DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 847 CS 511 653

AUTHOR	Zhang, Yuanzhong
TITLE	Re-Conceptualizing Engagement in Reading through Miscue Research.
PUB DATE	2001-10-00
NOTE	41p.; Paper presented at the International Symposium on Language Teaching (4th, Beijing, China, October 5-15, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Education; *Miscue Analysis; *Reading; *Reading Instruction; Reading Motivation; *Reading Research
IDENTIFIERS	*Literacy Engagement; Reading Behavior

ABSTRACT

With the rise of the engagement perspective on reading, the concept of engagement has been increasingly applied in reading instruction and research without seriously questioning its underlying assumptions. By probing into the intellectual roots of the engagement perspective including Dewey's notion of reflective thinking, and Freire's critical pedagogy, this paper provides a critical analysis of the theoretical tentativeness and incoherence of the engagement perspective, and argues consequently for reconceptualizing engagement in reading through miscue research which is built on a unified theory of reading. Also, the possibility of integrating ideological ingredients into a new frame of conceptualization is explored. Contains 45 references and 4 tables of data. (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 847

Re-conceptualizing Engagement in Reading through Miscue Research

Yuanzhong Zhang

University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA 85721

Abstract: With the rise of the engagement perspective on reading, the concept of engagement has been increasingly applied in reading instruction and research without seriously questioning its underlying assumptions. By probing into the intellectual roots of the engagement perspective including Dewey's notion of reflective thinking, and Freire's critical pedagogy, this paper provides a critical analysis of the theoretical tentativeness and incoherence of the engagement perspective, and argues consequently for reconceptualizing engagement in reading through miscue research which is built on a unified theory of reading. Also, the possibility of integrating ideological ingredients into a new frame of conceptualization is explored.

Suggested Citation of the Document: Zhang, Y. (2000/01). *Re-conceptualizing engagement in reading through miscue research*. Educational Specialist' s Thesis (2000), Department of Language, reading and Culture, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona./Paper accepted for presentation at The Fifth International Symposium on Language Teaching (2001), Beijing, China.

Note: This article is part of the series on Assessment and Evaluation Studies in English Reading and Literacy Education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Y. Zhang
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 511 653

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Re-conceptualizing Engagement in Reading through Miscue Research

by

Yuanzhong Zhang

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

THE DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE, READING AND CULTURE

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Educational Specialist's Degree

IN THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2000

Introduction

It is a noticeable trend in recent reading research that a burgeoning interest has been zeroed in on building a framework of the engagement perspective for reading research and pedagogy (see Guthrie & Alvermann, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 1997; Baker, Afflerbach, & Reinking, 1996). This growing body of literature draws on Dewey's (1933) notion of reflective thinking and Freire's (1970, 1987) works on critical pedagogy and relates these theorizing to the agenda of educating motivated self-directed learners who maintain sustained interests in reading and achieve desirable academic and social goals (Mosenthal, 1999; Guthrie & Anderson, 1999). Much has been written in this line of inquiry to examine the conditions of curriculum and instruction, and of home and communities in order to explore possibilities that would foster readers' voluntary participation in literacy activities that help improve their effectiveness in reading.

Although most of these studies stimulate on-going debates on the nature of reading and the implications for instruction, an apparent contradiction is betrayed in the conception of the fundamental concept—engagement. Given the premise that "reading should be conceptualized as an engagement" (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999, p. 17) involving "a person in a conceptual and social world" (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999, p. 37), if "engaged reading" means an elevated state of reading wherein readers mobilize motivational, conceptual, and strategic resources through social interaction to make meaning of the text (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999), it is then legitimate to reason the possible existence of "non-engaged" reading which contradicts, however the stated premise. Hence, the whole notion of "engagement" which underlies research on the engagement perspective on reading needs to be reconceptualized in order to (re)-build a unitary and coherent account of interpretation.

As a point of departure from the above explorations, this article investigates the concept of engagement by drawing on theories and practices related to miscue research. The miscue research discussed in this article includes miscue analysis (Goodman & Burke, 1972; Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987) which examines the miscues produced during authentic reading events using procedures developed from Goodman Taxonomy of Reading Miscues (Gollasch, 1982; Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987), and retrospective miscue analysis which involves readers in exploring with teachers/researchers or peers their own reading process (Goodman & Marek, 1996). Miscue research done in the past three decades has been instrumental in framing a socio-psycholinguistic transactional model of reading. I believe that the insights that emerge from the longitudinal miscue research would provide us with a powerful lens to understand the meaning of engagement for reading. As I relate miscue research to scrutinize the engagement perspective on reading, I focus specially on 1) what theories the engagement perspective draws on and how it departs from these theories in building its own frame, 2) how the engagement perspective is (re)-conceptualized by miscue research to support the reader's and the teacher/researcher's growth, 3) what can be built on miscue research to explore new insights into engagement in reading.

Intended as a conceptual paper that offers a critical cross-fertilization of a diversity of ideas and perspectives concerning engagement in reading, this article falls into three interconnected parts. It is unfolded by a critical analysis of the key concepts that undergird the engagement perspective by tracing its intellectual roots. Then, the whole notion of engagement will be reexamined in the light of miscue research, using examples from the existing miscue research data pool and my own research to illustrate its impact on readers' awareness. Finally, the possibility of integrating sociocultural, critical and ideological perspectives into a new frame of conceptualization will be discussed.

Reading as a Motivated Act of Engagement:
The Intellectual Debts of the Engagement Perspective on Reading

The engagement perspective on reading conceives of reading as a motivated act of engagement, and cultivation of "engaged readers" should be the overarching goal of reading instruction. In order to be engaged in reading readers need to be motivated, strategic, knowledgeable, and socially interactive (Afflerbach, 1996), capable of applying skills in connected and reflective manners (McCarthey, Hoffman & Galda, 1999). Reading engagement is, therefore, a condition "in which a person builds on existing conceptual knowledge by using cognitive strategies in order to fulfill motivational goals and to understand or participate in a social world" (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999, p. 20). Motivation serves as the primary trigger for engaged reading to transpire and sustain. Central to readers' engagement are the conceptual processes that underlie meaning making as readers form, apply and reorganize their schemata along motivated social interaction. Social interactions mediate readers' regulation of motivation and their subsequent choice of proper cognitive strategies to attain conceptual knowledge. In sum, motivational goals, application of strategies, and social interaction form together a centripetal force to propel readers' conceptual development. And readers' enhanced conceptual understanding leads to the enhancement of motivation (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999).

Legitimate as the assertions of the engagement perspective sound and appealing as the description of the processes of engagement looks, the engagement perspective, as Alvermann notes (1999), is, however, "not a theory in itself", but compels researchers to "turn to theories that are amenable to explaining what engaged readers do" (p. 143). That it cannot be accepted as an independent theoretical model consists in at least two reasons. One is, as previously alluded, the under-differentiation of "reading-as-engagement" from "engaged reading" confuses the boundaries of different levels of thinking that are emphasized in the engagement perspective.

Equating "reading-as-engagement" with "engaged reading" would inadvertently lead to a counter-intuitive conclusion to the effect that there might exist instances of reading engagement that are not engaging and renders it thus vulnerable to the criticism of attempting to disguise the hidden hierarchy, and undermining consequently the logical frame of the perspective.

Second, paradigmatic conflicts are evident between the constructivist paradigm and interactionist paradigm in the conceptualization of motivation as a valued goal. Educators and researchers who side with the constructivist camp emphasize the intrinsic aspect of motivation. Motivation is considered to be driven by a "continuing impulse to learn" (CIL) (Oldfather, 1992) that generates "thoughts and feelings that emerge from the learners' processes of socially constructing meaning" (Oldfather & Wigfield, 1996, p. 94). CIL exists inherently in readers' mind as a dynamic representation of personal beliefs and conceptual development. It is activated by and evolves along readers' involvement in literacy events and interaction with other members of the learning community. Although CIL influences readers' engagement behaviors, it cannot be taken as a metric to predict and measure readers' achievement and success. Conversely, interactionists tend to believe that motivation is predominantly shaped by and correlated with external forces in sociocultural environments that surround learning. Guthrie & Anderson (1999) enumerate factors that may exercise influences on motivation as to include readers' involvement in particular literacy events, their interests in the current reading task, their perceptions of social demands, values, and personal capacity, and their willingness to take up challenge. Readers' perceptions of self efficacy, which appears as the determining factor for their positioning of motivation, has been shown to be varying considerably with the outcomes of their school performance (Schunk et, al, 1991) Connecting motivation with school achievements, as observed by Oldfather & Wigfield (1996), produces such a major paradox that while school achievement

reinforces learners' acquiring of intrinsic motivation by the values it promises, it, however, induces learners to pursue "standard" knowledge and decontextualized skills that breed instrumental motivation which is predicated on external stimuli. Hence, it corrupts consequently the quest for meaning on which intrinsic motivation thrives. Being such, this paradox creates an intensified antagonism between the intrinsic and extrinsic aspect of motivation, and results in but an overemphasis on transmission rather than construction of knowledge in instruction.

The lack of a unified account of theory compels the apprenticeship of the engagement perspective with proven theories of education, reading and learning. As Mosenthal (1999) and Guthrie & Anderson (1999) admit, the engagement perspective owes intellectual debts to Dewey's (1933) treatise on reflective thinking and benefits also from critical pedagogy (Freire 1970; Freire & Macedo, 1987). I will discuss in the following Dewey's and Freire's influences on engagement in reading, and explain how the engagement perspective departs from the original theories it claims to draw on. I will also discuss the connections between the notion of ownership of literacy (Au, et al, 1990; Au, 1993) and the engagement, which has received less attention than needed from literature. These discussions are intended to legitimize the necessity to reconceptualize reading engagement by shifting toward a different angle—miscue research which views engagement as a constituent of, instead of an appendix to, the reading process.

Engagement is essentially informed by the notion of "reflective thinking" (Dewey, 1933, 1938). As Dewey (1933) defines it, "reflective thinking" is an "active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends to constitute reflective thought" (p. 9). The expressions of "active, persistent and careful" were translated into "motivated, sustained, and knowledgeable", which become the cornerstones of the engagement perspective. According to

Dewey (1933, 1938), what distinguishes reflective thinking from non-reflective thinking is that the former is propelled by a purposeful quest for solutions to reduce uncertainties in understanding, whereas the latter is predominantly controlled by the existing personal or public beliefs which have not yet undergone critical scrutinization. As a result, non-reflective thinking leads at best to "a kind of emotional commitment" in lieu of "intellectual and practical commitment" (p. 7). In contrast, reflective thinking contributes to the broadening of vision that allows an individual to reach unknown realms of knowing and builds new experiences on to the existing ones.

As Dewey (1933) put it, reflective thinking "involves (1) a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity, mental difficulty, in which thinking originates, and (2) an act of searching, hunting, inquiring, to find material that will resolve the doubt, settle and dispose of perplexity". (p. 12). That is, reflecting thinking entails a process of problem-posing and problem-solving on the part of the learner. Through the stimuli of curiosity, individuals problematize issues in learning that takes place in the real world. Curiosity grows in three phrases, starting from the organic curiosity to satisfy physical needs, moving toward social curiosity that attends to the exploration of interpersonal ties, and culminating in the stage of intellectual curiosity that focuses on constructing meaningful questions that would guide individuals' course of action (Dewey, 1933). The act of problematizing, being directed by an intellectual curiosity, results often in the interrogation of personal beliefs systems. Faced with the condition of cognitive dis-equilibrium as a consequence of the validity and accountability of prior conceptions being jeopardized, learners have to search for alternative modes of thinking to modify their current schema so as to better accommodate anomalies encountered. However, instead of anticipating a definite answer,

the act of problematizing suggests that one cross the boundary of knowing and thinking that embrace new zones of possibilities.

Although the engagement perspective looks deceptively analogous to reflective thinking, it deviates from Dewey's (1933, 1938) original assertions and assumptions in three important aspects. First, it has a different conception from that of Dewey's of the functions of reflective thinking—how reflective thinking is contextualized in actual engagements in reading. The engagement perspective contends that engaged thinking and reading should be treated as the first and foremost goals of literacy development, while taking into little account of the range of functions and purposes of reading as they might vary with the contexts and situations in which reading occurs. It tends to treat all engagements in reading regardless of situational variation as performing the same function and serving the identical purposes. It is well illuminated in Baker, et al (1996) that intention of monopolizing the diversity of the cultures of home communities by concentrating on the commonalities of all types of discourses as a frame of reference to the exclusion of variations

> We believe that children are more likely to develop into engaged readers and writers when the influences of these two important contexts are *synergistic*, that is, when parents and teachers have a shared understanding of children's needs and work toward common goals (italics added to the original quote, p. 21).

Although Dewey (1933) differentiated reflective thinking from non-reflective thinking and deemed the former as a better way to make meaning of the world, he did see that reflective thinking is situated in the contexts where problems arise. The way that individuals think is related to their orientations to identified problem. He vividly illustrated the "situatedness" of reflective thinking with a real-life example.

> When a situation arises containing a difficulty or perplexity, the person who finds himself in it may take one of a number of courses. He may dodge it, dropping the activity that brought it about, turning to something else. He may indulge in a flight of fancy, imagining himself powerful or wealthy, or in some other way in possession of the means that would enable him to deal with the difficulty. Or, finally, he may face the situation. In this case, he begins to reflect (p. 102).

Second, the engagement perspective differs from Dewey as regards whether engagement is a course of action or a process of thinking, or a consortium of both. Entertaining engagement as a course of action by which readers gain the power and strength to motivate themselves to participate in literacy events in school and home settings, research on engaged reading (e.g. Baker, et al, 1996; Guthrie, et al, 1996; Afflerbach, 1996) adopts chiefly an interactive stance by developing novel instructional approaches to stimulate students' interest to involve in literacy activities. They have demonstrated that engagement-based reading instruction does make a difference in students' attitudes of reading and their reading proficiency. Yet, they overlook an important fact that students' changing attitudes would impact reciprocally on instruction and curriculum. In contrast, Dewey (1938) classified engagement as a component of the thinking process acted upon the meaning constructed from experience. Reflective thinking increases the breath and depth of learners' engagement. In the meantime, being engaged in reflective thinking provides thinkers with incentives to acquire deeper meaning which fosters more rigorous thinking. It is experience that connects and mediates thinking and acting that both underlie engagement. Experiences are built on and influence each other reciprocally so that they need to be attended to as a whole instead of being broken down into discrete units (Dewey, 1938). The

best way to engage people in activities is to allow them to explore "desirable future experiences" (Dewey, 1938, p. 16)

> The effect of an experience is not borne on its face. It sets a problem to the educator. It is his business to arrange for the kind of experiences which, while they do not repel the student, but rather engage his activities, are nevertheless, more than immediately enjoyable since they promote having desirable future experiences. Just as no man lives or dies to himself, so no experience lives and dies to itself. Wholly independent of desire or intent, *every experience lives on in further experiences*. (italics added, p. 16).

Third, the engagement perspective does not seem to share with Dewey (1933, 1938) the same expectations of the outcomes of engagement. Readers involved in the engagement-based instruction and learning are expected to grow to be motivated readers who will possess a strong interest in reading and demonstrate their competence in school-based literacy tasks. They are expected to learn to solve self-given problems in reading (Mosenthal, 1999). This product-oriented view of the outcome of engagement diverges, again, from Dewey's (1933) process-oriented conception that reflective thinking involves purposeful questioning of the personal and/or public beliefs and assumptions behind the given goals. What learners are obliged to do when engaged in reflective thinking is beyond setting up concrete goals and objectives, but to build a *meta-goal* that would enable them to transgress the boundaries of their own thinking. This meta-goal "rests upon careful and extensive study, upon purposeful widening of the area of observation, upon reasoning out the conclusions of alternative conceptions to see what would follow in case one or the other were adopted for belief" (Dewey, 1933, p. 8).

In addition to the ties to Dewey's thoughts on reflective thinking, the engagement perspective on reading pronounces its kinship to Freire's critical theory of education in that the way that the engagement perspective construes literacy echoes what Freire & Macedo (1987) assert that "the reader's development of a critical comprehension of the text, and the sociohistorical context to which it refers to, becomes an important factor in our notion of literacy" (p. 157, cited in Guthrie & Anderson, 1999, p. 19). However, as Alvermann (1999) notes in her extensive review of the inquiry modes to engaged reading, the critical approach is virtually "missing" and "underrepresented" in the current research (p. 145). That the claim of concurrence with critical pedagogy in theory contradicts the methodological under-representation of critical approaches in research significantly weakens the concordance of the engagement perspective in theory, research and practice. This very incompatibility is also suggestive of an autonomous view of literacy, as labeled by Street (1984, 1995), which tends to neutralize the prevalent influences of the social, cultural, and ideological realities on the practice of instruction and learning by focusing on a set of selected strategies and skills to be acquired by students. Seen in this light, the engagement perspective on reading short-circuits Freire's critical argument that learning to read is a process of exploring what happens in the real world. Hence, the critical components in the engagement perspective happen to be a mere coincidence in lieu of contemplated concurrence with Freire's model of pedagogy.

The engagement perspective, although allying itself to Dewey and Freire, seems to have more immediate links with the notion of ownership of literacy defined by Au, (1993), Au, Scheu, & Kawakami, (1990), and Au & Kawakami (1991). The ownership perspective was developed to draw attention to the importance of affect in literacy development with students from diversified cultural backgrounds (Au, 1993). The central mission of the ownership perspective, as being

resounded by the engagement perspective, is to make "schooling a rewarding experience for students of diverse backgrounds" and to make "literacy meaningful in their lives" (Au, 1993, p. 68). Similar to the engagement perspective, the ownership perspective is built on the tacit premise that certain groups of students are under-motivated and under-prepared for schooling. And in order to gain the membership for the mainstream society, they need to possess literacy as a tool. Although the notion of ownership recognizes students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, it views their backgrounds, in analogy to the engagement perspective, as a route to transit to the mainstream culture instead of preserving them as part of the learning goals. In addition to the basic assumptions and academic goals, the ownership perspective shares with the engagement perspective common or similar visions on instructional and curriculum framework as well as assessment and accountability. Table 1 summarizes the major similarities between the ownership perspective and the engagement perspective.

Table 1 Similarities of the Ownership Perspective and the Engagement Perspective

Parameters	The Ownership Perspective	The Engagement Perspective
Assumptions	Ownership is concerned with students' valuing of their own competence in reading and writing and their willingness to use literacy on a regular and voluntary basis in everyday life (Au, 1993; Au, et al, 1990).	Reading engagement is the condition in which a person builds on existing conceptual knowledge by using cognitive strategies in order to fulfill motivational goals and to understand or participate in a social world. (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999, p. 20)
Goals	As an overarching goal in a whole literacy curriculum, the ownership of literacy is to make "schooling a rewarding experience for students of diverse backgrounds" and to make "literacy meaningful in their lives" (Au, 1993, p.68)	One of the major goals in literacy instruction is to cultivate engaged readers who are motivated, strategic, knowledgeable, and socially interactive, capable of using skills in coherent and reflective manners. (Baker, Afflerbach & Reinking, 1996)
Instructional and Curriculum Framework	The ownership curriculum framework consists of six interlocking aspects: (Au, 1993, p. 62-68) 1) ownership as the overarching goal 2) writing process 3) reading comprehension 4) language and vocabulary knowledge 5) word reading strategies 6) voluntary reading	The engagement curriculum model contains the following ingredients: 1) identifying the problems in learning 2) developing strategies for exploring these problems 3) solving problems through social interaction 4) building new concepts about learning 5) evaluating the achievement in learning
Assessment & Accountability	The assessment of ownership measures (Au, et al, 1990) 1) personal interest and preference 2) confidence and pride 3) self-monitoring 4) voluntary engagement in reading outside school 5) exploring and sharing of resources 6) interaction and collaboration with others	The assessment of engagement measures: (Afflerbach, 1996) 1) personal interest 2) confidence 3) use of prior knowledge and experiences 4) self-monitoring and self-assessment 5) critical comprehension 6) willingness to interact with others

Reading as Engagement: Insights from Miscue Research

Given the incoherence and inadequacies of the engagement perspective on reading discussed above, an alternative lens built on a unified theoretical model of reading is indispensable to reconceptualize the mechanism of engagement in reading. Miscue research, which emerges from and feeds the socio-psycholinguistic transactional model of reading (known also as Goodman's model of reading, see Goodman, 1994; 1996) provides a powerful frame of reference to revision engagement as an inherent part of reading. I will first analyze the major assumptions of and conclusions from miscue research relevant to the current debate of the nature of engaged reading. Then, I will explore how engagement in reading is reconceptualized in miscue research by using concrete examples from the on-going projects on miscue during the past ten years (Goodman, Marek, Costello, Flurkey, & Brown, 1989; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Goodman & Anders, 1999; Goodman & Paulson, 1999; Flurkey, 1996; Zhang, 2000).

Miscue research is composed of miscue analysis and retrospective miscue analysis (RMA). From its very inception, miscue research has been attempting to transcend "standardized" criteria of evaluation imposed by school-based literacy by rationalizing and advocating a set of beliefs and assumptions about the reader and the reading process consistent with the principles of scientific realism and the transaction theory (Dewey & Bentley, 1949). Miscue analysis was originated by Ken Goodman & Yetta Goodman to involve a reader in reading and retelling a new, unabridged authentic text. The main purpose of miscue analysis is to look into the instances of mismatch between print and the reader's oral rendition by examining their syntactic and semantic acceptability in relation to meaning change and graphophonic alternation. In fact, the term "miscue" itself speaks of the potential legitimacy of divergence from print being part of the parallel text constructed by the reader (Goodman, 1994) as opposed to

"mistake" or "error" that excludes that possibility. Based upon "The Goodman's Taxonomy of Reading Miscues" (Gollasch, 1982), Goodman & Burke (1972) & Goodman, Watson, & Burke (1987) have developed an applicable inventory of procedures of miscue analysis for teachers/researchers known as Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI). The procedures for miscue analysis as described in RMI share the same steps in material preparation and the arrangement of oral reading and retelling sessions, and vary in the respects of coding and analyzing miscues according to the purposes and functions of the oral reading session. The notations appearing in this article follows the conventions supplied in Goodman, Watson & Burke (1987).

(R) stands for repetition of words or phrases.

(C) means that the miscue has been corrected.

(UC) signifies unsuccessful attempts of correcting substitutions.

[ ] indicates omission.

Λ represents insertion of additional words or phrases.

As an outgrowth and expansion of research in miscue analysis, retrospective miscue analysis (Goodman & Marek, 1996) came into being in late 1970s and has become popularized as a tool for literacy instruction and research. RMA engages readers in demystifying the nature of the reading process and (re)-examine their self perception as a reader through in-depth exploration of their own miscues in collaboration with teachers/researchers and/or peers. The overarching goal of RMA is to establish principles and strategies of revaluing, assisting teachers/researchers, among others to revision what counts as reading and what counts as a reader, and to help learners appreciate their own competence and strengths as a reader and inquirer. Typically, an RMA session is made of four cyclically connected parts: 1) preparation and arrangement of the oral reading, 2) oral reading and retelling session, 3) RMA session

(discussing, examining and reflecting on miscues), 4) analyzing the discussion session and planning for next RMA sessions (Goodman & Marek, 1996). RMA session itself asks readers questions related to the legitimacy of the miscue (e.g. "Does the miscue make sense?", "Does the miscue sound like language?", Goodman, & Marek, 1996, p. 45), the relevance of miscue to print (e.g. "Does miscue look like what was on the page?", Goodman & Marek, 1996, p. 45), the motives and reasons for making miscues (e.g. "Why do you think you made this miscue?", Goodman & Marek, 1996, p.45), and the effect of miscues on understanding (e.g. "Did that miscue affect your understanding of the text?", Goodman & Marek, 1996, p.45).

Research in miscue analysis and retrospective miscue analysis in the last thirty years has discovered, among other things, that readers, regardless of their proficiency, are all involved in the *same* process of making sense of print. (Marek & Goodman, 1996). It is the way that individual readers "control the process" that leads to the differences in reading effectiveness and efficiency (Marek & Goodman, 1996, p. 23). The way that readers control the process is affected by the knowledge, experiences and strategies that they activate to transact with the text (Goodman & Goodman, 1990). Motivation exists intrinsically in learners (Goodman, 1986). What motivates readers to engage in reading is the knowledge and experience they choose to bring to the sense making. Consider the following argument by Goodman & Goodman (1990):

> In our own work we have been aware that there are complex differences among being able to read, being able to talk about reading, and understanding the reading. But it is the knowledge learners bring to the making of meaning, the knowledge and the relationships between the people in the environment who interact with the learners, and the particular environment itself that influence how easily and how well reading develops (p. 230-231).

This compelling thrust encodes at least two intriguing implications to ponder on. First, it seems necessary to distinguish the notion of "motivation" from that of "motive". Motivation is *a priori* that prevails independent of the sociocultural environments that surround learning. The role of environment is to *activate* rather than create motivation conducive to learning and inquiry. In contrast, motive can be defined as a context-dependent construct, responding to both the influences of sociocultural circumstances and the motivation at work. From this vantage point, the kind of "motivation" that the engagement perspective discusses resembles more to the concept of "motive" than to "motivation" as I define here. Noticing this crucial difference is of fundamental importance to reconsider what counts as engagement and what values and functions it has for reading instruction and learning.

Second, the intrinsicality of motivation corroborates that reading is an act of engagement whereby readers construct meaning and build understanding of the text and the world. Reading without engagement is a non-existent condition that cannot be counted as reading at all. The notion of "engaged reading", which has frequented in literature on the engagement perspective on reading, might shortchange the meaning making process central to reading in that it tacitly accepts the possibility that non-engaged reading might survive. Therefore, akin to the disruptive redundancy in the term "reading comprehension" as analyzed by Goodman (1975), "engaged reading" undermines in effect the essential productivity of the reading behavior and contributes only to mystifying the reading process that alienates readers' involvement. Seen in this view, notwithstanding the immediate gratification as engaged reading allures, it is questionable how far engaged reading is able to facilitate the growth of further and richer experience beneficial to thinking and understanding. Hence, reading is *not a condition* for engagement; *it is engagement* in its own right.

The reading-as-engagement perspective influences our conceptualization of the nature of engagement in schooling in general. In antagonism to the dichotomy of learning in school and learning outside of school, Goodman & Goodman (1990) agree with Dewey (1902) by arguing for a "single learning process" on which engagement thrives.

> We believe, rather, that learning in school and learning out of school are not different. The same factors that make concepts easy to learn out of school make them easy in school. Learners build on experience, expand on schemata and rely heavily on language for development. We cannot accept the notion that the two kinds of concepts develop differently. Whole language assumes a single learning process influenced and constrained by personal understanding and social impact (p. 229).

Miscue research provides important understandings for us to reconceptualize engagement in reading as 1) a process of active meaning-making, and 2) a constructive revaluation of diversity of language and culture as resources.

Engagement as a Process of Active Meaning-Making

Goodman & Goodman (1994) regard miscue as a vehicle that "liberate(s)" readers "from detailed attention to print as they leap toward meaning" (p. 112). Such an understanding of the meaning-making process presents a scenario that differs qualitatively from what the engagement perspective advocates meaning-making as the consequence of rather than the cause of reading and learning (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999). As shown in miscue research, engagement in active meaning-making is mediated largely by 1) the willingness to take risks and 2) the use of varied socio-cognitive strategies.

Risk-taking Risk-taking requires, above all, readers to be aware of the need to step outside of their comfort zones to explore zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) which are pitched at their cognitive and intellectual potentials. Being one of the missing links that explains the risk-taking behaviors and the motivations behind in research on risk-taking, the zone of proximal development perpetuates readers to be engaged in meaning construction through the flow of reading. It is because of the power of the zone of proximal development that motivates readers, when troubled by something unknown, to utilize various resources to coordinate the appropriate use of language cueing systems, not to get entrenched in one particular cueing system that concerns more the surface features of text information rather than the meaning itself. Consider the following remarks made by Eddie (pseudonym), an adult ESL reader in the initial reading interview of the RMA session (Zhang, 2001).

> I remember the first time when I came into an English Chat-room called "Chattown USA" in which a lot of native speakers of English participated. I read their writing and find that the style is so fresh, not like those writings I learned from my English teachers. I asked them why their English does not strictly follow grammatical rules. Guess what they said? They said that it is their own language so why they should bother to think about grammar all the time. That is really a wake-up call to me. I decided not to let grammar slap on my head and constrain my imagination and expressiveness any more. From then on, I began to play with English by my own intuition. I am not afraid of making mistakes for I know I will no matter how hard I try to avoid that. I began to erect the confidence of being a writer and inquirer and found myself doing a better job to articulate what I think and what I want to say.

The awareness of his overuse of the syntactic cueing system in writing, through his interaction with a community of native users of English, counseled Eddie a point of departure from his general fixation on achieving grammatical precision to communicating meaningful thoughts to the audience.

The shades of meaning constructed through risk-free modes of thinking would significantly differ from those obtained from situations when high-risk reflective thinking and inquiry is involved. The following vignette taken from Flurkey's (1996, p. 117) RMA session with Rolando, an at-risk middle-school student, portrays the differences.

Alan: What did you say?

Rolando: *Regultion*?

Alan: Yeah, could you write that down however you think it should be spelled?

Rolando: Ah, regulations? That's something—regulations? I guess I didn't understand it, or I wasn't really interested in reading that day. Something that happens if I don't feel like reading, I don't really pay attention to the words and trying to figure them out as much as I do. But right now, I'm in the mood, so it's regulation.

Alan: Okay. Also, you know what the story's about. You've read it once. So that might help, too. But, how you deal with it the first time? You said....

Rolando: *Re-, re-, regultion?* That's what I said?

Alan: Yeah.

Rolando: Uh, I don't know—when I was reading, that's what it sounds like. The *u* and *tion*, Gultion—right now. If the *r-e's* gone, it's *gul*, *g-u-l*, /shun/, *t-i-o-n*.

Alan: Why didn't you go back and self-correct?

Rolando: Well, there I just wanted to read through the—in the beginning, you want to get to the "what happens" more. In the beginnings, hardly something never really happens this time, so I just try to really skip that, I guess, and keep on reading and when it comes, maybe figure it out. Just one word ain't gonna be the whole story importance. Might not. May might, then again.

That "Rolando initially excuses the miscue as a result of "not paying attention" as Flurkey (1996, p. 117) remarked captures subtly Rolando's shyness to take risks in exploring his own miscuing process. However, his attitudinal shift along the RMA interaction led him to moving from the superficial causality between inattentiveness and incomprehension toward seeking the "purpose and intelligence behind his actions" (Flurkey, 1996, p. 117), and brings consequently in him a heightened awareness of the strategy employed in meaning making.

Use of Socio-Cognitive Strategies As shown in miscue research, engagement in reading is realized primarily through two overarching socio-cognitive strategies—the schema-driven miscuing strategy and the schema-forming miscuing strategy (Goodman & Goodman, 1994). From Piagetian's point of view, "assimilation" is set in motion in the schema-driven miscuing process, while "accommodation" is at work in the schema-forming miscuing process. The schema-driven miscuing process refers to the generating of miscues from sampling text information to make predictions about comprehension based upon the existing schema. Let us look at an example from my own miscue research on Jim, an adult ESL reader (Zhang, 2000).

but

"Name?" she asked, ʌ not noticing my attempted obedience.

By drawing from his knowledge of syntactic structure in English, Jim inserted a "but" to predict what follows "she asked" might be a clause indicating a contrast to what was previously said.

When schema-driven miscues tend to disrupt the meaning of the text, readers' meta-cognitive awareness would bring up self-corrective behaviors to redress the meaning to achieve understanding. It seems that self-correction of schema-driven miscues is mediated by the meaning-oriented metacognitive awareness. Compare the following two examples of omission in Jim's reading.

(1) It's always struck me as funny (in mirthless sort of way) that I can more readily say "I am Korean" in Spanish, German and even Latin than [I can] in the language of my ancestry.

(2) I've never been in love with someone I dated, or [dated] someone I loved.

In example 1, Jim did not regress to correct his omission of "I can" because it results in a grammatically acceptable form of ellipsis that does not alter the meaning. However, in example 2, the omission "dated" was retrieved in that leaving out "dated" produced self-contradiction in meaning.

The schema-forming miscuing process pertains to the producing of miscues as readers acquire new concepts to form schema in digesting text information. Goodman & Anders' (1999) examination of Erica's struggle with the word "husband" in her reading "The Man who Kept House", a Canadian folk tale, provides an excellent account of how miscues mediate readers' learning what texts teach. A ten-year-old then, Erica did not successfully sound out the word "husband" when it was encountered at the very beginning of the story, which refers anaphorically to woodman. However, the recurrence of "husband" in such various contexts as being preceded by the definite article "the" or co-occurring with "wife" across the story provides Erica with opportunities to make hypotheses and inferences of the meaning of "husband" by virtue of the clues from the syntactic and semantic cueing systems. The numerous miscues

produced along her struggling serve as, what Flurkey (1997) calls, "riverbed" to support the flow of reading to get to the meaning.

The schema-forming process often requires readers to relate to their prior knowledge and experience to make sense of the current reading task. One of the common strategies employed by developmental readers to build new conceptions is through "transmediation" (for detailed discussion, see Short & Harste with Burke, 1996). In the process of transmediation, readers bring in experiences with other sign systems such as drawing, theater, & sculpture to make sense of print. The transaction among different sign systems would spark off insights and enlightenment. Rolando, a middle-school struggling reader, highlighted in his RMA session with Alan Flurkey (1996) the role of movie in assisting him to visualize meaningful images that are not graphically presented in the text.

> Alan: but the movie may give you—may let you see some things, help you imagine… I don't know.
>
> Rolando: I know because imagination you see more things, like, in the book it doesn't tell you every single thing that happens in the movie. Like this guy can be right here, and you can see, like the waves coming up. They don't tell you about the waves. They don't tell you about the submarine. I mean, they can tell you the missile, you know, the torpedo, but you don't see the torpedo, how, they are. How they go through the water. See, that's the thing that, you, like…"

It is important to note that in many cases the schema-driven miscuing process and the schema-forming miscuing process operate simultaneously in the process of meaning. This becomes especially transparent in the types of miscues that share the identical or similar patterns. The following table gives information about Jim's miscues related to the use of articles. As it

suggests, Jim was using his intuitive knowledge of the use of English articles which advised him to put an article before a common noun as what he did in L-0124. When proper nouns appeared in the text, the knowledge that he applied with the common noun becomes the frame of reference to form a new concept that a zero article should be used before proper nouns.

Table 2 Jim's Miscues Related to the Use of Articles

Expected Response	Observed Response	Status of Self-correction
0124 graduate school	the graduate school	Uncorrected
0145 the Homecoming football game	∧ Homecoming football game	Uncorrected
0227 for a Ph.D. in English Literature	for ∧ Ph.D. in English Literature	Uncorrected

Engagement as Constructive Revaluation of Language and Culture

As one of the cardinal concepts of miscue research, revaluing defines the agenda for reading instruction and research. Goodman (1996) builds a model of revaluing to empower teachers/researchers and learners to challenge the "diagnosis and remediation" approach (p. 13) in reading instruction through revisioning the act of reading and the notion of reader. Table 3 (p. 26) offers an account that includes the major parameters of revaluing on the part of the teacher/researcher and learner. As much attention has been invested on how miscue research makes a difference in readers, I will provide examples in the following to focus particularly on the transformative power of miscue research on teachers/researchers to build critical perspectives as they revalue the diversity of language and culture that students bring in.

One of the important insights that transform Flurkey's (Goodman, Marek, Costello, Flurkey, & Brown, 1989) understanding of the use of self-correction in oral reading through his informant, Rolando, is that the ostensible self-correction behavior may not be the result of the

reader's faithful commitment to an accurate reproduction of the text; rather it is indicative of his awareness of the audience.

Miscue: "But it's Saturday, " Lester said. "I don't go to school on Saturday. I stay home and [© pick] [dig] potatoes.

Rolando: "pick potatoes". Pick, uh, you can pick potatoes. Pick 'em. You know you pick carrots, pick berries. You can pick potatoes. I guess, that's fast—came on my mind. And I wanted to say that, so what the heck, I said it.

Alan: And let's listen to what happened. Did you self-correct it or not?

Rolando: I think I did.

Alan: How come?

Rolando: Well, I wanted to say it. Like, I know I really wanted to say "pick potatoes" because it sounds better to me—I like it more. And, well, *the truth, that thing stayed in my head, but to read, it out loud and show the people, I read how it was.*

Alan: To show the people....

Rolando: *...that's I'm reading to, for they can understand it, more likely, 'cause they might not think like me.*

On another occasion, Rolando made a similar explanation of "showing people" for his over-correction.

Miscue: "[® d-- I do] not allow crying [© my class in the classroom]," said Mrs Gorf.

Alan: Why do you suppose you went back and corrected them?

Rolando: Because, I do—because, it wasn't—I'm there, right, so I went back and corrected it for it would look right. But like I said again, a lot of times I probably

kept "my class" in my head, but to show people right, I did it the right way. Really wasn't wrong, but it was just the way it was written.

My research (Zhang, 2000) on Jim, a confident adult ESL reader helps me understand that when ESL readers who have gone through skills-based instruction in their schooling, would swing to the other end of pendulum by assuming a stance of "egocentric resistance" to the author's ideas when engaged in the exploration of meaning. And such a shift may also be perceived as resulting from, as Board (1982) labels as, the influence of "instruction-independent" personalities".

> Jim's reading and retelling corroborated that he was resistant to some of the arguable ideas and perspectives in the text, and demonstrated an eagerness to challenge the writer's authority. Although his resistance and eagerness signified his initiative in self-empowerment, they unmistakably divulged his egocentric approach to the ownership of literacy. Indeed, relatively fewer instances were observable during his oral reading to show his conscious reflecting on the text with which he was transacting. Rather, he processed textual input according to his existing schema.

Table 3 Revaluing—An Agenda for Reading Instruction and Research

Revaluing—An Agenda for Reading Instruction and Research (Goodman, 1996)		
Parameters	Teacher/Researcher	Learner
Goals	To support readers in trouble to grow to be confident and effective readers and inquirers	To help readers in trouble become more effective in and conversant about reading.
Principles	1) learning about the students 2) shifting from skills-based reading instruction to meaning-based reading instruction 3) revaluing learners' strength by their progress	1) revaluing themselves as learners 2) revaluing the process of reading as the construction of meaning in response to print 3) appreciating their own strengths in relation to the productive strategies they use in reading 4) putting in perspective their transactions with authors with text 5) realizing the importance of interest and background for comprehension (Goodman, 1996, p. 17)
Methods & Strategies	1) providing students with more options and control to set up the content, pace and direction of learning 2) developing text materials that are more accessible to student readers 3) encouraging students to use writing as a tool of meaning construction	1) understanding the gist of the text in lieu of every detail 2) learning to focus selectively on important or difficult information 3) learning to how to frame questions to ask the teacher they do not understand 4) learning to explore multiple sources of information (Goodman, 1996, p. 19)

Engagement as Cultural Ideology in Action: What can be Built on Miscue Research

Miscue research has shown that engagement in reading is in essence a transactional process that involves active meaning making and constructive revaluation of language and culture. Viewing reading as engagement in lieu of a condition for engagement offers an epistemology to thwart the encumbrance and frustrations of what Dewey (1938) named as "mis-educative" experiences in schooling and learning (p. 13). It internalizes motivation as an inherent part of the meaning construction process by lifting the overemphasis misplaced on the reliance of external resources to build motivation. These assertions speak of an ideological view of literacy (Street, 1984; 1995) that enables us to further conceptualize engagement as a practice of cultural ideology.

Ideology, as defined by Soltow & Stevens (1981), denotes a set of "moral and value prescriptions" of a "given class" that "functions by an appeal to moral norms" to cope with "social and political discontent" (p. 59, cited in Luke, 1988, p. 19). That means that ideology exercises social sanctions for certain beliefs and values systems, and moral codes that reflect the expectation of proper conducts and behavior on the part of a social class or group concerned. Ideology is not only mediated by the socioeconomic needs of the society and community, but also by the expectation and practice that individuals opt in reaction to the meanings and values of a given social class or group (Williams, 1976). Dominant culture can be manufactured through a collective participation of the human beings in a course of action that reinforces the network of social political relationships consistent with the ideological agenda of one particular class or group.

As part of the general ideological agenda, "ideology of literacy", a term coined by Soltow & Stevens (1981), accords to literacy instruction political implications that concern the

communication of a series of beliefs, assumptions, values and relationships. At a societal level, the inequality in negotiating the rules for proper conducts provides literacy education with the trigger to "reproduce the meaning of text and society" in ways that assist the "understanding one's own history and culture and their connection to the current social structure" and that promotes "an activism toward equal participation" that "effect and control our lives" (Shannon, Jongsma, 1991, p. 518). Hence, regardless of the awareness of the omnipresent influences of ideology, the act of teaching promotes "a particular set of social and cultural practices that are linked with the broader social and cultural ideology of the dominant society" (Bloome & Dail, 1997, p. 612).

The ideological message from miscue research is, in general, to transgress the ideological imposition of skills-based literacy instruction by (re)engaging readers/writers in a different set of social relationships wherein they are empowered to construct their own understanding while consciously unpacking the assumptions and bias behind the discourses. The set of social relationships that miscue research proclaims purports to a genuine rediscovery of self as a social being, instead of a compliance with the dominant discourse through forming collaborative partnerships between the teacher and students so as to *co-engage* each other. This is a marked difference between miscue research and the engagement perspective on reading. By validating readers' knowledge and experience as resources, miscue research exposes students to a variety of discourses related to the reading process and instruction. Students become more critically conversant about their engagement in reading as they study these discourses as the subjects and to grow to be "multi-discursive" (Edelsky, 1996, p. 154). Moreover, miscue research enables teachers/researchers and students to put their beliefs into action by incorporating diversity into

assessment practices. Students are measured not in terms of the tangible achievements in school settings, but the less transparent growth they are experiencing.

In contrast, the engagement perspective does not provide students with the opportunity to critique the discourse that defines the theory and practice of school-based literacy. It produces thus in students but a *motivated compliance* with the dominant discourse in disguise. The act of engagement upon such a narrowly defined premise is essentially an *asymmetric* practice that leads to dis-empowerment.

As we caution the tendency to neutralize the ideological implications of engagement in reading, we cannot overlook the voice that stretches the ideological impact to the exclusion of socio-cognitive internalization of the ideological influences in literacy development. Bloome & Dail (1997) present an alternative account viewing miscues as events wherein readers negotiate a set of social and cultural relationships to frame their reader stance and reader identity in relation to their use of intertextual mediation. Such a perspective would provide us with a great deal of insight into the complexities involved in the social, cultural, and ideological processes if they gave sufficient attention to the linguistic and socio-cognitive internalization of these processes. Unfortunately, their criticism promotes but sociocultural determinism that dissolves the contributions of language to thinking.

> Although miscue analysis involves a major shift in thinking about reading, and although, retrospective miscue analysis increases the reader's participation in generating insight about what is happening during the reading of a text, as currently defined, miscue analysis is part of a technological view of reading that defines reading as consisting of a set of cognitive and linguistic processes that readers use to interpret texts (Bloome & Dail, 1997, p. 611).

As Halliday (1975) observes, language learning is a process coordinated by three coordinating forces: learning language, learning about language, and learning through language. Learning language is concerned with the communication and performance of the functions of language. Learning about language is to study the infrastructure of language. Learning through language focuses on acquiring knowledge and skills through the medium of language. If what Bloome & Dail (1997) argue is considered to be concentrating exclusively on the aspect of "learning about reading as a social and cultural practice", then over-emphasizing one aspect of language learning would inadvertently obscure the importance of the rest. Given that knowing is different from doing, talking about language without using it in productive ways "can generate feelings of impotence" that aggravates the alienation of language users from engaging in connecting their own culture with the dominant culture Edelsky (1996, p. 155).

If Bloome & Dail's (1997) criticism of miscue research is misfired, then how can we build on miscue research to conceptualize and utilize engagement as cultural ideology in action? Edelsky (1996) envisages four ways that I borrow here to accomplish the purpose.

1) to treat all discourse as if they were equally interesting and legitimate objects for scrutiny,
2) To act on the results of that scrutinization,
3) to stretch the dominant discourse into accommodating more subordinate discourses,
4) To reconnect literacy learners with their communities (p. 154).

I incorporate Edelsky's theorizing into the conceptual frame of engagement in reading that I am constructing. In addition, this framework draws extensively from Dewey (1933), Goodman (1994, 1996), Goodman & Goodman (1994), Goodman & Goodman (1990), and

Freire (1970) and Freire & Macedo (1987). Table 4 provides the basic ingredients that buttress the whole frame.

Table 4 Basic Ingredient in the Conceptual Frame of the Perspective on Engagement in Reading

Engagement as Cultural Ideology in Action	
Symmetric Inquiry	Probing into the dominant as well as subordinate discourses to heighten the awareness of the variation and its underlying ideological assumptions
Reflective thinking	Relating discourses to one's prior knowledge, belief systems and experiences to understand the similarities and differences Transgressing one's boundaries of thinking to explore new zones of possibilities
Collaborative Meaning Construction	Involving in productive social interaction to construct and share the meaning with other members of the learning community
Conscious Transformation	Building critical consciousness to transform the conceptions of the reading process, self perception and the understandings of strategies and skills

Conclusion: The Dual Potential of Engagement in Reading

As the three perspectives presented in this article show, the notion of engagement in reading has "dual potential", to borrow a term from Edelsky (1996, p. 158), depending upon the way it is conceptualized. It can be both emancipatory and oppressive. This is because engagement is a social, culturally and cognitively embedded construct responsive to the influence of ideology, beliefs and values we build into the concept. If we consider engagement is a different state or process from what is typically involved in normal reading behaviors, we create, consciously or unconsciously, a hierarchy that leads directly to the stratification of behaviors. Certain types of behavior are thus touted as desirable and superior whereas others become problematic. The purpose of instruction is then to change what is undesirable into

desirable based on narrowly and shallowly defined criteria. Often, such kind of criteria is associated invariably with the dominant discourse, marginalizing non-mainstream discourses in literacy instruction and research. Under this ideology, students are engaged to learn how to compromise their own cultures in order to achieve success in school, which contributes to the hidden hegemony imposed on teaching and learning.

On the other hand, if we conceive of engagement as part of the reading and writing processes, we begin to realize that the differences in individual practice of engagement are not caused by the process of engagement itself, but by how the process is situated in sociocultural contexts that affect individuals' control. The goal of instruction is to create supportive sociocultural environments for learners to participate in productive inquiry. Under this ideology, learning to read and write becomes an enterprise that concerns the social and cultural realties relevant to individual and/or collective literacy praxis.

Hence, reconceptualizing engagement as a culturally ideologically mediated construct has important ramifications for literacy instruction and learning. First, it alerts the attention of teachers/researchers of the fact that literacy instruction is a "complex cultural activity" (Goodman & Goodman, 1990, p. 240) in which ideology is at work. Second, what we need to provide students is with "options" to choose from, not "directions" to follow if we expect genuine engagement to transpire. Third, learning should be treated as situated and dynamic instead of decontextualized. Accordingly, the engagement behaviors manifest differently as learning contexts vary. Fourth, although the nexus of miscue research and the ideological approach to literacy needs to be further investigated, it is clear that viewing engagement as cultural ideology in action should not negate the socio-cognitive internalization of the complexities involved in social interaction.

References

Afflerbach, P. (1996). Engaged assessment of engaged readers. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.) (1996). *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities,* (pp. 191-214). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Allan, L. (1988). *Literacy, textbook and ideology: Postwar literacy instruction and the Mythology of Dick and Jane*. London: The Falmer Press.

Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.

Au, K., & Kawakami, A. J. (1991). Culture and ownership: Schooling of minority students. *Childhood Education*, *67* (5), pp. 280-284.

Au, K., Scheu, J. A., & (1990). Assessment of students' ownership of literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *44* (2), 154-156.

Baker, L., Afflerbach, P., & Reinking, D. (Eds.) (1996). *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Board, P. (1982). *Toward a theory of instructional influence: Aspects of the instructional environment and their influence on children's acquisition of reading*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the known*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Education and experience*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

Edelsky, C. (1996). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (2 edition). London: Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Flurkey, A. (1997). *Reading as flow: A linguistic alternative to fluency*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona.

Flurkey, A. (1996). Revaluation and revelation. In Y. M. Goodman, & A. Marek (Eds.) (1996). *Retrospective miscue analysis: Revaluing readers and reading* (pp. 107-118). Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen.

Freire, P & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and world*. MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gollasch, F. V. (1982). *The selected writings of Kenneth Goodman* (Vol 1). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Goodman, K. S. (1996). *On reading*. Portsmouth, NH : Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S. (1996). Principles of revaluing. In Y. M. Goodman & A. M. Marek (Eds.) *Retrospective miscue analysis: Revaluing readers and reading* (pp. 13-20). Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen.

Goodman, K. S. (1994). Reading, writing and written texts: A transactional sociopsycholinguistic view. In R. B. Ruddell, M. P. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th edition) (pp. 1093-30). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, Y. M. & Anders, P. L. (1999). Listening to Erica read: Perceptions and analyses from six perspectives. In T. Shannahan, & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.) *National Reading Conference Yearbook 48* (pp. 178-200). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference

Goodman, Y. M. & Paulson, E. J. (1999). *The analysis of teacher-student oral interaction during retrospective miscue analysis sessions: Developing language about reading*. Unpublished research report, National Council of Teachers of English.

Goodman, Y. M. & Marek, A. (1996). *Retrospective miscue analysis: Revaluing readers and reading*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen.

Goodman, Y. M. & Goodman, K. S. (1994). To err is human: Learning about language processes by analyzing miscues. In R. B. Ruddell, M. P. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th edition) (pp. 104-123). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, Y. M. & Goodman, K. S. (1990). Vygotsky in a whole-language perspective. In L. C. Moll (Ed.) *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 223-250). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, Y. M., Marek, A., Costello, S., Flurkey, A., & Brown, J. (1989). *Retrospective miscue analysis with 7th and 8th grade good and poor readers*, Unpublished research report, National Council of Teachers of English/University of Arizona.

Goodman, Y. M. (1975). Reading comprehension: A redundant phrase. *Michigan Reading Journal*, *9* (2), 27-31.

Goodman, Y. M. & Burke, C. L. (1972). *RMI manual: Procedures for diagnosis and evaluation*. New York: Richard C. Owen.

Guthrie, J., & Alvermann D. (Eds.) (1999). *Engaged reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Guthrie, J. & Anderson, E. (1999). Engagement in reading: Processes of motivated, strategic, knowledgeable, social readers. In J. Guthrie, & D. Alvermann (Eds.) (1999). *Engaged*

reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications (pp. 17-45). New York: Teacher College Press.

Guthrie, J., & Wigfield, A. (Eds.) (1997). *Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Guthrie, J., McGough, K., Bennett, L., & Rice, M. E. (1996). Concept-oriented reading instruction: An integrated curriculum to develop motivations and strategies for reading. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.) (1996). *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities,* (pp. 165-190). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language.* New York: Elsevier.

Jongama, K. S. (1991). Critical literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *44*, (7), 518-519.

McCarthey, S. J., Hoffman, J. & Galda, L. (1999). Readers in elementary classrooms: Learning goals and instructional principles that can inform practice. . In J. Guthrie, & D. Alvermann (Eds.) (1999). *Engaged reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications* (pp. 46-80). New York: Teacher College Press.

Mosenthal, P. B. (1999). Understanding engagement: Historical and political contexts. In J. Guthrie, & D. Alvermann (Eds.) (1999). *Engaged reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications* (pp. 1-16). New York: Teacher College Press.

Oldfather, P. (1992, December). *Sharing the ownership of knowing: A constructivist concept of motivation for literacy learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Oldfather, P. & Dahl, K. (1994). Toward a social constructivist reconceptualization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning. *Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy, 26*, 139-158.

Short, K., & Harste, J. with Burke, C. (1996). *Creating classrooms for authors and inquirers*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Soltow, L. & Stevens, E. (1981). *The rise of literacy and the common school in the United States*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. London: Longman.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, R. (1976). Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory. In R. Dale (Ed.) *Schooling and capitalism: A sociological reader* (pp. 202-210). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul in Association with the Open University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge. MA: Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, Y. (2001). *Conceptualizing "observed authenticity" and "expected authenticity": Implications for adult literacy development*. Paper accepted for presentation at the International Reading Association 2001 Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Zhang, Y. (2000). Listen Twice: Exploring Jim's reading through miscue analysis. *Reading Instruction Journal*, 46 (2), 12-18.

Series on Assessment and Evaluation in English Reading and Literacy Education

by

Yuanzhong Zhang

Zhang, Y. (1998). A review on programmed instruction and adaptive testing. *Journal of Sichuan Teachers College (Philosophy and Social Sciences), 98*, (6), 27-33. (In Chinese)

Zhang, Y. (1998). Programmed instruction and adaptive testing. *Foreign Language Teaching Abroad*, *83*, (3), 46-50. (In Chinese)

Zhang, Y. (1999) Examining the role of student-written texts in college EFL instruction. *The Arizona Reading Journal*, *26*, (1), 19-25.

Zhang, Y. (1999). On GRE computerized adaptability test: An extension of programmed instruction in testing. *Journal of Shenzhen University (Humanities and Social Sciences), 16*, (1), 104-109. (In Chinese)

Zhang, Y. (1999). *Role-relationships in peer review discussions: A study of collaborative learning in a college EFL workshop.* 4th International Symposium on Language Teaching, Beijing, China.

Zhang, Y. (1999). *The blind leading the blind?: Using learner-authored texts to foster EFL students' cognitive development.* The Third International Conference on Language for Specific Purposes. University of Barcelona, Spain.

Zhang, Y. (2000). Understanding a reader's understanding: Exploring Jim's reading through miscue analysis. *Reading Instruction Journal*, 46 (2), 12-18.

Zhang, Y. (2001). Literacy as Conversations: Understanding a reader's understanding through retrospective miscue analysis. *The Arizona Reading Journal*, 28 (1), 46-54.

Zhang, Y. (2001). *Re-conceptualizing engagement in reading through miscue research.* The 14th Annual Colloquy of the Department of Language, Reading and Culture (http://www.arizona.edu/html/lrccolloquy.html), The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Zhang, Y. (2003). *Problems and prospects: Putting theories and practices of reading in the context of history.* Paper presented at 2003 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

CS 511 653

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Re-conceptualizing Engagement in Reading through Miscue Research	
Author(s): Yuanzhong Zhang	
Corporate Source: 5th International Symposium on Language Teaching	Publication Date: October 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
↑ ☑	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Yuanzhong Zhang	Printed Name/Position/Title: Yuanzhong Zhang/Faculty	
Organization/Address: Yuanzhong Zhang, College Prep Department Miami-Dade Community College-North Campus 11380 N.W 27th Avenue Miami, Florida 33167	Telephone: 305-237-1488	Fax: 305-237-8029
	E-mail Address: yzhang@mdcc.edu	Date: November 2002

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org