountas and Pinnell leveling system (Fountas & Pinnell, 2010). This has been the way that many of the readers in Carolyn’s classroom and school have begun to define themselves as readers. The books in the classroom are grouped by reading level and
Therefore the students’ reading levels are constantly on display for other students. Pierce (1999) claims that teachers are beginning to focus so much on reading levels that they are beginning to ignore or devalue other ways of describing or defining readers in their classrooms. Organization of books in the classroom has evolved from being organized by genre to being organized by level (Pierce, 1999). This limits the student’s ability to choose books they are interested in as well as their ability to choose books on their own. In Carolyn’s class she was told she was a level “N” reader based on one assessment. This limited Carolyn to level “N” books and made her identify herself as a below average reader. As the study progressed she was retested and then deemed a level “R” student by her AIS (academic intervention services) teacher. While working with Carolyn, I did not have a leveling system, but based on my data it was apparent to me that she was well above a Fountas and Pinnell level “N”. Through the use of RMA, the student is not defined by his or her level but instead by the strategies he/she uses and his or her ability to derive meaning from a text. I made this idea clear to Carolyn during our sessions by taking the time to discuss her effective strategies as we were discussing her miscues. By doing so, Carolyn began to see the strategies she was using and what she did well during the reading process. In pointing out her strengths, she was able to build on those strengths as we progressed through the research study.

During this study, I had an error in judgment by trusting the reading level that was given to me by Carolyn’s classroom teacher. I used this level to determine my first text selections for the study. In the first session with Carolyn, I used multiple
texts to find one that she was interested in to begin the study. After three sessions of using the text, *Aliens for Lunch*, I determined it was too easy for her and tried another text during session four (Etra & Spinner, 1991). I determined the text for session four was too hard for Carolyn even though she was interested in the topic. The text level did not give Carolyn a chance to effectively use her strategies due to her frustration with the text. In the final three sessions, I found a text that seemed to be a perfect match for her. By jumping from text to text, I felt as though I was not able to see how Carolyn’s abilities had developed at the appropriate text level. Moore and Brantingham (2003) used a QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory) at the beginning and end of their study to determine reading growth throughout the study. I would have liked to use a diagnostic assessment like this one at the beginning and end of my study to determine appropriate text level and observe the progress she made on that text level after participating in multiple RMA sessions.

In Theurer’s article about a proficient reader chosen to participate in the RMA process, she talks about the idea of educational experiences and their influence on readers (2003). The participant in the study had experience with teachers who would correct each word that she miscued while reading aloud to her classes in elementary, middle, and high school. This experience led the participant to believe that reading was all about reading each word accurately. The participant’s educational experiences formed the basis of her theory about reading. Carolyn has had similar experiences as the participant in Theurer’s study and also believed in a text reproduction model of text. This was seen when Carolyn would come to words that
she knew the meaning of, but would not move on because she could not derive the correct pronunciation of the word. The belief in the text reproduction model was causing Carolyn to focus the majority of her attention on phonetic decoding which took away from her ability to derive meaning from the text as she was reading. Both leveling and teachers’ focus on accurate text reproduction influenced Carolyn’s view of herself as a reader.

Many other studies involving RMA (e.g; Theurer, 2003; Almazroui, 2007; Moore & Gilles, 2005) began with readers who follow a text reproduction theory of reading. Through the RMA process readers are able to build a more realistic view of how readers read and that reading is more than recalling words accurately. A student like Carolyn and the students mentioned in the other studies benefit from RMA because it allows the readers to transform their skill driven definition of reading into a more meaning driven definition of reading. The students are brought to the realization that recall of every word is not the goal of reading (Goodman, 1996). This realization came about when Carolyn and I discussed her uncorrected miscues. There were a number of miscues that Carolyn did not correct that did not affect the meaning of the text. By talking about these miscues, Carolyn was able to see how she does not have to read every word accurately in order to make sense of the text. Through this process Carolyn’s definition of reading was transformed.

As cited in Moore and Gilles (2005), various studies (e.g; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Martens, 1998; Moore & Aspergen, 2001; Moore & Brantingham, 2003) reveal improvements in the comprehension of readers who participated in the RMA process.
These improvements were determined based on observations, conversations with the students, comprehension rubrics, and miscue analyses. With Carolyn, I saw improvements in her ability to recognize a comprehension breakdown as she progressed throughout the research study. This ability was determined by the number of times Carolyn went back to correct miscues that did not make sense and continue on when her miscues still made sense in the text. She showed an increase in this ability in the final three sessions. Her percentage of acceptable miscues (self corrections + uncorrected miscues with no meaning change/ total number of miscues) was 20 percent higher in the final three sessions in comparison to the first three. These data indicate that Carolyn was thinking more during the reading process allowing her to increase the number of acceptable miscues in her reading.

Not only did the data discussed above show Carolyn’s increase in comprehension but my own observations of her reading enabled me to observe her thinking during the reading process. In the final three sessions as Carolyn was reading a text about forensic science, she was making connections and thinking aloud as she read the text. Carolyn brought a lot of background knowledge to this text and shared with me her knowledge of forensics based on her viewing of shows such as NCIS and CSI. Liontas (2002) discusses how effective comprehension requires the readers to relate texts to their prior knowledge. With the text about forensic science, Carolyn was connecting her old knowledge with the new knowledge in the text allowing her to have greater comprehension. This ability to recognize what the reader is bringing to the process was important for me as the teacher and researcher in this
process. Due to Carolyn’s background knowledge she was able to make more
connections with the text and therefore I noticed improvements in her inferential
comprehension.

Carolyn’s literal comprehension was strong from the start of her sessions with
me, but inferential comprehension was a weakness for her throughout the process.
Liontas (2002) talks about how comprehension is not about answering factual
questions. Many times classroom teachers may have students read a passage and
answer the factual questions that follow. This can also be seen in the structure of
sections of the New York State English Language Arts exams. RMA opens up the
idea of comprehension for readers who might believe comprehension is about
answering those factual questions. By asking more open ended questions during
RMA, I was able to honor the reader’s response in the comprehension process (Moore
& Brantingham, 2003). I believe Carolyn’s literal comprehension was strong based
on the structure of past comprehension tasks where factual responses were honored.
As the RMA process developed, Carolyn began to think more deeply about the texts
she was reading and provided more connections, predictions, and inferences during
her retellings because her responses and connections were honored in the RMA
process.

Carolyn’s BRI (Burke Reading Interview) indicated that she said she only
used sounding out as a strategy to solve words. This is similar to many other cases of
students who have taken part in the RMA process. Wilson talks about her student
Matt who only talks about sounding out in his BRI, but Wilson noticed him doing
more than that in his reading (Moore & Gilles, 2005). I noticed the same thing about Carolyn as I watched her reading the texts I provided for her. In this case Carolyn was either unable to articulate her semantic and syntactic strategies or was unaware that she had these strategies in her repertoire. RMA brings these strategies to a conscious level for the students participating in the process. In each RMA session, as Carolyn and I discussed her miscues we talked about her strategies and I praised her when I noticed she used a strategy other than sounding out. By forcing Carolyn to talk and think about the strategies she was using, she became more metacognitive about the reading process (Moore & Gilles, 2005).

In the final BRI, Carolyn still primarily discusses her graphophonemic strategies as opposed to the semantic and syntactic strategies that she was observed effectively using during the reading process. The only reference Carolyn makes to syntactic and semantic strategies in the final BRI is when she mentions her strategy of going back to reread when the text does not make sense. Due to our conversations during the RMA process about miscues and self correcting when miscues do not make sense, her ability to verbalize this strategy as opposed to other strategies she uses makes sense. Many of our conversations revolved around this idea that Carolyn had to go back when something did not make sense.

Carolyn’s inability to verbalize her reading strategies may have been impacted by my own language throughout the RMA process. I did not use any consistent language when discussing strategies with Carolyn. For example, when Carolyn and I talked about her miscues I should have set up my questioning the same way each
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I could have been more explicit in asking the questions: Does the miscue sound right? Look right? And make sense? I was not consistent in the way that I talked about her miscues and the strategies I noticed her using throughout the process. If I had used consistent, explicit language when talking to Carolyn about her strategies, I wonder if she would have been able to verbalize her strategy use more effectively in the final BRI.

Limitations

This study had some limitations that must be addressed and that could have played a role in the results that were seen. One limitation of this study is the brief amount of time allotted for the study. I met with Carolyn for seven reading sessions and seven RMA sessions. One of the readings I determined was not appropriate for the study and therefore six of the seven sessions were used for data collection and analysis. I would have liked to extend the length of time and number of sessions for this study. Unfortunately, my own after school schedule as well as the student’s after school schedule caused the study to take place over four months as opposed to the originally two months due to cancelled sessions. With more time, I would have been able to incorporate more texts in the data collection and more trends and development might have been observed in the data.

Another limitation of this study was the texts used. I only used two texts during the study and both of the texts were split between three sessions. Some of our sessions were 1-2 weeks apart and made it difficult for Carolyn to have a cohesive reading experience. She had to try to remember what she had read in the previous
session and bring it to the next session. This may have affected her comprehension of the text for this study. Next time, I may want to use shorter texts that have a beginning, middle, and end for each session and connections will not have to be made between two or more sessions.

Also, in regard to text choice, it may have been valuable to have two to three fiction texts and two to three non-fiction texts. With some of the results, I was unsure if differences were due to the genre of the text or other factors. By using multiple examples from each of the genres, I may have been able to make comparisons and observe more obvious trends in the data in regards to genre type.

Another potential limitation for this study was the fact that it was my first time participating in RMA. I was learning about the process along with Carolyn during this study. Even with an extensive amount of research I did beforehand, I did not have any hands-on experience with RMA before this study. As the study pushed on, I learned about the types of texts that may be effective or ineffective when used during multiple RMA sessions. I was also able to determine the importance of using explicit and consistent language throughout the RMA process. If I had been more explicit when discussing strategies with Carolyn she may have been able to articulate her semantic and syntactic strategies more efficiently in the final BRI.

Looking back on the location of the reading and RMA sessions, I see some flaws in the site that was chosen. I chose to have the study take place at my dining room table. Some days this was a quiet place while on others; there were people in the next room over watching television. Carolyn had issues with attention and this
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could be due to the background noise. Also, there is a big picture window in my dining room where Carolyn was able to see out to the neighborhood. She knew the young girl across the street and at times made comments when she was outside. It may have been beneficial to place Carolyn in a spot at the table where she could not see out the window.

The time of day the sessions took place could have also played a role in the results of the study. The fact that I went to pick up Carolyn each day after school was dismissed could have also played a role in the number of times Carolyn did not make it to our sessions. There were three occasions where she chose to stay after school, two occasions where she went out to play with friends and did not come back to her house in time for our session, and another occasion where she went to her uncle’s house directly after school. If the sessions took place at her school, I wonder if I would have had the same dilemma with multiple missed sessions.

Not only do I think the time of day may have resulted in missed sessions, but her attention may have been affected. Carolyn came to me after seven hours of school and many times was hungry and complained of being tired. I helped with her hunger by providing food during the sessions, but I could not do anything about her energy level. Her attention, concentration, and engagement may have been affected by her lack of energy at the end of a school day.

With the limitations and weaknesses of this study in mind, I have concluded that overall a fifth grade student’s understanding of the reading process was impacted
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by the participation in the instructional strategy of retrospective miscue analysis (RMA).

Recommendations for teachers

The results of the study show that overall a fifth grade student’s understanding of the reading process was impacted by her participation in multiple RMA sessions. As the researcher and a teacher, I would use information from this study to plan future instruction in the classroom setting.

Throughout this process, I have developed what Davenport (2002) calls “miscue ears”. By going into such depth with RMA and the miscue analyses, I am better able to listen to students read and hear miscues rather than mistakes. It’s imperative not to count up all of the student’s miscues, determine an accuracy score, and label a child based on that information. By doing so, the teacher is further perpetuating the text reproduction model of reading. If we only look at the number of miscues a child makes we are neglecting everything that can be learned from analyzing miscues. By using reading miscue inventories in the classroom, the teacher is able to find out more about his/her reader and is better able to support the reader during the reading process. Miscues offer a window into the child’s thoughts (Goodman, 2003). As a teacher participates in miscue analysis, his/her knowledge of the reading process will expand and the teacher will then be better equipped to help students understand the reading process.

I found that taking miscue analysis even further by involving Carolyn in a conversation about her miscues allowed not only me to learn more about her as a
reader but also helped Carolyn learn about herself as a reader. Talking about miscues with a student helps him/her to understand why we make miscues and what our miscues tell us about ourselves as readers. Not only does this conversation result in talk about miscues but also the strategies that readers are constantly using during the reading process. These strategies are unconscious and bringing the strategies to a conscious level during RMA conversations slows down the process of reading and makes it visible to the student (Goodman, 2008).

As I worked with the one-on-one form of RMA during this study, I found out about variations of RMA that have been adapted in order to be used in the classroom setting. Teachers might look at this study and assume that this process of talking about our miscues is impossible to fit into the six to seven hour school day. Once a teacher has developed “miscue ears” and becomes more familiar with RMA it becomes easy to incorporate RMA into a normal classroom routine (Davenport, 2002).

During ELA (English language arts) time, the teacher can use reading conference time to analyze a reader’s miscues on a one-to-one basis. The teacher would make a copy of the text being read or already have multiple texts transcribed and copies made ahead of time. As the student reads to the teacher, the teacher marks the miscues and discusses these miscues with the student immediately following the reading. This shorter form of RMA would not be successful if the teacher does not already have a strong basis of knowledge about miscues, the cueing systems, and the idea of talking about miscues (Davenport, 2002). My suggestion would be to take
part in some in depth RMA sessions with less confident or less proficient readers and then move into individual shorter sessions as described above.

It is also possible to involve an entire class in the process of RMA. Yetta Goodman terms this process as “Whole class RMA strategy lessons” (Goodman, 2008). The teacher can record a reader (with the reader’s permission) and have the text available to all of the students. As the students listen to the recording, they will mark the miscues and the entire class would discuss the miscues. This enables the entire class to become a part of the process and understand that reading is about meaning making and not just accurate word call. This process can become a part of the classroom’s weekly routine and become threaded throughout the entire curriculum of the classroom. In the primary grades it may prove to be more beneficial if this process is executed in small groups (Goodman, 2008).

During the study, the idea of “reading levels” came up a number of times. Although this topic was not directly related to the purpose of RMA, it is one that is important to talk about when we look at the theory behind RMA. RMA is a process that values the student’s strengths and productive reading strategies (Moore & Gilles, 2005). Teachers who use RMA determine student success based on the reading strategies students use as well as what they do well during the reading process. Teachers who have not had exposure or experience with miscue analysis may not interpret miscues in the same way as those who have done miscue analysis research. Many leveling systems determine a student’s “reading level” by counting the number of miscues and finding the accuracy rate which is a percentage. The quality of
miscues is not considered and students are given levels based on this information. This level indicates to the student what books he/she can choose off of the book shelf and students begin to define themselves in this way. Defining students in this way is detrimental to their self confidence and is not an accurate picture of the reader.

During the research process, I was able to use an interview called the Burke Reading Interview or BRI (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 2005). The BRI asks students about strategies as well as their opinions of themselves as readers and other readers in their lives. Using this during this study was helpful but I also feel it can be valuable when used in the classroom. It allows the teacher to get to know his/her students better by providing a picture of what individual students think/know about the reading process. The questions will aid the teacher in providing instruction for the entire school year. By administering this interview at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year, teachers would be able to see how their students’ views of reading develop in their classroom throughout the year.

**Recommendations for future research**

Through my study, I was able to answer the questions I had about RMA and its impact of a child’s understanding of the reading process. However, this study also has left some questions that could be further explored while also bringing up new questions that I did not have before this study began.

In order to gain more information about Carolyn, the study could have spanned a longer period of time as I had mentioned before. If I were able to carry out this research for an entire school year, I believe the improvements that were seen in
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This short study would be much more drastic with more exposure to RMA. Greater change might be seen in Carolyn’s self perceptions, definition of reading, comprehension, and strategies that developed if the length of time for this study were increased. More time may have also allowed my own skills as a reading teacher using RMA develop which may have in turn affected Carolyn’s development as a reader as well.

Including multiple readers in this research process could also expand the information and credibility of the study. The participants could include various age levels, gender, race, ethnicities, and abilities. With a more diverse population comparisons could also be made between the groups as they progress through the process of RMA. I would also be able to make a more generalized statement about the impact of RMA on a student’s understanding of the reading process.

As I grappled with a focus for my study, RMA came to mind because of the many encounters I had had with students who were not confident in their abilities as readers. Due to my own circumstances for this particular study, I ended up with a student who claimed to have confidence in her abilities as reader. For future research, I would be interested to find readers who are not as outwardly confident as Carolyn was. I would be fascinated to see how RMA might impact a more apprehensive reader who does not define him/herself as a good reader. Finding a student like this might be easy if I had my own classroom, but it might also be possible to administer the BRI to a larger group of students and then focus on students within that group that expressed dissatisfaction with their reading abilities for future RMA research.
Based on the data that I collected during the study, overall a fifth grade student’s understanding of the reading process was impacted by her participation in multiple RMA sessions.
Appendix A: Cover Letter for Parental Consent Form

October 4, 2009

Dear Parent or Guardian,

I am currently completing my thesis at The College at Brockport on how Retrospective Miscue Analysis might impact a student’s understanding of the reading process.

I would like to ask for your permission to work with your child using Retrospective Miscue Analysis two 30-45 minute sessions per week for an eight week period of time. During this time, I will be taking observational notes on your child, administering reading running records, as well as audio taping each session. Your child will also be answering interview questions at the beginning and end of the process and engaging in conversations with me about his/her miscues made during reading. These sessions will take place within the researcher’s (my) home in order to ensure a quiet environment.

All information collected will be kept strictly confidential and will be used solely for the purpose of completing my thesis. Your child’s name will not be placed on any of the materials used in this research study and all audio tapes will be destroyed after the completion of the study. At any time if you wish for your child to stop participating in the sessions, please inform me of your wishes and I will stop collecting information from your child.

Your child’s participation in this thesis project is greatly appreciated and will not affect his or her grade or take away from instruction time.

Please read and complete the second page of this letter and return it to school with your child by ________. If you have any questions or concerns do not hesitate to contact me at (585) 436-3449 or efarr1@brockport.edu. You can also contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Sue Novinger at anytime with questions about this study by phone: (585)395-5935 or by email: snovinge@brockport.edu.

Thank you,

Miss Elizabeth Farrell
Appendix B: Parental Consent Form

Consent for Observation, Tape Recording, and Interviewing Student

The purpose of this research project is to examine how Retrospective Miscue Analysis might impact a student's understanding of the reading process. Retrospective Miscue Analysis is an instructional tool as well as an assessment tool that is used to determine how a student is thinking about reading as a whole. This study will be looking into how this instructional tool might impact a student's self-perceptions, comprehension, reading strategies, and definition of reading. The person conducting this research is a graduate student at SUNY Brockport. If you agree to have your child participate in this study, your child will participate in sessions with the researcher twice a week after normal school hours for a period of eight weeks. Sessions will take place at a location that is agreed upon between the parent(s) or guardian(s), researcher, and child.

In order for your child to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to allow your child to participate in the project. If you would like for your child to participate in the project, and agree with the statements below, please sign your name in the space provided at the end. Your child can decline participation even if you have given your consent. You may change your mind at any time and your child may leave the study without penalty, even after the study has begun.

I understand that:

1. My child’s participation is voluntary and he/she has the right to refuse to answer any questions.
2. My child’s confidentiality is guaranteed. His/her name will not be written on any observation notes, transcriptions of text or forms of assessment. There will be no way to connect my child to the observations, assessments, or transcriptions of tape recorded sessions. If any publication results from this research, he/she would not be identified by name. Results will be given through the use of pseudonyms, so neither the participants nor the school can be identified.
3. There will be no anticipated personal risks because of participation in this project. A possible benefit is that the student will learn to revalue reading and her/himself as a reader.
4. The researcher will be administering a reading running record outside of the normal school hours once a week, for approximately 30 minutes for eight weeks total.
5. The researcher will be having a conversation with my child outside of the normal school hours once a week, for approximately 45 minutes for eight weeks total. This is a separate day from the reading running record session.
6. My child will complete a ten question interview, given by the researcher, sharing his/her thoughts about reading. This interview will be administered once at the beginning of the research and once at the end.

7. The results will be used for the completion of a master’s thesis by the primary researcher.

8. Each session my child participates in will be tape recorded by the researcher. Only I, my research advisor, and research partners will listen to these recordings. These recordings will be destroyed when data analysis has been completed.

9. Data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet by the investigator. Data and consent forms will be destroyed by shredding when data analysis has been completed.

10. My child will be the only participant in this study.

I understand the information provided in this form and agree to allow my child to participate as a participant in this study. I am 18 years of age or older. I have read and understand the above statements. All my questions about my child’s participation in this study have been answered to my satisfaction.

If you have any questions you may contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Researcher</th>
<th>Thesis Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Farrell</td>
<td>Dr. Sue Novinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student, SUNY Brockport</td>
<td>SUNY Brockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efarrl @brockport.edu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snovinge@brockport.edu">snovinge@brockport.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(585)436-3449</td>
<td>(585)395-5935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Parent_________________________ Date __________________

Child’s Name: _______________________________________

I give permission to tape record my child’s voice throughout all planned retrospective miscue analysis sessions.

Signature of Parent_________________________ Date __________________
Appendix C: Minor Assent Form

Statement of Assent
To Be Read to a Fifth Grade Student

I am going to school at night to learn about being a reading teacher. My assignment for school is to see how talking about your miscues will help you to understand the reading process a little better. Miscues are made when readers say a word that does not match the text on the page. You and I will be meeting twice a week for about eight weeks to read together and talk together about miscues. I will also ask you some questions at the beginning and end of our time together to see what you think and feel about reading. All of our conversations will be audio taped. The only people who will listen to the audio-tapes are me, my research advisor, and my research partners.

Your parent or guardian has given me permission for you to take part in this study but it is up to you to decide if you would like to. If you would like to participate in my study, but change your mind later, you can tell me, and we will stop working together after school. I will not use your name on anything that I collect for my study, and I will not use your name on anything that I collect for my study, and your privacy will be protected. You will be the only student I will be working with during this study.

If you would like to participate in my study, write your name and date on the lines below.

Thank you very much,

Miss Farrell

Child’s name: _____________________________________________

Signature of witness over 18 years of age_____________________

Date: ____________________________________________________

If you give permission for your voice to be recorded during all of our sessions together write your name and date on the lines below.
Child’s name: ________________________________

Signature of witness over 18 years of age____________________

Date: ________________________________
Appendix D: Burke Reading Interview

Burke Reading Interview (BRI)

Name____________________ Age____________ Date________________
Occupation________________ Education level________________
Sex______________ Interview Setting ________________________________

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 that _________ ever comes to something she/he doesn’t know?

5. Yes- When she/he does come to something she/he doesn’t know, what do you think she/he does about it?

   NO - Suppose/pretend that she/he does come to something that she/he doesn’t know, what do you think she/he does about it?

6. If you knew that someone was having difficulty reading how would you help them?
7. What would a/your teacher do to help that person?

8. How did you learn to read?

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

10. Do you think that you are a good reader? Why?
Appendix E: Comprehension Assessment Summary Sheet

Comprehension assessment summary sheet
Reading comprehension assessment summary
Student ___________________________ Grade ______ Text ______
School ____________________________

Levels of understanding
4—Sophisticated understanding
3—Solid understanding
2—Emerging understanding
1—Understanding not yet demonstrated

Summary level

Areas of comprehension and student’s abilities
   Comments/examples

Literal comprehension
Restate information after reading

Interpretive comprehension
Work with ideas after reading; for example, recognize cause/effect, compare/contrast, predict, and draw inferences

Critical thinking
Express and support an opinion after reading, evaluate positions, analyze relevance and credibility, and draw inferences

Story parts
Recognize and analyze the setting, main characters, events, problems, and solutions in a story

Word meaning
Use strategies to determine the meaning of new words encountered while reading

Organizing information
Recognize how information is organized—for example, sequence, cause/effect, problem/solution, main
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idea/supporting detail, compare/contrast, and description

**Visualization**
Create mental pictures while reading; this is assessed by asking students to create artwork during and after reading—students are not assessed on art ability

**Questioning (analysis and generation)**
Identify the type of question being asked of them, apply an effective strategy to answer it, and ask appropriate questions as a result of reading

**Summarization**
Recognize, organize, and express the most important idea of a given selection after reading

**Applies reading strategies in all areas**
Uses comprehension strategies to understand written material in other curricular areas

**Recognizes and remedies comprehension breakdown**
Recognizes when what is being read no longer has meaning to make sense and then applies an effective strategy to restore understanding

Comments and observations:

Appendix F: Miscue Analysis Coding Form III

Appendix C: Blank Form

PROCEDURE III MISCUE TALLY FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Selection Read

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence #</th>
<th>Reader Said</th>
<th>Text Said</th>
<th>Uncorrected</th>
<th>Graphic Similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Corrected</td>
<td>No Meaning Change</td>
<td>Partial Meaning Change</td>
<td>With Meaning Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page Column Totals:

Total Miscues this page: Total Miscues this page coded for Graphic Similarity:

Cannot code for graphic similarity: Complex miscues, omissions, insertions, partials.

Appendix G: RMI Procedure III Reader Profile

### Blank Reader Profile

**READING MISCUE INVENTORY**  
Procedure III—Reader Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection read**

**Number of sentences coded**

**INFORMATION FROM TYPESCRIPT**

Comprehending in Process (Sentence Codings)

- --- % YYN
- --- % YYP
- --- % YYY
- --- % YN-
- --- % NN-

**Syntactic Acceptability**

- --- % Acceptable
- --- % Unacceptable

**Semantic Acceptability**

- --- % Acceptable
- --- % Unacceptable

**Meaning Change**

- --- % No Change (N)
- --- % Partial Change (F)
- --- % Change (Y and Dash)

**INFORMATION FROM RETELLING GUIDE**

Comprehension --- %

**INFORMATION FROM MISCUE TALLY FORM**

Total Number of miscues tallied ---

Corrections

- --- % Self-Corrected
- --- % Uncorrected, No Meaning Change
- --- % Uncorrected, Partial Meaning Change
- --- % Uncorrected, With Meaning Change

Total Number of miscues coded for graphic similarity ---

Graphic Similarity

- --- % High
- --- % Some
- --- % None

**COMMENTS**
Appendix H: RMA Session Organizer

**RMA Session Organizer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape-Recorder Counter Number</th>
<th>Miscue</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

---

Appendix I: Double Entry Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Questions/Reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Burke Reading Interview Answers (Initial and Final)

Burke Reading Interview (BRI)

Name: Carolyn  Age: 10  Date: 1/21/10
Education Level: 5th grade
Sex: female  Interview Setting: Carolyn’s home

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

Do you ever do anything else?

I clap it or put the words into syllables.

2. Who is a good reader you know?
   Mrs. L. Smitten (pseudonym for the girl’s teacher)

3. What makes ______ a good reader?

She reads at home and when she doesn’t read, she’s reading cook books. So she is always reading.

4. Do you think that ________ ever comes to something she/he doesn’t know?

Yea but the students correct her. If she doesn't know it then Mrs. R. helps her.

5. Yes- When she/he does come to something she/he doesn’t know, what do you think she/he does about it?

She sounds it out or puts the word into syllables.

NO - Suppose/pretend that she/he does come to something that she/he doesn’t know, what do you think she/he does about it?

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

I would tell them to sound it out or put the word into syllables.
7. What would your teacher do to help that person?

She would tell them the word.

8. How did you learn to read?

Until I was 2 1/2 I could not see so I used sign language and had something in my ear. I just sounded out the words to learn.

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

Sign language so I could show a deaf person what the story is about.

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

Yes, because I read a lot

Goodman, Watson, and Burke

Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc. 2005
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Burke Reading Interview (BRI)

Name: Carolyn         Age: 11         Date: 4/15/10
Education Level: 5th grade
Sex: female
Interview Setting: Teacher’s dining room

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

   I would sound out the word or put my finger over the word and find a word that is within a word.

   Do you ever do anything else?

   Break the word apart.

2. Who is a good reader you know?

   You.

3. What makes ________ a good reader?

   You read a lot and you do projects like this one and listen to my tapes to pick out miscues and do science stuff.

4. Do you think that ________ ever comes to something she/he doesn't know?

   yes

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

   Look for the word that is within the word and break the word apart.

   NO - Suppose/pretend that she/he does come to something that she/he doesn't know, what do you think she/he does about it?

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

   Help them to break the word apart
Tell them to sound it out
Listen to their miscues with them

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

*Put the word on the smart board and break the word apart for the person.*

8. How did you learn to read?

*Dad taught me words such as the, to, see, that and gave me books to read.*

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

*Listen for miscues and reread when something does not make sense.*

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

*Yes because I have been reading a lot and learning new words every day. I am also getting better at sounding words out and breaking words apart.*

_After interview: I had a conversation with her about what she is doing in comparison to what she says she is doing so that she is aware of all of the strategies she is using since she was unable to verbalize them within this interview._
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