Open
WORDS

Access
and
English
Studies

In this issue

Open
WORDS

*Access
and
English
Studies*

Co-Editors
John Paul Tassoni
Miami University Middletown

William H. Thelin
University of Akron

Assistant Editor
Leann Bertoncini
College of Wooster

OPEN WORDS: Access and English Studies is dedicated to publishing articles focusing on political, professional, and pedagogical issues related to teaching composition, reading, creative writing, ESL, and literature to open admissions and non-mainstream student populations. We seek critical work in areas such as instructional strategies, cultural studies, critical theory, classroom materials, technological innovation, institutional critique, student services, program development, etc., that assist educators, administrators, and student support personnel who work with students in pedagogically difficult settings. Articles should consider the particularities of these settings—issues, for example, surrounding the identifier of "open access," intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability, regional and cultural differences, and the range of competencies students bring with them to classrooms—in light of the aims of English studies to empower students' critical and creative endeavors. We value works pertinent to specialists yet accessible to non-specialists, and we encourage submissions that take into account what interactions with students teach us about the broader, democratic goals of open access educations and English studies.

OPEN WORDS: Access and English Studies accepts manuscripts year-round and is interested in theory, critique, qualitative or quantitative studies, narrative, biography, history, or pedagogical practice. Prospective contributors should prepare manuscripts in MLA style with all identifying references to the authors deleted. Submissions should include a cover page, giving the name, address, and institutional affiliation of the author. We do consider longer works, but submissions should try to stay under 30 pages. We will acknowledge receipt of submissions immediately and inform contributors of the status in approximately 8-12 weeks.

Electronic submissions should be sent to John Paul Tassoni at *tassonjp@muohio.edu* or William H. Thelin at *wthelin@uakron.edu*. Paper submissions can be sent to John Paul Tassoni, OPEN WORDS, Department of English, Miami University Middletown, Middletown, OH 45042. Please prepare three copies.

OPEN WORDS: Access and English Studies is published twice a year. Single issues are available at $5.00 a copy. Checks should be made out to William H. Thelin and be sent to OPEN WORDS, Department of English, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1906. Personal and institutional subscriptions should inquire at *wthelin@uakron.edu*.

Volume 3
Number 1
Spring 2009

Open
WORDS

Access
and
English
Studies

Table of Contents

Editor's Introduction:

The Peculiar Relationship to Reading in College Curriculum

READING CLASSES IN COLLEGES TEND TO DO ANYTHING BUT TEACH STUDENTS THE nuances of successful, enjoyable, effective reading. Rather, colleges more often than not label these courses "remedial" or "developmental," sometimes incorporating the learning of study skills into them, and gear the curriculum toward understanding the "basics" so as to support students in their attempts at mastering what the academy considers "academic" reading. As Louise Bohr states, "[A] developmental reading program at a college earns its keep by trying to help college students succeed in [other] classes" (63). Reading, then, similar to the perception other disciplines still have of first-year composition, provides a service for the college. In this mindset, reading does not have a subject of its own nor does it carry disciplinary capital.

Yet, if any complaint heard on college campuses surpasses the tired, "My students don't know how to write," it would be, "My students don't know how to read," meaning, variously, that students do not read assigned materials, they do not comprehend textbook prose, they have no interest in pursuing outside readings on a subject, or, simply, they do not read aloud well. The field of reading theory, of course, offers solutions to these problems, but the direction it would lead us would suggest to college educators that at least part of the difficulties students encounter comes from curricular and pedagogical decisions instructors make. As with writing, educators too often pay attention to the product—giving direct treatment to a problem related to a particular assignment—and lose sight of the process. Therefore, students do not transfer "reading skills" from one assignment to the next, one course to the next, or one discipline to the next. Educators bemoan the insufficiency of student preparation and wonder how high schools (and college composition and reading programs) give passing marks to such students. The polemic these educators end up embracing calls for more of the same education (or, more accurately, treatment) that produced the so-called "literacy crisis."

We can analyze student non-investment in literate ways from several angles. Too many of these, though, blame the students, thus safely, from an educator's perspective, shielding higher education from making changes. We see students as having become progressively more slothful, as technology has made life too easy and substituted pop culture for serious study. We see work schedules interfering with time that should be devoted to library research and isolated reading. (And of course, economic and social conditions do impact our

students.) Further, students' individual choices and psychological make-ups definitely contribute to "reading problems." If we end the analysis there, however, the responsibility for improvement rests entirely with the students; they must merely prioritize more appropriately. A more complex response would involve educators understanding the alienation students feel from academic pursuits and the perhaps deliberate methods in which the system estranges students.

Bowles and Gintis have shown rather convincingly that schools train students to develop in ways that replicate socio-economic class systems: the lower-tier learns to respond to bells and receive high rewards for obedience and cooperation. For example, K-12 schools' reading instruction subjects students to phonics programs, ignoring research that does not fit this agenda. In what Richard J. Meyer describes as a "pre-fabricated mandated curriculum," students lose their uniqueness and learn that "schools are not about standards... [but] about some impossible process of standardization" (82), a standardization that reduces access to power for students beholden to public education. Stephen D. Krashen succinctly exposes the illogic behind the rationale for phonics, explaining that research into the supposed effectiveness of the method contains flaws (see also Allington; Allington and Woodside-Jiron), and recommends, ala Frank Smith's call for students to affiliate with "the club of readers" (113), that access to books and saturation into a culture of reading work toward turning students into readers. Given the class warfare seen in No Child Left Behind and the general celebration of private schools over their public counterparts, conspiracy theories that suggest that the goal of public education is to under-educate students to provide for corporate America a compliant but thoughtless workforce are not too far fetched (see Ohanian on this point). Barack Obama's selection of Arne Duncan as the Secretary of Education does not bode well for turning the tide. As explicated by Giroux and Saltman in their critique of Duncan's tenure as CEO of Chicago Public Schools, students can expect more of the same.

How implicated are we as college educators in this process? When we align our conceptions of literacy with ideologies that rely on "back to the basics" or other such unexamined calls for rigor in curriculum and on notions of privilege and strict disciplinary boundaries for instructors, we become part of the problem. On this latter point, college instructors often try to distance themselves from high school educators. A symbolic act of this distancing is the lack of credit-bearing reading courses in most colleges and universities. The only valued reading on campuses is literature, or at least the canon and contemporary works deemed to be literature by those with status. Professors do not teach how to read as much as they do how to appreciate and interpret a certain body of novels, poems, and short stories. The de-privileging of reading goes hand-in-hand with ignoring the voluminous knowledge on reading theory generated by both K-12 and college instructors. Despite all the reading problems students

experience and no matter how frustrated we get, referring to and adapting ideas from reading research seemingly sullies us, lowering us to the level of teacher and diminishing our role as professor, a position that, after all, stakes claim to advanced, disciplinary knowledge. With such an ideology, we, in essence, continue the sorting system begun in K-12, refusing to let students experience reading and helping them develop into readers, reducing the chances of far too many students toward individual success and the ability to function in a democratic society.

My co-editor John and I designed this issue of *Open Words* to respond to the challenge of making reading theory and research an integral part of the curriculum in English studies. In putting together the call for papers and reading manuscripts, we had to sheepishly admit that we, too, needed to strengthen our relationship with ideas drawn from K-12 educators, educational theorists, and researchers in both secondary and post-secondary institutions. As our first article demonstrates, reading research can inform our teaching. Chris Anson, Robert Schwegler, and Susan Rashid Horn study computer-assisted eye tracking in "The Promise of Eye-Tracking Methodology for Research on Writing and Reading." Eye tracking has been a staple in reading research, and Anson, Schwegler, and Horn use it to focus on the impact on reading of readers' perceptions of error, suggesting that pairing eye tracking with other methodologies will reveal much about writing and pedagogy.

The sad but true reality facing us as instructors is that students dislike reading. Pamela Mason-Egan's "Re-Valuing Readers and Reading in a College Support Program" addresses the low self-esteem students maintain when trying to think of themselves as readers. Using a case study approach, Mason-Egan reviews the misconceptions about the reading process of students and reaffirms what K-12 whole language instructors know: students read better when looking for meaning. Diane DiVido Tetreault and Carole Center in "But I'm Not a Reading Teacher!" pick up on this strand by focusing on ways to counter student avoidance of and non-interest in reading. They argue that reading, thinking, and writing are dialogically interwoven and recommend that writing instructors incorporate reading and reading strategies into the composition classroom.

This issue concludes with Jeanne Henry's "Cultivating Reading Workshop: New Theory into New Practice," where she revisits her version of reading workshop from her seminal work *If Not Now: Developmental Readers in the College Classroom.* She adds to her work by suggesting we use the term "disenfranchised readers" to discuss students whom we previously might have labeled as "reluctant" or "resistant," and like Mason-Egan, embraces the concept of "re-valuing" to help build in students a self-conception of themselves as readers. Her update includes a discussion of the use of multi-modal technology in the classroom.

Much more needs to be done than one issue of a journal can possibly do, but John

and I humbly submit this to you, our readers, in the hope that you will continue the dialogue our contributors have begun. If reading matters—and most of us think it does—we have to teach students how to do it. As Tetreault and Center suggest, we all must become reading teachers.

William H. Thelin

December, 2008

Works Cited

Allington, Richard. "Overselling Phonics: Five Unscientific Assertions about Reading Instruction." *Reading Today* 15 (1997): 15-16.

Allington, Richard, and Haley Woodside-Jiron. "Thirty Years of Research in Reading: When Is a Research Summary Not a Research Summary?" *In Defense of Good Teaching: What Teachers Need to Know about the Reading Wars.* Ed. Ken Goodman. York, ME: Stenhouse, 1998. 143-57.

Bohr, Louise. "College and Precollege Reading Instruction: What Are the Real Differences?" *Teaching Developmental Reading: Historical, Theoretical, and Practical Background Readings.* Eds. Norman A. Stahl and Hunter Boylan. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 60-71.

Bowels, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life.* New York: Basil Books, 1977.

Giroux, Henry A., and Kenneth Saltman. "Obama's Betrayal of Public Education? Arne Duncan and the Corporate Model of Schooling." Truthout Dec 18, 2008; Dec 17, 2008. *https://www.truthout.org/121708R.*

Krashen, Stephen D. *Three Arguments Against Whole Language & Why They Are Wrong.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1999.

Meyer, Richard J. *Phonics Exposed.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.

Ohanian, Susan. *One Size Fits Few: The Folly of Educational Standards.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1999.

Smith, Frank. *Reading Without Nonsense.* Fourth Edition. New York: Teachers College Press, 2006.

Chris M. Anson, Susan Rashid Horn, and Robert A. Schwegler

The Promise of Eye-Tracking Methodology for Research on Writing and Reading

THE FIELD OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH HAD ITS ORIGINS IN DIVERSE methodologies ranging from case studies to longitudinal investigations and ethnographies (see North), and has developed or adapted a number of unique data-collection techniques such as discourse-based interviews (Odell, Goswami, and Herrington), think-aloud protocols (Emig; Flower, Swarts, and Hayes; Hayes and Flower), and keystroke logging (Sullivan and Lindgren). However, over the past two decades, empirically-based studies—those Haswell characterizes as "replicable, aggregable, and data-supported" (201)—have declined in some of the central publications in the field (Anson, "The Intelligent"; Durst; Haswell; see also Juswik, et al.). The reasons for this decline are complex but appear to be related to the "social turn" in composition studies, which has "rejected quantification and any attempts to reach Truth about our business by scientific means, just as we long ago rejected 'truth' as derivable by deduction from unquestioned first principles. For us, 'truth' is rhetorical, dialectically constructed, and provisional" (Fulkerson 662).

We find this suspicion of empirical research methodologies problematic in a field as historically interdisciplinary and open to inquiry as written communication. First, many unexplored questions about writing and literacy processes can be studied using experimental and clinical methods which, while not always employed in naturalistic contexts, still give us data that have both foundational and heuristic value. Second, experimental research can supplement more contextually-rich investigations involving thick description (Geertz), or quantitative and qualitative methods can be triangulated within a research setting (see Charney; Jick). Third, emerging technologies now provide new means of empirical data collection and analysis that allow us to investigate a broader range of questions about the nature and acquisition of written literacy. Text-mining programs, for example, afford analysis of millions of possible patterns and correlations of features across a limitless number of texts in a matter of seconds—analyses that would take humans months or years to conduct. Other technologies that have been available for some time have now become refined enough, and reasonable enough in cost and convenience, to employ in new research on writing.

Computer-assisted eye tracking represents one such technology. Sophisticated eye-

tracking devices can now capture the exact movements and resting points of humans' eyes as they read text or look at visually presented material. Although eye-tracking devices have been available for many years and have spawned large amounts of research in some areas, particularly reading processes (see Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years"), they have rarely been used to study writing or the relationships between reading and writing.

In this essay, we focus on the possible uses of eye tracking as a methodology for research in composition. We will first describe what eye tracking has shown us about the processes of human reading. Next, we will demonstrate the potential of eye-tracking methodology for the study of language behaviors through a pilot study of readers' perceptions of written errors embedded in brief texts. Finally, we will suggest some implications for further research on textual processes using eye tracking, with special focus on needed work in the social construction and psycholinguistic effects of error in written texts.

Eye Tracking as a Method for Research on Reading and Writing Processes

It is beyond the scope of the present article to describe the history of eye tracking technology, which has included electro-oculography, scleral contact lenses and search coils, photo- and video-ocularity, and reflective devices (see Duchowski). Mediated by computer technology, today's eye-tracking equipment is highly sophisticated and precise. Most contemporary eye trackers use a video-based system that collects data by measuring movement in the cornea and pupil as a function of reflection. Infrared light is reflected via a mirror into one of the participant's eyes, in turn creating a reflection off the retina and cornea. The corneal glint and the retinal reflection are used to calculate where the participant's eye is focused. The eye tracker measures the eye location—the gaze trail—and the number of fixations (or pauses in eye movement) that occur as the subject reads text or looks at visually presented material.

Eye tracking has been used to study a wide range of human perceptual processes (see Henderson and Ferreira). In an overview of eye tracking methodology, Andrew Duchowski devotes separate chapters to the adaptation of eye tracking technology to the study of advertising and marketing, neuroscience and psychology, industrial engineering and human factors research (e.g., studies of driving), and computer science. Eye tracking has also been used in disability research (Chapman), in diagnoses of schizophrenia (Campana, Duci, Gambini, and Scarone), and in usability studies (e.g., Web design; see Jepson). Increasingly, eye tracking is being used to study the ways in which learners process visual and textual information in textbooks and in e-learning environments involving multimedia presentations (see Patrick, Carter, and Wiebe; Slykhuis, Annetta, and Wiebe).

In the area of psycholinguistics and language processing, eye tracking has been underutilized in studies of written text production (but is now increasingly employed in some European research; see Alamargot, Chesnet, Dansac, and Ros; Anderson, et al.). In the United States, the only eye tracking study of which the authors are aware in the field of rhetoric and composition examined the relationship between what college students spent time looking at in drafts of their peers' papers and what they subsequently recommended for improvement (Paulson, Alexander, and Armstrong). However, for several decades an extensive body of research on reading processes using eye tracking technology has accumulated. The general results of this research are important to synthesize for purposes of both explaining the pilot study reported here and of suggesting new avenues for the use of this technology in the study of written discourse processes.

Although differing models of reading have been proposed based on close observation and readers' reported experiences, eye tracking has provided researchers with the most accurate pictures of fluent reading. When we read, we persistently make rapid, intermittent eye movements called *saccades*. Between the saccades, our eyes remain comparatively still—that is, they *fixate*—for about 1/4 of a second. During saccades, our eyes move so quickly that all we perceive is a blur. Our sensitivity to visual input is reduced during these quick eye movements, and we do not access any new information. This is called *saccadic suppression*. To maintain a text's coherence, our brains "fill in" information that our eyes skip; that is, although visual information is suppressed during saccades, lexical processing is not. We continue to feel *as if* our eyes have seen every word that our brains piece together into understandable sentences (see Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years" 373).

When we look straight ahead, the visual field can be divided into three areas: the fovea, the parafovea, and the periphery. The fovea—the central two degrees of vision—has the best acuity. The parafovea extends five degrees to either side; here acuity is less good. The periphery, or the region beyond the parafovea, has the poorest acuity of all. When we read, we move our eyes to locate the fovea on that part of the text we want to see clearly. That central two degrees of focus allows us to see clearly six to eight letter spaces (Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years" 374). However, the perceptual span for readers extends about 18 or 19 letter spaces beyond that and includes the part of our vision that is off fovea. This span of effective vision is asymmetric, depending on which language we are reading. Because English is read from left to right, we can see 14 or 15 letter spaces to the right of fixation, but only four letters to the left (Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] Processing " 82).

The characteristics of what we see in the parafovea or periphery influence whether we need to make a saccade to it in order to identify it. Sometimes we can identify words we see off fovea without having to look at them directly. Largely, this depends on the length of

the word, but we may also be able to identify a word without fixating on it if it occurs repeatedly in the text, if it is predictable from prior context, or if it is a function word (such as a conjunction or a preposition; see Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years").

When we read English, our eye fixations last for about 200-250 ms (though we can access information during a much shorter fixation), and the mean saccade length is about eight letter spaces. Most words in a text are fixated during reading, but many are skipped over. As the number of letters in a word increases, the probability of fixating the word also increases. Words of eight letters or more are almost always fixated, sometimes more than once. A good place for the gaze to land on a word is about halfway between the beginning and the middle. If the gaze does not land there initially, a word may need to be refixated multiple times in order for processing to take place (Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years" 386-387).

Although most saccades in reading English are made left to right, about ten to fifteen percent of saccades are *regressions*, that is, right to left—either along the same line, or back to previously read lines. Short, within-word regressive saccades may occur when the reader has made too long a forward saccade or is having difficulty processing the text. Longer regressions (more than 10 letters back, or even back to a previous line) occur because the reader did not understand something in the text (Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years" 387).

Although average values can be assigned for fixation duration, saccade length, and frequency of regression, there is considerable variability among readers. For example, fast readers make shorter fixations, longer saccades, and fewer regressions than do slow readers (Everatt, Bradshaw, and Hibbard; Everatt and Underwood; Rayner, "Foveal"; Underwood, Hubbard, and Wilkinson). But regardless of the reader's skill, eye movements are influenced by textual variables. As the text becomes more conceptually difficult, fixation duration is prolonged, saccade length shortens, the frequency of regressions escalates, and the perceptual span shrinks (Jacobsen and Dodwell; Rayner and Pollatsek). These values, for example, are likely to be more pronounced for you at this moment than if you were reading a children's book or an article in a popular magazine, but they are likely to be less pronounced for you than for someone who knows little about scholarship on written communication and is unfamiliar with the kind of material published in this journal.

Eye movements are closely related to a reader's cognitive processing. Readers independently decide when and where to move their eyes depending on how easy or how difficult it is to process the word they have fixated (Pollatsek and Rayner; Pynte). Various language patterns also influence readers' decisions about when and where to fixate. For example, if we are reading a story about beavers and we learn that Native Americans called beavers "little men of the woods," every time we begin to encounter that phrase after initial-

ly reading it, we will make a saccade beyond the limits of the phrase because the information is redundant. The same is true of text within logical patterns ("nine or ten," "one hundred to two hundred), expressions ("as a matter of fact"), or information that we do not want or need (such as when we skip over several parenthetical references at the end of a line in a research article). The influence of such textual patterns and information, as well as other forms of prior syntactic, lexical, and world knowledge, has been the source of debate within the study of reading; but it is clear that this knowledge creates a process of reading in which we do not need to see every letter or word on a page; indeed, depending on the text, we may jump over a surprising amount of text that is supplied by our brains and not through our eyes (see Smith, *Reading Without*).

> "influence of such textual patterns and information, as well as other forms of prior syntactic, lexical, and world knowledge"

Because of the close link between complex information processing and the position of the gaze, it is reasonable to deduce moment-to-moment cognitive processing by observing eye movements (Just and Carpenter; McConkie, et al.; Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] Developments; Rayner, Sereno, Morris, Schmauder, and Clifton). The mental operations involved in deriving meaning from a text determine our eye movements. If processing difficulty influences eye movement variables, therefore, it is important to understand what happens when error is present. Analyzing the eye movements of a person reading a text containing errors in grammar or punctuation could show us whether (or in what ways) the reading process is perturbed, and the relationship between the strength of that perturbation and the type or nature of the error causing it. Knowing more about these phenomena can help us to refine current models of error in written language production and reception, leading to innovations in pedagogy as well as the presentation of information about error in textbooks and other educational materials currently based on formalist grammar.

Testing the Methodology:
A Pilot Study in the Perception of Written Error

Recent research on the nature and effects of error in student writing has used "secondary" methodologies from which conclusions can be derived only tentatively. Researchers have counted errors and instructor marking of errors (Connors and Lunsford), surveyed readers' attitudes towards errors (Hairston; Beason), and interviewed readers about their responses to

9

writing containing errors (Beason). While these methodologies may be appropriate for determining the average number of errors in student writing (Connors and Lunsford; Lunsford and Lunsford) or the image of a writer that readers create in response to errors in a text (Beason), the data they produce stand at a considerable distance from the cognitive processing of text. That errors have cognitive consequences is, however, the fundamental assumption of most error research. Connors and Lunsford, for example, accept Mina Shaughnessy's claim that errors are "unintentional and unprofitable intrusions upon the consciousness of the reader . . . . They demand energy without giving back any return in meaning" (Shaughnessy, qtd. in Connors and Lunsford, 396). And they assume that errors affect the processing of text: "Nevertheless, very few of us can deny that an outright comma splice, its/it's error, or misspelled common word distracts us" (396).

The speed at which readers process text falls within hundredths of seconds, making text processing a matter of what Anthony Giddens calls "practical consciousness," a level of activity between discursive consciousness and the unconscious (53). Because eye-trackers gather data in the millisecond range, they provide more direct evidence of text processing activities than do even talk-aloud protocols, which require mediation through verbalization, or interview and survey methodologies, which offer retrospective or generalized data (see Tomlinson). In contrast, our ongoing research provides evidence about how errors affect the process of reading. The evidence also suggests that the concept of "severity" of error, treated in a limited number of dimensions in much prior research (especially Connors and Lunsford; Hairston), is multifaceted and based on a number of factors, including the ways in which certain errors do or do not slow down or frustrate the processing of text relative to the reader's context and purposes for reading.

We see considerable potential in the use of eye tracking to identify visual responses to varied kinds of errors in written text, including grammatical, syntactic, punctuation, and usage errors. To illustrate this potential—and the broader potential of eye tracking in research on writing—we describe a pilot eye-tracking study involving a small group of subjects. The results of this study suggest plausible links between visual behaviors and both the psycholinguistic and social consequences of error in written texts. Such results can be useful not only in understanding the nature of error during the evaluation process but also in helping students to learn about error from something more than a traditional grammatical or remedial perspective.

Participants and Measuring Tool

A group of eight subjects at a large, research-extensive university were recruited for this study. All were well-educated and self-described skilled readers. All had at least some college

education, and three had at least some graduate school. Because of technical difficulties, one subject was dropped from the study.

The eye tracking system used in this study was an Applied Science Laboratory (ASL) eye tracker, model 504. The eye tracker collected data 60 times per second on the gaze direction of the left pupil relative to the computer screen. For the purposes of this study, we defined a fixation as lasting at least 200 ms and covering an area of 1.8 visual degrees.

Test Instrument

Six errors "most likely to confuse or irritate readers in the academic community" were selected from Anson and Schwegler's list and crosschecked with Connors and Lunsford's and with Hairston's lists: a status marker (subject/verb agreement); a serious error (fragment); two fairly serious errors (unclear pronoun reference and dangling modifier); a deviation (incorrect apostrophe); and a spelling error.

We excerpted a short article from *The New York Times* on Hong Kong Disneyland, a subject likely to fit into readers' general world knowledge, yet presenting some cognitive challenge. Next, we constructed a parallel text on a likewise common subject, cats, and determined an order in which the errors would be embedded in both texts (see Appendix A). We matched the *Cats* text as closely as possible to the *Disneyland* text in genre, sentence structure, style, grammar, lexis, and length. Each text was prepared in two ways: with and without error. Errors of the same type were placed at the same location in the error version of each text.

We created six multiple-choice comprehension questions relating to information in passages that appeared with and without errors (see Appendix B) in order to measure the possible consequences of error on comprehension. To avoid the confounding effects of text order as well as reading the same passage twice, we employed a two-by-two design; half the participants read an error-free text first, then the alternate error-laden text; the other half read an error-laden text first, then the alternate error-free text. In addition, we prepared a Likert-style adjective rating scale that asked readers to report their estimates of the author in terms derived from Beason's work: hasty to conscientious, uninformed to informed, poorly educated to well educated, and the like (see Appendix C).

Procedure

After providing demographic data, each participant donned the eye-tracking headset. Through trial gaze locations, an assistant calibrated the equipment to ensure it was capturing data precisely. The participant read one text onscreen and answered the multiple choice comprehension questions, then followed the same procedure for the second text. After completing the readings, the participant filled out the rating scale to provide evaluative responses about the authors of the selections. In addition, the eye-tracker produced two visual

records: a movie and a snapshot, both capturing eye movements in relationship to text. The movie showed the complete gaze trail in all its complexities, while the snapshot simplified the gaze trail information, indicating regressions as straight lines and identifying fixations of at least 200 ms.

Analysis

The eye-tracking records of each subject were analyzed independently. Each visual record captured on CD was slowed 32 times using Windows Movie Maker. This procedure enabled us, through multiple viewings of the records, to segment the data for analysis.[1] Results of the eye tracking analysis were then mapped against the results of the questionnaire and the authorial persona surveys.

Results

Effects of Errors on Reading. The data showed a positive correlation between the number of fixations per text and the length of those fixations. Those readers who had fewer fixations also had shorter fixations. Since more fixations meant longer fixations, an even stronger correlation existed between the number of fixations per text and elapsed reading time. All seven subjects made more fixations of longer duration in the error-laden texts than in the error-free texts, resulting in longer readings times when errors were present.

The gaze trails on the non-error texts revealed considerable difference among the normal or regular reading techniques of the subjects, but marked consistency within each subject's behavior. Some subjects read consistently in a linear fashion, left to right, along each line, regressing, most often, back along the lines. Others moved through the text in less linear ways, moving backwards and forwards, fixating on words or clusters of words, yet behaving consistently in this fashion.

The gaze trails for the error-laden texts revealed similar patterns. For example, readers demonstrated markedly different kinds of regression behaviors from each other in response to the errors, yet the regression patterns were consistently different from the reader's typical reading technique. In the case of each reader, therefore, we were able to identify behaviors in response to errors that deviated from the subject's usual reading technique and that we believe provide evidence of perturbation. Most importantly, in almost all cases, eye movements took on perturbed or deviant behaviors at the same points in the error texts: at the point of most, though not all, of the errors.

---

1. In much of reading research, a fixation is defined as a pause of 200 ms. or more, but fixations can range anywhere from under 100 ms. to over 500 ms.; "readers typically acquire the visual information necessary for reading during the first 50-70 ms. of a fixation" (Rayner, "Eye Movements [. . .] 20 Years" 378). Thus, applications of this methodology can adjust fixation points to briefer durations in order to register more fixations for faster readers.

In addition to comparisons of the gaze trails (including fixations and regressions) of each subject while reading error-free and error-laden texts, this perturbation could be identified in the length of fixations on specific errors as a function of the subject's average fixation length. For example, Subject 5, who we will call "Lindsay," had an average fixation length (>200 ms.) of 318 ms. Her fixation length at the point of the sentence fragment in *Disney-error* was 946 ms., or approximately three times her normal fixation length. Other errors that also caused greater fixation length included the subject/verb error (706 ms.) and apostrophe (429 ms.). Yet for Lindsay, there was no discernible fixation on the pronoun or dangling modifier errors. Similarly, "Sarah" (Subject 7) had an average fixation length of 328 ms. In *Cats-error*, she fixated for 2330 ms. on the fragment and 766 ms. on the dangling modifier, but there were negligible fixations on the subject/verb agreement and spelling errors.

As illustrated in Table 1, activity around specific errors, as defined by longer fixations on or regressions to the site of the error, was consistently present for sentence fragment errors, dangling modifiers, and apostrophes in both error-laden texts. In contrast, only one subject's reading seems to have been affected by the spelling error or subject/verb agreement error in either text. The pronoun error shows more mixed results.

Table 1							
Summary of Readers' Ocular Reactions to Error							
Subject	Frag	S/V	Pron	Dang	Apos	Spel	
1	✓		✓	✓	✓		
2	✓		✓	✓	✓		
3	✓				✓		
4	✓		✓	✓			
5	✓	✓			✓		
6	✓		✓	✓	✓		
7	✓			✓	✓	✓	

One of the most important findings of this pilot study, then, concerned the relative effect of specific errors on subjects' reading. In spite of their usual parallel treatment in writing textbooks and classroom instruction, the errors embedded into the sample texts did not

> ## "the errors embedded into the sample texts did not affect readers uniformly"

affect readers uniformly; rather, for this cohort of subjects, some errors appeared to be more egregious than others. If an error caused confusion in meaning or difficulty for linguistic processing, readers reacted at an ocular level. If an error was present in a text, but the reader had no trouble disambiguating meaning, or if it did not affect text processing, then there was no ocular interference. The passages containing the spelling error were apparently unambiguous to most readers, in spite of the fact that they were homophonous and could be misread phonologically (led/lead). The sentence fragment, on the other hand, caused marked interference that was observable in the gaze trails of all subjects.

Though we believe that the eye movements show evidence of perturbation in text processing, their absence in relation to a particular error does not mean that the error goes unnoticed. An error may have a negative effect on a reader's image of an author, for instance, without significant evidence of a disruption in the reading process.

Effects of Errors on Comprehension. Scores on the multiple choice comprehension measure were approximately the same. Readers of both versions of the *Disney* text answered all the questions correctly. Readers of both versions of *Cats* repeatedly missed three questions, those coincident with passages containing a fragment, a dangling modifier, and a spelling error in the *Cats—error* text. Because readers of *Cats—no error* had comprehension difficulties with the same passages, the errors probably had little or no relationship to the comprehension problems.

Effects of Errors on Writer's Persona. Readers of the error-laden texts gave more negative ratings on all but two items ("sarcastic/sincere" and "caring/uncaring") on the binary adjective scale, with particularly strong differences on the items "careless/careful" and "not a detail/detail person." Differences in the "sarcastic/sincere" item for *Cats* were negligible. *Disney-error* received a slightly higher rating on the "caring/uncaring" item, perhaps because it is not clear whether this item refers to the author's errors or attitude toward the subject. Although it is impossible to know what specific aspects of the texts influenced subjects' judgments about the writers, we believe that the correlation between eye-movement evidence of perturbation in the error-full texts and the stronger negative judgments of the writers of those texts suggest that processing difficulties or frustrations caused by error may contribute to readers' construction of or trust in the writer's ethos and abilities, a possibility that, through further confirming research, could validate a social-constructivist approach to error in classroom instruction and textbook presentation (see Anson, "Response").

Conclusion

Through the use of the eye tracker, this modest pilot study detected processing consequences related to errors. Readers exhibited different gaze trail patterns when reading texts with and without errors, took longer to read the error-laden texts as a consequence of making more (and longer) fixations and regressions, and judged authors' personas more negatively when errors were present than when they were absent. These specific findings suggest some general principles to be tested further through more robust eye-tracking studies with larger numbers of subjects.

- Reading time is generally longer for texts that contain errors than when these same texts error-free.
- Certain errors may cause more gaze disruption than others, although the reasons (syntactic, semantic, lexical, and the like) need further research.
- Perhaps because of the need or tendency to "repair" problems in text processes (resulting in longer fixations and more regressions), even serious errors may not necessarily affect recollection of content; the reader does not necessarily recall the content of an error-laden text any differently than s/he does the same text error-free.
- Readers are more likely to have a negative image of writers who produce error-laden texts, but this may depend on the types, nature, and frequency of the errors and their effects (causing processing difficulties, for example, as opposed to marking the writer as uninformed or unskilled).

Implications of Eye-Tracking for Error Research

Our pilot study suggests several fruitful extensions of eye-tracking methodology for the study of error perception and the social construction of error. First, it is likely that the perception of error is influenced by other textual and contextual factors, such as the writer's persona, the location and types of initial errors in the text, and the genre and physical location of the text itself (e.g., an Internet article vs. a printed chapter in a scholarly book). In the field of written communication, with a few exceptions, scholars of error have tended to view it monolithically or abstractly, disregarding the ways in which errors affect readers depending on other factors such as goals and contexts for reading. Using eye-tracking methodology, it is possible to compare the

> "scholars of error have tended to view it monolithically or abstractly"

effects of specific errors on readers when they are reading "natural" texts for the purposes of learning something or being entertained with the effects of these same errors in student texts read by teachers for the purpose of response and/or evaluation.

Our pilot study showed that there is a varied relationship between the presence or absence of error and the reader's construction of the writer's persona and perception of ability. Yet we know almost nothing about the social effects of error—what readers *make* of error when they encounter it, how it affects the construction of broader discursive and rhetorical features such as the writer's ethos, and what role error plays in that construction relative to other variables such as word choice, sophistication of ideas, and the like. When paired with other methodologies such as discourse-based interviews or read-aloud protocols, eye tracking can show us the relationship between frustrations in processing (as measured by excessive fixations or backtracking) and the cumulative impressions readers create about the writer.

The pilot study also showed that certain kinds of errors appear to be responsible for more fixation/regression activity than others. This finding suggests that it may be possible to create an error hierarchy based on the severity of processing effects, effects on comprehension, effects on the construction of the writer's persona, or combinations of these—a hierarchy, that is, based not on what errors teachers mark on student papers or on what errors readers say bother them the most, but on the actual effects of errors on reading. But substantially more research is needed across a much wider range of readers, texts, and contexts in order to discover whether such a hierarchy is statistically possible to create. In addition, variations in the effects of error suggest the need to consider subject background more fully (education, literacy experience/ability, etc.).

The psycholinguistic effects of errors may also vary as a function of textual difficulty, reading role, context, and prior experience with error. The pilot study used simple, journalistic-style stories written at a general reading level for a broad, public audience. When subjects read far more difficult texts for which they may lack certain schemas, or texts that have highly complex syntax, do the resulting constraints on processing cause readers to overlook errors they might otherwise notice or be affected by in simpler texts? In addition to textual difficulty, are readers affected by their knowledge of the context in which a piece of writing appeared? This question is creatively illustrated in an essay by Joseph Williams titled "The Phenomenology of Error." Williams ensured that the final essay, published in *College Composition and Communication,* contained a number of grammatical and other errors. Because to its readers the article is, in Mary Louise Pratt's terms, "preselected"—that is, sanctioned by a complex editorial and publishing process—they are not expecting the errors (117-118). When this fact is disclosed at the end, they discover to their surprise that they overlooked the errors. If error recognition, measured by percentage of errors noticed, is more

prevalent when teachers read student work than when they read professional work, such results could call into question the relationship between pedagogical treatment of writing and how readers and writers behave beyond schooling. In addition, certain roles and "life themes" (Schank and Abelson)—broad schemas readers bring to all reading based on their occupations and interests—could explain variations in readers' responses to errors. English teachers might respond quite differently to the presence of error than lawyers or doctors, or these roles might influence the nature and degree of error recognition based on varying significances relating to broader professional concerns. In addition to such role-influenced behaviors, do individual readers bring idiosyncrasies to texts in the realm of error, perhaps hyper-noticing errors that are the most irksome to them? When accompanied by demographic and personal information from case studies, eye-tracking research can help us to explore these questions more fully across a range of populations.

In the realm of pedagogy, eye-tracking studies of error also hold promise for a much fuller understanding of teacher behavior. Extending the research methods of Paulson, Alexander, and Armstrong, researchers could use eye tracking to capture the effects of error on teachers reading student papers and then study the ways in which teachers communicate with the students—through marginal and end comments or other means—about their writing, focusing especially on how or whether they refer to the errors or their effects. Discourse-based interviews might also discover which of the errors consciously affected the teachers and which remained tacit.

Applications of Eye-Tracking Research in Composition

Based on the explorations described above, as well as the extensive existing research in other areas of language study, we believe that eye tracking holds much promise for further investigations of the relationships between reading and writing. That we could find only one study of writing in the United States that employed this research tool in rhetoric and composition is not surprising in the context of the social turn and a growing aversion, throughout the late 1980s and 1990s, to the assumptions of positivism, behaviorism, and empiricism (see Fulkerson). That this lone study has appeared so recently in one of the field's premier research journals also suggests to us a newly emerging paradigm that allows for the mixing of qualitative and quantitative inquiry, that recognizes the heuristic contributions of clinical and empirical research for broader and more contextually varied studies, and that values the principles of replication, aggregation, and support from data (Haswell) in the creation and mediation of knowledge in composition studies.

Beyond the study of error, eye tracking offers many further possibilities for research on the processes of written language production and reception. Paulson, Alexander, and Arm-

strong's interesting findings that students tend not to focus their oral responses on those features of their peers' texts that they most attended to bears replication and extended exploration. Eye tracking can give us precise information about what students are doing when they read both texts-in-progress and published texts. Such research could be especially useful in furthering our understanding of students' revision processes by revealing patterns in their rereading and rescanning of their own texts and then considering those patterns against specific changes at global and local levels in students' emerging drafts. In addition, further work on composing processes can extend existing research on the relationship between the words writers produce in real time (through keystroke logging or digital capture of pen movements) and what they are looking at as they produce these words (through eye tracking; see Alamargot, Chesnet, Dansac, and Ross; Holmqvist, Holsanova, Johansson and Strömqvist).

In the area of writing from sources, eye tracking could be used to study the relationships between the processes students use to read and examine source work and what they do with that material in their own writing. Such research could contrast expert and novice practices in the integration of external material into one's own writing in order to create more effective pedagogies and interventions in the teaching of writing.

Finally, we envision the use of eye tracking in studies of reference materials, instructional guides, and the like. We know little about what students do, for example, when they consult a handbook or other resource in order to make a decision about an ongoing draft. What presentation of textbook material is most effective, based on examinations of students' reading processes and subsequent development of their writing? When students consult material in a handbook, what do they pay attention to? How easily do they process advice and information about language and writing in the materials created for the purpose of helping them improve their work, and what do they subsequently do with this information?

The use of eye tracking, alone or in combination with other research methods, may help us to explore these and many other as yet unanswered questions in the study of writing and reading. With the increasing sophistication of eye-tracking devices, their lowering costs and ease of use, and their potential to be paired with other data-gathering equipment or techniques, we believe that they hold much potential for continued scholarship in written composition.

Texts With and Without Errors

Disney Without Errors

Hong Kong Disneyland, the second Disney venture into Asia, is known to some in the theme park business as Disney Lite. At a little more than 300 acres, it's far smaller than Disney parks in the United States, Japan and France, with fewer of the elaborate signature rides.

But in one area, the Hong Kong park more than holds its own: its long lines.

In several weeks of trial runs leading up to the official opening last week, parkgoers complained of waits of over two hours for some attractions. One visitor said that in 12 hours at the park, he went on only four rides.

The first few weeks of operation are the worst time to visit any theme park, so many problems were no doubt attributable to the newness of the place and its employees.

Still, the waits led some Hong Kong Disney officials to urge Disney to reduce the planned number of daily customers, currently 30,000. Further, the delays sparked cultural complaints in Internet discussion groups. Some Hong Kong residents said that mainland Chinese visitors, who pushed and shoved because they were unaccustomed to orderly waiting, made the problems worse.

There are, in fact, cultural differences in how people behave while in line, according to social scientists and park designers. Those differences have even led to physical changes in so-called queuing areas at some parks.

Disney With Errors

Hong Kong Disneyland, the second Disney venture into Asia, is known to some in the theme park business as Disney Lite. At a little more than 300 acres, it's far smaller than Disney parks in the United States, Japan and France. **Containing fewer of the elaborate signature rides.**

But in one area, the Hong Kong park more than **hold** its own: its long lines.

In several weeks of trial runs leading up to the official opening last week, park employees observed people waiting in line over two hours for some attractions. Park employees said that in 12 hours at the park, **they** went on only four rides.

The first few weeks of operation are the worst time to visit any theme park, so many problems were no doubt attributable to the newness of the place and its employees.

Still, the waits led some Hong Kong Disney officials to urge Disney to reduce the planned number of daily customers, currently 30,000. Further, the delays sparked cultural complaints in Internet discussion groups. **Not accustomed to orderly waiting, Internet**

posts from Hong Kong residents said that mainland Chinese visitors pushed and shoved and made the problems worse.

There are, in fact, cultural differences in how people behave while in line, according to social **scientists'** and park designers. Those differences have even **lead** to physical changes in so-called queuing areas at some parks.

Cats Without Errors

The domesticated cat, a descendent of the African wildcat, is seen by some in the feline world as a miniature Simba. At no more than an armful, it's far smaller than its wild animal cousins in Africa, Asia and North America, but with practically all of the same genes.

But in one area, the domesticated cat more than outpaces its wild counterpart: its sociability.

In casual observations of barn cats spontaneously forming social groups, observers took note of females cooperating in rearing their young. An observer said that in one colony of barn cats, he often saw mothers nursing even unrelated kittens.

The first few weeks of a kitten's life are the most crucial in creating mutual trust, so many antisocial problems are no doubt attributable to lack of early interaction with humans or other cats. In fact, this point led scientists to test how long it would take kittens to approach a seated person from across a room, about eight feet away. Not surprisingly, results showed differences based on cats' early socialization. Scientists said that some kittens, which had not established friendly relations with human beings because they had not been handled till seven weeks old, made the trip more slowly than those socialized earlier.

There are, in fact, marked differences in how domestic cats become sociable while in their kittenhood, according to scientists and pet owners. Those differences have even led to practical changes in training cats by breeders.

Cats With Errors

The domesticated cat, a descendent of the African wildcat, is seen by some in the feline world as a miniature Simba. At no more than an armful, it's far smaller than its wild animal cousins in Africa, Asia and North America. **However, having practically all of the same genes.**

But in one area, the domesticated **cat** more than **outpace** its wild counterpart: its sociability.

In casual observations of barn cats spontaneously forming social groups, observers took note of females cooperating in rearing their young. Researchers said that in one set of observations, **they** often nursed even unrelated kittens.

The first few weeks of a kitten's life are the most crucial in creating mutual trust, so

many antisocial problems are no doubt attributable to lack of early interaction with humans or other cats. In fact, this point led scientists to test how long it would take kittens to approach a seated person from across a room, about eight feet away. Not surprisingly, results showed differences based on cats' early socialization. **Not having established friendly relations with human beings, scientists** said that kittens who had not been handled till seven weeks old made the trip more slowly than those socialized earlier.

There are, in fact, marked differences in how domestic cats become sociable while in their kittenhood, according to scientists' and pet owners. Those differences have even **lead** to practical changes in training cats by breeders.

Appendix B
Comprehension Questions
(Glossed to Type of Error at Site of Information)

Disney

Question 1 [fragment]
How many elaborate signature rides does Hong Kong Disney have compared to other Disney parks?
☐ More ☐ Fewer ☐ Same as

Question 2 [subj/verb agreement]
In what area does Hong Kong Disney hold its own?
☐ Lines ☐ Number of rides ☐ Types of attractions

Question 3 [unclear pronoun reference]
In 12 hours, how many rides did visitors go on?
☐ Only 4 ☐ More than 4 ☐ All of the rides

Question 4 [dangling modifier]
Who pushed and shoved because they were unaccustomed to orderly waiting?
☐ Mainland Chinese visitors ☐ Hong Kong residents ☐ New employees

Question 5 [incorrect apostrophe]
Who believes there are cultural differences in how people behave while they're in line?
☐ Social scientists ☐ People in queing areas ☐ Mainland Chinese visitors

Cats

Question 1 [fragment]

How many of the same genes does the domestic cat have compared to the African wildcat?

☐ Practically all   ☐ All   ☐ Not many

Question 2 [subj/verb agreement]

In what area does the domestic cat outpace its counterpart?

☐ Sociability   ☐ Gene pool   ☐ Rearing its young

Question 3 [unclear pronoun reference]

In one colony of barn cats, what did an observer see?

☐ Mothers nursing unrelated kittens

☐ Cats spontaneously forming social groups

☐ Mother cats rearing their young

Question 4 [dangling modifier]

Who established friendly relationships because they had been handled earlier?

☐ 7-week old kittens   ☐ Kittens younger than 7 weeks   ☐ Kittens older than 7 weeks

Question 5 [incorrect apostrophe]

Who believes there are marked differences in how domestic cats learn sociability while they're in kittenhood?

☐ Scientists   ☐ Cat breeders   ☐ Seated people in experiments

Appendix C
Author Rating Scale

How do you rate the writing ability of the author of *Disney?*

☐ Awful ☐ Not very good ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Great

How do you rate the writing ability of the author of *Cats?*

☐ Awful ☐ Not very good ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Great

Please rate the author of *Disney* on the following dimensions. Circle the appropriate number between the two words that best matches your impression of the author:

hasty	2	1	0	1	2	conscientious
careless	2	1	0	1	2	careful
uncaring	2	1	0	1	2	caring
uninformed	2	1	0	1	2	informed
faulty thinker	2	1	0	1	2	good thinker
not a detail person	2	1	0	1	2	a detail person
poor communicator	2	1	0	1	2	good communicator
poorly educated	2	1	0	1	2	well-educated
sarcastic	2	1	0	1	2	sincere

Please rate the author of *Cats* on the following dimensions. Circle the appropriate number between the two words that best matches your impression of the author:

hasty	2	1	0	1	2	conscientious
careless	2	1	0	1	2	careful
uncaring	2	1	0	1	2	caring
uninformed	2	1	0	1	2	informed
faulty thinker	2	1	0	1	2	good thinker
not a detail person	2	1	0	1	2	a detail person
poor communicator	2	1	0	1	2	good communicator
poorly educated	2	1	0	1	2	well-educated
sarcastic	2	1	0	1	2	sincere

Works Cited

Alamargot, Dennis, David Chesnet, Christoph Dansac, and Christine Ros. "Eye and Pen: A New Device to Study Reading During Writing." *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers* 38.2 (2006): 287-299.

Andersson, Bodil, Johan Dahl, Kenneth Holmqvist, Jana Holsanova, Victoria Johansson, Henrich Karlsson, Sven Strömqvist, Sylvia Tufvesson, and Åsa Wengelin. "Combining Keystroke Logging with Eye Tracking." *Writing and Digital Media*. Ed. Luuk Van Waes, Marielle Leiten & Christine Neuwirth. North Holland: Elsevier, 2006. 166-172.

Anson, Chris M. (forthcoming). "The Intelligent Design of Writing Programs: Reliance on Belief or a Future of Evidence?" *WPA: Writing Program Administration.*

Anson, Chris M. "Response and the Social Construction of Error." *Assessing Writing* 7 (2000): 5-21.

Anson, Chris M., and Robert A. Schwegler. *The Longman Handbook for Writers and Readers*. New York: Longman, 2005.

Beason, Larry. "Ethos and Error: How Business People React to Errors." *College Composition and Communication* 53 (2001): 33-64.

Campana, Arturo, Alessandro Duci, Orsola Gambini, and Silvio Scarone. "An Artificial Neural Network that Uses Eye-Tracking Performance to Identify Patients with Schizophrenia." *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 24 (1999): 789-799.

Chapman, J. E. "Use of an Eye-Operated Computer System in Locked-In Syndrome." *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual International Conference on Technology and Persons with Disabilities,* Los Angeles, CA, 1991.

Charney, Davida. "Empiricism is Not a Four-Letter Word." *College Composition and Communication* 47.4 (1996): 567-593.

Connors, Robert J., and Andrea A. Lunsford. "Frequency of Formal Errors in Current College Writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle Do Research." *College Composition and Communication* 39 (1988): 395-409.

Duchowski, Andrew T. *Eye Tracking Methodology: Theory and Practice.* London: Springer, 2003.

Durst, Russel. "Research in Writing, Postsecondary Education, 1984-2003." *L1- Educational Studies in Language and Literature* 6.2 (2006): 51-73.

Emig, Janet. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.

Everatt, John, Mark F. Bradshaw, and Paul B. Hibbard. "Individual Differences in Reading and Eye Movement Control." *Eye Guidance in Reading, Driving and Scene Perception*. Ed. Geoffrey Underwood. Oxford: Elsevier, 1998. 223-242.

Everatt John, and Geoffrey Underwood. "Individual Differences in Reading Subprocesses: Relationships Between Reading Ability, Lexical Access, and Eye Movement Control." *Language and Speech* 37 (1994): 283-297.

Flower, Linda S., Helen Swarts, and John R. Hayes. "Designing Protocol Studies of the Writing Process: An Introduction." *New Directions in Composition Research.* Ed. Richard Beach and Lillian S. Bridwell. New York: Guilford, 1984. 53-71.

Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century." *College Composition and Communication* 56 (2005): 654-687.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory.* Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1979.

Hairston, Maxine. "Not All Errors are Created Equal: Nonacademic Readers in the Professions Respond to Lapses in Usage." *College English* 43 (1981): 794-806.

Haswell, Richard. "NCTE/CCCC's Recent War on Scholarship." *Written Communication* 22 (2005): 198-223.

Hayes, John R., and Linda S. Flower. "Uncovering Cognitive Processes in Writing: An Introduction to Protocol Analysis." *Research on Writing: Principles and Methods.* Ed. Peter Mosenthal, Lynne Tamor, and Sean A. Walmsley. New York: Longman, 1983.

Henderson, John M., and Fernanda Ferreira. *The Interface of Language, Vision, and Action: Eye Movements and the Visual World.* New York: Grove, 2004.

Holmqvist, Kenneth, Jana Holsanova, Victoria Johansson, and Sven Strömqvist. "Perceiving and Producing the Frog Story." *Perspectives on Language and Language Development.* Ed. Dorit Diskin Ravid and Hava Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2006.

Jacobson, Zachary, and Peter C. Dodwell. "Saccadic Eye Movements During Reading." *Brain and Language* 8.3 (1979): 303-314.

Jepson, Kevin. "CU Uses Eye Tracking Studies to Create More User-Friendly Website." *Credit Union Journal,* Nov. 2006. Retrieved on Sept. 20, 2007 from *http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_km3607/is_200611/ai_n16978998*

Jick, Todd D. "Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24 (1979): 602-611.

Just, Marcel Adam, and Patricia A. Carpenter. "A Theory of Reading: From Eye Fixations to Comprehension." *Psychological Review* 87 (1980): 329-354.

Juzwik, Mary M., Svjetlana Curcic, Kimberly Wolbers, Kathleen D. Moxley, Lisa M. Dimling, and Rebecca K. Shankland. "Writing Into the 21st Century: An Overview of Research on Writing, 1999-2004." *Written Communication* 23 (2006): 451-476.

Lunsford, Andrea A., and Karen Lunsford. "The Top Twenty." Retrieved on July 5, 2007, from *http://bcs.bedfordstmartins.com/lunsford/Lunsford_TopTwenty.aspx*

McConkie, George W., Thomas W. Hogaboam, Gary S. Wolverton, David Zola, and Peter A. Lucas. "Toward the Use of Eye Movements in the Study of Language Processing." *Discourse Processes* 2 (1979): 157-77.

Meyer, Antje S. "The Use of Eye Tracking in Studies of Sentence Generation." *The Interface of Language, Vision and Action: Eye Movements and the Visual World.* Ed. Fernanda Ferreira and John M. Henderson. London: Routledge, 2004.

North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

Odell, Lee, Dixie Goswami, and Anne Herrington. "The Discourse-Based Interview: Procedure and Rationale." *Research on Writing: Principles and Methods.* Ed. Peter Mosenthal, Lynne Tamor, and Sean A. Walmsley. New York: Longman, 1983. 221-236.

Patrick, Michelle D., Glenda Carter, and Eric N. Wiebe. "Visual Representations of DNA Replication: Middle Grades Students' Perceptions and Interpretations." *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 14 (2005): 353-365.

Paulson, Eric J., Jonathan Alexander, and Sonya Armstrong. "Peer Review Re-viewed: Investigating the Juxtaposition of Composition Students' Eye Movements and Peer-Review Processes." *Research in the Teaching of English* 41.3 (2007): 304-35.

Pollatsek, Alexander, and Keith Rayner. "Eye Movements and Lexical Access in Reading." *Comprehension Processes in Reading.* Ed. David A. Balota, Giovanni B. Flores d'Arcais, and Keith Rayner. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990. 143-63.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Toward a Speech-Act Theory of Literary Discourse.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1977.

Pynte, Joel. "Lexical Control of Within-word Eye Movements." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 22.4 (1996): 958-69.

Rayner, Keith. "Foveal and Parafoveal Cues in Reading." *Attention and Performance VII.* Ed. Jean Requin. New York: Erlbaum, 1978.

Rayner, Keith. "Eye Movements in Reading and Information Processing: 20 Years of Research." *Psychological Bulletin* 124.3 (1998): 372-422.

Rayner, Keith. "Eye Movements in Reading: Recent Developments." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2.3 (1993): 81-85.

Rayner, Keith. "Eye Movements in Reading and Information Processing." *Psychological Bulletin,* 85.3 (1978): 618-660.

Rayner, Keith, and Alexander Pollatsek. *The Psychology of Reading.* New York: Prentice, 1989.

Rayner, Keith, Sara C. Sereno, Robin K. Morris, A. Rene Schmauder, and Charles Clifton, Jr. "Eye Movements and On-line Language Comprehension Processes." *Language & Cognitive Processes* 4.3-4 (1989): 1-50.

Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977.

Slykhuis, David A., Eric N. Wiebe, and Len A. Annetta. "Eye-tracking Students' Attention to PowerPoint Photographs in a Science Education Setting." *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 14.5-6 (2005): 509-520.

Smith, Frank. *Reading without Nonsense.* 4th Edition. New York: Teachers College, 2006.

Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read.* 6th ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1996.

Sullivan, Kirk, and Eva Lindgren, eds. *Computer Key-Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications.* New York: Elsevier, 2007. Studies in Writing, vol. 18.

Tomlinson, Barbara. (1984). "Talking about the Composing Process: The Limitations of Retrospective Accounts." *Written Communication* 1.4 (1984): 429-45.

Underwood, Geoffrey, Alison Hubbard, and Howard Wilkinson. "Eye Fixations Predict Reading Comprehension: The Relationships Between Reading Skill, Reading Speed, and Visual Inspection." *Language and Speech* 33.1 (1990): 69-81.

Williams, Joseph M. "The Phenomenology of Error." *College Composition and Communication* 32.2 (1981): 152-168.

Chris M. Anson *is University Distinguished Professor of English and Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, where he helps faculty in nine colleges to use writing and speaking in the service of students' learning and improved communication. A scholar of writing, language, and literacy, he has published 15 books and over 90 articles and book chapters, and has spoken or run faculty-development workshops across the U.S. and in 18 other countries. www.home.earthlink.net/~theansons/Portcover.html*

Susan Rashid Horn *is an Assistant Professor of English at Clayton State University, where she specializes in Rhetoric and Composition and is the Director of the Writers' Studio 224. She teaches courses in writing for non-profits, tutor training, ethnographies and oral histories, as well as first-year composition. Writing Centers and reader reaction to error are her particular research interests. She presents regularly in these areas at CCCC and at other composition conferences.*

Robert A. Schwegler

Robert A. Schwegler is Professor in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric at the University of Rhode Island. He is the author of numerous articles in rhetoric and composition studies and co-editor of the award-winning collection, Coming of Age: The Advanced Curriculum in Writing. *He has also written or co-written a number of textbooks, including* The Longman Handbook for Writers and Readers *(with Chris Anson). He is particularly interested in the economies of composition instruction and curriculum development and in the emergence of rhetoric and composition studies as a discipline.*

Pamela Mason-Egan

Revaluing Readers and Reading in a College Support Program

Introduction

I RECENTLY HAD A CONVERSATION ABOUT READING WITH ONE OF MY STUDENTS, JASON, a charismatic, 18 year-old, college freshman from New Jersey. He was diagnosed with a language-based learning disability in the fifth grade and had received academic support services ever since. Jason was a freshman enrolled in the PALS program (Program for Academic Learning Skills) at Hofstra University during the fall of 2005. I asked Jason to describe himself as a reader, and he said, "Horrible . . . Lost . . . Like a lost dog." I then asked him to describe his feelings about reading, and he stated, "I hate reading . . . Reading doesn't like me and I don't like it." Over the last 16 years or so, I have heard many of my college freshmen who had been classified as Learning Disabled (LD) say similar things about their abilities as readers. And, in addition to doubts about their abilities as readers and negative attitudes toward reading, many worry that they will not be successful college students. Jason also talked about the negative expectations placed on him. He said, "They stereotype and they label you almost as like you are second best, because you have that title [LD]. You're not expected to achieve what others [non-LD] can achieve."

It is estimated that almost 67% of high school students diagnosed as LD are planning to attend college. As a result, approximately 3.5% of college freshman are classified as LD (Scott et al.). The executive director of the Association on Handicapped Student Service Programs in Postsecondary Education (AHSSPPE) states that the "population of individuals with learning disabilities is the largest contingent of students with disabilities being served on American campuses" (qtd. in Morris and Leuenberger 355). For the majority of those college students, the classification is the diagnosis of a language-based learning disability, in other words, a "reading disability" (RD). The terms "learning disability" and "reading disability" are used interchangeably in the field of special education because the majority of students (75%-80%) classified as LD have been diagnosed with a "specific reading disability" or dyslexia (Rath and Royer 354-355; Gaffney et al. 119-120). Difficulties with reading, spelling, and writing, as well as problems with organization, time management, and self-esteem, are the "most common deficits in adults with LD" (Vogel and Adelman) in post-secondary education.

Other issues surrounding the LD classification, including social and emotional problems, anxiety, depression, motivational issues, low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, low confidence levels, and cycles of repeated failure, have been documented in children and adults diagnosed as LD/RD (McNulty 363; Wright-Strawderman and Lindsey 262-263; Elbaum and Vaughn; Linnenbrink and Pintrich 128; McCabe and Margolis 241; Stone and May 370). In addition, students diagnosed as LD/RD often view their own academic and reading self-concept as significantly weaker than those of their peers (Stone and May 370).

Students' pessimism about their abilities as readers certainly affects their motivation to read and often becomes "the most powerful obstacle that teachers face in helping those students to become better readers" (McCabe and Margolis 45). Many students enter the PALS program with low self-efficacy, believing that they cannot learn or that they do not read well no matter how hard they try. It is not uncommon for a PALS student to say, "My problem is reading . . . I can't do it . . . I'm dyslexic." For teachers who work with students who struggle with reading, enhancing self-efficacy is an important goal.

In addition to the academic and emotional issues of classified college students, "adult readers who seek support from remedial reading centers [including college support programs] often possess misconceptions about the nature of the reading process and their accomplishments relative to that process" (Marek 51). Instructors not only need to address students' beliefs about themselves as readers and learners, but they must attend to the beliefs students have about the reading process itself. Unfortunately, many students believe that reading is sounding out words and that good reading means getting all of the words on the page correct (Marek 51). That belief is the basis of how students actively approach reading tasks. Bartholomae and Petrosky state: "Our students are bound by the model of reading they carry to the act of reading. These stories of reading are what a teacher must attend to, not isolated reading 'skills'" (18-19).

Kenneth Goodman uses the term "readers in trouble" to refer to those students who are not doing as well as they think (or someone else thinks) they should be doing in the development of reading proficiency:

> The common denominator among such readers is that they have become their own worst enemies. They have acquired a view that the world is populated by two kinds of people: those who can read and those who cannot, those who can learn and those who cannot. They believe that if they can just learn the phonics rules, just get enough word attacks, or just master the skills, they could do what good readers [and learners] do easily and well. However, they know they cannot because something is wrong with them; they just do not learn like normal people. (421)

Goodman believes that the key to helping "readers in trouble"—and I believe this would also

benefit college students labeled LD/RD—is to "help them revalue themselves as language users and learners, and revalue the reading process as an interactive, constructive language process" (421) and not just "the sounding-out of words," which many students believe to be the act of reading. Several other goals of revaluing are to support learners in risk-taking, self-monitoring, and confidence-building.

Overview of this Study

This qualitative study began several years ago when I first became interested in critically examining the instructional practices of the college support program I had been working in for the past 16 years. I was an instructor in the Program for Academic Learning Skills (PALS), which is considered a comprehensive support program (providing literacy skills instruction and academic accommodations) for students who have been diagnosed with language-based learning disabilities. PALS is specifically designed as a skills-development program (reading skills, writing skills, study skills, etc.), utilizing one-to-one instructional sessions and small group workshops for university freshmen.

In an effort to find a new way to support my struggling readers, during the fall 2005 semester, I implemented a reader and reading revaluing protocol using Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA), as proposed by Yetta Goodman and Ann Marek, with several of my PALS students. RMA is an assessment and instructional tool that involves students in a process whereby they listen to and analyze their reading in an effort to gain insight into how they process language. One of the procedures of RMA is the analysis of miscues. Miscues are considered unexpected responses the reader produces that change, disrupt, or enhance the meaning of a text. Miscues are chosen for analysis by either the reader or the teacher. The discussion that follows is directed "toward understanding why certain miscues were made, what they reveal about the reader and reading in general, and how this knowledge can lead toward gains in reading skill" (Paulson, "The Discourse" 114). The idea is that students will gain more control over their reading process and become more effective readers on their own. Instructors use knowledge gained through RMA to support students as they develop more effective reading strategies, as well as to revalue their abilities as readers.

According to Goodman, Watson, and Burke, the most important use of Miscue Analysis is to help teachers and students gain insight into the reading process (3-4). The information gained from Miscue Analysis allows instructors to plan individualized reading instruction that builds on a particular student's strengths rather than focuses solely on his/her weaknesses. I believe that this strength-based pedagogy can be very helpful when working with classified students because it allows both the student and the teacher to move beyond the limitations of a deficit focus.

Utilizing RMA not only can help challenge the negative reading self-concept that is so prevalent in college students labeled RD, but it is also a tool that helps students recognize the useful reading strategies they already employ. Analyzing and discussing miscues with students helps them build on the productive reading strategies they already possess and to develop new ones to aid in improving their reading skills.

Brief Overview of RMA Process

To begin, the teacher/researcher establishes a rapport with the student and then conducts a reading interview. I used the Burke Interview Modified for Older Readers (Goodman and Marek 213) in order to acquire information regarding the student's literacy history and view of him/herself as a reader. After the reading interview, the student reads a suitable yet challenging and unfamiliar short story or article aloud and unaided. The teacher/researcher marks the reader's miscues on a typescript of the story or article the student is reading according to one of the procedures in the *Reading Miscue Inventory* (Goodman, Watson, and Burke). Once the student finishes reading, he/she is asked to retell the story. Both the reading and retelling are recorded to ensure accuracy. Shortly after the initial reading, the student and teacher/researcher meet again to begin the revaluing/RMA procedure, which involves the reader and the teacher listening to, thinking about, and talking about the miscues the student made during the initial read-aloud.

> "helps them build on the productive reading strategies they already possess and to develop new ones"

Revaluing with Jason:

My work with Jason began in early September 2005. It was his first semester at the university, and he was excited and nervous. When I first approached him with the idea of participating in my study, he jumped at the opportunity. He told me that reading was a big concern and that he didn't think he would be able to keep up with it in college. He said, "This is the real deal . . . I really need to read." I explained that we would be meeting on a weekly basis to "work on his reading" using RMA. I explained that he would be reading several short stories aloud, along with a retelling of the stories, and that he would be tape-recorded. After each of his readings, I would listen to the tape and follow along with the typescript documenting exactly how he read each text. I told him this would give us a lot of information about the way he read, and that we would use that information to figure out which reading strategies

worked for him and to discover and change the ones that were not. Jason felt that the RMA sessions would help him, so we scheduled two one-hour sessions each week for the entire semester. In total, Jason and I worked together for 13 sessions. We did not follow the typical RMA protocol in which Jason normally would have read approximately 10-12 texts in those 13 weeks. Instead, I chose five texts, including three short stories (one Jason read twice), a textbook chapter, and a magazine article. I had decided that I would let the sessions determine where we would go and when.

During our first session together, I interviewed Jason using the aforementioned Burke Interview Modified for Older Readers (Goodman and Marek 213). The interview with Jason explored his perceptions about his abilities as a reader, his attitudes toward reading, his reading strategies, his perceptions/beliefs of what "good reading" meant to him, his early reading experiences, and his reading habits. As the interview progressed and evolved, we explored some of his feelings about the experiences he'd had with the diagnostic procedures and subsequent reading remediation. Even though those questions are not part of the Burke Interview, I felt that it was important for me to have an understanding of Jason's experiences as a student diagnosed with a learning disability.

The first question I asked Jason was to explore the strategies that he normally used as he read.

Pamela: When you are reading and you come to something that gives you trouble, what do you do?

Jason: I usually read it over again . . . either read it over or skip it because it frustrates me . . . Either I'll read it over twice, sometimes three times, and if I don't understand something, I'll either ask somebody or just skip it. Usually, I just skip it because I'm usually reading alone. Yeah, I usually just skip it and then see if I can put it together with something else in the beginning, or I go back and read what was before and after that and see if I can get it then using context clues.

Jason used a strategy of re-reading text when he came to something that was confusing or did not make sense to him. This could have been a useful strategy when he was focusing in on an important point while reading a difficult text, but in Jason's case, his re-reading strategy may actually have been hindering his reading process. As I later found out, after listening to Jason's first reading for our RMA sessions, he re-read and repeated words and parts of sentences frequently, even when he read the sentences correctly. When Jason found his re-reading strategy frustrating, he moved to another strategy, such as "skip it and read on." This too could have been a productive strategy for him. Jason recognized that he didn't need to read every word on the page to comprehend the text. He also stated that he used the con-

> "Jason saw these strategies not as productive, but as weak attempts at reading that only caused him frustration."

text of the story to help him when he ran into trouble. Again, that is another productive strategy. However, at that point, Jason didn't see that his re-reading strategy, "skip it and read on," as well as using context cues, as useful. Jason saw these strategies not as productive, but as weak attempts at reading that only caused him frustration.

After a short discussion about Jason's use of reading strategies, we explored his beliefs about what constituted "good reading." What started to emerge was that Jason seemed to be in conflict regarding his beliefs about good reading, his beliefs about his own reading strategies, as well as his perceived competence as a reader. Unfortunately, he didn't believe that he possessed any positive traits as a reader.

Pamela: So, who is a good reader you know?

Jason: My best friend . . . He read *The Da Vinci Code*. He sat down and read it and that was that. He was interested . . . He doesn't like reading, but he was able to read it completely and tell me word for word what happened. I was really impressed. He liked it and understood it and that was not an easy book. It was amazing to me because that is very hard. I'm reading *Clockwork Orange* now and I can't get through the first five pages.

Pamela: So, getting back to your friend . . . Do you think that he ever comes to something that gives him trouble?

Jason: Oh, sure. I'm sure no one's perfect.

Pamela: So what do you think he does?

Jason: He uses a dictionary. I know that. He sits there and opens the dictionary and looks for a word. If he gets to a paragraph that he doesn't know . . . I really don't know.

Pamela: Do you think he uses any other strategies?

Jason: No . . . It seems like I'm the only one in this . . . I'm alone and I just don't know how to read. I don't understand it easily and if I do read, it takes me forever and I get very frustrated easily. So, I think that I am one of the very few. I don't think that my best friend has any problems.

Here, Jason revealed a little more about his beliefs. To begin, Jason felt that his friend was a good reader because he was "able to read it completely and tell me *word for word* what

happened." So, for Jason, good reading meant being able to decode and recall just about every word in a text; consequently, it was not surprising that he felt his "skip it and read on" strategy was not very good. I felt that Jason's belief that he should "get every word" was influencing his inefficient use of his "re-read" strategy. I believed that as he was reading and trying to recall every word on the page perfectly, Jason reinforced his memory by re-reading most of the text over again, regardless of the circumstances. While Jason read several of the texts used for our RMA sessions, he re-read text often, even if he read it correctly the first time around.

Another of my revaluing goals was to show Jason that he has strengths as a reader and that he uses many strategies that good readers use. One such goal was to show him that he used these good strategies naturally, although they may have contradicted the strategies he had been taught during his years of reading remediation, which focused more on slowly decoding letters and words than on constructing meaning. I believed he needed to understand that he was not alone, that all readers make miscues, and that he had the ability to make improvements.

I asked Jason to describe himself as a reader.

Pamela: Can you describe yourself as a reader?

Jason: Horrible . . . Lost . . . Like a lost dog. Umm, I can read and I can get the job done, but it takes me a long time. I'm not accurate and my speed is not very good. I'll read very fast and then very, very slow. I'm all over the place . . . I'm like a heart monitor going up and down.

Pamela: Is there anything that you would like to change about your reading?

Jason: Speed and accuracy . . .being able to read quicker and more efficiently and to be able to read for enjoyment, almost.

Jason saw himself as a reader in a negative light, feeling lost and frustrated. He recognized that he *could* read, but felt that the way he read was basically unacceptable. He made comments about his accuracy and speed, both of which he wanted to improve. His desire for speed and accuracy was not unreasonable; however, he had spent more than eight years in reading remediation by that point, which traditionally "emphasizes a need for readers to look more carefully at the letters in words and to read more slowly, more cautiously" (Goodman and Marek 23). In addition, many remedial reading students are expected to incorporate the isolated skills and strategies into new reading experiences. According to Sheila Macrine, the literacy activities in many remedial reading programs are inauthentic and mechanistic, which in turn may lead to slow, labored reading for those students enrolled (386). Constance Weaver states that "difficulty in reading coherent and connected text may often be instruc-

tionally induced, through an overemphasis on skills for identifying words in isolation" (23). So, it is possible that Jason's "reading disability" had been learned.

Jason and I moved on to the RMA sessions by the second week of September, when we began the slow process of exploration and insight into his reading process. Jason subsequently termed our sessions his "Reading Therapy." By the end of our sessions, I concurred. I tried to be compassionate, supportive, and open to the process of discovery and change. I did not have strict lesson plans because this was a student-centered approach, which meant that I needed to remain flexible and supportive. I did, however, identify specific strength-oriented, high quality miscues as avenues for discussion of Jason's specific reading strategies.

For our first three RMA sessions together, Jason and I analyzed his reading process using a short story entitled "The Prisoner" by Edward Wellen. I chose this as the first text because it has been rated by the Reading and Writing Clinic at Hofstra University specifically for use with adults and has been used frequently by the literacy specialists at the University's Reading/Writing Learning Clinic. On September 23, 2005, I conducted the first Miscue Analysis with Jason. He read "The Prisoner" aloud and I tape-recorded the reading and retelling. I then marked the transcript of the text using Miscue Analysis Procedure III (Goodman, Watson, and Burke 115). I chose several high-quality miscues (miscues that did not change the meaning of the sentence) to begin our exploration of Jason's reading process.

The results of the statistical analysis of Jason's reading of "The Prisoner" indicated that Jason was reading at a proficient level. However, the statistics did not tell the whole story. As Jason read the text, it became clear to me that he was very focused on word accuracy, which in my opinion caused him a tremendous amount of frustration. "The Prisoner" has 111 sentences and Jason repeated sentences, parts of sentences, and individual words 58 times. For example, on lines 21 and 22, Jason repeated four different parts of the two sentences:

> ⊛He started guiltily from his trance, hearing the siren of an ambulance, nearing, nearing, then on the spot and ⊛moaning into silence. ⊛He had known instantly, by the terrible fling and the rag doll fall, and by the mangled bike, the ⊛the boy was past saving.

Our discussion directly after he read the story confirmed Jason's focus on word accuracy. Before Jason gave his retelling, he said, "That was the worst reading I've ever done. See how I stutter and I can't get it out and then I don't know the words and then I skip and then I go too far." Jason mentioned that he did not like how he sounded when he read aloud. However, he also said that he "had the same problems" when he read silently.

After the retelling, I asked Jason to think more about his comprehension of the story.

Pamela: I know you feel that you read the story poorly, but do you think

that it affected your ability to understand the story?

Jason: No . . . [he smirks] . . . because I understand it. I totally understand it.

I wanted Jason to discover, based on his retelling, that he did understand the story even though his reading did not flow well. I wanted him to begin focusing more on the most important aspect of reading—making meaning—rather than on word accuracy. But we did discuss the fact that Jason frequently re-read words, parts of sentences, and full sentences. This was getting in his way and caused him a tremendous amount of frustration. The following dialogue came from the discussion of a miscue from "The Prisoner." We discussed lines 8 through 11 where Jason repeated himself four times in four sentences. He also substituted "the" for "and" and "his" for "the" in two different sentences and reconstructed the syntax of the first sentence successfully.

The text read:

It was just past dawn, and traffic was light in the streets outside his prison.
He focused the binoculars. At the nearest intersection came the young paper-
boy riding his bike no-handedly. He could not hear, of course, but from the
cant of the head he knew the boy was whistling or singing.

Jason read:

It was just past dawn. **The** traffic was ⊗light in the streets outside his prison.
He focused **his** binoculars. At the nearest intersection came the young paper-
boy riding his bike ⊗no-handedly. ⊗He could not hear, of course, ⊗but from
the cant of the head he knew the boy was whistling or singing.

First, we addressed the issue of re-reading and then we discussed the word substitutions, which I considered high-quality miscues because they did not change the meaning of the sentence. One of my goals, at that point, was for Jason to recognize the strategies that were not working for him, but also to recognize those strategies that were. Initially, I wanted to focus on Jason's strengths and discuss only high-quality miscues, but as soon as we listened to the audio tape, the repetition and re-reading were so apparent that we needed to explore that issue right away.

Pamela: So, now let's talk a little about your repeating.

Jason: Like I told you . . . When I read and then all of a sudden my eyes are
down here. And it's like I'm trying to read too fast. My eyes are down here
and I'm trying to read what's up here and I just can't process both at the same
time and it's like overload and then I have to reset and start again. And that
is what happens when I get going. Like when I start to flow and really start
to read, I find myself skipping ahead and then I say to myself, "STOP!" and
then, "Okay, start again." I feel like I am trying to read too much at once.

Pamela: And that's getting in your way?

Jason: Yes.

Pamela: Even though your comprehension of this was very good?

Jason: I think everything gets in the way of my reading because I want to read like . . . normal. I want to flow and it to be very fluent and I want to be able to understand it. I know that I can comprehend it and that has gotten better over the years. This was part of my learning disability, but the comprehension is not really what I'm concerned about. It's the matter of speed, the articulation and the perfect pronunciation. This repeating just pisses me off more than anything.

> "What Jason saw as a weakness caused by his 'learning disability' is something that all good readers do."

I sympathized with Jason's feelings of frustration and told him that I understood how it would be getting in his way. Jason's description of what went on "in his head" as he read was very important to our understanding of his reading process. I got the feeling that once Jason found himself "flowing," he would get nervous that he might miss something or that he might make a mistake. Then the alarms would go off in his head and he told himself "STOP!" Then, once he realized everything was okay, he gave himself permission to keep reading.

It concerned Jason that his eyes moved all over the page and that he felt as if he couldn't process all of the information quickly enough while reading. I explained to Jason some of eye-movement studies that Eric Paulson ("Are Oral Reading") has conducted. I told Jason that as he actively engaged in comprehension, it was normal for his eyes to move around the text. He seemed to be worried that he was skipping words and subsequently unable to get an accurate reading of the text. But eye-movement studies show that in normal reading, anywhere from 20% to 40% of the words in a given text is skipped. This is not carelessness on the part of the reader. It happens as a natural process of reading whereby the reader uses predictions, from the context of the story, to direct his/her eye to either fixate on or skip over a word or even multiple words (Paulson 49-50). What Jason saw as a weakness caused by his "learning disability" is something that all good readers do. It is not abnormal, or considered a symptom of a disability. It is normal and showed that Jason was transacting with the text. Next, I pushed Jason to begin thinking about why he re-read text so much.

Pamela: So why do you think you do it? Why do you repeat yourself even

when you've gotten it correct? Ninety percent of these you got correct the first time.

Jason: Sometimes it doesn't sound right to me or I think that I have said it wrong . . . Sometimes I'll have to read a sentence four times before I get it. A lot of the time, I think it has to do with my mind not being on the page.

Pamela: Okay . . . When you are reading, do you make a movie in your head?

Jason: Yes.

Pamela: So, when you are making a movie in your head . . . Are you more focused?

Jason: Yes! That is something else I noticed with this and that is something I'm starting to learn. With this type of reading, I was able to make a movie . . . some type of visual connection in my head. But when I read *Clockwork Orange*, I read words and I'm lucky if I understand anything.

Jason then went on to talk a little about his confidence level as he was reading.

Jason: I just wasn't confident on the words and that screwed up the whole sentence.

Pamela: Well, I do think that making a movie in your head can be helpful if you can engage in the story right off the bat and just start envisioning it. Maybe it will help to keep you focused.

Jason: Absolutely! I sometimes VERY, VERY rarely . . . this has only happened to me a few times . . . have I ever found myself reading, but not realize that I'm reading.

Jason not only believed that he was careless, but unfocused as well. However, Jason seemed to begin to make the connection that when he was focused on the words, he did not understand the text very well. But as he visualized the action in the text, not only did he understand it better, he actually enjoyed it, not even realizing that he was reading. Jeffrey Wilhelm states that the visualization of text has many positive effects for readers: "It has been demonstrated that visual imaging encourages students to access and apply their prior knowledge as they read, increases comprehension, and improves their ability to predict, infer, and remember what has been read" (117). I believe that when Jason was not focused on words, he engaged in comprehension, which allowed him to visualize the text.

Jason was so worried about producing a perfect rendition of the text that he overcorrected high-quality miscues. For example, the following is part of the discussion we had about another miscue where Jason engaged in high-quality word substitutions and a word omission

that did not alter the meaning of the sentence, yet he corrected the miscues.

The text read:

And each time he had smiled a twisted smile knowing . . . he was inside these walls of gray sandstone painted white and Pardee was on the outside.

Jason read the text as (but did self-correct):

And each time he had [omitted **smiled**] a twisted smile knowing . . . he was inside these walls of gray **stone** painted white and Pardee was on the outside.

Jason corrected what I considered high-quality miscues—miscues that were semantically and syntactically acceptable. Goodman, Watson, and Burke state that readers who correct high-quality miscues may be paying too close attention to the graphic cues in the text. I believe that this was the case with Jason. He paid too close attention to word accuracy, which led to inefficient reading and frustration.

Jason had made it clear that word substitutions were unacceptable in his eyes. He worked very hard to read exactly what was on the page. He argued that the word substitutions, regardless of the fact that most of them were high-quality word substitutions that did not change the meaning of the sentence, were caused by carelessness or by reading too fast. At that point, I explained to Jason that good readers substitute words all the time and that good readers substitute words that may be different from those on the page, but that it is not caused by inattention. It is caused by the fact that the reader is making sense of what "sounds better" to him or her using the context of the story or text. I then linked this to the fact that he engaged in overcorrecting high-quality miscues, which in turn made reading inefficient and unpleasant. We began to move from the exploration of miscues to insight about the "hows" and "whys" of his reading process.

At that point in our conversation, I thought that if Jason and I could just increase his confidence by recognizing his strengths as a reader and challenging those unproductive beliefs about the reading process, then he could minimize the repetitions and over-corrections of high-quality miscues. This, in turn, would help to lower his frustration levels and increase his ability to focus and, ultimately, enable him to "make a movie in his head." As he comprehended the texts better, Jason might even begin to enjoy reading, which might help to motivate him to do it (read) again. This is not a linear process. It is an interdependent cycle that can build over time.

As our sessions progressed, we continued to discuss issues including word substitutions, maintaining focus, and miscue overcorrection. Insights made during the RMA sessions marked a shift in Jason's beliefs about reading and about himself as a reader. In addition, Jason made adjustments in his reading strategies as well. I found that Jason and I engaged in

long discussions about his reading from analyzing just one or two miscues. Of course we discussed many more, but it was amazing how just analyzing the miscues together opened up a forum for exploration and an opportunity to make changes. For each miscue we discussed, Jason divulged a little more of his beliefs about reading, and as each belief became apparent I was able to challenge it, if necessary. It was those points in the RMA sessions that I considered "teachable moments," where I saw an opportunity to explore, analyze, challenge, and teach not *to* Jason, but *with* Jason. It was very powerful.

On October 28, Jason summed up what he had learned about his reading process up to that point.

> **Jason:** That when I get frustrated, I'm focusing more on the words than on the context of the sentence. I need to focus more on reading and not sounding out the words. Reading and taking in what the paragraph or sentence is saying rather than what each word is saying or how each word is pronounced. Skipping words that aren't always necessary is okay and going through it and letting it flow rather than getting stuck on one thing.

I was so impressed. Jason moved from a word-focused view of reading to a meaning-centered view of reading. This was at the core of what I felt he needed to shift. Once he was able to recognize and articulate this, I felt a weight lift from my shoulders, and I think he felt the same way. He understood that reading is a meaning-making process, one in which he is in transaction with the text. He was insightful about himself as a reader. And he was brave to travel down this path with

"a forum for discussion, insight, challenge, and change"

me. He told me that it was difficult for him "to talk about this stuff," but that he really wanted "to work on it."

The data suggest that Jason's "reading problem," i.e. re-reading text often, was a learned response based on all his years of reading remediation, which focused on part-to-whole reading instruction and word accuracy. He was doing what he had been taught to do. In addition, that instruction served to reinforce his belief that good reading meant producing a perfect rendition of the text. Throughout the semester, we were able to discuss Jason's reading process and, at the same time, uncover some of those beliefs about reading that were influencing his reading behavior. The RMA revaluing sessions served as a forum for discussion, insight, challenge, and change. Jason's "reading problem" improved significantly by the end of our sessions, and he reported in our closing interview that he felt much more confident as a reader as a result of our sessions together.

A Final Thought for Now

Learning-assistance centers that support under-prepared, developmental, and non-traditional college students (including those diagnosed as RD/LD) must be willing to break from traditional instructional models in order to serve their students well (White and Schnuth 161). White and Schnuth call for a more individualized and student-centered approach to instruction and support services. I agree that educators need to move in that direction. However, I believe that in order to truly break from tradition, we must shift our views regarding the entire concept of reading disabilities. It will not be enough to just blindly change educational practices. We need to critically examine, and I believe change, the epistemologies that serve as the foundation for our program's educational mission.

I am advocating for revaluing as a cornerstone of reading instruction for classified students seeking literacy support in college. As Alan Flurkey writes, "Revaluing is a shift toward viewing learners as purposeful users of the language process and a corresponding shift away from relying on reductionistic diagnostic tests that promote a deficit view of learners" (219). I would like to see instructors in college support programs move in this direction helping students change some of the fundamental negative beliefs they hold about themselves as readers, as well as challenge their misconceptions about the reading process and in turn develop more productive reading strategies.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts and Counterfacts: Theory And Method for a Reading and Writing Course.* Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1986.

Elbaum, Batya, and Sharon Vaughn. "School-Based Interventions to Enhance the Self-Concepts of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Meta-Analysis." *The Elementary School Journal,* 101(2001): 303-329.

Flurkey, Alan. "Inventing Learning Disabilities." *Teaching and Advocacy.* Eds. Denny Taylor, Debbie Coughlin, and Joanna Marasco. New York: Stenhouse Publishers, 1997. 211-232.

Gaffney, Janet, Jeanette Methven, and Shahe Bagdasarian. "Assisting Older Students To Read Expository Text in a Tutorial Setting: A Case for High-Impact Intervention." *Reading & Writing Quarterly* 18 (2002): 119-150.

Goodman, Kenneth. "Revaluing Readers and Reading." *On the Revolution of Reading: The Selected Writings of Kenneth S. Goodman.* Eds. Alan Flurkey and Jingguo Xu. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2003. 421-429.

Goodman, Yetta, Dorothy Watson, and Carolyn Burke. *Reading Miscue Inventory: Alternative Procedures.* New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1987.

Goodman, Yetta, and Ann Marek. *Retrospective Miscue Analysis: Revaluing Readers and Reading.* New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1996.

Linnenbrink, Elizabeth, and Paul Pintrich. "The Role of Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Student Engagement and Learning in the Classroom." *Reading & Writing Quarterly* 19 (2003): 119-137.

Macrine, Sheila. "Toward a Dialogical Mediated Action Approach to Reading Remediation." *Education* 117 (1997): 386-398.

Marek, Ann. "An Accomplished Professional: A Reader in Trouble." *Retrospective Miscue Analysis: Revaluing Readers and Reading.* Ed. Yetta Goodman and Ann Marek. New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1996. 51-70.

Margolis, Howard, and Patrick McCabe. "Enhancing the Self-Efficacy of Struggling Readers." *The Clearing House* 75.1 (2001): 45-49.

___. "Self-Efficacy: A Key to Improving the Motivation of Struggling Learners." *The Clearing House* 77.6 (2004): 241-249.

McNulty, Michael. "Dyslexia and the Life Course." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 36 (2003): 363-381.

Morris, Mary, and Janice Leuenberger. "A Report of Cognitive, Academic, and Linguistic Profiles of College Students with and Without Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 23 (1990): 355-385.

Paulson, Eric. "Are Oral Reading Word Omissions and Substitutions Caused By Careless Eye Movements?" *Reading Psychology* 23 (2002): 45-65.

___. "The Discourse of Retrospective Miscue Analysis: Links with Adult Learning Theory." *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 32 (2001): 112-128.

Rath, Kenneth, and James Royer. "The Nature and Effectiveness of Learning Disability Services for College Students." *Educational Psychology Review* 14 (2002): 353-381.

Scott, Sally, Joan McGuire, and Stan Shaw "Universal Design for Instruction." *Remedial & Special Education* 24 (2003): 1-17.

Stone, Addison, and Alison May. "The Accuracy of Academic Self-Evaluations in Adolescents with Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 35 (2002): 370-383.

Vogel, Susan, and Pamela Adelman. *Success for College Students with Learning Disabilities.* New York: Springer-Verlag, 1993.

Weaver, Constance. "Reconceptualizing Reading and Dyslexia." *Journal of Childhood Communication Disorder* 16 (1994): 23-35.

White, William, and Mary Schnuth. "College Learning Assistance Centers: Places for Learning. *Handbook of Developmental Education.* Ed. Robert Hashway, New York: Prarger, 1990. 155-177.

Wilhelm, Jeffrey *"You Gotta Be the Book": Teaching Engaged and Reflective Reading with Adolescents.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1997.

Wright-Strawderman, Carol, Pam Lindsey, Lori Navarette, and Joseph Flippo. "Depression in Students with Disabilities: Recognition and Intervention Strategies." *Intervention in School and Clinic* 31 (1996): 261-75.

Pamela Mason-Egan *is an Adjunct Assistant Professor, Graduate Program in Literacy at the University of Cincinnati College of Education, Criminal Justice, & Human Services, Division of Teacher Education. Recently, she served as the Academic Success Coordinator for a Title III grant at Palm Beach Community College in South Florida where she worked with faculty and learning specialists to develop support programs for students who have placed into developmental reading and math classes. Prior to moving to Florida, she taught for 16 years at Hofstra University in New York. While at Hofstra, she worked as a literacy and learning specialist in the Program for Academic Learning Skills (PALS), working with students who had been classified with language-based learning disabilities and/or ADHD.*

Diane DeVido Tetreault and Carole Center
But I'm Not a Reading Teacher!

Introduction

RECENT CALLS FOR MORE ATTENTION TO COLLEGE STUDENTS' READING COMPETENCE assert that inexperience with reading is a barrier to success in college for many students. The latest installment of the National Endowment for the Arts report, titled *To Read or Not to Read,* confirms what many college reading and writing teachers already witness on a daily basis: Americans are reading less and their reading proficiency is declining at troubling rates. The NEA reports that in 2006, 15 to 24 year-olds spent just 7 to 10 minutes a day voluntarily reading anything. It also finds that between 1992 and 2003 the percentage of college graduates who tested as "proficient in reading prose" declined from 40 to 31 percent. In a recent iteration of the call for more attention to reading, David Jolliffe in his review article in *College Composition and Communication,* asserts that "reading as a concept is largely absent from the theory and practice of college composition" (473). As first-year composition teachers, we wholeheartedly agree that this reality—students' lack of experience as critical readers of difficult texts—is one that composition teachers too often ignore. Instead of ignoring this reality, we might view first-year composition classes as an ideal location in which to teach students the practices of close, critical reading that will allow them to interact confidently with texts throughout their college careers and beyond. Nobody likes to clean up someone else's messes. Inheriting the unresolved reading problems of previous classrooms can be seen as an annoying burden, but the freshman composition class is one of the last opportunities to reach these students. As John Perkins argues in "A Community College Professor Reflects on First-Year Composition,"

> In past generations, when first-year composition students arrived at college with more extensive reading experience than today, perhaps it was not altogether necessary for a composition teacher to conduct a serious study of the reading process, as well as a study of how the two processes work together as a larger written language process . . . the time has arrived for first-year composition instructors to become more knowledgeable about the reading process and its application to the process of writing college compositions. (239)

To address reading in first-year composition challenges teachers, who may not feel prepared, and students, who are juggling multiple challenges socially, emotionally, and aca-

demically during their first two semesters. The benefit of converting reluctant readers to more confident, effective readers at this time in their lives is, however, exceedingly powerful. It can change their lives.

Students approach college reading at a disadvantage when they have lost confidence or interest in reading and, consequently, try to avoid it as much as possible. This resistance to reading is one part of the reality that must be addressed. But even when students are willing to read, they often lack effective strategies for responding to the difficulty they will encounter in texts. Without a repertoire of strategies, students fail to realize that difficulty is not a closed door.

Jolliffe argues that "[s]tudents have to read in college composition, but rarely does anyone tell them why or how they should read" (474). In order to persuade students that they need to read, first-year composition teachers have to understand the purpose of reading assignments in our teaching practices. While we recognize that the readings assigned in a composition course can function as models for rhetorical strategies or as jumping off points for writing about personal experiences and opinions, we argue that first-year composition teachers must highlight assignments that position reading as part of a composing process in which reading, thinking, and writing are dialogically interwoven. First-year composition teachers need to assign reading because reading "teaches us how to think" and "begs us to speak our minds about what we have read" asking us "to substantiate our interpretations and opinions--our readings--with evidence from our lives and the texts" (Petrosky 21). We want to make reading/writing assignments that involve thoughtful reading leading to writing in which students speak their thoughts, substantiating their interpretations with evidence from the readings.

As Jolliffe suggests, composition teachers first need to understand why we assign reading in order to sell students on reading as part of the writing process. Then, we need to teach students "how they should read." Students' reading problems become apparent when they move from reading to composing their own texts in response to the reading. Therefore, we need to teach reading strategies that assist students in becoming strong readers, readers who are prepared to compose a reading and to write about the meaning they construct. These strategies are the moves that experienced critical readers make when they encounter difficulty, including boredom and distraction, when reading. Such reading strategies are routinely discussed in reading pedagogy, but since much of this scholarship is housed in the discipline of education rather than English studies, often with a focus on K-12, "the act of reading is not part of the common professional discourse in composition" (Helmers 4). The authors of this article demonstrate this disparity: Diane, a former high school teacher, has been able to bring her knowledge of reading pedagogy to the college classroom while Carole, who has taught

exclusively at the college level, is just beginning to do so.

Reading Reluctance

Reluctant readers have adequate reading ability but don't read. They may not find the time to read, have come to a point in their lives where they are not reading, or choose not to read because they do not like reading (Booth 43). As instructors, some of the symptoms we see include reluctant readers missing the author's intent, ignoring significant details that contribute to creation of the author's argument, and avoiding unfamiliar words, complex sentences, and challenging paragraphs. It's also common to observe students giving up after meeting any obstacle in the reading process and, instead, creating their own version of what the piece is really about. Many just stop reading because they feel uncomfortable with the challenge that lies ahead of them. Identifying reluctant readers in a first-year college composition class can be tricky business, yet it's a critical first step for both the student and professor.

> "missing the author's intent, ignoring significant details that contribute to creation of the author's argument, and avoiding unfamiliar words, complex sentences, and challenging paragraphs"

At the beginning of the semester, students need to know that this freshman composition class deals with reading as well as writing; these two skills are interconnected and top priorities. It's also crucial to have a class discussion about the ways in which college reading and writing are different from high school and non-academic reading and writing. *College Success Strategies* by Sherrie Nist and Jodi Patrick Holschuh tells students, "College is different from high school in many ways. You must think differently about the expectations, learning conditions, level of responsibility and study methods than you did in high school. This is not bad. It simply means you will have to make some transitions in the way you learn and study in order to be successful" (8-9). It becomes clear that the expected level of critical thinking is higher; therefore, making meaning and pushing beyond the obvious are important skills that may have not been in the forefront of students' previous experience in reading and writing. Calling attention to the differences in independence, pacing, study effort, evaluation, responsibility and the importance of being proactive helps to highlight potential prob-

lems at college and assist students in finding strategies to overcome them.

Students' comments about their preconceived notions of reading or themselves as readers provide a wealth of information that might have gone undiscovered. The student responses become the fodder for the first series of notes next to each student's name in the grade book. It's the beginning of the differentiated instruction that's needed even though few teachers or students want to admit it. Here are some sample notes in Diane's records:

Student A: I can't read long books without zoning out.

Student B: I don't read anything unless I like it.

Student C: I hate to read and won't ever, ever read aloud in class. So don't ask.

Student D: I like to read, but never have the time.

Student E: I used to love reading, but if I do it now, people will think I'm a nerd.

Student F: I'm a slow reader. I struggle, really struggle.

Student G: I want to be a good reader, but it never happened.

Student H: I want to be smarter through reading.

Student I: I have ADD, and reading is a hassle.

Student J: I'm dyslexic, and I don't like to read. I'd rather play soccer.

Student H: I work two jobs and have a family. There's no time for books in my life.

This feedback gives a clearer picture of what students think of reading and themselves as readers. It reveals the often hidden agendas and baggage that get in the way of a successful composition class. Some reluctant readers are quite visible (or audible) and may brag that they never have read a book throughout their four years in high school: "I never had to read the book. If I waited long enough, the teacher would give enough details that I'd piece with SparkNotes, and I could get away with it." Many reluctant readers, however, seem to have an uncanny ability to be invisible in many classrooms. They hide and slip through the cracks. That's how they end up as college freshmen with difficulty reading and writing critically.

Problems

Reluctant or inexperienced readers are at a disadvantage when they face writing assignments that ask them to reflect on readings. Such assignments generally call for students to summarize and discuss what the reading says and then respond by articulating their own thoughts about the reading. These assignments are based on the belief that we develop something to say in interaction with others' ideas and that reading, therefore, is a form of invention (Bartholomae 99). Weaker readers will have problems with both parts of these kinds of assignments: they will not feel confident enough about their understanding of the reading to summarize it with authority, and having read passively or incompletely, they will

not have constructed a response to the reading that gives them something to say back to the author. But writing assignments in which students respond to readings are crucial if we are to invite students to enter a dialogue with readings and to write from the dialogic connection between reading and writing.

As David Bartholomae argues, such assignments position reading at the heart of the invention process in which writers discover something to say by "collecting and shaping information" (96), reassembling a new text "by discovering patterns of significance" (97). Effective academic writers transform source texts to create their own new texts by moving from the meaning they compose when they read to the meaning they compose when they use the source texts in the context of their own writing (Spivey). To understand what we need to teach students about reading, we need to identify the kinds of writing problems that students experience when they attempt to transform source material in order to use the text in their own writing. These may appear to be *writing* problems, but they are, in fact, *reading and writing* problems. Reading and writing are "hybrid acts of literacy," blended processes in which the successful reader-writer imposes an organization on both the read and the written text, selects the important and relevant content, and makes connections to pre-existing knowledge (Spivey). The overlapping and intersecting problems students exhibit when working with a source text include 1) selecting quotes without careful reading, 2) misunderstanding the source text, and 3) failing to move from writer-based to reader-based prose when presenting textual evidence. Errors in reading may well predominate in the first two scenarios while errors in writing predominate in the third, but reading and writing clearly intersect in all these situations. Our point in discussing these student missteps is not to demean students or their abilities, but to try to understand the logic of the errors students commit in order to recommend appropriate interventions by teachers. In doing so, we position ourselves within the tradition exemplified by Mina Shaughnessy in *Errors and Expectations*, a tradition of examining students' ideas and texts not only in order to illustrate the kinds of problems that composition students run into but also "to tease out the reasons that lie behind the problems" (Shaughnessy 6).

Students who quote without careful reading choose textual evidence by "plucking" a provocative quote from the text without fully considering what the passage means in the context of the reading. They treat the reading as they would a list of pithy quotations. Thus, in a first-year composition course, in which students read Stephanie Coontz's *Marriage, a History* to gain a sociohistorical perspective on the theme of marriage, a student who wanted to argue that marriage was a "blessing" for some and an "aggravation" for others, plucked a quote from Coontz and presented the quote—"it is remarkable that people still considered it a dreadful inconvenience" (139)—as if "it" were the necessity of marrying. In fact, it is clear from the

context that "it" refers to the complicating presence of love in arranged marriages. The student liked "dreadful inconvenience" as a synonym for aggravation and applied the phrase to marriage even though Coontz is not talking about marriage as an inconvenience in this statement.

Students who misunderstand what they read often work hard at the reading, but despite their efforts, these students fail to grasp the thrust of the argument as it is developed in the text. Students who misread confuse statements of fact and acknowledgments of counterclaims with the author's own claims. As a result, they often misrepresent the textual evidence they select. Students working with Stephanie Coontz's *Marriage, a History* had great difficulty distinguishing between propositions that represent Coontz's own conclusions and propositions that she would put forward and then refute. For example, in a chapter discussing the reasons that marriage exists, Coontz acknowledges the biological explanation advanced by some and then rejects that explanation, saying "when we move beyond the most superficial similarities, we find nothing in the animal kingdom that remotely resembles human marriage" (25). Several students missed the refutation, latching on instead to Coontz's descriptions of the biological explanation. Thus a student uses a partial sentence from Coontz to argue that there is a biological basis for life-long, love-based marriage, quoting part of the first sentence in a paragraph—"there is a biological basis for love and even, perhaps, for long-term pair bonding" (25)—but missing both the end of the sentence ("although one scientist who believes there is such a biological base in humans claims that it is limited to about four years") and the way that Coontz's argument develops in the paragraph as she goes on to reject this explanation as partial at best. Perhaps the student has plucked a quote that serves the purposes of the arguments she wants to make, but, more likely, she reads what appears to be a claim made by the author and fails to understand it as the opening proposition in a paragraph that comes to a very different conclusion.

Another kind of misunderstanding that showed up in students' papers when they integrated textual evidence from Coontz was the confusion of descriptions of historical facts with Coontz's own ideas. Thus, a student reads a passage from Coontz describing the emergence of a sharply divided division of labor based on gender differences in the 17th Century as an endorsement of rigidly divided gender roles. In the following passage, the student writes that this claim by Coontz is one of two influential readings that caused the student writer to question her own beliefs about female breadwinners:

> I personally disagree with the idea that female breadwinners can throw off the balance of a marriage. But by two influential readings, my belief may be swayed. In the book *Marriage, a History* by Stephanie Coontz, she states that "The theory of gender differences divides humanity into two distinct sets of traits. The male sphere encom-

passed the rational and active ideal while the females represented the humanitarian and compassionate aspects of life. When these two spheres were brought together in marriage, they produced a perfect, well-rounded whole" (156).

After mentioning the second influential reading, the students goes on to say "I see that there is some evidence that in fact a female breadwinner in a marriage can throw off the balance of that marriage," implying that Coontz's statement is such evidence when it is a description of a centuries-old attitude, not a statement of Coontz's ideas about gender roles in current marriage practices.

There were so many instances of this kind of misunderstanding when students tried to incorporate Coontz's ideas into their writing that we were relieved to come across a discussion of students experiencing very similar problems in a composition course described in Russel Durst's ethnography *Collision Course*. In one of the composition courses Durst observed, students read an essay on changes in the American family, "The Paradox of Perfection" by Arlene Skolnick, and, despite adequate scaffolding, misunderstood Skolnick's argument. Durst reports that "[s]tudents' misunderstandings mainly entailed their thinking that the author was herself taking the positions that she was actually attempting to characterize and, in some cases, to critique" (136), precisely the problem our students were experiencing.

Even student writers who construct attentive, active readings may find it difficult to convey their understanding of the text to their own readers. In presenting textual evidence, these students fail to adequately introduce and explain the quotations they select. Generally, students who fall into this category fail to make explicit for readers the relationship between their discussion and the textual evidence they have selected to support or illustrate that discussion. Perhaps these student writers fail to realize that what they are thinking will not be evident to readers unless they say it, or perhaps they haven't developed facility in using punctuation or signal phrases to convey the relationship between the quoted text and their discussion. Students consistently fail to use a colon to show that the quote that follows a sentence is an illustration of what the sentence is saying. Beyond this seemingly intractable failure to use punctuation to help readers see the connections that the writer is making, students working with Coontz's *Marriage, a History* would sometimes present textual evidence without making the historical context or even the pronoun antecedents clear, leaving their readers somewhat mystified. In the following passage, the student writer causes confusion for her readers by supplying an illustration without labeling it as such:

> During early medieval Europe, divorce was quite frowned upon, and remarrying was completely unheard of. It was extremely hard to get around the strict divorce laws set forth by the Church. "In 1152 the divorce of King Louis VII of France and Eleanor of Aquitaine was approved when the couple pointed out that they were related within

four or five degrees" (Coontz 100). The only way the couple was able to get a divorce was proving that they were related.

The writer intends to use the historical example as an illustration of the difficulty of divorce in that the royal pair had to go to such extremes to obtain permission to divorce. But without some introduction to the quote, this relationship between the writer's claim and the example that illustrates that claim is unclear.

Omitting a comment after a quote causes similar confusion. At times, it appears that student writers fail to clearly state the connections they see between what they have read and a point they are making in their writing because they lack confidence in their own thinking. Perhaps they imagine that it will be safer to float a connection out there and let readers draw their own conclusions rather than take the risk of making their own thinking explicit. That may be happening in the following opening paragraph:

> Marriage is a loving and caring intimacy between two human beings. In something as sacred and precious as marriage, there arises a new question. Why then are there cases of abuse, torture, or even rape in the marriages of today? And as you look deeper into this question, you then find yourself looking at a whole history of domestic violence, abuse, torture, and even rape. In Stephanie Coontz's Marriage, a History, she states that "Writers on domesticity across Europe and the United States held that women could exert a unique and sorely needed role in the public world through their influence   at home. Only a wife could combat the businessman's tendency to close his ears to 'the voices of conscience' as he competed in the struggle for 'world aggrandizement'" (Coontz 165).

Since the paragraph ends at this point, there is no way to know what connection the writer is making between "the darker side to marriage" (the title of the paper) and wives' influence on husbands' behavior. Possibly the quote has been misunderstood or ill-chosen since it refers to public behavior while the student in discussing private behavior. But perhaps there is a connection that is not immediately apparent. Unless the student makes that connection explicit, her point is lost.

Solutions

Given this evidence of the problems students face when attempting to transform reading into writing, composition teachers need to intervene by both deepening and broadening students' reading. To deepen students' reading, teachers must design activities that invite students to muscle their way into the text and continuously redirect them back to the text, to reread and rethink, as they work to transform reading to writing. Activities for deepening reading include annotation, double entry notebooks, identifying and responding to sig-

nificant statements in texts, Salvatori and Donahue's difficulty paper assignment (9-11), and Rosenwasser and Stephen's method for looking for patterns of repetition and contrast (48). In responding to the problems in drafts, such as those in the three categories we have just explored, teachers need to pose questions that send students back to the reading. In addition, teaching students the steps necessary to "sandwich" quoted material between an introduction and an explanation will strengthen students' reading as they return to the text and reexamine the quote in order to explain it to readers. The template sentences in Graff and Birkenstein's *They Say/I Say* are particularly useful for teaching students some of the "stock formulas" for introducing and commenting on quotes (xi). Effective writing moves—moves that communicate the writer's understanding of the reading clearly to readers—are thus entwined with deeper, more careful reading.

At the same time that teachers are setting up activities to deepen students' reading, they must also construct opportunities for students to broaden their reading. The activities of analysis and rereading that students must pursue in order to deepen their reading call for concentrated penetration of a text. These should be accompanied by reading assignments that allow students to stretch out as readers by increasing the amount and variety of reading. The value of increasing student reading by encouraging reading both for class and for recreation is supported by research from multiple sources. In *The Power of Reading*, Stephen Krashen states that this research shows that "[m]ore reading results in better reading comprehension, writing style, vocabulary, spelling and grammatical development" (17). Broadening reading, through opportunities such as self-selected reading, will allow students to acquire and reinforce effective reading strategies in the context of reading for pleasure and to validate their existing competencies as readers, albeit readers in unfamiliar genres, such as text messaging.

As instructors, one of the first places to begin is in selecting reading materials that support, not thwart, the students' attempts to create a dialogue with the written word. This means being mindful of the topics as well as length and difficulty of reading, Too often we teach what we love, regardless of the audience. If there is an institutionally required text, perhaps it can be supplemented with handouts of reading that offers a greater opportunity for the student to be successful. For example, Emerson's essay "Self-Reliance" might be among the department's required texts, but reading portions of Horatio Alger's *Ragged Dick* or Janet Tashian's *The Gospel According to Larry* will make the required text more palatable. Also, it is critical to keep the number of pages to be read in synch with the amount of prep time expected for each class; a reluctant reader maybe be able to read and process a five-page essay well, but be unable to stay focused on a thirty-page piece of writing.

Because each reading assignment requires an active engagement, it became impor-

tant for the length of the reading to be manageable. Giving a reluctant reader thirty pages of reading while trying to re-teach successful reading skills is counterproductive. Less is more; if there are less pages to read, the instructor can require closer textual analysis and more active engagement with the text. A review of more than twenty anthologies/readers revealed that very few are compiled with reluctant readers in mind. Most selections were quite lengthy and challenging pieces. As Jolliffe comments, such reading selections imagine an ideal student reader very unlike most reluctant readers who "consider themselves both fortunate and prepared if they have read the assigned work once before they come to class" (476). Other textbooks had excerpts from works that are required readings in many high schools. They were tired. Enthusiastic, strong readers probably won't flinch at these issues, but struggling readers will easily add the texts to the long list of books they will not read.

Reading problems can only be ameliorated by teaching in a way specifically designed to strengthen students' reading competencies. There is no silver bullet for meeting the needs of the reluctant college reader, but there are reasonable strategies and approaches to explore. Collecting data from the questionnaire during the first week of class allows the professor an opportunity to create a curriculum that more adequately addresses the students' long overdue needs. One size does not fit all, especially in a first-year composition class. The data also show that there are students who do enjoy reading and could use the supportive environment to strengthen these already established skills. It also exposes the heterogeneous nature of the class and provides data for the professor's inquiry process. Student input plus teacher observation and experience shape the focus of this class. A review of the results of the survey is a perfect opportunity to have a discussion about these questions and clear up many misconceptions that these students have about themselves as readers. It becomes a teachable moment to explain the various ways people learn how to read and to expose the joys and agony they've experienced in deciphering the written word.

This is an opportune time to discuss strategies successful readers use. What do good readers do? How can our students learn from research about successful readers? Chris Tovani's book *I Read It, But I Don't Get It* is an excellent teacher's source for this discussion. Tovani refers to P. David Pearson's research on characteristics of proficient readers and his list of seven strategies commonly used by successful readers:

1. They use existing knowledge to make sense of new information (also the inquiry method we use in first-year composition).
2. They ask questions about the text before, during and after reading.
3. They draw inferences from the text.
4. They monitor their comprehension.
5. They use "fix-up" strategies when meaning breaks down.

6. They determine what is important.

7. They synthesize information to create new thinking. (17)

These strategies are taught, modeled, reviewed, practiced as a group as well as in pairs and individually. They are the missing tools that the reluctant reader can finally find in the first-year composition classroom.

We discuss the different types of reading a student does daily. The list includes everything from reading food labels, to the sports page, to internet blogs, magazines, comic books, junk mail, cook books, required novels for classes, textbooks, Instant Messages, e-mail, and non-fiction required class reading. We then analyze what is required to do each of these different reading tasks well. On an overhead, they'll see a sample food label and as a group, we'll pick it apart. Why would you read a food label? How do you read a food label? What problems do you bump into? How do you solve them? What does it take to read the food label well? How is this similar and/or different from other reading you do? Next we move on to another form of reading they're all too familiar with: Instant Messaging. The sample IM is shown on the screen and we ask the same questions: Why read it? How do you read it? What problems do you bump into? How do you solve them? What does it take to read the IM well? Compare/contrast IMing to other reading you do. Add the additional question: Who does IM better, you or your parents? Why? It's empowering for them to realize that they have more control of some uses of language than more experienced readers.

> "they see that this instructor is not a speed reader"

We continue with the process by studying an e-mail, internet blog and then a few newspaper selections (sports, entertainment, front page article). In each case the words are on a large screen, and the instructor models how she reads the first few sentences and then turns it over to the class. Typically, modeling demonstrates exactly what's going on in the instructor's head while reading the passage aloud. The process involves questions the instructor asks herself, emerging from confusion experienced, connections made, items that seem important, and vocabulary that is unfamiliar. Modeling makes it clear to them that reading is thinking, and good readers are actively engaged in making meaning. It doesn't happen by waving a magic wand. They see how a "good reader" works to make meaning, and they start to learn some new methods. One interesting by-product is that they see that this instructor is not a speed reader; some types of content can be read quickly, but others need more of an engagement in order to get satisfaction. For many, that's a surprise; they were under the impression that good readers just glide over difficult material and absorb it automatically by osmosis.

The whole concept of reading speed becomes important. Once students see that different texts require different pacing, they start to realize that they can approach a text as a puzzle to be solved, and they get to choose which strategies they might want to use. A newspaper article about a celebrity's new clothing line will be read at a faster pace than last night's text on social democracy. Expose them to multiple strategies and require that they try them all. For example, an assignment to read a selection from their class anthology is always accompanied by an annotation or writing assignment that requires their full engagement with the text. No "drive by" reading is allowed! Students will be required to mark up a three-page text with at least 10-15 comments. Check to see that this work is done and hold students accountable. Alternatively, they'll be asked to write five questions that point out any confusion they might have with the text and five questions that can each generate five minutes of thoughtful class discussion.

A careful, slow reading of a meaningful text encourages dialogue, especially when the student is asked to create lists of questions raised throughout his/her reading. Some student sample questions include the following:

To Mark Twain: Why do you use slang in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn?* It's hard to read.

To David Mamet ("The Rake: A Few Scenes from My Childhood"): Why write about such disturbing, awful events? Don't you want to forget all this horror?

To Toi Derricotte ("The Black Notebooks"): What ever happened to you after this phase in your life? Did you survive or crawl up in a ball and die?

These questions start to open the dialogue and encourage students to see their reading as a product of a writer. They are asked to notice how writers use words and create arguments; they will be doing the same in their writing. The connection between writing and reading takes time, but it can begin with the student having a dialogue with the assigned text.

Sometimes students will be asked to write the three most important ideas expressed in the reading and map how these ideas are developed. This is a reasonable time to spend several classes teaching mapping and the use of graphic organizers; students need to see how a piece of writing is organized and creating thinking maps that track arguments and the best evidence that builds these arguments helps deconstruct the piece they're reading while providing a model for building compositions of their own. David Hyerle has several excellent sources about mapping; the Venn diagram is just the beginning! Each class begins with a discussion about what it was like to read the particular selection. Paying attention to the act of reading, and honoring it as a worthy discussion topic, sends an important message to the students. It also allows them to *talk* about reading, something good readers do.

If instructors are able to choose the text for their first-year composition course, a good

choice for reluctant readers, as well as all learners, is a textbook that appeals to multiple learning styles: information presented visually, graphically, and chunked into manageable pieces enables more access from a broader base of students. Making the connection between writing and reading clear should be a priority. Students can be taught to deconstruct reading selections and simultaneously link this process to the creation of their own pieces of writing. They're not just reading for comprehension; they're reading to see how writers write. Also, it's helpful to use a text that shows that writing is a multi-phased process including pre-writing, brainstorming, mapping, and multiple drafts. The reluctant reader is often a reluctant writer and needs to learn that the first pass at either is not the last. Rereading a text in slow motion and rewriting a piece is honorable work and what good readers and writers do. This is a new idea for many reluctant freshmen.

Giving students choices in what they read and write about has proven to be another important teaching strategy. Giving the student the option to read three out of a list of five or six is an effective tool. They own the pieces they select; the old power struggle between student and professor is diminished. Additionally, each essay assigned gives the student the responsibility of selecting his or her own topic as well as the piece of writing s/he is responding to or analyzing. Again, one size seldom fits all.

In addition to the class text, students are required to be actively engaged in self-selected reading. Yes, reluctant readers can and do select books to read in and outside of class. It's one of the more empowering parts of reaching reluctant readers. Last semester 49 freshmen read more than a total of 164 books in Diane's classes: that's an average of 3.3 books per student. How does this happen? It's not magic; it's pretty simple and very easy to replicate. When given free choice and encouragement to select books for pleasure reading, people of all ages do it. There are basically just a few rules: choose a book (not a newspaper of magazine) you like, read until page 30, and if it doesn't grab your interest, drop it and find another. Instructors might try specifically telling the students, "Drop it like a bad boy/girlfriend." They remember that. Also, read every day and tell somebody about what you're reading. This idea came from Nancie Atwell, a noted educator who has used it successfully in lower grades. It's supported by research from multiple sources including *If Not Now: Developmental Readers in the College Classroom* by Jeanne Henry, who applies Atwell to the college classroom. If one of our teaching goals is that students achieve independence and confidence in using literary and critical strategies, self-selected reading gives them a vehicle to express their own thoughts and ideas while understanding those of professional writers. Another benefit of self-selected reading is that often students are able to fluidly read texts of their own choosing; this develops confidence as a reader which often transfers to required texts. One freshman student recently commented "I never like to read anything but once I got hooked on *Tuesdays*

with Morrie, I had to read Alblom's other books. Then I realized that I wasn't so afraid to read the required reading. At first, I just didn't think I could do it"

Giving students permission to be involved with a book for 30 pages and then letting class members decide to keep or drop the book is a powerful tool to give to reluctant readers. It puts them in control of their reading and gives them ownership. No, there are no preferred books. The choice is all theirs. The titles they choose fill an entire literary spectrum. Last semester's titles included *The Devil Wears Prada, The Lovely Bones, The Bluest Eye, The Kite Runner, The Secret Life of Bees, Teach Like Your Hair is on Fire, Tuesdays with Morrie,* the *Shopaholic* series, several books about sports figures, and a vast array of others too numerous to list. All that matters is that students find books they can fall in love with and read every day. Even busy people can find ten minutes a day to sit down and read a book, so this works for students with fully packed schedules.

Part of this strategy is that the reader has to talk to somebody about what s/he is reading. It's what good readers do. Share what you're reading. Diane was reading *Reading Lolita in Tehran* and got excited to read some of the other novels it discusses. So, she reread *The Great Gatsby* and just bought Nabokov's *Lolita*—something she has never read, sharing all of this with the class. This kind of "book talk" happens regularly now at the beginning of class. They will start to talk about the book they're reading. It's casual and relaxed talk: "My book is about.... I like how the main character behaves in the second chapter. This book reminds me of...." After a short while, we're all aware of what each other is reading, and we're kind of curious about some of the titles. Reluctant readers are much less reluctant to read. As the semester progresses, the book talk becomes contagious. It also becomes not only "safe" to talk about books, but actually cool to talk about what book you're reading.

Excited readers start to read at night before they go to bed. Some say that having time alone to read every day is an enjoyable way to relax. Others said it was one of the few nice things they did for themselves in the midst of a very busy semester. They get protective of their time with their book. That's not a bad thing! And they borrow books from each other.

Students need to select their own reading materials and engage in free voluntary reading (Pilgreen 9). If we really want our students to become lifelong readers we need to ensure that they have the opportunity to do so and the choice to read what they find interesting (Ivey and Baker 35). Of course, they can apply all of the skills and strategies that we have taught them.

At the end of the semester, students write about their self- selected reading experience (SSR). The results are overwhelming. These comments were typical:

- I personally like self selected reading, and I have not liked reading my whole life. It gives me a chance to go at my own pace and read something I like.

- Self- selected reading reminded me that reading is fun and good books are awesome to read. Reading is a much better way to spend my time than playing online or watching TV.
- SSR reminds me that I don't hate reading.
- I got in the habit of doing my SSR late at night. I almost look forward to it now. It got me to start reading again, and it feels good!
- From SSR I feel that my vocabulary expanded and I also feel that I am a better writer because of it. I write more detailed, informational sentences.
- I was finally able to pick out books that interest me, and I'm able to enjoy reading rather than feeling that it was forced upon me.
- I always hated reading, but SSR got me to enjoy it. I found myself not being able to put the book down. This has never happened to me before.
- I learned that reading fast is not what reading is all about.

What began in September as an arduous burden ends up being quite a celebration.

Conclusions

Working with reluctant readers of all ages has taught us that in order for the students to change their opinion of reading, we have to change our approach to teaching. Reluctant readers don't have the same learning style as we did when we were students. Their experience with books was not the same as ours. In order to reach these students, we had to change gears and reach to meet their needs. Teaching smart reading strategies that they might have missed, making connections between reading and writing, and giving students a choice of writing topics and reading titles are three reasonable places to begin. Another is to recognize that the old mantra "All teachers are reading teachers" is true in most classrooms, but especially true in first-year composition classes.

We set ourselves up for failure when we enter the classroom full of enthusiasm for an assigned reading and become disappointed, even angry, when we find that students were bored or confused. This is not a failure, but it is the moment when we need to become reading teachers and help students use the approaches to difficulty that they have been learning. It is always helpful to model our own difficulties with a reading and how we dealt with them. By modeling, we not only show skills and strategies, but also we show our vulnerability and our willingness to expose that making meaning can be a challenge, hard work, but also fun, like solving a puzzle or unraveling a mystery. Most importantly, we show that learning is an ongoing process that requires engagement, and engagement can push students out of their reluctance and into active learning.

As the NEA report, "To Read or Not To Read" makes clear, reading transforms the lives

of individuals—whatever their social circumstances. Regular reading not only boosts the likelihood of an individual's academic and economic success—facts that are not especially surprising—but it also seems to awaken a person's social and civic sense. Reading correlates with almost every measurement of positive personal and social behavior surveyed. It is reassuring, though hardly amazing, that readers attend more concerts and theater than non-readers, but it is surprising that they exercise more and play more sports—no matter what their educational level. something that most readers know but have mostly been reluctant to declare as fact— books change lives for the better (6).

Works Cited

Atwell, Nancie. *In the Middle*. 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998.

Bartholomae, David. "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills." *A Sourcebook for Basic Writers*. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987. 84-103.

Booth, David. *Even Hockey Players Read: Boys, Literacy, and Learning*. Markham, ON: Pembroke Publishers, 2002.

Coontz, Stephanie. *Marriage, a History: How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Durst, Russel. *Collision Course: Conflict, Negotiation, and Learning in College Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1999.

Graff, Gerald and Cathy Birkenstein. *They Say/I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing*. New York: Norton, 2006.

Helmers, Marguerite. "Introduction: Representing Reading." *Intertexts: Reading Pedagogy in College Writing Classrooms*. Ed. Marguerite Helmers. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 2003. 3-26.

Henry, Jeanne. *If Not Now: Developmental Readers in the College Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook. 1995.

Hyerle, David. *Visual Tools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1996.

Ivey, Gay, and Marianne I. Baker: "Phonics Instruction for Older Students: Just Say No." *Educational Leadership* 61.6 (2004): 35-39.

Jolliffe, David. "Review Essay: Learning to Read as Continuing Education." *College Composition and Communication*. 58.3 (2007): 470-494.

Krashen, Stephen. *The Power of Reading*. 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2004. National Endowment for the Arts. To Read or Not to Read: A Question of National Consequence. Research Report #47. November 2007.

National Endowment for the Arts. To Read or Not to Read: A Question of National Consequence. Research Report #47. Office of Research and Analysis, 2007.

Perkins, John. "A Community College Professor Reflects on First-Year Composition." *What Is "College-Level" Writing?* Ed. Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2006.

Petrosky, Anthony. "From Story to Essay: Reading and Writing." *College Composition and Communication.* 33.1 (1982): 19-36.

Pilgreen, Janice. *The Self Selected Reading Handbook.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2005.

Rosenwasser, David, and Jill Stephen. *Writing Analytically.* 5th Edition. Boston: Wadsworth, 2008.

Salvatori, Mariolina Rizzi and Patricia Donahue. *The Elements (and Pleasures) of Difficulty.* New York: Pearson/ Longman, 2005.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations.* New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Spivey, Nancy Nelson. "Transforming Texts: Constructive Processes in Reading and Writing." Technical Report No. 47. eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno = ED334543

Tovani, Cris. *I Read It, But I Don't Get It.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers, 2000.

Diane DeVido Tetreault *teaches in the English Department at Bentley University, Waltham, MA. In addition to teaching Expository Writing, she also teaches Bestsellers as Literature, American Icons, and Graphic Novel: Lit or Lite. All classes always include multiple strategies to improve critical reading, writing, and thinking. She lives in Wellesley, MA with her husband, daughters, and her books.*

Carole Center *is the Writing Program Director and an assistant professor of English at Lasell College in Newton, MA. Her research centers on composition pedagogy and the impact of race and gender on classroom interactions. Her work has appeared in* Teaching English in the Two-Year College, MELUS, *and* Journal of Basic Writing.

Jeanne Henry

Cultivating Reading Workshop: New Theory into New Practice

IN 1995, I PUBLISHED A BOOK CALLED *IF NOT NOW: DEVELOPMENTAL READING IN THE College Classroom*, which documented my adoption of a reading workshop approach, styled after the one described by Nancie Atwell in *In the Middle: New Understanding About Writing, Reading, and Learning*, for use with my college developmental reading students. My goal in using an Atwell-inspired workshop was to put into practice a pedagogical approach that was congruent with the transactive socio-psycholinguistic model of reading described by researchers like Kenneth Goodman in *On Reading* and the late Louise Rosenblatt in *The Reader, The Text, and the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*, and explained by writers like Frank Smith in *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. This theoretical understanding of reading convinced me that the only way to improve reading was by purposeful, authentic, and engaged reading. However, that rarely happened in my pre-workshop college reading classroom, where I first failed with skills-based reading textbooks and later with anthologies of earnest, short, non-fiction that I enjoyed but my students found impossible and uninteresting. I realized that my students were not going to engage with their reading if I kept selecting it for them and that they were not going to chose texts on their own time, either, since they reported that they hated to read and rarely did. If I wanted to motivate the kinds of high volume reading they needed to further develop their ability, I knew that I had to provide them with opportunities to experience pleasure and success as readers.

In the Atwell-inspired reading workshop I developed, my students were able to read any book of their choice, as long as they made steady progress with it and began a new book as soon as they finished one. The students wrote literary letters to me and to each other in which they discussed the books they were reading, and their classmates and I responded to these letters with letters of our own. In *If Not Now*, I described how students became eager readers, once they began to have authentic and engaging reading experiences with books of their own choosing. These are the kinds of reading experiences those of us who love to read already have had—we raced through Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner*, for example, before passing it on to friends we knew who would also take pleasure in a good story so well told—but many of our students simply have not had positive reading experiences and, as a result,

they cannot quite imagine what the rest of us see in books. Workshop changed that for my readers in 1990, when I first began using the approach at Northern Kentucky University, and seventeen years later, it continues to enrich the literacy of students in the college reading program I now direct at Hofstra University,[1] in New York, where our undergraduate reading course, LYST 12: College Reading, is taught as a reading workshop.

Through the years, a number of individuals have contacted me to let me know they were implementing a workshop approach, as well as to ask for advice, and a number of colleges, a cluster of them in Minnesota, have also developed workshop-styled reading courses. I would not call this a revolution (although I am sure my younger self must have hoped it would be); still, reading workshop does represent a pedagogical alternative to the traditional college reading skills/study strategies approach, as well as a theoretically sound alternative to the part-to-whole view of reading from which sub-skills approaches are drawn. It is the result of tightly theorized and well researched practice,[2] and it represents a pedagogical approach that is in step with the broader field of literacy theory and research, rather than a step behind.

When asked to talk about reading workshop at the college level, I make a point of focusing on new aspects the workshop, as it has taken shape at my university in New York— which is the focus of the remainder of this work as well—because I think it is important to continuously fold newer theoretical perspectives into existing pedagogy. Many provocative new layers of understanding about the nature of reading and readers themselves have emerged in the past fifteen years, not to mention that literacy went digital, practically overnight, and these developments need to inform *any* pedagogical approach to teaching reading.

---

1. Hofstra University is a private, non-sectarian, four-year institution located on Long Island, New York. Total enrollment, including, full and part-time undergraduate and undergraduate students, is 12,700. LYST 12: College Reading is located in the Literacy Studies Department, which offers masters degrees in literacy teacher-education and doctoral degrees in Literacy Studies. LYST 12 is a 3 semester hour course that counts as elective credit toward students' degree requirements. The course is not mandatory, and it is graded.

---

2. While providing a detailed discussion of how to implement a reading workshop approach is outside the scope of this paper, I recommend Nancie Atwell's *In the Middle* for both guidance and inspiration and Carole Avery's *And With a Light Touch,* which details her use of a reading and writing workshop with first graders. Avery's work demonstrates the ways in which the approach can be adapted (rather than "replicated"). While, in my view, the goal of a reading teacher is the development of readers, rather than the teaching of texts, I see the work of my colleagues in English as being much more focused—not always in ways they would prefer—on the need to "teach" specific texts to specific readers. This has been a frequently-voiced reservation about workshop on the part of the in-service secondary English teachers with whom I work. For them, I recommend Sheridan Blau's *The Literature Workshop.* While Blau's use of the term "workshop" is one I regard as more synonymous with "seminar," the way his approach to teaching literature is informed by reader response theory resonates with the way workshop is premised on a transactive, socio-psycholinguistic understanding of reading: both put readers, and their needs, at the very center of the meaning-making process.

My first shift in thinking about reading workshop came in the late 1990s when I came across Kenneth Goodman's perspective on the need to "revalue" struggling readers. Goodman believes that we must help readers "revalue themselves as language users and learners, and revalue the reading process as an interactive, constructivist language process" (421). My department colleagues[3] were unified in the belief that focusing on readers' strengths, rather than their "deficiencies," created the kind of strengths-based environment in which struggling readers could flourish, and we believed that helping students rebuild their relationship to reading was a crucial aspect of helping them to develop further. The concept of "revaluing readers," as well as the need for it, made immediate sense to us.[4] Many of our freshmen had been labeled in the ego-bruising and unproductive way we often describe children in American schools: remedial, at risk, learning disabled, reading disabled, weak, or low functioning. These students believed they were destined to be, by nature, "poor" readers for the rest of their lives. I came to see this as an important obstacle for them to overcome, but first I needed to start with the way *I* described my students.

> "believed they were destined to be, by nature, 'poor' readers for the rest of their lives"

In my earlier writings, I referred to my students as "non-readers" and "reluctant readers." Certainly these terms described their behavior and attitude toward reading, but they also placed the blame on the students, even though I had long been convinced that their reluctance to read had been instructionally-induced by skills-based remedial reading classes and/or high school English courses that required reading that was too difficult and too distant for the vast majority of students to experience any success with, or pleasure in. Yet the term Alan Flurkey tended to use to describe young readers who were in trouble, "struggling readers," did not quite describe my college students. My freshmen were very much *able* to read; they were simply disinclined *to* read. As a result, they lacked experience with different genres, writing styles, and degrees of difficulty.

---

3. It would be burdensome for readers if I were to individually name and credit—in the body of this paper—each member of my department for his or her particular contributions to the overall conceptualization that has become our reading workshop. However, I do want to list each of them—Barbara Cohen, Alan Flurkey, Andrea García, Debra Goodman, Teresa McGinnis, Denny Taylor, and Joan Zaleski—and to make the observation that having LYST 12 housed in a literacy department has ensured that the course is shaped by an array of ever-evolving theoretical and pedagogical perspectives, as well as diverse teaching experiences.

4. For more information about the concept of revaluing, as well as revaluing-related assessment and pedagogical practices, see Flurkey and Goodman, Y.M, pp. 129-150; Goodman, Y.M., pp. 600-609, and Goodman, Y.M. and Marek.

The eventual term I settled on was due in large part to Elvira Sousa Lima, a Brazilian educator who joined our department as a visiting professor. For an amazing two years, Elvira commuted between Paris, Sao Paulo, and New York, and she brought a sophisticated, global perspective to our discussions about literacy. We talked about the late Paulo Friere's work in Brazil and his belief that literacy is both a fundamental right and an emancipatory tool. Elvira invited me, along with several of our doctoral students, to visit community literacy and dance projects in one of Sao Paulo's notorious *favellas*, and I could see for myself the determination with which these people were educating themselves and their children in the face of the world community's failure to so do. And while it would have been ridiculous to say my students had been denied their rights as readers, or to in any way compare their struggles to those of the people I met in Brazil, thinking about literacy as a *right* did make me think about how sad it was that so many of my students had spent most of their young lives without the pleasure, or the power, of extensive reading. It was fair to say that, for whatever reason, my students had not been fully enfranchised as readers. It occurred to me that even though my students had had a dozen years of schooling, somehow—in spite (or because) of all that educational effort—the fundamental pleasure that so many people find in reading had not been successfully cultivated in them. I began describing them as "disenfranchised" readers.

The idea of "revaluing" readers meant more than finding something tactful to call them, however. My *students* had to revalue *themselves* as readers, and revaluing really got legs as a pedagogical practice when I began to see it in relation to some of the newer research that was exploring the ways in which literacy is a social practice. I had always seen literacy as primarily a linguistic process, but after reading David Barton and Mary Hamilton's *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community,*[5] my thinking shifted. *Local Literacies* was an ethnographic study of the everyday literacy practices of several people living in Lancaster, England, in the 1990s, and the study examined what Barton and Hamilton call "vernacular literacies practices" (10-11), which they define as "literacy practices that are essentially ones which are not regulated by the formal rules and procedures of dominant social institutions and which have their origins in everyday life" (247). These "everyday" literacies, such as reading and signing petitions, for example, or reading religious texts, community newsletters, or fliers for lost kittens, fill our lives and are areas in which we are linguistically (and socially)

5. For more theoretical information on the subject of social and/or situated literacies, see Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanic's Situated Literacies and Brian V. Street's *Social Literacies*. For pedagogical practices that make use of these sociolinguistic perspectives, see Egan-Robertson and Bloome's *Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities*. Catherine Wallace, pp. 101-114, provides a thoughtful reflection for the need to balance an appreciation of local literacies with an awareness of the pressure globalization is exerting on individuals to expand and to internationalize their linguistic capabilities.

competent. However, they are taken for granted. I realized that if I took my students' every-day, vernacular literacies for granted, they probably did, too. Yet, these were literacy prac-tices in which they not only engaged but also excelled. Instant messaging, for example, requires a facility for instantly transposing oral language into a written register that still sounds like speech. I lack this skill and, by and large, so does my entire generation, but our students are experts, and this linguistic skill, evidence of verbal strength that it is, gets over-looked in academic contexts.

I decided to add classroom activities to the reading workshop that would help stu-dents identify their everyday, home and community, non-academic literacy practices, because I saw this as a way of helping banged-around readers explore the huge role reading plays in their lives outside of school and notice for themselves how successfully they man-aged these literacy demands and pursuits. One of the first activities we developed was bor-rowed from one of our graduate teacher-education courses, "Introduction to Literacy Studies." In the class, we ask our new teachers to record all of their literacy practices for a 24-hour period. The goal was to help our graduate students to broaden their definitions of literacy to include non-academic reading and writing. To introduce the logs, I typically would ask stu-dents to tell me, off the cuff, all the reading and writing they could remember having done in the past 24-hour period. Usually my freshmen mentioned the book they were reading in the workshop and other academic assignments, but they rarely mentioned their instant mes-saging, reading the scrawl on news channels, or texting, or live journaling, or blogging, or any of the other dozens of ways they regularly use reading and writing in their daily lives.

After the discussion, I assigned students to keep a log for a 24-hour period, beginning at the end of our class meeting, and to bring it with them to the following class, along with a one-page reflection paper. For the paper, I asked them to write about what they had learned about their own reading, from their log entries, and to discuss their *attitude* toward the differ-ent reading activities in which they engaged, in terms of the different settings in which it occurred or the different purposes it served. In the fall of 2006, my most recent class of fresh-men readers recorded dozens of different literate activities in their reading logs. They wrote about the writing they posted to their social networking website of choice, as well as all the different postings they read there. Troy and Tina turned out to be regular readers of a partic-ular TV blog that is also a (guilty) pleasure of mine. The very cerebral Clay's[6] log document-ed that he read different political, anti-war, and anti-Bush blogs. Every student read material

---

6. I obtained students' written consent to make use of their classroom discussions, as well as their assignments for the class. All names are pseudonyms. While the material included in this article does not represent formal research, I did take fieldnotes when I could, and often recorded notes later, when the students had had a discussion I wanted to remember. All conversations included here are heavily edited to avoid typical digression (frequently, my own).

available on the internet during the 24-hour period, whether they were looking up information for a class, cheat codes for a video game, or getting information about campus events. Offline, they read washing instructions, greeting cards, signs in their residence halls, as well as menus from the various restaurants and cafes located on campus. Clara's log showed that she had been up late reading Jeffrey Eugenides' *Middlesex* (and I had to wonder, not for the first time, why she was in a reading class). And, to a student, they sent and received dozens of text messages during the twenty-four hours they recorded their uses of literacy.

We spent the rest of the class discussing the revelation each student came to that he or she was reading and writing all the time and that most of this reading and writing was completely untroubled, efficient, and easy. Gaby said, "You know how I said the first day that I hated to read? Well I realized that I don't hate everything I read. I like reading for this class, and I like what we're reading in my seminar." I asked her what she thought made the difference, and she replied, "Well, I pick the books for your class, and my seminar teachers picked books I'm interested in. The stuff I don't like to read..."

"Like *Crossroads of the Warrior*,[7] by Alex Edwards," Jason interrupted, and the six members of the class who had also been assigned this very difficult and very long book, laughed.

"You guys have got to get your head around that book," I said. "Think about how much faith your instructor has in you since he assigned you such a tough book."

"He may have faith in me," Jason said, "but I'm the one praying I'll pass."

"What qualities do you dislike in a book, Abby?" I asked.

"If it's boring, or too hard, or somebody told me I had to read it."

"So, you like reading when you're interested in the topic, or when you chose the book yourself, and if it's not too difficult."

"Yes."

"And five weeks ago you told me you hated to read more than almost anything else?"

Gaby smiled. So did I.

With the exception of the three students who began the class as avid readers, Clara, Donna, and Clay, all of the others made admissions similar to Gaby's. I considered it progress to see the students begin to redefine themselves as people who liked to read some things, but not other things, because this made them like every other reader on the planet, rather than "poor" or "reluctant" readers. As we further discussed their log entries, I was struck by their prolific dispatch of text messages. Honestly, I just did not "get" the appeal of this form of communication. I decided to ask the students to teach me to text. For a minute, they looked so

---

7. Neither the title of the book nor the name of the author is actual. I needed to protect the anonymity of the professor who assigned it, as well as the reputation of the author.

embarrassed for me that I quickly explained that I knew the mechanics of working my phone, but what I did not understand was the "why" part of communicating in this way.

"It's...I don't know. Why *do* we do it all the time?" Clara asked.

> "I decided to ask the students to teach me to text."

"It's fun. You know people are thinking about you, or you're thinking about them," Clay said.

"Sometimes it's just quicker," Troy said. "People can talk too long on the phone."

"And texting's good if you don't want to get involved," Clay said.

"One time I sent this guy a text message to break up with him," Angie said.

"That's harsh," Jason scolded.

"Hey, it beat having to tell him to 'man up' when he started crying, didn't it?" Angie replied. Who could quarrel with that logic?

"It's gotta be funny," Peter said. "You know you want to picture the person reading the message and just cracking up."

Gaby added, "My mom sends me really sweet messages."

"My mom texts me inspirational stuff," Tina said, "like just one word, stuff like 'soar.' She spells out the entire word though. She doesn't really know how to do it."

"Tell me about that," I said, "what you leave out."

"I was thinking about that when you did the lesson where you showed us the paragraph that left out all the vowels, and we could read it anyway," Clay said. "It's like that with texting. You leave out a lot of the vowels."

"You use numbers for words that are...what do you call two words that sound the same?" Gaby asked.

"Homonyms?"

"Yeah. 'See you' is 'CU.'"

"There's something else I don't understand," I said. "With all the unlimited messaging pricing plans available now, how come people still keep the messages short?"

"It's just how it is. It's the style," Angie said and shrugged.

"I think it's part of what's fun about texting. You see an abbreviation that's cool, or funny, and you start using it too," Troy said.

"Weren't you reading a book about the Marconi device?" Clay asked me. Clay and I shared an interest in early 20th century history that the other students had learned to tune out.

I nodded and said, "*Thunderstruck*, by Erik Larsen."

"And they used telegraphese for those messages back then too, right?" Clay said.

I nodded. "You're right. I read that entire book and never made the connection to any other type of wireless messaging until now."

"That's because you don't text," Clay said.

"Right again."

"But what I was thinking," Clay said, "is that even rich people back then probably used telegraphese in their messages, because that's what a wireless message was supposed to sound like, even if you could pay hundreds of dollars."

"So what you're saying is that there are social and linguistic conventions to text messaging now that persist beyond their original need?"

"Not in so many words," Clay said, "but yeah."

Peter looked at Clay. "Marconi device? How do you know this stuff? Are you going to tell us the history of smoke signals next?"

"As a matter of fact . . . ." Clay said, and laughed.

What was born from this conversation with my students was a new revaluing mini-lesson in which I will explore with students the social and linguistic conventions of text-messaging, as a means of helping them recognize the linguistic strengths they display in this form of communication. For example, language has to be pared down to its least redundant but still comprehensible elements, and texters have to be very aware of graphophonemic relations. Texting requires a linguistic adroitness, and my students have these particular skills well in abundance of most members of my generation. Praising teenagers for their texting skills may seem to some like praising someone who can write backward— a bit useless in real world terms—but I think we have very little idea of what our students will need to know in the future and what talents will best serve them. I know my high school teachers in the 1970s never guessed that I would someday need to know that to access encrypted files on my USB drive using either a Mac or a PC I would need a cross-platform encryption utility.

I have been slow to produce pedagogical practices that reflect relatively recent thinking of theorists and researchers like Gunther Kress, who are examining the ways in which literacy is multimodal in nature.[8] In *Before Writing: Rethinking the Paths to Literacy*, Kress offers the view that the future of meaning-making will be less dependent on written expression and more infused with other symbolic systems, such as imagery, music, and movement. Young

---

8. For further reading about the multimodal nature/future of literacy see Kress' *Writing the Future*; Gregory, Long, and Volk's *Many Pathways to Literacy*, and Alvermann, Hagwood, and Williams' article, "Images, Language, and Sound: Making Meaning with Popular Culture Texts."

people have already incorporated these modalities into their social lives. Visit the social networking site of just about anyone, from tweens to twenties, and you will see an all-about-me profile that includes, at the very least, videos, music, writing, and photographs, and there is a likelihood that many of these materials were original compositions. In an irresistibly titled article, "Khmer Rap Boys, X-Men, Asia's Fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating Multilingual and Multimodal Classroom Contexts," Theresa McGinnis argues that contemporary educational practices "do not address the diversity or complexities of our students' literacy and language practices" (570). One consequence of our continued emphasis, perhaps over-emphasis, on teaching and regarding meaning-making as primarily a written process is that we are not harnessing the intense energy students direct toward multimodal expression. McGinnis persuasively points out that "when we allow... students to bring in the literacy practices they engage in naturally in their social worlds, we are given broader perspectives of our students. We will see them as talented and capable learners, and we will want to create more learning opportunities that tap into these abilities and talents" (578). I agreed whole-heartedly, but I struggled with how to incorporate multimodal expression into my teaching, because it was a kind of creativity I had not experience on a visceral level myself, and therefore had not fully embraced. It was a former doctoral student in our program, Aga Krauze, who finally got me across this digital and creative divide.

Aga's dissertation was a study of the way her college reading students responded to an assignment to produce a multimodal interpretation of a book they had read in her reading workshop. One of the first interpretation projects Aga told me about was one in which a student had burned all the songs mentioned in Stephen Chbosky's novel, *The Perks of Being a Wallflower*, onto a CD to create a soundtrack for the novel. What struck me about this response to the novel was how it was entirely obvious, yet it had never occurred to me to listen to a single song mentioned in the book, not even an important one mentioned more than once, The Smiths' "Asleep." The main character, Charlie, tries to describe for readers how beautiful the photograph of a girl he loves is by saying, "If you listen to the song 'Asleep,' and you think about those pretty weather days that make you remember things, and you think about the prettiest eyes you've known, and you cry, and the person holds you back, then I think you will see the photograph" (48). Clearly it was an invitation to the MTV generation to go and listen to the song. I had missed an entire layer of meaning in the book and had, apparently, failed to notice that most of my students had sprouted white earbuds, had instant access to virtually everything ever recorded, and were enthralled by music. Could there be any more welcoming an invitation to the interpretation of literature—for this generation—than music? I was sold on the literature interpretation project after hearing how Aga's student had responded to *Perks*.[9]

I tried Aga's literature interpretation project[10] myself for the first time in the fall of 2006, and to introduce it to my students I borrowed an example of a literature interpretation project created by one of our undergraduate teacher education students. He had used iMovie, and numerous video clips downloaded from the Internet, to create a short film depicting his interpretation of the future described in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. The student had also used Garage Band, an Apple application for composing music, to create the soundtrack for his video. My reading students that fall were speechless for a moment when I showed them the movie because they were so impressed, and a number of them decided to try making movies of their own.

Using RealPlayer, QuickTime, or iMovies, students like Donna created videos that reflected either plot elements or themes of their books, and I was most impressed by Donna and Clay's projects. Donna enjoyed the Sophie Kinsella novel, *Confessions of a Shopaholic*, and the images in her movie included Park Avenue storefronts, twirling credit cards, a montage of fine furs, and other luxury items either being worn or purchased. She downloaded these images from the Internet, and she used Gwen Stefani's song "Rich Girl" as the soundtrack for her movie. I was not surprised that her classmates sang along when we watched the movie in our classroom. I had ordered pizzas to celebrate their presentations of their literature response projects, and the students were in a terrific mood. I joined them in singing along to the soundtrack for Clay's movie, rapper Yung Joc's "It's Going Down," and they were laughing so hard they cried.

Clay's movie was the most ambitious. He created a visual exploration of the setting of Darcy Frey's investigative book, *The Last Shot: City Streets, Basketball Dreams*. Frey had followed the short basketball careers of several high school players in the Brooklyn neighborhood of Coney Island. The book chronicled the hopes and, in many cases, the disappointments of these urban youths whose dreams were tied to the NBA. Clay was moved by Frey's description of the poor community in which he had focused his research, and his

9. While the various classroom activities described in this paper are intended to support students' reading in the sense of helping them come to revalue themselves as capable readers—as evidenced in their everyday uses of literacy—as well as to make connections between their highly energized and completely voluntary personal and social literacy practices and the world of academic literacy, I still expect that readers will want to know how all this helps students read textbooks, as well as distant or difficult primary sources. My answer is that there are no shortcuts from here to there. Students have to become confident and willing readers before they can tolerate—let alone master—any reading that, for them, might be irrelevant, uninteresting, or so difficult that stress (and possibly resentment) compete with comprehension. As long as we exclusively focus reading instruction, in K-12 as well as in post-secondary literacy classrooms, on what students cannot yet read, we fail to help them discover the readers they already are...and the readers they can become.

10. Aga Krauze's dissertation is available through Dissertation Abstracts International and provides details about implementing her multimodal literature interpretation project.

movie included images of Abraham Lincoln High School and its gym, along with the housing projects the players lived in. One of Frey's subjects, Stephon Marbury, did make it to the NBA, where he still plays for the Knicks, and Clay included a picture of him. I was pleased that for this project, and another one he had done earlier in the semester, Clay had taken advantage of Hofstra's proximity to New York City to take photographs for his work. Ironically, the out-of-state students were more likely to venture into Manhattan than were their local, suburban classmates. These weekend excursions always provided good stories in class on Monday, not a few of which involved "Prada" bags sold from basements in Chinatown.

There are people who knew me ten years ago who would be surprised by how many changes or additions I have made to my practice of reading workshop. When I read a draft of my former doctoral student Barbara Green's dissertation, "Making Progress: Implementing Innovative Pedagogy in a College Literacy Program," which was a qualitative study of a community college's adoption of reading workshop, I was incredulous and outraged that this community college had a required minimum number of pages students had to read in order to pass the course. Now, my reading workshop also has a minimum page requirement. This makes administrators much more relaxed than the way I had previously phrased the reading requirement for workshop: "Read as much as you can, as often as you can."

My earlier orthodoxy was a result of my determination that the workshop not be compromised by efforts to please those with a different, or non-existent, theoretical understanding of reading, as well as those who wanted short-cuts and quick fixes. I am still wary, but the fact is that I am in a department in which there is the security that comes from shared thinking about the nature of literacy and how best to teach it. I have more help, and all of it is expert and passionate—when I need to explain or to defend workshop, or to, once again, resist the kinds of assessment practices that reassure administrators but then become the tail that wags the dog, as worried teachers start teaching to the test and worried students start asking them to. But it is the exchange of ideas within my department—both with my colleagues and our doctoral students—that easily allows us to cultivate our knowledge of literacy and to refine our teaching practices. I welcome whatever comes next, as we fold new theories, new teaching practices, and new blood into what has become—at Hofstra—a collective, collaborative, and on-going implementation of the reading workshop approach Nancie Atwell imagined for us twenty years ago.

Works Cited

Alvermann, Donna, Margaret C. Hagwood, and Kevin B. Williams. "Images, Language, and Sound: Making Meaning with Popular Culture Texts." *Reading Online.* (4) 11, 2001. *< http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/action/alvermann/index.html >*

Atwell, Nancie. *In the Middle: New Understanding About Writing, Reading, and Learning.* Rev. ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998.

Avery, Carole. *And with a Light Touch: Learning About Reading, Writing, and Teaching with First Graders.* Rev. ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002.

Barton, David, Mary Hamilton, and Roz Ivanic. *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Barton, David, and Mary Hamilton. *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Blau, Sheridan. *The Literature Workshop: Teaching Texts and Their Readers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2003.

Chbosky, Stephen. *The Perks of Being a Wallflower.* New York: MTV, 1999.

Egan-Robertson, Ann, and David Bloome. *Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 1998.

Eugenides, Jeffrey. *Middlesex: A Novel.* New York: Picador, 2003.

Flurkey, Alan D., and Yetta M. Goodman. "Andrew, Stuck in Words: A Retrospective Analysis Case Study in Revaluing." *New Ways of Looking at Learning Disabilities: Connections to Classroom Practice.* Eds. Lou Denti and Patricia Tefft-Cousin. Denver, CO: Love Publishing, 2001. 129-150.

Frey, Darcy. *The Last Shot: City Streets, Basketball Dreams.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004.

Goodman, Kenneth S. *On Reading.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996.

___. "Revaluing Readers and Reading." *On the Revolution of Reading.* Eds. Alan Flurkey and Jingguo Xu. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2003. 421-429.

Goodman, Yetta M. "Revaluing Readers While Readers Revalue Themselves: Retrospective Miscue Analysis." *The Reading Teacher* 49.8 (1996): 600-609.

Goodman, Yetta M. and Ann M. Marek. *Retrospective Miscue Analysis: Revaluing Readers and Reading.* New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1996.

Green, Barbara P. Making Progress: Implementing Innovative Pedagogy in a College Literacy Program. Diss. Hofstra University, 2002. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: 63, no. 12A.

Gregory, Eve, Susi Long, and Dinah Volk. *Many Pathways to Literacy: Young Children Learning with Siblings, Grandparents, Peers, and Communities.* London: Routledge, 2004.

Henry, Jeanne. *If Not Now: Developmental Readers in the College Classroom.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann-Boynton/Cook, 1995.

Hosseini, Khaled. *The Kite Runner.* New York: Riverhead Trade, 1994.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World.* 1932. New York: Harper, 1998.

Kinsella, Sophie. *Confessions of a Shopaholic.* New York: Dell Mass Market Paperback, 2003.

Krauze, Aga. *Interpretations Through Art: Aesthetic Transactions With Text.* Diss. Hofstra University, 2004. Dissertation Abstracts International: 66, no. 50A.

Kress, Gunther. *Before Writing: Rethinking the Paths to Literacy.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

___. *Writing the Future.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1997.

Larsen, Erik. *Thunderstruck.* New York: Crown, 2006.

McGinnis, Theresa Ann. "Khmer Rap Boys, X-Men, Asia's Fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating Multilingual and Multimodal Classroom Contexts." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy.* 50.7 (2007): 570-579.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. *The Reader, the Text, and the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work.* Rev. ed. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read.* Rev. ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994.

Street, Brian V. *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy, Ethnography, and Education.* Boston, MA: Addison Wesley, 1995.

Wallace, Catherine. "Local Literacies and Global Literacy." *Globalization and Language Teaching.* Eds. David Block and Debra Cameron. London: Routledge, 2001. 101-114.

Jeanne Henry *is the author of* If Not Now: Developmental Reading in the College Classroom *(1995) and an associate professor of Literacy Studies at Hofstra University in New York, where she teaches college reading and literacy teacher education courses.*