[Reading Faculty Publications](#)   [College of Education and Human Development](#)

2013

Illuminating Teaching and Learning: Students' Metacognition and Teacher Responsiveness in One College Developmental Reading Class

Tasha A. Vice

Texas A&M University-San Antonio, tvice@tamusa.edu

Illuminating Teaching and Learning:

Students' Metacognition and Teacher Responsiveness in One College Developmental

Reading Class

by

Tasha Anne Vice, B.A., M.Ed., M.A.,

A Dissertation

In

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

Carole Janisch, Ph.D.
Chair

Barbara Morgan-Fleming Ph.D.
Committee Member

Mary-Frances Agnello, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Michelle Kiser, Ed. D.
Committee Member

Dominick Casadonte
Interim Dean of the Graduate School

December 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this study those students greatly challenged by the task of reading.   I am hopeful that with the right guidance, every student can improve their reading skills. I am overjoyed that my students have expressed that the instruction they have received has made them more aware of the task of reading. Furthermore, I am thrilled that they have embraced some reading strategies and experienced growth in terms of their vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. What I have learned from them has also been of extremely valuable on my journey as an educator.

/

Contents

ABSTRACT

College students enrolled in a developmental reading program often do not perceive themselves as remedial readers, have low self-esteem about their abilities, or have a limited understanding about reading and therefore are unable to engage themselves with effective reading strategies. The challenge for educators in developmental college reading is to engage and motivate students with educational methods that create an awareness and understanding of reading by using strategies and practices appropriate for students' diverse educational needs also necessary for their reading achievement. At the same time students need to develop the metacognitive awareness of their own knowledge of and use of reading strategies necessary for becoming proficient and achieving readers. Two research questions framed the study: What do students reveal about their metacognition in the context of a community college developmental reading course? How does understanding the students' reading metacognition inform the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course? Data collection included field notes, memos, audio- recordings of class time, student documents, student interviews, and a researcher's journal. Findings suggest that despite their placement in the course, many students do not believe they need help with college reading because of their previous reading experiences. Those students who did think they needed reading could (at least vaguely) express what reading skills and abilities they thought would hinder their reading success. The students' thinking informs the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course because student's thoughts help teachers to identify the ways which students are mis-informed and the ways which they might become resistant to learning, as well as what their

learning needs may be. With this information, instructors can begin to develop

instructional goals, to select self-discovery activities, and to implement practice time with

the strategies that students can use to achieve in the tasks of reading. Furthermore, when

reflection follows self-discovery and/or strategy practice students are encouraged to

exercise metacognition, thinking about thinking.

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Some students come to my college developmental reading courses believing that they do not belong in the course or that their existing abilities will not limit their success in college. Students assert, "I don't even know why I'm here" or "I'm only here because I partied the night before my ACT and didn't have time to retake it." Many times, I hear students exclaim, "I've already learned this in high school!" Occasionally, a student admits, "I'll never be able to remember what I read." My observations of students' perceptions led me to believe that students cannot adequately discern what they know, or they have inadequate perceptions of what they actually know about reading. In some cases, students believe that they can succeed without reading. Often, I wonder how I can respond to their beliefs in ways that will promote a more accurate metacognitive reflection of their behaviors and abilities in relation to college reading achievement.

What I have learned from my experience as an instructor informs my beliefs about teaching developmental courses for college students. I believe that some students may not have accurate perceptions of themselves as developmental learners. College students enrolled in a developmental reading program who do not perceive themselves as remedial readers might be masking their low self-esteem about their abilities or might have a limited understanding of reading. Therefore, they will lack the motivation to engage themselves with effective reading strategies. I also believe that it is my job to help students to develop a more accurate awareness of their needs and abilities so that they can increase their motivation and learn the content and strategies of reading.

Background of the Study

Reading teachers consider multiple facets of literacy when planning, implementing, and assessing their instructional practices, including intervention methods, instructional content, and student experience. A solidified path for 'college' reading teachers includes the intricate ties between intervention methods, instructional content, and students' needs across different grade levels. For instance, in 2002, the Literacy Research Initiative (LRI) announced a study aimed at expanding the knowledge of adult, adolescent, childhood, and early childhood reading across 16 different states. Various study designs emanating from the LRI (Greenberg, Rodrigo, Berry, Brink, & Joseph, 2006) resulted and focused on literacy interventions in decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension instruction at all levels. Other areas of interest were related to family literacy and/or English speakers of other languages (Attewell, Domina, Lavin & Levey, 2006). Some studies noted the importance of reading in the workplace setting (Patterson, 2005) as well as the need for a supportive relationship between students and teachers (Mellard Scanlon, Kissam, & Woods, 2005). More recently, discussions of college readiness emerged in the field of developmental education, introducing another complex element into the conversation for college reading teachers.

National legislative trends push for quality education programs to 'ready' students for college by focusing on teacher, school, and administrator accountability along with the alignment of core standards with curriculum requirements across all grade levels. For example, the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) instituted a demand for accountability in a "rigorous," "systematic," and "valid" reading curriculum that draws on students' prior knowledge and "observations." In some cases, state legislative trends followed suit by

advancing college readiness standards into high school and even elementary curriculums. Many states established college readiness standards to align secondary school course-work with that of colleges (Callan, Finney, Kirst, Usdan, & Venezia, 2006). As of recently, Texas is one of the few states actually implementing college readiness standards by aligning graduation requirements, assessments, and data analyses of readiness and accountability (Gewertz, 2011). In a special session designed to establish college readiness standards the 79th Texas Legislature passed House Bill 1 which required the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) to create vertical alignment teams and develop readiness standards.

Despite these legislative trends, students enter college underprepared. Vitale and Schmieser (2006) contended that readiness in reading was at an all-time low; reportedly, 51% of students, especially males, African American, American Indian, Hispanic students, and students with annual family incomes below $30,000 were not college ready. More recently, only half of the 10th grade students and high school graduates who took ACT college entrance exams were college ready in the field of reading. Fifty-two percent of all high school students taking college entrance exams were college ready in reading (ACT, 2012). For students who do not have the required reading skills to succeed, remediation is offered by means of developmental education.

Developmental education is a research field within higher education consisting of programs and services that address preparedness, course placement, and strategy development (National Association for Developmental Education/NADE, 2011). This field of research encompasses "all forms of learning assistance, such as tutoring, mentoring, and supplemental instruction, personal, academic, and career counseling,

academic advisement, and coursework" (p. 1). Additionally, NADE contends that developmental programs and services should promote "cognitive and affective growth" (p. 1) for postsecondary learners with diverse learning needs and abilities. Such services and programs exist to ensure that the complex needs of a developmental student are met; Core factors for the services and programs for developmental students include proper course placement and educational standards requiring competency. Developing the necessary skills and attitudes for success that enhance students' educational opportunities and retention rates is another crucial component.

The community college accepts responsibility for accessing, placing, tutoring, and supporting developmental education students in programs which often consist of course-work designed to address student deficiencies (Bailey, 2009). However, the exact components of remedial courses may vary according to institutional requirements and the approaches of the remedial reading instructors who accept the challenge of readying those students who lack the necessary skills. Notably, when students fail to complete developmental education courses, sequences of courses, and subsequent college semesters, the cost for students, colleges, and the public can be high (Bailey, 2009). In some states (e.g., Texas, California, Kentucky, and Tennessee), legislative criticisms force colleges to examine program effectiveness, instructional practice, and the diverse learning needs of students (Bailey, 2009; Kever, 2010). Reading educators can challenge these criticisms through study and exploration into the field (Boylan, 1999) and into the beliefs and understandings that drive instructional practices (Richardson, 1996) and back the instructional approaches.

In Texas, college developmental education programs adhere to the Texas College and Career Readiness Standards (2009), which "specify what students must know and be able to do to succeed in entry-level college courses at post secondary institutions in Texas" (p. iii). Generally, these standards are concerned with the skills, knowledge, content, and behaviors that students need to be successful in college. Under the Texas Education Code Section 51.3062 and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) amendment to Subchapter F, and Chapter 51 of the education code which authorizes the Texas Success Initiative Program (TSI, 2003), students take the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) or the Accuplacer examination and provide their scores to the Texas public institution of higher education prior to the attending term to determine if they have met the College and Career Readiness Standards established by the Texas Department of Education. THEA and Accuplacer assessments measure student academic skills and indicate college readiness in reading, writing, and mathematics. Minimum passing scores for the THEA were: Reading-230, Writing-220, and Mathematics-230 (TSI, 2003). Passing scores for the Accuplacer are: Reading-78, Writing-80, Mathematics-63 and Essay-6 (TSI, 2003). By law, students not meeting requirements must attain advising, enroll in, and complete a formal skills development program to meet college readiness requirements unless they re-test with passing scores. In Texas, public institutions of higher education outline enrollment processes in developmental education programs or courses for non-compliant undergraduate students. As a result, administration and/or program interpretations of the law may result in different program requirements and/or instructional approaches.

Statement of the Problem

The challenge for educators in developmental college reading is to engage and motivate students with educational methods that create an awareness and understanding of reading. By using strategies and practices appropriate for students' diverse educational needs, teachers can help developmental readers achieve. What may influence an instructor's ability to deliver appropriate instruction begins not only with the instructor's perceived understanding of student needs, capabilities, and behaviors in reading, but also builds upon the students' own perceived understandings about these factors. Additionally, educators must challenge students to improve their reading capabilities as well as transfer the insight and understandings into other reading contexts. Ultimately, the teacher's responsiveness to these needs, capabilities, and behaviors is the key to implementing a comprehensive curriculum capable of addressing these facets.

Moje (2008) examines responsive pedagogy and concludes that there needs to be "further analyses of young peoples' growth overtime in terms of skill and attitude" (p. 80). For the underprepared college student, metacognitive capabilities are the key to college success; analysis, interpretation, precision, accuracy, problem solving, and reasoning are required critical skills (Conley, 2007). Metacognitive behaviors related to self-management, time management, strategic study skills, persistence, and an awareness of one's true performance are essential for the developmental reading student (Conley, 2007). The fact that students need to have an awareness of their own performance in order to have more precise/accurate understandings further illustrates a strong correlation between reading and metacognitive skills, and reading and metacognitive behaviors.

Discrepancy between what the students know (their awareness) and what they think they know about reading is evident in my classes. Additionally, student

understandings of reading are not accurate as apparent by their placement in a

developmental reading course. Students need to be engaged in and motivated by

instructional practices that create an awareness of their behavior and ability. They also

need an understanding of the strategies and practices that they can use to meet their

diverse educational needs and to achieve in the tasks of reading. The problem is that

college students enrolled in a developmental reading program may not perceive

themselves as remedial readers, have low self-esteem about their abilities, or have a

limited understanding of reading behaviors; therefore, they may lack the motivation to

engage themselves in effective reading strategies and consequently fail to improve their

reading skills.

Purpose and Background of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to describe what was revealed by

students about their metacognition in order to gain insight and give instructional

recommendations for helping students become reflective thinkers that better achieve the

task of college reading. The following research questions framed the study: What do

students reveal about their metacognition in the context of a community college

developmental reading course? How does understanding the students' reading

metacognition inform the instructional practices in a community college developmental

reading course?

During the semester of study, a Texas Community College which I will refer to as

Panhandle Community College (PCC) provided educational opportunities across the state

to more than 9,000 degree seeking students and just under 6,000 students in certificate

programs or short-term training courses. PCC was established in the late 1950's and

nearly half of all students are first generation college students; which means their parents have not earned a four-year degree.

When PCC received student placement scores, non-compliant students were advised into a developmental college reading course focused on providing opportunities and incentives for students to read. The course also addressed individual skill deficiencies as determined by their TSI assessment (either THEA or Accuplacer). At the time of this study, fewer than 500 students were enrolled in developmental reading courses at combined serviced locations and fewer than 100 of those students were enrolled in my sections of developmental reading.

For this study, course attendees were students enrolled in one face-to face community college developmental reading course. I selected the first course section of reading to fulfill an enrollment cap of 21 students. Students enrolled ranged in age, ability, gender, and ethnicity. All indicated they were degree seeking (thought some undeclared in terms of their study area). The students took the course in order to comply with state and local college readiness standards. The course is offered at several campus extension sites, but this particular study took place on the main campus and in the traditional classroom. On eight occasions, students met in a computer classroom at the technology center which was also located at the main campus. And, on one occasion, students met in the library which was also on the main campus.

While enrolled in the developmental reading program, students were required to take one other college course but were restricted from taking any course that was reading intensive. This prevented developmental reading students from enrolling in college- level history, political science, social science, and behavioral science courses until students

became compliant with the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) and thereby college ready in the area of reading.

To successfully complete the course, students were required to attend classes where they would complete all assignments, examinations, and class projects with an average of B or better. To show satisfactory compliance for the Texas Success Initiative (TSI, 2003) and college readiness standards, students had to pass their developmental coursework with a B or better, retake the Accuplacer and gain a passing score, or pass the Nelson Denny Assessment with a 12th grade reading performance (either the first day of class or at the end of the term). Students received financial aid credit for course completion but credit did not count toward degree completion. State mandates and the course syllabus (see Appendix A) outlined the students' required participation in the course.

Each course section was designed to strengthen the student's ability to interpret visual representations of reading (pictures, charts, tables, and graphs), to condense, interpret, and/or summarize written information, to take notes over reading, to demonstrate listening/learning and remembering, and to apply basic study skills to improve test-taking strategies. My instructional focus was on helping students understand reading by exercising their own metacognition or "thinking about thinking" (Flavell, 1979) in order to increase fluency; to expand and develop vocabulary using word parts and context clues; to learn dictionary skills; to interpret implied main ideas and details; to interpret stated main ideas, details, facts, patterns, types, and themes; to identify author's purpose, point-of- view, and intended meaning; to analyze relationships between texts and across content areas; to integrate prior knowledge and experience with new

concepts from reading; and to implore critical thinking and reasoning that better demonstrates reading comprehension.

Theoretical Framework

This study is concerned with metacognition and the behaviors of those learners in the context of a developmental reading classroom where students express their thinking and knowing about reading in relation to their past, present, and future experiences. Those theoretical frameworks which frame my beliefs and inform this study include principles of behaviorism, social learning theory, and cognitive/ metacognitive theory. Central to the discussion of these theories is a review of Dewey's philosophy and related concepts of knowing and thinking. In addition, theories of teaching and learning are presented. I discuss those theories that outline my role as a teacher and guide my instructional practice in my attempts to respond to students' needs.

Behaviorism. In the 1950's the theoretical components of behaviorism proposed that with practice and training one could automatize required behaviors if positive reinforcements were in place (Skinner, 1985). Behaviorism resulted in the "systematic" division of skills (Alexander & Fox, 2004). Under the proponents of behaviorism, a remedial student would have experienced reading through instruction centralized on one's deficiency in fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension skills. Emerging from this theory was an interest in "developing and validating diagnostic instruments and remedial techniques" focused on measuring achievement in those deficiency areas (Alexander & Fox, 2004, p.36). Unfortunately, the assessment proponents of behaviorism centered on observable behaviors and failed to consider the students social needs, experiences, or the reader's cognitive processes --those behaviors that were unobservable.

Behaviorism informed this study because it provides an accounting for what is required in remedial programs (a focus on systematic skill sets) and for what is lacking in remedial programs (social support systems), thus emphasizing the importance of offering reading instruction through a developmental education program which not only addresses the students necessary skills, but also provides reinforcements (i.e., social support services) that can help students learn the required behaviors of reading.

Boylan (1999) argued that remedial education focuses on the remediation of a specific deficiency area or skill set. This is unlike developmental education which offers remediation alongside support services and with an instructional focus on the cognitive aspects of learning. Programs centralized on providing interventions for students based on the theoretical tenements of behaviorism would be categorized in the field of 'remedial' education; unfortunately, when the area of skill deficiency is the focus of intervention and positive reinforcement in the form of support services is not available the student's needs may remain unmet.

Social learning theory. In the discussion of this section, I consider motivation, self-efficacy, and attribution. In response to the aforementioned theory of behaviorism, Bandura's (1997) Social learning theory posited the notion that there is a reciprocal relationship between one's environment and their behavior; that is, a person is a result of their environment and reciprocally one's environment is a result of that person's behavior. Primarily, Bandura emphasized the importance of observing and modeling behaviors, attitudes, and emotions in a particular environment; as noted, "most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed" (Bandura, 1977, p. 22). However, for an

individual to adopt the modeled behavior, the observer must have admiration for or be able to make a personal connection with the one presenting the behavior. Additionally, individuals are more likely to adopt behaviors if they value the resulting outcome. Motivation is an internal and psychological force or drive towards a goal that is rooted in physiological, behavioral, cognitive, and/or social need or desire. Bandura (1997) argued that despite all efforts to reinforce positive behavior in any environment, motivation is essential for learning because of its ties to self-efficacy.

Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their own ability to succeed. Self-efficacy is derived of one's perceived notion about their experiences and the possible outcome of events. Those who have high self-efficacy (positive beliefs about their ability to perform a task well) will likely view difficult tasks possible; but, they may lack the motivation to complete tasks if there is little challenge. Those with low self-efficacy (negative beliefs about their ability to perform a task well) will likely view difficult tasks chores to avoid. Meaning, without positive beliefs about one's ability to perform task well, students will lack the motivation necessary for learning to occur. Both motivation and self-efficacy can be related to attribution theory.

Attribution theory. Attribution theory is a psychological concept that accounts for the misconceptions of individuals when accounting for behaviors and events. Attribution theorists addressed a phenomenological problem whereby the incorrect perceptions of an object were blamed on or attributed to the surrounding sensory data that exists only in the mind of the perceiver (e.g., Hewstone, Fincham, Jaspars, 1983). Central to attribution theory is regard for how people perceive each other and account for one another's behavior by considering motive and intention (Weiner, B., 1992).

Cognitive bias results when there is a perceptual distortion or the observer's illogical interpretations of experience impact judgment and decision making in irrational ways (e.g., Baron, 2007; Ariely, 2008). Attribution theory contributes to this study because it is an exploration of developmental reading students who have inaccurate perceptions of themselves as readers who attribute their failures to a variety of factors. Their cognitive biases impact their ability to make decisions about using reading strategies as appropriate and necessary for college success. These misattributions or cognitive biases may be a direct result of students' experiences in reading.

Dewey. Dewey was an American psychologist whose philosophies in education triangulated concerns for social interaction, reflection, and experience within a democratic community. His works, such as *Democracy and Education* (1916), challenged teachers to end the instruction of rote memorization, encouraging instead the teaching of critical thinking skills in specialized content areas where teachers were the experts. Because I was charged with improving students' learning abilities in reading and motivating them to read in various content areas, Dewey's theories were fitting for this study. Dewey's concepts of teaching and learning revolved around the notion that vital to improving abilities and motivating learners was the task of 'thinking' about the world around them (Eldridge, 1998); these concepts amalgamated with that of one's lived 'experience'.

The work *School and Society* (1899) demonstrated Dewey's beliefs about the role of schools in an individual's education. He argued that a school's primary role was to instruct skills and provide experiences that would allow students to practice those skills by mimicking those of the "miniature community" (p. 15). This was contrary to what

Dewey observed, namely curriculums which revolved around the students' passive and receptive roles in learning. Dewey's contentions required students to be more active by engaging in questioning, a reflective process that would help them to develop thoughts of their own. As teachers, our ways of knowing and of doing should be related to experience as well as the practices we seek to make effective (Eldridge, 1998). Complicating the ability to assure effective instructional reading practices that can motivate and engage students were those observed discrepancies between what students know and what they think they know. While knowing and thinking are both grounded in experience, some distinctions have been made.

In an examination of Dewey's works, Parodi (1939) declared the relationship between what is known and the past, present, and future experiences of the knower. He asserted that "knowing is only a peculiar type of such events among others, events that have their specific conditions in those that precede them and which in turn react upon those that follow" (p. 231). Because experience determines the known, knowing has no permanence. Knowledge is but an 'illusion' symbolic of inferences, significations, or shades of meaning, drawn from one's experiences or perceptions of that, and are only relevant in a given time and context; he contended, "perception can be regarded as existing facts, with certain qualities and in certain spatial and temporal relationships" (p. 232). To better understand, explain, or demonstrate knowledge one must recognize that although their experiences were situated in permanence, the perspective of those events and what is known can change. He (1939) maintained that both "permanence and change are perhaps dialectical moments" equally necessary "for the conceiving and regulating of experience" (Parodi, 1939, p. 242). He (1939) offered the following:

14

> Psychology therefore is not a science of states of consciousness, but of ways of acting, of continuous readjustments of our habits and our impulses to circumstances always new. Knowing is nothing but a series of organizing acts (p. 231).

His clarification, intended for the field of psychology, fits well into the educational setting, a place where students combine their personal experiences as well, their perceived understandings about those experiences, and what they read to construct knowledge (Bloom, 1956; Alexander & Judy, 1988). What may be lacking for my students, for whom inconsistencies about knowing exist, is the 'continuous readjustment' of knowledge, a process which requires thinking.

In *Essays in Experimental Logic* (1916) Dewey argued that "thinking is […] a specific event in the movement of experienced things, having its own specific occasion or demand and its own specific place" (p. 127). Parodi (1939) suggested that knowledge enters our "thoughts which constitute our inferences and which permit us to foresee and to estimate consequences" (p. 240). Therefore, thinking cannot be separated from our lived experiences; it is a tool for problem solving and for developing philosophies about lived events (Eldridge, 1998).

> Dewey regarded thinking as an activity that was a part of –not apart from- our interactions with one another and the world. Dewey thought thinking was the aspect by which we discern and modify; the connections in cognitive and non cognitive experience (Eldridge, 1998, p. 5).

Reflecting on experience can assist with discerning or modifying one's thinking about the world.

In a review of *Democracy and Education*, Boucher (1998) noted Dewey's call for teachers to reflect on their content area practices and promote them as methods of learning to learn. This and other connections between the experiences of knowing, thinking, and learning made by theorists provide an open window for a discussion of metacognition (Dewey, 1916; Parodi, 1939; Eldridge, 1998; & Boucher, 1998). Particularly since the concept of learning to learn is one reiterated by the definition of metacognition, a theory of "learning about learning," "thinking about thinking," or "knowing about knowing" (Flavell, 1979). Dewey's theoretical framework informed my study because I wanted my students to not only know and practice the skills that I instruct, but to be able to be "thinking about their thinking" or to think about their level of awareness in order to be more successful readers.

Cognition/metacognition. According to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2009) cognition is a "product of […] mental processes," "to become acquainted with; know or "to come to know" (p. 240). Therefore, cognition is the product of mental processes that assist with acquainting or coming to know. Researchers noted the importance of the cognitive aspects for learners (Chomsky, 1965; Chomsky, 1972) particularly in regards to reading, a subject which requires students to demonstrate higher order thinking skills (Bloom, 1956); connect to the student's prior knowledge; and activate a student's mental schema (Anderson, 2004). Their contributions add to the definition, formulating a more complete definition. Cognition encompasses metacognition: having an awareness of knowledge and using cognitive processes to make judgments based upon that knowledge.

Metacognition is defined as "an awareness of analysis of one's own learning or thinking processes" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 779) which differs from

cognition in that it extends beyond what is known to how it is known, or the process by which it became known. Flavell (1979) claimed metacognition is "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (pg. 906) which he subsequently tied to the definition, "thinking about thinking" and "knowing about knowing." Flavell (1979) coupled metacognition with self-regulated learning or "cognitive monitoring" which is dependent upon metacognitive experiences (or the events of knowing) that alter metacognitive knowledge (or the facts of knowing).

According to Flavell's (1979) theory, metacognition consists of three components: (1) metacognitive knowledge, (2) metacognitive regulation, and (3) metacognitive experiences. Also referred to as metacognitive awareness, metacognitive knowledge is concerned with 'knowing,' particularly the knowing about one's self and others. In contrast, metacognitive regulation is concerned with 'monitoring' one's knowledge, experiences, and behaviors with various sets of activities that can direct or control learning. Finally, metacognitive experiences are 'events' both current and ongoing in the endeavor of cognition. Each of the primary categories split into subcategories.

Subcategories relevant to the process of reading include declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge (Straw, 1998). Declarative knowledge is knowledge of factors that influence one's own learning and performance in reading. Procedural knowledge refers to knowledge about strategies, and the use of those strategies, the automaticity of those strategies when 'doing' or performing tasks. Conditional knowledge denotes knowing how, when, and why to employ strategies, declarative knowledge, and procedural knowledge.

Three skills essential to the regulation of cognition are the subcategories of planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Demetriou & Kazi, 2006; Oyserman & Destin, 2010). That is, planning for the use of strategies to complete tasks and improve performance, monitoring one's awareness of understanding and performance of tasks, and evaluating and re-evaluating the completed tasks and the person's or strategies' efficiency at such These skills are those that should regulate students' metacognitive experience. There remains a paucity of research or theoretical precedents focused on the metacognitive experience. However, Griffith and Ruan's (2005) theory about metacognitive processing delineates a better understanding of metacognitive experience and ongoing endeavors of reading during all three phases of reading (before, during, and after). Griffith and Ruan's (2005) theory of metacognitive processing outlined how readers use metacognitive information to monitor their comprehension for success or failure. For readers, "knowledge of cognition is stable and statable. It's the knowledge readers have about their own cognitive resources, about the reading task, and about the compatibility between the two" during a reading event (p. 7). In their construct of metacognitive processing, they argued that one reading event is characterized by the completion of cognitive processes in all three reading stages (before, during, and after). "Frequently, a reading event is depicted in three phases: preparing to read, constructing meaning while reading, and reviewing and reflecting on reading" (Griffith & Ruan, 2005, p. 6). In each phase of reading, metacognitive strategies assist students with demonstrating what they know about their knowing; metacognitive strategies are those used to make thinking visible (i.e., "statable") for one's self or for others who are measuring the achievement of learning outcomes.

When preparing to read students preview the text, establish their prior knowledge, and make inferences about the content and author's purpose. From this, they construct questions that will help them attend to and engage with the text while reading. Griffith & Ruan (2005) state the following:

> To illustrate, the readers could know that prior knowledge is important for reading comprehension, how to use previewing strategies to tap into prior knowledge, and when and why to adjust their reading rate to achieve the goals set of the reading event. Once this type of information has been established, it will continue to be known and can be discussed" (p. 7).

The idea is that students need to continually answer questions, clarify their inferences, and revise their prior knowledge accordingly.

During reading, readers not only revisit and revise their pre-constructed knowledge, but also use "regulatory mechanisms" that involve checking, revising, and evaluating strategies for more effective understanding (Griffith & Ruan, 2005, p. 7). More often, metacognitive strategies used during reading are linked to students' understanding of the text and correspondingly with their reading achievement (i.e., success). Griffith and Ruan (2005) state the following:

> Because metacognitive studies have their roots in comprehension studies, most instructional strategies in this area focus on supporting reading comprehension. In particular, research in the past three decades suggests that teaching student to monitor their reading is crucial to success in reading comprehension (p. 12).

Marking, annotating, and note-taking are among the 'during reading' strategies that assist with monitoring and increased comprehension. Researchers have contributed discussions

about the ways that these metacognitive strategies can also help regulate motivation (Broussard & Garrison, 2004).

After reading, readers are required to review and reflect on meaning in ways that will help them infer, draw conclusions, make predictions, summarize, build on or create meaning. However, Griffith and Ruan (2005) argue that young children, high school students, and early college students may not be able to summarize material. Therefore, they are unable to complete metacognitive processes in all phases of reading, an indication that they lack "metacognitive maturity." According to Griffith and Ruan (2005), "Not many high school graduates and beginning college students are metacognitively mature with respect to reading" (p. 8). If teachers want students to complete metacognitive events, fulfilling the jobs of metacognitive strategies in all phases of reading (before, during and after), they must consider how to help students better accomplish the tasks of reading.

Teaching and learning. In this section, I discuss major theorists relative to teaching and learning. Vygotsky's work (1962, 1978) focused on three key factors of teaching and learning: social interaction, the more knowledgeable other, and the zone of proximal development. He believed the internalization of these three components would lead to higher order thinking skills. Vygotsky's (1978) focus on social interaction directed educators' attention toward the connections between people and the social context in which those people interacted or shared experiences. His theory of social development argued that social interaction is necessary or precedes one's intellectual development and that consciousness and cognition are the resulting products of one's' socialization or social behaviors (Vygotsky, 1978). Within the social context, the student

can develop the tools, speaking, reading, and writing that mediate social environments and communicate their needs.

Vygotsky (1978) argued that in terms of learning, a child masters and internalizes discussions that result from social interactions with the more knowledgeable other. The more knowledgeable other refers to a person who has more knowledge or higher thinking abilities than the learner in respect to the task, processes, or concept. The more knowledgeable other includes teachers who model the required behavior(s) until the student has the ability to learn independently.

Vygotsky's examination of social learning not only discussed the role of a teacher as the more knowledgeable other, but also examined the role of the learner contending that students needed to work within a Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). His concept of the ZPD outlined the range of potential cognitive development or possibility when involved in social learning and described the distance between a student's ability to perform a task with a more knowledgeable other and the ability to perform a task independently. The theories of the more knowledgeable other and the Zone of Proximal Development contribute to this study because they introduce the idea of scaffolding instruction and knowledge, a concept that is key to instructional practices in a developmental reading course.

James Gee (2004) argued that reading is necessary in order to scaffold student performance, interactions, and social activities where it is necessary to gain perspective among cultural, ideological, and social groups and institutions. Gee (2004) contends that when reading, one's comprehension is tied to experience with or situated actions in the material and social world:

When we talk about social languages and genres, oral and written language are

inextricably mixed. Some social languages are written; some are spoken. Some

have both spoken and written versions; written and spoken versions are often

mixed and interrelated within specific social practices (p. 123).

Social language led to the developmental of discourse, which integrates the ways of

talking, listening, writing, reading, acting, interacting, believing, and feeling, in socially

situated activities. He noted:

It's almost as if you have a kit full of specific devices (i.e. ways with words,

deeds, thoughts, values, actions, interactions, tools, and technologies) in terms of

which you can enact a specific identify and engage in specific activities associated

with that identity (Gee, 2004, p. 124).

Gee (2004) concluded that most children need social experiences, or social action time, to

learn the "school" language, or discourse (Chomsky, 1965; Chomsky, 1972). Although

focused on children, Gee's theories informed my study of college students because they

lacked discourse knowledge about the skills of "listening, writing, reading" which can

help them succeed.

Varied discourses as well as a student's own academic discourse are of particular

importance to the success for those who are entering college for the first time. Peter

Elbow (1991) claimed that for college freshman, success is directly tied to one's

knowledge of academic discourse. Elbow charged educators with assisting students with

the identification of this discourse, because "not to help them with academic discourse is

simply to leave a power vacuum and thereby reward privileged students who have

already learned academic discourse at home or in school" (p. 135). For Elbow, teaching

students academic discourse "is especially important for week or poorly prepared students-particularly students from poorer classes or those who are the first in their families to come to college" (p. 135).

In her revelation of language socialization theory, Shirley Brice Heath (2004) also noted the importance of teaching reading students discourse, a lifelong process for translating concepts, power, and knowledge across contexts and through experiences. She argued, "It is essential that we see relationships of knowledge and power that both connect those within communities and disconnect them" (Heath, 2004, p. 207). Additionally, Heath expressed the need for "individuals [to] learn to communicate completely across contexts and experiences" (p. 191). Heath's work informs this study as it establishes the need to evaluate students' social context, the power structures, as well as the time and space necessary for socializing students in language (processes of reading, writing, speaking, and listening).

Critical theory is foundational to a developmental program because it reveals the influence of one's personal, social, cultural, ideological, and political context (Gee, 2001), and critical approaches allow students to evaluate their social borders in order to begin forming literacy identities (Appleman, 2000; Gee, 2001; Giroux, 1993; Lesley, 2004). Much has been said about using critical approaches for agency and empowerment (Gee, 2001; Giroux, 1993). When critical literacy practices are employed, readers are engaged with the task of reviewing a larger discursive body of knowledge (Foucault, 1970) to determine what might be missing and why. Critical literacy assists with identifying the omission of perspectives, recognizing binary oppositions, and distinguishing multiple representations. More importantly, "readers with critical literacy

knowledge and skills are most likely to employ metacognitive strategies for text understanding and critiquing" (Griffith & Ruan, 2005, p. 11). Teachers can form a curriculum around critical theories by implementing critical literacy strategies which encourage readers to analyze texts for underlying messages through decoding processes that will reveal hidden agendas or meanings. Not only is the reader's active role central in critical literacy, but being an agent is also key in the process of transacting reading.

Researchers comment on the importance of recognizing the student and the text relationship (Wade and Moje, 2000). Transactional theory discusses the student-text relationship (Rosenblatt, 1978). She claims that reading is an action, a unique transition between the reader and the text. Like the proponents of social learning theory, transactions of reading necessitate the "inclusion of the psychological, social, and cultural context of the reader's life" (Karolides, 2000, p. 5). Additionally, the transactional processes of reading require active rather than passive behavior on the reader's part during all stages of reading: "This focus on the reader and the text grows out of an understanding of what happens during the process of reading; it recognizes that readers, rather than being passive recipients of text, like empty vessels being filled, are active during the process" (Karolides, 2000, p. 5).

Reader/text transactions are both inductive and deductive; students induct meaning into the text by bringing their beliefs and experiences to the act of reading and students deduct new knowledge that they can connect to those beliefs and experiences. However, Karolides (2000) noted that if "the reader has insufficient linguistic or experiential background to allow participation, the reader cannot relate to the text, and the reading act will be short –circuited" (p. 6). On the other hand, if the reader can make

impressions from their prior experiences with "words, events, or information" they can consciously reflect in ways that will expand their understandings (Karolides, 2000, p. 7). Crucial to constructing understanding is the readers' recursive reflective process of looking forward and backward:

> Recursiveness may be an actual turning back of pages-immediate glances back or returns many pages later, provocation by another passage to reread a segment to confirm or reconsider and impression, the implication of a behavior or situation. Recursiveness may be thoughtful reflection on previous scenes, events, or behaviors to savor the images or sensations or to consider the import of a particular dialogue or event (Karolides, 2000, p. 7).

Transactional theory influenced this study because it informed my methods of instruction. Students were required to exercise metacognitive strategies in class as methods of engaging and transacting with the text. I urged students to examine what experiences they brought to the text, to record the knowledge taken from the text, and then re-examine their experiences of reading and understanding in recursive ways.

Summary

Remedial education programs frequently employ interventions focused on fluency, phonics, and/or vocabulary. In such programs which result in the systematic division of skills, there is a need to implement positive reinforcement when required behaviors are presented. While relevant, reading not only requires certain behaviors or skills sets but also depends on one's experiences and their ability to make connections to what is read. Furthermore, motivation for learning behaviors is impacted by a students' self efficacy or capability for the task from the start. Social theory like that of John

Dewey, speaks to the importance of student experience in the process of reflection and the ways that students come to know or think about learning concepts. Cognitive theory acknowledged the social environment as well as the role of motivation and one's perception of self efficacy or ability. Additionally, metacognition referred to more specific processes of thinking necessary for performing the tasks of reading in all phases of a reading event. These metacognitive processes have relevance for the more knowledgeable other that scaffolds instruction for the learners who transact with texts to assume more critical roles as readers. Critical theory demands recognition of one's context and an evaluation of discursive practices necessary for empowerment and agency. Theorists are recognizing that the reader's experiences have a direct relationship to the meaning that is derived from a text during a reading transaction.

These theories are deemed relevant because they speak to what strategies are taught, the importance of the social environment and language socialization in the setting (Ormrod, 2004), and toward the instructional approaches that can help students negotiate meaning and learn discourse by transacting with texts (Rosenblatt, 1978). More specifically, theories of metacognition were derived from the concepts of behavior, experience, motivation, etc. that grew out of these theories; therefore, they add to our knowledge about thinking, knowing, and the behaviors of such.

Limitations of the Study

The main limitation of this study lies in its attempt to examine and describe what was revealed by students about their metacognition. Knowledge can actually be measured, but no measurement system of thinking exists. Because thinking cannot be observed, educators must rely on self-reporting of thoughts; and therefore we must rely in

part on the student's level of honesty. Moreover, because I was the teacher and was also collecting data, their responses may have been skewed because they were trying to please me.

Furthermore, metacognitive strategies are intended to represent what students think and know about reading, developmental reading students have limited vocabulary skills and thereby complicating the documentation of thinking. This required extra effort on my part to assure that I provided multiple opportunities for students to express and clarify their thinking in both verbal and written form.

Additionally, this is a qualitative and naturalistic study of the teaching I delivered to students who responded in one developmental reading classroom, which is on its own a complex culture. Our personal experiences and beliefs negate the possibility of any one experience of teaching or learning from being repeated in its exact, or any the group dynamics from ever being duplicated. Thus, many variables are subject to biases and our (teacher/researcher and students') reflective perceptions (Merriam, 1998).

Definition of Terms

Achievement. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines achievement as the "act of achieving: Accomplishment," "a result gained by effort," and "the quality or quantity of student's work" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 10). Therefore, achievement is an action requiring student effort in the act of attaining a level of quality or a specified quantity of work, resulting in accomplishment. The terms quality and quantity create the implication that achievement results in a measurable outcome.

Ability. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines ability as "capacity, fitness, or tendency to act or be acted ion in a specified way;" "competence in doing: skill;" and the

"natural aptitude or acquired proficiency" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 3).

Hence, ability refers to one's capacity or aptitude for completing a task, for acting

(behaviorally) in some way and for demonstrating proficiency or competence when

demonstrating skills. The terms aptitude, proficiency, and competence suggest that one's

ability can be measured or observed.

Behavior. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary reveals the definitive qualities of

behavior as "the manner of conducting one's self;" "anything an organism does involving

action and response to stimulation;" "the response of an individual, group, or species to

its environment;" and "the way in which something functions or operates" (Webster's

Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 111). Behavior is a manner of conducting, functioning, or

operating in response to stimulation from an individual, group, or other environmental

factor.

Basic skills. Basic denotes "the basis or starting point" and is "concerned with

fundamental scientific principles" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 101).

While the term 'skill' indicates "the ability to use one's knowledge;" "learned power of

doing something competently;" and "dexterity and performance in the execution of doing

something" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 1169). Thus, basic skills refers to

one's ability and power to execute and perform those fundamental tasks that are

considered to be the very basis (or starting point) of an activity.

College readiness. Conley (2007) defined college readiness as "the level of

preparation a student needs in order to enroll and succeed, without remediation, in a

credit-bearing general education course at a postsecondary institution that offers a

baccalaureate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate program" (p. 4). In order to succeed, students need to be adequately prepared for the demands of college reading.

College and career readiness standards. Texas college developmental education programs adhere to the Texas College and Career Readiness Standards (2009) concerned with the skills, knowledge, content, and behaviors that students need to begin and succeed in entry-level college courses at a post secondary institution in Texas.

College success. Conley (2007) defined succeeding as "completing entry-level courses at a level of understanding and proficiency that makes it possible for the student to consider taking the next course in the sequence or the next level of course in the subject area" (p. 4).

Cognition. According to the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2009) cognition is a "product of […] mental processes;" "to become acquainted with; know;" or "to come to know" (p. 240). Therefore, cognition is the product of mental processes that assist with acquainting or coming to know.

Critical skills. The term critical is "relating to, or being a turning point or specially important juncture;" "exercising or involving careful judgment or judicious evaluation;" "including variant reading an scholarly recommendations" and "relating to or being a state in which or a measurement or point at which some quality, property, or phenomenon suffers a definite change;" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 296). Additionally, the term skills circumscribes "the ability to use one's knowledge;" "learned power of doing something competently;" and "dexterity and performance in the execution of doing something" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 1169). Interpretively, the resulting definition of critical skills is the ability to use one's power or

knowledge to execute tasks competently and carefully at important junctures or points as indicated by a change in qualities properties or phenomenon. Such skills may be indicative of the state of learning or act of scholarly reading.

Developmental education. Developmental education is a research field within higher education consisting of courses, programs and services that   address instructional preparedness, course placement, and strategy development for students who are not prepared for college. Developmental education promotes "cognitive and affective growth" (p. 1) for postsecondary learners through "all forms of learning assistance, such as tutoring, mentoring, and supplemental instruction, personal, academic, and career counseling, academic advisement, and coursework" (National Association for Developmental Education/NADE, 2011, p. 1).

Literacy. The American Collegiate Dictionary (2009) defined literacy as the state of being literate." Also offered are definitions of literate which include, "able to read and write;" "versed in literature or creative writing;" and "having knowledge or competence." Additionally, the Workforce Investment Act (1998) defined literacy as the "individual's ability to read, write, speak in English, compute and solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job, in the family, of the individual, and in society" (U.S. Public Law 105-220, Aug. 7**,** 1998). These definitions contribute to the working description of literacy for this study. Literacy is the functional ability, knowledge or competence of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and problem solving in proficient ways for a variety of personal and social reasons.

Metacognition. Metacognition is "an awareness of analysis of one's own learning or thinking processes" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 779). The term is also

defined as "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (Flavell, 1979, p. 906) and correspondingly, the phrases 'thinking about thinking' and "knowing about knowing" (Metcalfe & Shimamura, 1994).

Remedial education. This is a field of educational study focused on increasing basic skills sets through intervention models focused primarily on fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension. Remedial courses only address the students' deficiencies- not the other factors linked to college success (Boylan, 2001).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Only half of 11th graders taking college entrance exams in 2012 were college ready in reading (ACT, 2012). Thus, many college students find themselves required to enroll in developmental reading classes. As members of those classes, they often have low self-esteem about their abilities, limited understanding about reading, and lack the motivation to engage themselves with effective reading strategies. Of equal concern, they often question why they are in the class, i.e., they do not perceive of themselves as remedial readers. Delivering appropriate instruction begins with the instructor's and students' understandings of student needs, capabilities, and behaviors in reading. Students need to extend their reading skills beyond the basics in fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension and attain critical skills necessary for higher order thinking. Educators face the challenge of engaging and motivating students with instructional methods that create an awareness and understanding of reading beyond the basic skills.

The reading teacher's responsiveness to students' educational needs is the key to implementing a comprehensive curriculum full of metacognitive strategies and practices that can help them achieve in the task of reading. In this qualitative research I examined instructional practices in one developmental reading class and how those practices might become responsive to the students' needs in order to help them become more aware of what the task of reading entails at the college level, and, in turn, to become more successful and motivated readers. My research questions included: What do students reveal about their metacognition in the context of a community college developmental

reading course? How does understanding the students' reading metacognition inform the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course?

This chapter offers a review of literature focused on the following areas: college readiness and developmental education, reading teaching and learning, motivation and engagement, achievement in reading, metacognition, and developmental reading teachers.

College Readiness and Developmental Education

In 2002, the Literacy Research Initiative (LRI) announced a study aimed at expanding knowledge of adult, adolescent, childhood, and early childhood reading across 16 states. Most of the research efforts (Greenberg, Rodrigo, Berry, Brink, & Joseph, 2006) focused on literacy interventions such as decoding, improving vocabulary and fluency skills, or increasing reading comprehension. Some subsections of the LRI research efforts examined the relationship between reading and family literacy or instructional practices for English speakers of other languages (ESOL) (Berbaum, Bercovitz, Carter, Deardorff, Levy, Mandernach, & Rasher, 2004). More relevant to late adolescent/early adult readers were the studies focused on the importance of reading in the workplace setting (Patterson, 2005). Regardless of the age level of the student, particular attention was paid to the need for developing a supportive relationship between students and teachers (Mellard Scanlon, Kissam, & Woods, 2005). Missing in the scope of LRI research were those studies that addressed college readiness in the field.

Concern has emerged in response to the number of unprepared high school students. National legislative trends such as the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) forced administrators and teachers to strengthen their curriculums and ensure that students not only met the grade level requirements, but also worked toward preparation for their

futures. In some states, No Child Left Behind became synonymous with the goal of preparing every high school graduate for college and thus a discussion of college readiness. Conley (2007) offered the following definition of *college readiness*:

> The level of preparation a student needs in order to enroll and succeed, without remediation, in a credit-bearing general education course at a postsecondary institution that offers a baccalaureate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate program (p. 4).

As of 2012, Texas was one of the only states to implement college readiness standards aligned with graduation requirements, assessments, and data analyses of readiness and accountability in K-12 schools (Gewertz, 2011). For instance, in 2005 the 79th Texas Legislature passed House Bill 1 in a special session designed to establish college readiness standards. As a result, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Higher Education Board (THECB) created vertical alignment teams and outlined college readiness standards. Those Texas and College Career Readiness Standards (2009) "specify what students must know and be able to do to succeed in entry-level college courses at post secondary institutions in Texas" (p. iii). These standards are concerned with the skills, knowledge, content, and behaviors that students need to be successful in college. Although special attention has been paid to getting students ready for college in high school, students are still underprepared or unprepared for college reading and require remediation as indicated by formal assessment measures.

To measure a students' preparedness, the Texas Education Code Section 51.3062, the THECB amendment to Subchapter F, and Chapter 51 of the education code, authorized the Texas Success Initiative program (TSI, 2003). One component of TSI is

the assessment of student readiness in the fields of reading, writing, and mathematics.

According to the Texas Department of Education, TSI students must take the Texas

Higher Education Assessment (THEA) or Accuplacer exam to measure their academic

skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. They provide their scores to the college prior

to the first day of classes in their first term. The primary assessment form for Panhandle

Community College (PCC) is the Accuplacer; the following scores determine a student's

level of college readiness. Minimum passing scores for the Accuplacer are as follows:

Reading, 78; Writing, 80; Mathematics, 63; and Essay, 6.

In terms of preparing for college, Vitale (2006) contended 51% of students were

not ready, especially boys, African American, American Indian, Hispanic students, and

those students with annual family incomes below $30,000. Reports from the ACT

(2011), a college entrance exam, indicated only 46% of the 11th graders who tested in

2010 were college ready in the field of reading.   More recently, an ACT (2012) report

for college entrance exams indicated that only half of the 10th grade students and high

school graduates who took ACT college entrance exams were college ready in the field of

reading.

Boylan (2001) argued that colleges must admit these unprepared students if they

want to maintain functional enrollment due to a declining number of students between the

ages of 17-22 (as compared to the past). However, admitting unprepared students is not a

new trend for universities; reportedly, half of the students enrolling at the University of

Wisconsin, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale have not met entrance requirements since the

early 1900's (Boylan, 2001). Students not meeting minimum assessment scores must

enroll in developmental education until the requirements of their program are complete.

Remedial vs. developmental education. Definitive lines exist between what is deemed 'remedial' and what is coined 'developmental' education. Boylan (2001) noted that coursework in both forms of curriculum serve as "precollege-level courses designed to teach the basic academic skills necessary for success in college" (p. 1). Remedial courses compensate for deficiencies that stem from students' prior learning experiences and focus only on increasing specific skills sets. This means that many remedial courses only address the students' deficiencies and not the other factors linked to college success. Boylan (2001) argued that "although remedial courses were valuable, they were often not sufficient" (p. 1) for students who wanted to be successful in college because students fail for a variety of reasons:

> Factors such as personal autonomy, self-confidence … study behaviors, or social competence have as much or more to do with grades, retention, and graduation than how well a student writes or how competent a student is (p. 2).

Unlike remedial education, developmental education integrates personal and academic development by adding support services to remedial coursework to help students address some of the other success determining factors.

The National Association for Developmental Education (NADE, 2011) defined developmental education as a research field in higher education comprised of programs and services to address preparedness, course placement, and strategy development. Accordingly, developmental education encompasses "all forms of learning assistance, such as tutoring, mentoring, and supplemental instruction, personal, academic, and career counseling, academic advisement, and coursework" (p. 1). As Boylan (2001) noted:

Modern developmental education involves a range of services designed to

promote personal and academic development. These services may include

counseling, advising, tutoring, topical workshops, individualized instructional and

courses to enhance study skills and strategies, promote critical thinking or

introduce students to the rewards and expectations of college. They may also

include precollege basic skills or remedial courses (p. 2).

Remediation is offered by community literacy organizations and is available in

developmental education programs at some four year universities; however, the

community college accepts primary responsibility for accessing, placing, tutoring, and

supporting readers with developmental education programs (Bailey, 2009).

Boylan, Bonham, & White (1999) examined developmental education programs

to determine what program components could be attributed to student success. They

identified exemplary practices in developmental education including mandatory

assessment and placement, institutional commitment to developmental education, a

comprehensive approach to courses and services, ongoing orientation courses and

activities, strict attendance policies, centralized services, professional developmental for

staff and instructors, assessment of classroom techniques in developmental courses,

program evaluation, frequent assessment/testing, theory based approaches to teaching,

and the integration of classroom learning assistance and laboratories. More importantly,

Boylan, Bonham and White argued for the focus on the development of metacognitive

skills for developing the reading skills and attitudes for success, and to enhancing

students' educational opportunities and retention rates.

The cost of low retention and failure can be high; however, support services help students complete developmental education courses, sequences of courses, and subsequent course work thereby reducing the expense for students, colleges, and the public (Bailey, 2009). Kever (2010) argued that an increase in cost and concern about college retention prompted a focus on effectiveness for teachers and administrators. Vitale (2006) argued that students who are already reading-ready perform better in their first year of college in all content areas, earn higher grade point averages, and are more likely to return for a second year. Still, there are few disadvantages for colleges and universities who admit students that are not prepared because developmental education helps students pass courses and graduate with completion rates "equal to or greater than those of better prepared students" (Boylan, 2001, p. 3).

Researchers (Attewell, Domina, Lavin & Levey, 2006; Boylan, 2001) have attributed the effectiveness of developmental education directly to the availability of the support services on campus. When examining the effectiveness of developmental education, Attewell, Domina, Lavin, & Levey (2006) found that students who had previously enrolled in developmental reading were more likely to complete coursework and earn a college degree than those who had enrolled in developmental math courses. Still, legislators doubt the effectiveness of developmental education courses in the realm of higher education. In Texas House Bill (HB2369, 2007) requires colleges to analyze program effectiveness. Additionally, the bill calls for a complete assessment of developmental education in order to determine successful practices that will not only address diverse learning, but also help to ensure their success in college courses and with degree completion.

Reading Teaching & Learning

Reading is defined in the following ways. "The act of reading" is "to utter aloud the printed or written words" of story, "to learn from what one has seen or found in writing or printing," "to become acquainted with or look over the contests of (as a book)," "to attribute (a meaning) to something read or considered," "to perform the act of reading words: read something," "to pursue the course of study," " to yield a particular meaning or impression when read," "to understand more than is directly stated," "to interpret," "to anticipate an opponent's position," and "to deliver out loud or utter interpretively" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 1035). These definitions are the basis of my working definition of reading for this study. Reading is an act of uttering aloud, or in one's mind, written or printed words for the purpose of interpreting, understanding, and/or anticipating meaning positioned in a book or other text. Research studies that reveal what students' need to learn about reading are vital to the discussion of developmental reading.

Basic skills. Developmental reading students need to learn basic skills in reading. The term basic denotes "the basis or starting point" and is "concerned with fundamental scientific principles" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 101). The term 'skill' indicates "the ability to use one's knowledge," "learned power of doing something competently," and "dexterity and performance in the execution of doing something" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 1169). Thus, basic skills refer to one's ability and power to execute and perform those fundamental tasks that are considered to be the very basis (or staring point) of an activity.

Contributing to the body of knowledge on developmental reading in the community college is discussion about the vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension which are basic skills that developmental readers need. Biancarosa, Deschler, Nari, and Palinscar (2007) reviewed 32 intervention programs designed for adolescent readers and found that increasing fluency and decoding skills were the programs' primary foci. However, students not only need to increase vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension but also to extend their knowledge beyond skill building to be successful. Few intervention programs focused on vocabulary or basic comprehension, and even fewer were focused on advanced comprehension strategies (Biancarosa, Deschler, Nari, & Palinscar, 2007).

Vocabulary instruction is critical to developmental reading instruction (Simpson & Randall, 2000). Generally, developmental students need to expand their limited vocabularies or improve word recognition skills. Vocabulary knowledge inadequacies in pronunciation, contextual usage, and implied or stated meaning continually prohibit students from advancing their oral and written abilities. For instance, college students need advanced vocabulary skills to excel when giving presentations and/or writing essays in college (Simpson & Randall, 2000). Additionally, students with restricted academic vocabularies lack the prior knowledge and schemata (Willingham & Price, 2009) necessary for scaffolding between old information and new information (Vygotsky, 1978) which is essential for higher order thinking. Furthermore, Stahl & Nagy (2006) argued that vocabulary can limit or expand a students' ability to think critically. They claimed, "Words divide the world; the more words we have, the more complex ways we can think about the world (p. 5). For the community college student, academic

weaknesses, including deficient oral and communication skills, directly reflect limited

vocabulary (Willingham & Price, 2009).

In one research study, Willingham and Price (2009) presented theoretical

frameworks and research perspectives concerning vocabulary instruction for students

with vocabulary limitations. They found that research on vocabulary instruction can be

divided into two major categories: those studies that focus on indirect instruction and

those that are comprised of direct instruction. The proponents of indirect instruction

include incidental learning (the instructor does not mention the vocabulary and does not

address the words that are new and could be learned) in all phases of reading, before,

during, and after. Advocates of indirect vocabulary instruction argue that extensive

reading is an effective and authentic way to increase vocabulary (Krashen, 1989; Nagy &

Scott, 1990; Tekman & Daloglu, 2006). However, other researchers indicate that indirect

instruction is not as effective as learning through teacher led discussions (Eeds &

Cockrum, 1985). Not to mention that one of the requirements for successful indirect

instruction is that students read frequently and broadly (Nagy, Anderson, & Herman,

1987) but many developmental students are resistant to reading. In contrast, direct

instruction is "teacher led, student practiced, and tied to a specific objective. It often

follows the lesson plan format: introduction, modeling, guided practice, independent

practice, and assessment" (Willingham & Price, 2009, p. 4). Advocates of direct

instruction assert self learning experiences, morphology instruction, mnemonic devices,

and dictionary strategies are effective for teaching vocabulary (Eeds & Cockrum, 1985;

Simpson & Randall, 2000; Stahl & Nagy, 2006). However, Willingham & Price (2009)

noted that direct instruction is time consuming. More promising ideas have emerged

from combining instructional approaches that provide authentic word experiences and engage students in literature groups have discussion revolved around reading, writing, speaking, and listening to new words (Zimmerman, 1997).

Fluency, another basic skill, is a measure of accuracy in decoding and automaticy related to one's word recognition, a component that impacts a students ability to comprehend the written words. Students who are halted by low fluency skills spend too much time processing and decoding vocabulary and therefore have limited time for comprehending and constructing meaning. In an examination of fluency, Kuhn and Stahl (2003) collected 71 studies on fluency instructional approaches and found that research on instruction dealt with assisted reading, repeated reading, or other classroom interventions suh as developing automatic word recognition. While fluency was an indicator of one's ability to comprehend and construct meaning, Kuhn and Stahl's review indicated that current fluency practices were neither clearly effective or ineffective within the developmental curriculum:

> Although these approaches all seem to be effective, it is not clear why they are effective. Specifically, it is not clear whether these studies have their effects because of any particular instructional activities, or through the general mechanism of increasing the volume of children's reading. Fluency instruction may work only by increasing the amount of reading children do relative to traditional instruction. If so, there may be other approaches which work as well, or better (p. 12).

While there is an evident need for increased vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills, intervention methods with a singular focus on any of these skills could be detrimental to a developmental student's success.

Ivey and Baker (2004) maintained that isolated skill instruction proves limited in affecting student readers' abilities and behaviors. Instead, students need intervention methods that combine these different skills and promote higher order thinking strategies (Bloom, 1956) as necessary for advanced comprehension. Hinchman (2008) finds that "studies of literacy or reading beyond grade five are limited" (p. 19) and the "research we need includes that which helps us to understand the strengths of those who struggle with reading and how to foster application and extension of those to additional contexts" (p. 29). Unfortunately, there remains a paucity of research on adult/college readers; instead, studies focus on what is known and can be generalized about readers across lower grades and the development of basic skills in the areas of phonics, fluency, and/or vocabulary. For instance, Miller, McCardle, and Hernandez (2010) maintained that research on college reading has "defaulted to reliance upon literacy intervention models of the reading process in younger readers" (p. 104). Studies which identify the use (if any) of child processes or models of reading instruction for adults or adolescents in a developmental reading course are lacking. Moreover, researchers find there is no evidence that using child models or processes is successful for older readers. For example, Greenberg, Nanda and Morris (2010) studied the use of child based theoretical reading constructs with struggling adult readers. Three hundred seventy-one men and women whose reading levels ranged between 3rd and 5th grade were evaluated to determine whether measurement constructs of reading tests designed for children were

similar to those needed to assess adult readers. Using a range of assessment options,

skills (vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) were tested, as were sub-skills

(vocabulary-phonemic decoding, word/letter identification; fluency-letter naming rate,

sight word reading, phonological knowledge, blending; comprehension- passage

comprehension). To explore the performance of adult readers, standard scores were

identified, computed, and analyzed for norms. Researchers reported many challenges

when fitting child based theoretical measurement models to straggling adult readers:

> The major finding is the difficulty in fitting measurement models of construct
>
> from children's research with struggling adult readers. Results from this study
>
> depict the care that needs to be taken when applying assumptions based on the
>
> research of children's reading development to struggling adult readers
>
> (Greenberg, Nanda, & Morris, 2010, p. 152).

 Overall, there was difficulty fitting the measurement models for the struggling adult

readers.

In another study intended to determine if literacy interventions for children were

relevant for adolescent or adult readers with a broad range of reading abilities, Mellard,

Fall, & Woods (2010) examined program components for necessary reading

comprehension skills. Participants included 174 adults participating in both adult basic

education programs and secondary education programs for students whose reading levels

were within a fifth grade level reading range. Various psychometric assessments were

completed and cross compared to measure reading comprehension, fluency, language

comprehension, expressive vocabulary, word reading, phonemic decoding, auditory

working memory, and rapid automatic naming. Pathway analysis demonstrated that the

participants had a strong reliance on word reading and word recognition skills. However, the higher order levels of thinking such as summarization or inferencing that should contribute to reading comprehension were relied upon less, which is disadvantageous for adult readers who need more advanced reading skills. As a result, Mellard, Fall and Woods (2010) concluded that intervention models previously tested on younger children were not effectively meeting the needs of adult readers who require assistance with higher level thinking or more advanced reading skills i.e., critical skills.

Critical skills. The term critical is delineated by the subsequent definitions: "relating to, or being a turning point or specially important juncture," "exercising or involving careful judgment or judicious evaluation," "including variant reading an scholarly recommendations" and "relating to or being a state in which or a measurement or point at which some quality, property, or phenomenon suffers a definite change," (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 296). Additionally, the term skills circumscribes "the ability to use one's knowledge," "learned power of doing something competently," and "dexterity and performance in the execution of doing something" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 1169). Interpretively, the resulting definition of critical skills is the ability to use one's power or knowledge to execute tasks competently and carefully at important junctures or points as indicated by a change in qualities, properties, or at the presentation of a phenomenon. Critical skills include those higher order skills discussed by Bloom (1956) including remembering, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Such higher order thinking skills are required for literacy development and are especially important for struggling readers (Allington, 2011).

Literacy. The American Collegiate Dictionary (2009) defined literacy as "the state of being literate." Also offered are definitions of being "able to read and write," "versed in literature or creative writing," and "having knowledge or competence" (p. 726). Additionally, the Workforce Investment Act (1998) defined literacy as the "individual's ability to read, write, speak in English, compute and solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job, in the family, of the individual, and in society" (U.S. Public Law 105-220, Aug. 7, 1998). These definitions contribute to the working description of literacy for this study. Literacy is the functional ability, knowledge or competence of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and problem solving in proficient ways for a variety of personal and social reasons.

The literacy demands of today's society necessitate more practice and continuous reading instruction (Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore and Rycik, 1999) focused on attaining higher levels of thinking. As a result, college reading instruction should not be limited to basic skills or effective communication purposes but should also be directed at the personal, social and economic demands (Rassool, 1999) of the information era. Researchers (Bean, et al., 1999) posited the notion that students in the past were deemed literate once they acquired basic reading and writing skills at the elementary level; however, college students need to prepare for a complex variety of literacies in popular, personal, academic, and working worlds. These authors further delineate literacy of the future:

> Adolescents entering the adult world in the 21st century will read and write more
> than any other time in human history. They will need advanced levels of literacy
> to perform their jobs, run their households, act as citizens, and conduct their

personal lives. They will need literacy to cope with the flood of information they

will find everywhere they turn. They will need literacy to feed their imaginations

so they can create the world of the future. In a complex and sometimes even

dangerous world, their ability to read will be crucial. Continual instruction

beyond early grades is needed (p.3).

More often, literacy is being described as a social practice that "is integrally linked with

ideology, culture, knowledge, and power" (Rassool, 1999, p. 25). Because today's

adolescents engage in a variety of literacy practices, researchers examined the ways that

multiple literacies influence how students are taught and how they learn about literacy

and therefore, how they learn about reading (Gee, 2004).

In an examination of developmental reading projects funded by the state of

Pennsylvania and offered through the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP),

Weiner (2002), an instructor of two developmental reading classes for the program,

applied principles of social responsibility (i.e., honesty, respect, and accountability)

alongside a pedagogy of critical questioning (i.e., attitudes, actions, and beliefs about the

reading content). His approaches were intended to prepare students for reading to learn

and to use their knowledge for transforming society. He argued that multiple literacy

instruction develops empowerment and promotes agency by preparing developmental

college students for a world where social and economic domination is prevalent. He

pointed out that "students who need remediation are not stupid and have an array of

literacies to draw upon that can help them interrogate, interpret, and revise dominating

discourses" (Weiner, 2002, p. 3). His concluding notion was that reading itself is an

intervention used to critique power relationships and ideological literacies and "transform the world" (p. 3).

Literacy encompasses the affective domain as well as the cognitive. Crucial to meeting the diverse needs of a reading student is instructional consideration for the students' psychological or affective state. Boylan, Bonham, and White (1999) claimed "this term [developmental education] reflects an emphasis on the holistic development of the individual student and is rooted in developmental psychology" (p. 90). The National Association for Developmental Education (NADE) emphasized the importance of promoting "cognitive and affective growth" (p. 1) for postsecondary learners. Alvermann (2000) argued that in terms of instruction for adolescents who are preoccupied with their identity and bring their personal experiences into the classroom with them, social interaction addresses affective growth by encouraging engagement. Such factors become a part of their literacy development.

Motivation and Engagement

Much attention has been given to engaging and motivating students with instructional methods that create an awareness and understanding of reading. When trying to motivate and engage students with developmental instruction, special attention needs to be given to the social and emotional aspects of teaching remedial readers. Motivation and engagement (Schraw and Bruning, 1999) not only influence student perception and self esteem (Bandura, 1986) but also indicate student success. Students with high self efficacy have higher performance and read with less time and effort (Ruddell and Unrau, 1997). Researchers have explored the ways technology, multiple literacy instruction, and social interactions with the teacher help to motivate and engage

pupils with reading instruction despite the students' perceptions or past experiences with reading.

According to Fischer and Ivey (2006), various computer programs are designed not only to assist teachers with instruction but also to help engage students with acquisition and/or remediation of reading skills. Lawrence, McNeal, and Yildiz (2009) describe a summer literacy program developed to bridge the out-of-school and in-school literacy practices of high school students. During their study, the researchers implemented a curriculum focused on reading graphic novels and utilizing current technology. Mini lessons were taught and followed by reading practice and/or technology sessions. The researchers indicated that students were engaged with the technology and students were frequently observed using the reading techniques that had been modeled by the faculty during the mini-lessons. They found that multi-tasking did not appear to hinder instruction; and, surprisingly, students had to have explicit instruction on how to use basic technology (i.e., spell check) but this did not appear to hinder the students' concentration for the task of reading (Lawrence, McNeal, & Yildiz, 2009). This research demonstrated that teachers could utilize technology as a method of engaging students with reading practices.

Despite the benefits of computer programs, the teacher has a much greater impact on student engagement than technology-assisted instruction in a developmental reading course. While such computer programs integrate technology into the classroom, researchers found that these reading programs do not effectively replace a student's social interaction with a teacher (Appleman, 2000; Gee, 2001). Mallette, Schreiber, Caffey, Carpenter, and Hunter (2009) contended that technology could not replace the "caring

ethic of the one who delivers instruction" (p. 184) an element of developmental instruction which is just as important as the scientifically based instructional methods or programs used for readers. To help students make connections with their reading, a teacher can and must activate students' interests by stimulating their background knowledge and helping them make personal connections to their experiences (Fischer & Ivey, 2006).

Students' motivation and self-perceptions of reading. In a study of student perceptions, Lesley (2004) researched students enrolled in a developmental course and found that students believed they needed remediation but constructed poor self-concepts as a result of their past reading experiences. The researcher argued that students have negative feelings derived from the perpetuation of the remediation cycle. Furthermore, students' strong negative emotions "had arisen from years of labeling and tracking in their previous educational experiences" (Lesley, 2004, p. 69), in which they became marginalized. Central to Lesley's research is the notion that critical approaches help students with "reclaiming their identities of themselves as readers" (p. 78). These critical approaches evolved from critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1993), which allows readers to analyze dominating discourse and use their knowledge for agency or personal empowerment.

In an attempt to better understand the role of motivation for struggling readers, Hall (2007) examined the reading techniques of three female middle school students who had been demonstrating 'silence' during reading. The students were of different grade levels and were reading for different content areas (sixth grade social studies, seventh grade mathematics, and eight grade sciences). The researchers wanted to determine if the

teachers' decisions or content subject matters were an influential factor in the students' silent status during class. The students were observed for one year to determine what factors influence the way(s) they might engage with and make decisions about reading texts in school and how those factors might be related to the students' sense of personal/social/academic identity. Biweekly field observations, audio taped student questionnaires, and interviews were the data collected during 50 classroom visits of 50 minutes each. Data from each student was analyzed for themes and then cross analyzed for similarities between the student participants. Hall's analysis revealed that one student specifically noted that she used silence during reading to "prevent her peers from seeing her as a poor reader." This sentiment was shared by the other two participants as well. Hall (2007) noted that those readers demonstrated an interest in the information that was presented in the text; however, they remained silent about their interest in order to avoid being noticed and labeled by peers with an identity that would be unfavorable. Additional results indicated that silence allowed students to listen and learn content that was covered in the assigned text and to protect them from being identified by their peers as either "good readers" or "poor readers."

Researchers suggest that student success in college lies in one's ability to understand his or her own personal experiences with literacy (Fischer & Ivey, 2006; Lesley, 2004) which may be comprised of family or school events. Conley (2007) argued that "students vary in the degree to which high school and family life prepare them for college, and that preparation has a dramatic impact on their transition to college and subsequent success there" (p. 3). College students need to understand college expectations and manage the content knowledge provided through lessons, but they also

need an understanding of the structure of a postsecondary education both academically and socially. Conley noted not only the role of high school preparation in student success but also that family experiences are indicators of a students' ability to transition between personal and academic literacy demands. In terms of developing reading skills, students can rely on those skills that are embedded in their out-of-school practices.

After following four high school students that had been labeled as lazy or "not good readers," Lutrell and Parker (2001) found that students participated in literacy events outside of the classroom such as reading for pleasure, journaling, and creative writing. The researchers noted that many teachers believe teens do not read and write outside of school. On the contrary, students do read and write, but their preferred modes of writing and reading selections do not align with the demands of an educational curriculum. However, these students' literacy practices were not supported or encouraged in the classroom and their disposition toward reading was more often a response to their teacher's perception of them as learners. Lutrell and Parker (2001) contended that teachers must close the gap between students' in-school and out-of-school practices. Equally important, they argue, is that students and teachers must challenge hierarchies in school and help students learn to use reading and writing to express their self identities.

Duke and Purcell-Gates (2003) found that underdeveloped home literacies are foundational to the problem of reading. Because emergent literacies are key to developing reading skills, students without family support are swept into a cycle of illiteracy that follows them from middle school through high school and into college. Beltzer (2002) posited that this cycle continues for women whose personal interests

contradict their learning. When studying five African American women aged 26–41 years enrolled in a GED adult literacy course, Beltzer noted that the students had no extensive home literacies as children. While they were growing up, they had limited support when they were forming initial fluency and vocabulary skills, and these limitations followed the women into their postsecondary experiences and beyond. School literacies continue to contradict adult practices for students whose reading is traditionally nonacademic. As a result, the lack of family support has lasting impact on student success by "close[ing] off access to information, cultural capital, and the ability to use reading to make personal and social change" (p. 6). Beltzer's study implied that educators must create learning opportunities in adult classes that engage, encourage, and reconcile in-school and out-of-school literacy practices.

Personal literacies and home literacies are not the only factors that determine a student's success in college reading. Research also shows that developmental readers harbor negative feelings (Lesley, 2001), lack motivation (Beers, 2002), and resist remedial reading instruction. Motivation and engagement (Schraw & Bruning, 1999) not only influence a student's self-perception and self-esteem (Bandura, 1986) but are also indicators of student success. Students with high self-efficacy have higher performance levels and read with less time and effort (Ruddell & Unrau, 1997). A lack of motivation may be related to a student's discursive identity (Brown, 2004; Gee, 2002) and the student's perception of himself or herself as a reader.

VanOra (2012) explored perceptions of personal experiences in the context of a community college developmental course to reveal students' academic and non-academic challenges and motivations for earning an associate's degree. Eighteen English speaking

community college students (ten men and eight women) of varying ethnicities and age groups were interviewed. Students were asked about their classes, their struggles and challenges with attending college, their positive and negative experiences while in college, and their motivators for persisting. Seventeen of the participants described serious struggles mostly tied to feelings of inadequacy or fear when completing writing assignments. Half of the students identified their teacher's disposition or teaching practices as a detractor for their success. Specifically, they noted the instructors were insensitive to their needs and did not tailor instruction to their interests. VanOra (2012) noted that "it is important to acknowledge many student complaints were aimed at those credit-bearing classes outside of their developmental reading and writing sequences" (p.33). As a result, he recommends that "we need to continue striving for additional ways to support developmental students' success in credit bearing classes from the outset" (p. 33). Despite the challenges, students expressed possessing intrinsic motivation for learning related to increasing the value of their life or future career paths. Many students were highly motivated by their social relationships and driven by the desire to make friends or family members proud. VanOra's work not only elucidated motivational factors for developmental students but also brought to light students challenges, as they perceived them. Other researchers have specifically documented the importance of attending to the perceptions of developmental readers.

Achievement in Reading

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines achievement in the following ways: "the act of achieving: Accomplishment;" "a result gained by effort;" and "the quality or quantity of student's work" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 10). Therefore,

achievement is an action requiring student effort in the act of attaining a level of quality

or a specified quantity of work, resulting in accomplishment. The definitive terms

quality and quantity create the implication that achievement results in some sort of

reportable or measurable outcome, respectively.

More often, the term achievement has been associated with that of a "gap." The

achievement gap often relates to academic disparity between groups of students,

especially those with low income backgrounds as compared to their counter parts with

more economic advantages. Achievement gaps may be the result of environmental

factors and limited opportunities, experiences, or support resources for low income

students, which is why support services to help address these issues have become so

crucial to developmental education programs.

Daggett (2003) argued for the importance of achieving reading proficiency for all

students. He proposed the International Center for Leadership in Education needed to

take an active role in creating proficiency standards, indicators of achievement, to help

close the gaps created by the No Child Left Behind act which resulted in underprepared

readers who would not likely succeed in college or the workplace. He stated:

> The greatest gap occurs between the reading requirements of the workplace and
>
> students' present reading levels … The International Centers Lexile analysis
>
> reveals that a large number of entry-level jobs have higher reading requirements
>
> than are required for high school graduation… Entry-level jobs today often have
>
> higher reading requirements than many of the more advanced position in the same
>
> field. Moreover, while white- collar workers may do more reading on the job, the
>
> material that many blue- collar workers must read is both complex and extremely

critical to job performance. Poor comprehension of technical manual[s] and

installation instruction[s], for example, can have disastrous results" (p. 4).

Additionally, Daggett (2003) proposed solutions for the problem of the achievement gap

including educating parents and communities about the gap, increasing the amount and

complexity of secondary level reading, selecting appropriate instructional levels

(according to lexiles), providing professional development opportunities for all involved,

directing readings toward students' career and real-world goals, and continuing

assessment to reveal progress. Typically assessment measurements dictate passing

scores, thus constituting numerical values to gauge reading achievement.

Diagnostic assessments are often a required component of developmental education

courses and used as identifiers of college readiness and as predictors of college

achievement.   In Texas (Texas Education Code Section 51.3062) the Texas Higher

Education Coordinating Board authorized the Texas Success Initiative Program (TSI,

2003). TSI required students to take a placement examination and provide their scores to

the Texas public institution of higher education prior to the attending term. Specifically,

the Accuplacer assessment is used to measure students' academic skills in reading,

writing, and mathematics according to set levels. The state mandated minimum score in

reading is 78 (TSI, 2003).

According to the Accuplacer program manual, even to attain low scores students

need to recognize main ideas, central ideas, tone, and the relationship between sentences

(Pearson, 2010). Students need to answer questions about point of view and audience,

recognize paragraph organization, and contrasting ideas for average scores. To attain a

high score, students need to extract implied ideas, follow complex arguments, and

analyze argumentative logic. Literal comprehension and inferencing was required for passages in six content areas: science, history/social science, arts/humanities, narrative, psychology/human relations, and practical situations (Pearson, 2010). By law, students not meeting average requirements must seek advising, enroll in and complete a formal skills development program to meet college readiness requirements unless they re-test with passing scores.

In Texas, public institutions of higher education outline enrollment processes in developmental education programs resulting in different program requirements and/or instructional approaches. At Panhandle Community College (PCC) students are given an additional opportunity to demonstrate their achievement in reading the first day of class when the Nelson Denny Test is administered. Brown, Fishco and Hanna (1993) posited the benefits of the Nelson Denny Reading Test; it effectively measures vocabulary, comprehension and reading rate, and aids in reading placement for adults with abilities up to the 16th grade level. Test designers selected passages drawn from widely used high school and college texts that included vocabulary words they deemed necessary for student success.   At PCC students passing the Nelson Denny Assessment with a 12th grade level reading ability are considered achievers, in that they are deemed college ready and may continue their coursework without completing a developmental reading course. As per the course syllabus, students who do not demonstrate that ability are tested again at the end of term.

Obviously, students who pass the ACT, Accuplacer, or the Nelson Denny would be considered "achievers" in terms of what they have accomplished to become college

ready, but the concept of achievement is not fixed. A passing Accuplacer score of 78 indicates 'average' reading abilities.

Remedial programs often neglect the role of one's self-concept, or mental image one has of their own strengths and weaknesses, in reading achievement. However, developmental education programs combine program interventions for basic and critical skills along with psychological considerations of personal experience, attitudes, and personality. Relative to those psychological considerations are those studies that examine the self-concepts of readers. Lund and Ivanhoff (2012) investigated 227 students including college freshman enrolled in a reading skills program to determine their self-concepts in comparison to those students not enrolled in reading. The Nelson Denny assessment, entrance exams, seven personality scales, 15 need scales, a defensiveness scale, and counseling readiness scale were instruments in the study. The results indicated women had different reading needs and males had depressed reading scores despite their high self-concept scores. The investigation provided evidence that self-concept differences existed between groups, reading abilities, sex, and enrollment in a reading skills course. Although, the female sample size was too small for specific conclusions, "males who exhibit reading problems and who enroll in developmental reading courses appear to be dependent and defensive, and seem to place emphasis on achievement while conforming in a serious, self controlled, and responsible manner" (Lund & Ivanhoff, 2012, p. 165). The researchers recommend that teachers generate remedial procedures inclusive of one's self development and integrative with supportive counseling programs. Self-concepts provide students with ways to shape and cope with their college experiences, thus motivating them and prompting achievement.

Teachers must also consider what 'good readers' do and know that helps them achieve in reading. Good readers know reading strategies and can determine when and where those strategies should be applied; this is their metacognitive knowledge about reading (Baker and Brown, 1984). Additionally, good readers react to text by generating images and by making predictions which enable them to respond to the reading with their own ideas, inferences, and reactions (Rosenblatt, 1978). Good readers' responses are always strongly related to their own experiences as well as their prior knowledge (Anderson and Pearson, 1984).

Pressley and Afflerbach (1995) catalogued the strategies and responses that good readers reported having and applying in three stages of reading. He outlined the cognitive strategies exhibited by effective readers: activating, inferring, monitoring/clarifying, questioning, searching/selecting, summarizing, and visualizing/organizing. These cognitive processes were used by skilled readers to construct meaning and create knowledge in long term memory systems. Pressley and Afflerbach (1995) suggested 'think alouds' provided opportunity for direct instruction and modeling of recorded and spoken thought. Furthermore, the researchers argued that "good readers are always changing their processing in response to the text" (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995, p. 2).

In an effort to expand on Pressley and Afflerbach's (1995) explanation of what good readers 'do,' before, during, and after reading, Pressley and Gaskins (2006) set out to examine the 36 year history of teaching for elementary and middle school students who repeatedly struggle and fail in reading to theorize about how to develop metacognitive competent readers. Pressley and Gaskins contended that before reading

the good reader will "size up the text, noting its length, structure, and parts of the article especially likely to be informative" (p. 100). This phase, the preview phase, helps the reader to situate knowledge gained during reading by relating it to prior knowledge. During reading good readers "think about particular ideas, perhaps re-reading a section or re-stating its content" and "take notes" on important points (Pressley and Gaskins, 2006, p. 100). Good readers return to their previewing assumptions which are "updated as the ideas in the text are encountered" and new inferences are made (Pressley and Gaskins, 2006, p. 100). Additionally, good readers look for the important components of reading such by attempting to identify topic paragraphs, main ideas, and important vocabulary words.

Key to Pressley and Gaskins' (2006) conversation on the theory of 'metacognition learning' is their discussion of what a reader does as they monitor their own reading, as monitoring is an action of metacognition, itself. Good readers recognize when they have trouble with reading, and when they need to adjust their speed, slow down, or gather background information to help them with reading. When outlining the after- reading process, Pressley and Gaskins noted the importance of self questioning as well as a "very systematic review and notating and reflective juggling of the ideas" (p. 101) which is necessary for students to organize and interpret what they have read. Their expanded version of what good readers 'do' became synonymous with what they deem to be "metacognitive competent reading" (p. 101). They recommend that in order to improve reading comprehension, explicit teaching of the "strategies is followed by years of practice applying the strategies to a wide variety of texts for a wide variety of purposes"

(p. 107). Pressley and Gaskins contend that monitoring should be modeled and encouraged in younger grades up until they have become habits.

Unfortunately, struggling readers do not know what strategies 'good readers' use (see Harvey & Goudvis, 2000; Tovani, 2000) and when given strategies in intervention settings the skills that are learned do not always transfer into the general classroom. A research study by Mallette, Schreiber, Caffey, Carpenter, and Hunter (2009) explores the value of a summer literacy program designed for seventh and eighth grade readers deemed at- risk. The researchers identified low income members from a rural community who had been targeted for school retention and selected them as participants for intensive reading intervention. Graduate students taught them explicit reading strategies and used texts that would promote their interests. While there were some positive gains in self perceptions (students exhibited confidence and expressed positive feelings about the summer program) the researchers observed that those gains were tied to the relationships they built in the context of the program. Overall, either there was no long term retention of skills, or the skills were not transferred into the regular classroom setting.

Researchers argue that successful skills instruction requires an attempt to integrate cognitive, metacognitive and motivational factors of learning (Broussard & Garrison, 2004). Ehrlich, Kurtz-Costes, and Lorridant (1993) examined cognitive, metacognitive and motivational factors of students' reading abilities of good and poor readers. They identified the top performing (highest 30%) and lowest performing (lowest 30%) students out of 227 seventh graders whose reading comprehension was assessed to identify the predictors of success for 'good' and 'poor' readers. Word recognition, metacognitive knowledge, perceived competence, and beliefs about academic outcomes were measured.

Results indicated good readers scored higher on word recognition, possessed richer metacognitive knowledge, and had positive beliefs about their academic abilities. For poor readers, word recognition was the primary predictor of limited reading comprehension abilities. A regression analysis also signified word recognition, perceived competence, and metacognitive knowledge were predictors of reading comprehension success for good readers (Ehrlich, Kurtz-Costes, and Lorridant, 1993). Educators who want to help 'poor readers' become 'good readers' should consider these predictors of student reading comprehension abilities as well as those strategies that promote positive perceptions about performance, increase word recognition, and foster richer metacognitive knowledge.

Metacognition

In their reveiew of developmental education program components, Boylan, Bonham, & White (1999) suggested that effective practices includes a focus on improving cognitive abilities and behaviors such as metacognition, 'thinking about thinking.' They contend metacognitive strategies and the application of those strategies in other contexts could improve reading comprehension. This section of the review examines available literature on the subject of metacognition, a component of cognition necessary for promoting behaviors and improving skills (both basic and critical skills) for successful readers.

Cognition. According to the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2009), cognition is a "product of … mental processes;" "to become acquainted with; know;" or "to come to know" (p. 240). Therefore, cognition is the product of mental processes that assist with acquainting or coming to know. Parodi (1939) declared that "knowing is only a peculiar

type of such events among others, events that have their specific conditions in those that precede them and which in turn react upon those that follow" (p. 231). Knowing has no permanence; what is known is drawn from one's experiences or perceptions only relevant in a given time and context (Parodi, 1939). Parodi rationalized that to better understand, explain, or demonstrate knowledge one must apply 'continuous readjustment' of knowledge, a process which requires thinking.

Thinking. Dewey further examined thinking and noted the value of reflective and critical thought. Dewey (1916) argued that "thinking is … a specific event in the movement of experienced things, having its own specific occasion or demand and its own specific place" (p. 127). Thinking, an action resulting from one's experiences, is a tool for problem solving and for developing philosophies about lived events (Eldridge, 1998). Therefore, thinking assists with discerning or modifying one's thinking about their experiences and events of learning.

Metacognition. Metacognition, "an awareness of analysis of one's own learning or thinking processes" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 779) can assist students with the process of learning. The term has been used to describe "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (Flavell, 1979, p. 906) and correspondingly 'thinking about thinking' and "knowing about knowing" (Metcalfe & Shimamura, 1994).

In one study, 130 student participants in their third year of a teacher training program received direct instruction on the use of metacognitive awareness for reading comprehension (Cubukcu, 2008). Turkish students received 45 minutes of direct instruction on the use of metacognitive strategies including inferencing, using background information, setting goals, evaluating goals, examining difficulty, revising,

guessing and predicting.   For the duration of five weeks, students were required to keep reflective journals documenting their thinking when reading English passages. Vocabulary and comprehension levels were checked prior to and after the implementation of journaling with a pre and post TOEFL examination, an assessment which measures a student's ability to comprehend and use English in an academic setting. Cubukcu (2008) found that metacognitive strategy training corresponded with increased achievement in vocabulary (though limited) and reading comprehension abilities. While Cubukcu's study provides evidence of the relationship between metacognition and vocabulary and comprehension abilities, there was no clear evidence that instruction of any one metacognitive strategy was more effective than another.

It is likely that reading success can be linked to having an array of metacognitive strategies on which to rely. Other strategies students can rely on include Know-want to know-learn (KWL) and Survey, Question, Read, Record, Recite (SQ3R). These fit nicely into metacognitive terrain "as do think aloud strategies," "response journals," and "portfolio assessment" (Miholic, 1994, p. 84). More frequently, reading journals or other forms of writing are implemented to inspire students thinking about their thinking, and thereby writing assignments become metacognitive strategies.

In a study of first-year college students with deficiencies in reading and writing, 34 students attended a six week intensive summer program to improve reading, writing, and studying skills prior to their first year in college (El-Hindi, 1997). Reflective journals or reading logs were used to promote metacognitive learning. Reading logs were analyzed along with pre and post questionnaires to assess student gains in metacognitive awareness. El-Hindi (1997) found that reading log entries became more detailed across

time in terms of summarization and there was a steady increase in log entries showing critical reflection and commentary. Metacognitive awareness for both reading and writing increased over time and learners had a greater understanding of the relationship between reading and writing (El Hindi, 1997).

Similarly, Soldner (1997) made recommendations based on her personal experiences with implementing learning logs in the classroom. Staggering due dates and focusing on content rather than format were her top recommendations for teachers. Soldner also noted the importance of metacognitive reflection:

> Besides providing students with metacognitive knowledge about themselves and their reading tasks, learning logs provide me as a teacher with important information about how my students are feeling about reading, learning, and life in general, and what, if anything, I can do to assist them during classroom instructional activities (p. 22).

Furthermore, Soldner found learning logs to be beneficial for improving students' retention of what had been read.

Miholic (1994) created an inventory (Metacognitive Reading Awareness Inventory). The inventory asked students to respond to prompts about what they do when they encounter unknown words or sentences, as well as questions about when to return to passages, or when to apply other reading strategies most often used by good readers. The inventory was designed to provide teachers with a basic idea of what their students know about achieving higher levels of comprehension.

Other metacognitive inventories have been tested and developed. While useful in determining a students' metacognitive awareness and their use of strategies for reading,

they are limited to use with elementary, middle, or high school students. One exception

is Mokhtari and Reichard's (2002) Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies

Inventory (MARSI). Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) noted the use of this instrument:

> The major purposes were to devise an instrument that would permit one to assess
>
> the degree to which a student is or is not aware of the various processes involved
>
> in reading and to make it possible to learn about the goals and intention he or she
>
> holds when coping with academic reading tasks. Such information can increase
>
> students' awareness of their own comprehension processes. As well, it can help
>
> teachers better understand the needs of their students (p. 251).

As suggested, MARSI was designed to assess adolescent and adult readers'

metacognitive awareness and students' perceived use of reading strategies. MARSI

required students to report their behaviors in terms of the Global, Problem-solving, and

Support strategies they most often used in academia.

Xianming (2007) designed a study to investigate the metacognitive awareness of

reading strategies of first-year college students who were also English as foreign

language learners (EFL). Xianming collected a questionnaire, classroom observations,

and interviews. The data was analyzed for percentages of occurrences to determine

students' frequency of using global reading strategies (planning, using prior knowledge,

organization, checking, guessing meaning, and checking guesses); problem solving

reading strategies (reading slowly, redirecting attention, adjusting speed, thinking about

reading difficulties, stopping to think, and re-reading); and supporting reading strategies

(taking notes, underlining and circling, using the dictionary, paraphrasing, asking

questions, using both English and Chinese to think, and reading aloud). Overall findings

from the self reported inventory indicated that of all the students, 55 had moderate awareness of their reading strategies, 18 had high levels of awareness about strategies, and, one had low level awareness of strategies.

Classroom observations and interviews were also analyzed by Xianming (2007) to determine the most frequent and least frequently used metacognitive reading strategies. Re-reading was used most frequently at 124 times while asking the teacher for help was used the least amount of times at three occurrences. Findings from Xianming's (2007) study indicated there were strategies that students did pay attention to: background knowledge, context clues, checking understanding, guessing meaning, skimming and scanning, using tables and pictures, adjusting reading speed, reading slowly, guessing unknown words, underlining and circling, translating and using the dictionary. Additionally, the study indicated there were strategies that students did not attend to: noting the length and organization of text, noticing what to read closely and what to ignore, analyzing and evaluating information, visualizing, thinking about the difficulties while reading, reading aloud, asking questions, paraphrasing, and note-taking. Most notably, those strategies not observed were necessary for monitoring during reading (i.e. note-taking) and those that would assist students with comprehension (i.e., paraphrasing).

A lack of monitoring strategies might account for the breakdown that reportedly occurs during developmental reading students' monitoring of comprehension. In one study designed to understand students' processes for making meaning, Purcell-Gates (1991) noted a problem: "Whether or not poor readers' failure to actively construct meaning during reading is inextricably linked to problems at the word level is not fully understood" (237). She argued that to understand the problem of reading comprehension

and vocabulary acquisition researchers needed to know about meaning construction for students who think, rethink, and experience reading. Six children in public schools and their teachers were observed in think aloud sessions to capture metacognitive awareness. Purcell-Gates (1991) concluded that remedial readers were passive, focused on surface meanings, and their understandings were limited by implied meaning; most of all, students failed to use monitoring strategies, self regulatory processes. From experiences, personal, social, and educational, developmental readers perpetuate attitudes (Lesley, 2004) that negate their own engagement and motivation with effective strategies such as those that could aid in monitoring and regulating of knowledge.

Researchers examined the importance of students' metacognitive accuracy. Geir, Kreiner, and Natz-Gonzales (2009) assigned previously highlighted reading passages of various difficulties to 180 undergraduate students. Random assignments were made to assure a variety of reading levels were assigned. Some students received passages with properly highlighted passages (of sentences related to comprehension questions) and others received passages with incorrectly placed highlighting. Students were then asked to respond to a metacomprehension ratings scale. The researchers compared students' reading comprehension performance to that of their self –reported metacomprehension ratings scale. Results showed that when reading inappropriately highlighted passages, students' reported their performance on a comprehension test to be better than it was. A negative correlation between how well students comprehend and how accurately they answered comprehension questions was indicated. Mostly, the inappropriate highlighting seemed to impair text comprehension and metacognitive accuracy (Geir, Kreiner, Natz-Gonzales, 2009).

Ability. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines *ability* in the following ways: capacity, fitness, or tendency to act or be acted on in a specified way;" "competence in doing: skill;" and the "natural aptitude or acquired proficiency" (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 3). Hence, ability refers to one's capacity or aptitude for completing a task, for acting in some way and for demonstrating proficiency or competence in terms of skills. The terms aptitude, proficiency, and competence suggest that one's ability can be measured or observed.

Many researchers have discussed students' ability in terms of their ability to perform tasks in core areas such as fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension (Hernandez, McCardle, Miller, 2010; Greenberg, Nanda, Morris, 2010*).* However, other researchers indicate that reading ability requires something greater or beyond that of skill attainment, something that cannot be measured or observed. Instructional practice focused on improving skills sets in the areas of fluency, vocabulary or comprehension independently are not only unsuccessful (Hernandez, McCardle, Miller, 2010; Greenberg, Nanda, Morris, 2010) but also do not address students' thinking abilities. Additionally, they fail to impart the responsibility for learning onto the student. For the underprepared college student, metacognitive capabilities are the key to college success; analysis, interpretation, precision, accuracy, problem solving, and reasoning are required critical skills (Conley, 2007). For instance*,* Conley contends students need the ability to:

> make inferences, interpret results, analyze conflicting explanations phenomena,
>
> support arguments with evidence, solve complex problems that have no obvious
>
> answer, reach conclusions, offer explanations, conduct research, engage in the

give and take of ideas, and generally think deeply about what they are being

taught (p. 5)

Paris and Winograd (1990) argue that metacognition not only promotes motivation, but

can also transfer the responsibility of learning from teacher to student. They also

maintain that metacognition provides insight into one's own thinking about their self

perceptions, which could be important for students who have had negative reading

experiences or for whom have poor perceptions of themselves as readers. Specifically,

systematic and direct instruction can enhance students' knowledge and awareness of their

own reading processes by enabling "them to manage their own learning" (Paris &

Winograd, 1990, p. 22). Managing one's own learning requires students to exhibit

certain behaviors.

Behavior. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary reveals the definitive qualities of

behavior as: "the manner of conducting one's self;" "anything an organism does

involving action and response to stimulation;" "the response of an individual, group, or

species to its environment;" and "the way in which something functions or operates"

(Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2009, p. 111). These qualities shape the term behavior;

a manner of conducting, functioning, or operating in response to stimulation from an

individual, group, or other environmental factor.

It is essential for developmental readers to possess metacognitive behaviors

related to self-management, time management, strategic study skills, persistence, and an

awareness of his or her true performance. In terms of academic behaviors, college

readiness necessitates student self awareness, self-monitoring, self control of processes

and actions in and across content areas (Conley, 2007). According to Conley, "another

important set of academic behaviors is student mastery of study skills including time management, stress management, prioritizing, using resources, taking notes, and communicating effectively" (p. 10).   These behaviors fall under the umbrella of self-management, a form of metacognition, which requires students to monitor, regulate, evaluate, and direct their thinking (Ritchhart, 2002). Students who have these behaviors self-manage their learning, motivation, and engagement. Conley (2007) further elaborates on the necessary self-managements skills of readers:

> Self-management skill areas are awareness of one's current level of mastery and understanding (and misunderstandings) of a subject; the ability to reflect on what worked and what needed improvement regarding a particular academic task; the ability to persist when presented with a novel, difficult, or ambiguous task, the tendency to identify and systematically select among and employ a range of learning strategies; and the capability to transfer learning and strategies from familiar settings and situation to new ones (p. 10).

Behavior is the action required for completing the task, and the skill is one's measureable ability to complete the task. For this reason the two, behaviors and abilities, are at times inseparable. Time management, for instance requires the action of regulating and monitoring (behavior) but also relies upon the student's ability to read quickly in a given time frame, or perhaps to keep accurate record of reading. Therefore, the skill of time management is related to one' ability to complete the given reading tasks in the time allotted if performing certain behaviors. Conley (2007) argued for the importance of time management:

Time management is perhaps the most foundational of all the self-management

and study skills. Examples of time management techniques and habits include

accurately estimating how much time it takes to complete outstanding and

anticipated tasks and allocating sufficient time to complete the tasks (p. 10).

Metacognitive strategies assist students with assessing their behaviors in order to improve

their abilities/skills.

Developmental Reading Teachers

Research on teacher understandings of adolescent literacy development indicated

that teachers in all content areas need to know how literacy is developmental and how

reading processes work. Additionally, teachers need to know what skills and strategies

need to be mastered for reading, and how to incorporate literacy into their instructional

practices. Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore & Rycik (1999) posit the notion that some teachers

do not have the tools or resources to teach reading in their content area. Although, this is

a negative reflection on reading teachers, other researchers have recognized the ways that

teachers caring ethics foster motivation and engagement which helps students develop

their reading identities as addressed in this section of the literature review.

Teachers' beliefs about teaching and their knowledge of reading programs and

practices have been documented (Anderson & Holt-Reynolds, 1995). Wyatt and Pickle

(1993) further examined teachers' beliefs about teaching reading. Nine teachers were

interviewed to demonstrate how basic belief systems shape the thoughts of reading

instructors and how basic beliefs about teaching influence their behaviors across different

types of programs for different aged learners. Four of the teachers interviewed

specialized in reading instruction for college students, four others specialized in early

childhood reading and the final participant had a background in developmental studies.

Ten significant statements for the participants and their responses were placed along a

continuum of transmission vs. interpretation views. Transmission was described as a

belief system for teachers who view themselves as transmitters of fixed knowledge and

leaders to pre-established truth. Those with interpretation views envisioned themselves to

be facilitators of student growth and teachers of students who interpret static knowledge.

Because the teachers responded consistently within a given range on the continuum, the

researchers determined that basic beliefs are persistent. Furthermore, they argued that

beliefs can overcome circumstances when their ideas about teaching do not align with

their diverse settings. Wyatt and Pickle (1993) argue further about this persistence:

> Instructors who believe that teaching involves developing their students into
>
> independent learning and instructors who believe that teaching involved
>
> endowing student with knowledge may hold to those ideas and goals across
>
> different teaching situation. These instructors have held to their beliefs not only
>
> across different programs, but also across such diverse settings as elementary
>
> school and college (p. 347).

Wyatt and Pickle's final contention was that belief systems were so prevalent in teachers'

minds that they would sabotage a fitting curriculum just to uphold their beliefs about

what constitutes good teaching. Teacher preparation may account for providing future

teachers with the knowledge and theoretical frameworks that evolve into their belief

systems.

Teacher preparation. In a position statement on adolescent literacy for the

commission of the International Reading Association, Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore & Rycik

(1999) argued that "the limited number of reading education courses required for pre-service middle and high school teachers often does not sufficiently prepare them to respond to the scaling needs of adolescent learners" (p. 3). Furthermore, Barry (1994) noted that teacher preparation focuses on teaching the content, not on "teaching the content through reading" (p. 17). Pre-service teachers admit that teaching content through reading is a challenge, one too great to meet during the standard teacher training period.

For instance, Freedman and Carver (2007) examined 66 pre-service teachers across five semesters to determine their emerging understandings of adolescent literacy development as teacher candidates in four core disciplines (science, mathematics, language, arts, and social studies). Freedman and Carver wanted to know how the candidates who were required to take general methods and secondary content literacy as a part of their teacher preparation coursework understood literacy processes as well as their role in supporting adolescent literacy development. Data collection included reading logs and written responses generated in the early weeks, at midterm, and for end of term essays. The teacher candidates reported a realization of the importance of knowing the instructional content and of preparing for and structuring for content area reading activities. Final essays written by the pre-service teachers indicated a growth in understanding about incorporating processes skills and strategies of reading into the content area, and at least one teacher candidate's final essay reflected the need to know more about reading. Freedman and Carver's (2007) analysis showed that by going through three stages (naïve wonder, dawning realization, and intellectual rigor) the

teacher candidates grasped the theory and practices necessary to facilitate their secondary students' acquisition of content knowledge through literacy (reading) development.

Content area reading. In a review of 60 years of research regarding high school reading programs and staffing, Barry (1994) noted that remedial reading classes are frequently understaffed because teachers are resistant about remedial reading and reading instruction. Additionally, teachers are underprepared. Barry emphasizes that teachers are less prepared to teach struggling readers:

> …for a variety of reasons, the American educational establishment has passed the buck when it comes to adolescents who struggled with reading.   Perhaps one cause for continued reading problems is that poor readers have, historically, been foisted upon teachers who had not the time, inclination or training to work with them (p. 19).

However, he indicated progress has been made in terms of preparing teachers to work with students who have reading difficulties and indicates that one positive change is in preparing content area teachers to teach reading. His study revealed that content area reading skills help foster a love for reading, yet the movement is still met with resistance by those who do not want to teach reading and those who do not know how to teach reading. As a result, specialized reading instruction is limited and establishes unrealistic student expectations and demands in the classroom (Barry, 1994).

Researchers asserted (Barry, 1994; McKenna & Robinson, 2002; Moje, 2006) that a student's struggle with reading is strongly linked to a teacher's opposition toward reading instruction and, specifically, the teacher's resistance to content area reading programs. Still, the effectiveness of curriculum programs that implement content area

reading strategies is well documented (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Alvermann & Swafford, 1989). Despite content area reading program successes, secondary readers in the United States still struggle with certain literary tasks and therefore are unable to comprehend, interpret, synthesize, or analyze expository texts (Moje, 2006) for various reasons linked to a teacher's knowledge and acceptance of content area instructional methods. Moreover, there has been a shift toward content area reading programs, programs that are designed to teach students the specific strategies needed to increase reading skills across different content areas.

To address teacher's lack of preparation in content area reading, as well as the need to bridge in school and out of school literacies, some computer programs have been designed to assist with reading instruction. According to Fischer and Ivey (2006), various computer programs not only assist teachers with instruction, but also help students with acquisition and/or remediation of reading skills. Although such computer programs integrate technology into the classroom, the researchers find that these reading programs do not effectively replace the social interaction with a teacher (Fischer & Ivey, 2006). Mallette, Schreiber, Caffey, Carpenter, and Hunter (2009) contend that the "caring ethic of the one who delivers instruction" (p. 184) is just as important as the scientific based instructional methods or programs that are used for remedial readers.

Social and cultural understanding. In a qualitative study of four adolescent English Language Learners (Ell's) enrolled in a READ 180, a Scholastic Books program comprised of 90 minutes of instruction and 20 minutes of small group work or computer assisted software exercise, Chiu-hui and Cody (2010) examined the students' responses to reading in relation to their cultural needs. The researchers describe the program

acknowledging that the 90 minute block and 20 minute rotations are effective in creating whole, small, and individual group experiences. However, they contend that the reading materials generalize culture for these learners who need specific, culturally relevant, reading materials. Program supplementation is suggested for students who are second language learners and for those with learning disabilities (Chiu-hui and Cody, 2010). Supplementing student materials helps students make connections with their social, emotional and cultural contexts and enables them to construct their literacy identity (Gee, 2001).

Chapter Summary

This chapter offered a review of reading. The study of such resonated from NCLB (2001) accountability stipulations and the demand for attention to college readiness. Developmental education intensifies efforts to remediate readers by contributing support services with skill intervention. Trends that hold promise for benefiting the students who are not proficient in developmental reading emerged from research (Gee, 2008; Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore & Rycik, 1999; Rassool, 1999; Weiner, 2002) noting the importance of multiple literacies and content area reading instruction. Additionally promising were those efforts in program research reflecting an attempt to bridge in- and out-of-school literacies (Beltzer, 2002; Lawrence, McNeal, & Yildiz, 2009) and those that amalgamated technology into the school setting (Fischer and Ivey, 2006).

Research efforts emphasized the importance of integrating social, emotional, cultural and ideological contexts in the classroom (Chiu-hui and Cody, 2010) for the purpose of deconstructing negative feelings (Lesley, 2001) and for reconstructing literacy

identities (Gee, 2001; Lesley, 2004). More importantly, are those studies which examine

metacognition, a component of thinking necessary for improving abilities and behaviors

(Conley, 2007). Self-management behaviors require students to monitor, regulate,

evaluate, and direct their thinking (Ritchhart, 2002) in order to develop awareness of their

true performance so they can implement strategies and practices to improve in reading.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

In this qualitative study, I examined student responses to my instructional practices in one college developmental reading course and described what was revealed by students about their metacognition. My purpose was to gain insight and give recommendations for helping students become reflective thinkers that better achieve the task of college reading. This study also allowed me to evaluate the effectiveness of my instructional plan, examine my responsiveness to students' learning needs, to clarify my thinking about teaching, and to foster my students' metacognitive awareness of reading abilities and behaviors.

From various studies, research findings that hold promise for benefiting students who are not proficient in reading emerged. Efforts to remediate students in specific skill sets (vocabulary, fluency, & comprehension) are believed to be ineffective when applied independently (Gee, 2008; Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore & Rycik, 1999; Rassool, 1999; Weiner, 2002). Researchers emphasized the importance of integrating social, emotional, cultural and ideological contexts in the classroom (e.g., Chiu-hui and Cody, 2010) for the purpose of deconstructing negative feelings (Lesley, 2001) and for reconstructing literacy identities (Gee, 2001; Lesley, 2004).   Efforts in program research reflect an attempt to bridge in and out-of-school literacies (Beltzer, 2002; Lawrence, McNeal, & Yildiz, 2009). They also address those efforts that integrate technology into the school setting (Fischer and Ivey, 2006). More importantly, studies which examine metacognition, a component of thinking necessary for improving abilities and behaviors, are key for students and teachers (Conley, 2007). Among those metacognitive behaviors are self -

management processes that require students to monitor, regulate, evaluate, and direct

their thinking (Ritchhart, 2002) in order to develop awareness of their true performance

so they can implement strategies and practices to improve in reading.

For one semester, I taught students in a developmental reading course using

primarily transactional direct instruction methods on the content, skills, and strategies of

reading. Courses met twice weekly for the duration of 1 hour and 15 minutes in a face-to

face traditional classroom setting. When not instructing, I led students through guided

practice, oversaw independent practice, and held group discussions. My intention was to

assist college students with learning and using effective reading strategies and

understanding what is necessary to succeed at the college level. Data collection,

originating from the students was a part of the regular and normal part of the conduct of

the class. Two major research questions framed this study: (1) What do students reveal

about their metacognition in the context of a community college developmental reading

course? (2) How does understanding the students' reading metacognition inform the

instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course?

Rationale for Qualitative Research

Qualitative research was best suited to my study because qualitative research

allows for the analysis of human behavior and for an investigation of the *why* and *how* of

that behavior. Strauss and Corbin (1990) defined qualitative research as any research that

does not produce findings through a means of statistical procedures. Rather than

focusing on numerical analysis, qualitative research, also referred to as naturalistic

inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), seeks to illuminate the dynamics of the research context

in ways that quantitative research cannot. In research instances, such as the context of

the classroom where teaching and learning transpires for those with disparate backgrounds and personalities', recognizing that reality is both constructed and subjective is key.

Qualitative research acknowledges the importance of the researcher's direct experience within personal and socially constructed contexts. Lincoln and Guba (1985) contended that unlike quantitative research, qualitative research recognizes multiple constructed realities formed in time and context and concedes that the researcher and what becomes known through the research are inseparable. The qualitative paradigm requires that the researcher be the primary instrument of data analysis (Creswell, 1994; Merriam, 1998) and allows the researcher to use inductive reasoning (Creswell, 1994) to build concepts, hypothesize, or form theories from "an in-depth understanding of human behavior" (Chhabra, Kapinus, & McCardle, 2008, p. 40). Researchers can study events and understandings that emerge in the classroom in order to gain insight and give recommendations for helping students better achieve the task of reading. Qualitative research allows for the discussion of these experiential events of teaching and learning in a college developmental reading course while retaining the contextual tone of the setting and an account of the personal and social experiences.

Creswell (1994) also explored qualitative research noting that qualitative study is characterized as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem with the intent to build a holistic picture with words inclusive of participant views in a natural setting. The qualitative paradigm often yields reflections of a "new diversity of milieus, subcultures, lifestyles, and ways of living" (Flick, 2006, p. 12). Rather than provide a numerical account of responses, qualitative research necessitates a more descriptive and

reflective account of the context, experiences, and relationships as expressed in the form of a narrative.

Narrative inquiry as a method. A method is a "way of doing literacy research" (Duke & Mallette, 2004, p. 1). Narrative inquiry is a carefully ascribed qualitative methodology comprised of detailed character descriptions transacted by readers who form interpretations of the research. The research allows for the "collaboration between researcher and participants, over time, in a place or series of places, and in social interaction with milieus" (p. 20). Therefore, as a methodology, narrative inquiry was a good fit for research in the context of a developmental reading course where I, as the teacher, came together with students in the collaborative experiences of teaching and learning to help them achieve in reading. Students' willingness to share their experiences of learning contributed to the collaborative efforts, helping me to better accomplish the tasks of teaching.

Narrative inquiry is a respected method used to develop a collection of anecdotes, construct character development, or to develop a story that will be transacted by the reader for interpretation in the "fields of education, English studies, and writing studies" (Schaafsma, Pagnucci, Wallace, & Stock, 2007, p. 284). Pinnegar and Daynes (2007) recognized that problems arise when "translating experience to numeric codes [because] researchers lose the nuances of experience and relationship in a particular setting that are of interest to those examining human experience"(p. 15). This is a problem best resolved with a narrative accounting or reporting of the data. As the practitioner, I was not only a teacher and researcher, but also a storyteller. Schaafsma & Vinz (2007) contend that narrative researchers construct anecdotes for narrative inquiry in "ordinary language" (p.

278) which then become stories because of the writer/researcher/teacher's use of "rhetorical devices, reflexivity, trenchant details, and fondness for character development" (p. 280). The accuracy of reporting the experienced through story was essential for reflecting a theoretical perspective about the importance of experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

The complexity of personal histories and social interactions also forge the experiences that are expressed in writing which is why I relied on narrative inquiry not only as a methodological structure, but also as part of a conceptual framework for understanding and reflecting on teaching and learning. John Dewey's (1933) notion of *continuity in experience* describes how experience exists as a temporal continuum in which the "living present" is in continuity with the past and future. Rather than expressing isolated events, narrative experience develops over time in relation to past, present, and future experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) referred to this continual developmental process as the *three-dimensional narrative space.* To account for these three dimensions which affect the expressed experiences, I asked students to reflect on their past histories of reading, and to analyze their current status as readers in phases (pre instructional, mid-term instructional, and post instructional, as well as their futuristic or predictive experiences of reading). That is, I wanted to provide instruction what would assist students with the development of metacognitive behaviors including their self - management processes such as monitoring, regulating, evaluating, and directing their thinking (Ritchhart, 2002), which in turn I hoped would help them gain an awareness of their true performance so they could implement strategies and practices necessary for reading achievement.

Context of the Study

      This section describes the campus setting, classroom setting, and the developmental reading course. The study took place in a suburban community college which I will refer to as Panhandle Community College (PCC) located in Texas. PCC is within a 30 mile radius of a major agricultural city and a large university. PCC was established in the late 1950's and provides educational opportunities for students across the state. Enrollment includes more than 9,000 degree seeking students per semester and just less than 6,000 students in certificate or short-term training programs. More than 15,000 students attend the college each year when considering dual-credit, workforce development, and continuing education attendance. More than 70% are first generation college students; their parents did not earn a four year degree. The average student age was 23. Less than one-half of the students attending the college were male. According to a demographics report from the main campus, the ethnicity of the student population included approximately 68% Anglo, 26% Hispanic, 5% African-American, and just over 1% of students identified themselves as other. Of all students attending, more than 95% were from the state of Texas. At the time of this study, fewer than 500 students at PCC were enrolled in developmental reading courses. Fewer than 100 of those students were enrolled in my five sections of developmental reading.

      During the semester of study (16 weeks), I instructed five sections of developmental reading for the two –year college students. Each class had an enrollment cap of 20-25. Three of the sections were scheduled to meet biweekly for 1 hour and 15 minutes at the main campus site. The other two sections met once weekly for 2 hours and 30 minutes at an ITV site and one extension site. The course selected for this study met

84

biweekly for 1 hour and 15 minutes on the main campus and in the traditional classroom; this section was selected because it was the first class to meet the maximum enrollment capacity of 25 students which provided a stable and maximum data set. On the first day of class, four students tested out on the Nelson Denny Assessment, setting the class enrollment at 21 students.

For the course section of study, one face-to-face community college developmental reading course with a final enrollment of 21 students enrolled was selected. Students ranged in age, ability, gender and ethnicity. All indicated they were degree seeking (though some undeclared in terms of study area). According to a demographics survey taken the first day of class, students identified their ethnic representations as: 3 Asian, 3 African American, 3 African (non-American), 3 Anglo-American, 6 Hispanic-American, and 3 Hispanic (non-American). Students of American decent originated from New Mexico and Texas and spoke only English. Non-American students originated from Vietnam, China, South Korea, Jamaica, and Mexico. They spoke their native languages, Vietnamese, Mandarin, South Korean, Jamaican, and Spanish, as well as English.

In addition, four students self identified as having a learning disability (two specified dyslexia) and sought out special accommodations through the college disability services center. Those accommodations provided students with note taking assistance and extended time for testing in the testing center. Students with accommodations were not required to take advantage of available accommodations.

While enrolled in the developmental reading program, students were required to take at least one other college course but were restricted from taking any course that was reading

intensive. This prevented developmental reading students from enrolling in college level

history, political science, social science, and behavioral science courses until they became

compliant/college ready in the area of reading according to the Texas Success Initiative

(TSI).

At the end of the course, students were required to demonstrate collegiate reading

skills. Students demonstrated these skills by completing all assignments, examinations,

and class projects with an average of B or better. They were also required to attend and

participate in class. To show satisfactory compliance with the TSI and demonstrate

college readiness, students had to pass their developmental coursework with a B or better,

or retake the Accuplacer and gain a passing score, or pass the Nelson Denny Assessment

with a 12th grade reading level or higher on either the first day of class or at the end of the

term. Students received financial aid credit for course completion but credit did not

count towards degree completion. State mandates, the course syllabus, and the students’

responsibilities contract (see Appendix B) outlined the students’ required participation in

the course.

Each course section was designed to strengthen the student’s ability to interpret

visual representations of reading (pictures, charts, tables, and graphs); to condense,

interpret, and/or summarize written information; to take notes while reading; to

demonstrate listening/learning and remembering; to apply basic study skills; and to

improve test-taking strategies. My instructional focus was on helping students to

understand their own metacognition or “thinking about thinking” (Flavell, 1979). More

specifically, my course was designed to increase fluency; to expand and develop

vocabulary using word parts and context clues; to learn dictionary skills; to interpret

implied main ideas and details; to interpret stated main ideas, details, facts, patterns, types, and themes; to identify author's purpose, point of view, and intended meaning; to analyze relationships between texts and across content areas; to integrate prior knowledge and experience with new concepts from reading; and to utilize critical thinking and reasoning processes that better demonstrates reading comprehension. Course design was addressed in students' tentative course agenda (see Appendix C).

Although I was the instructor for 5 course sections, I chose to study one. To select the course section for study, I looked at enrollment numbers. The first course to meet the maximum enrollment number of 21was arbitrarily designated the focus of the study.

Brown and Dowling (1998) discussed the process of selecting participants for an educational study. After examining several methodologies they noted that research which relied on case studies were disadvantageous because there was less consideration for the context and because "a dialogue, by definition involves more than one voice" (p. 167). The specific problem, they noted was that educators do not set out to instruct a select few, but an entire class. They further argued:

> Educational researchers attempt to put a gloss of deliberation onto their opportunity samples by referring to them as case studies. We have difficulties with this expression […] Essentially; all research IS [sic] case study research insofar as it makes claims about one or more specific cases of or in relation to a broader field of instances or phenomena (p. 30).

Additionally, unlike K-12 educators, there is difficulty for college educators who seek to identify cases at the beginning of the term because of optional attendance, enrollment and

completion rates. More importantly, as an educator I did not want my instructional

efforts to be limited to a select few. Rather, I wanted to implore the best methods for my

course as a whole entity inclusive of multiple individuals which would yield a more

realistic result. For these reasons, I decided to implore the use of key informants. Brown

and Dowling (1998) discussed the use of key informants who assist in the telling of the

stories in a setting "for which practitioners who seek to transformations in their own

practices" (p. 152).   For this reason, I elected to implore the use of key informants, to

which I refer to as key participants. To prevent any unknown or unconscious influence

on my study I did not select these students until after the term had ended, and I did so

using a data reduction process.

Key Participants

The qualitative paradigm requires the study of a small focused sample over time

(Creswell, 1998) within a bounded system (Creswell, 1998; Chhabra, Kapinus, &

McCardle, 2008). All 21 students in the course informed my instruction during the term

and contributed to my understandings and findings in this study of developmental

reading. I wanted to create narratives that would relay the learning experiences of

developmental students to give a better demonstration of their metacognition and doing

so for all 21 students during all stages of the course was impractical. To reduce the

sample size and focus my study, I selected six key participants. Allen, Erlandson, Harris,

& Skipper (1993) suggest that a measure of reducing the number of participants through

purposeful sampling "adds credibility" when the "potential purposeful sample is larger

than one can handle" (p. 83). To assist with the data reduction process and select key

participants, I created a Microsoft Excel file of all the documents collected, a total of 777

student documents were included. As a means of purposeful sampling, I eliminated

students who had dropped out of college, dropped out of the course, whom I had dropped

from the course for non-attendance, students who wished to be excluded from the study,

who did not complete any of the online course components, who tested out of the course

using Nelson Denny or Accuplacer, and finally students who did not complete the critical

study pieces, the components that I felt were necessary to reflect the students' narrative:

the conference session, final reflective portfolio, and the interview. To assist with the

process, a data reduction chart was created.

Specifically, one student was eliminated after she was identified as college ready.

She was not a developmental student but was taking the course because her coach told

her that it was a good course. Four students either dropped the course or I withdrew them

for non-attendance, one student dropped out of college, one student asked to be excluded,

two students did not complete the online course requirements, one student tested out at

the end of the term by Nelson Denny Examination and was exempt from completing the

course and course assignments, and one student tested out at the end of the course by

Accuplacer and was also exempt. Seven students had insufficient data sets because they

did not complete two or more of the critical study components: the conference session,

final reflective portfolio, or the interview which I felt were essential for developing a

narrative accounting of their experience.

After the data reduction process, two boys and two girls remained. However, I

wanted to assure that the data set maximized my "ability to identify emerging themes that

take adequate account of contextual conditions and cultural forms" (Allen, Erlandson,

Harris, & Skipper, 1993, p. 83) so I wanted to re-include a student who had tested out as

well as a student who was not successful in the course. I went back through the data

reduction chart and decided to include the student (Kyle) who had submitted more

documents than the four selected by reduction. An additional benefit of re-adding Kyle

was that he had completed all of the critical study components as well as the optional

interview. Additionally, I included Gregory, a student who had a history of failing the

developmental reading course with other instructors and myself. Not only did he

represent the non-traditional experience of a developmental reading student in college

because of his continued failure, but I was also determined to help him succeed, or at

least grow as a reader. Additionally, Gregory had completed the critical study pieces

including the final interview. He often frequented my office to tell me about books he

had been reading. I felt this made him a prime candidate for a closer examination and

that his willingness contributed to an "information-rich" case more suitable to an in depth

study (Patton, 1990). Furthermore, the re-inclusion of Kyle and Gregory provided a more

culturally accurate sampling of a college developmental reading course while also

"increase[ing] the range of data exposed and maximize[ing]" my ability to find emerging

themes (Allen, Erlandson, Harris, & Skipper, 1993, p. 83).

These six students, four males and two females, provided a small focused sample

representative of the gender, ethnicity, and ability levels of the students enrolled in the

course. According to their self reports all were taking the course for the first time and

one male student was repeating the course with me as an instructor for the third time.

The table below features demographics from a reading survey administered on the second

day of class. Providing this information was optional. A blank space for ethnicity

allowed students to self identify in their preferred manner, rather than to elect a pre-determined category.

Figure 3.1 Demographics of Key Participants

Pseudonym	Gender	Self Identified Ethnicity	Language	Age	Self Identified Disability	First Generation College Student
Marvin	Male	Hispanic-American	English	18	No	Yes
Bridget	Female		English	21	Yes (non-specific)	Yes (But, Sibling Attended)
Joslyn	Female	African (Jamaican)	Jamaican English	19	No	Yes
Gregory	Male	Anglo American	English	22	Yes (Dyslexia)	Yes
Kyle	Male	Asian (Chinese)	Mandarin English	18	No	Yes
Caleb	Male	Hispanic (Mexican)	Spanish English	18	No	Yes

State and local college readiness mandates and the course syllabus outlined the students' required participation in the course that was designed to assist college students

with learning and using effective reading strategies, understanding the reading and study skills, and preparing them to succeed at the college level. Consent forms were not required because data collection was regular part of the class. State mandates and the course syllabus outline the students' required participation in the course; however, students were recruited for the study through an oral presentation in class (included in the syllabus). Participation in the course was required, but their participation in the study was voluntary. Students who elected not to participate in the study could opt to take another section of the same course offered at the same time, or at another convenient time. Students were also permitted to indicate when and if they wanted specific statements or data excluded from the study.   As a result, verbal permission was requested of students to procure digital recordings of conference sessions and interviews for the data study.

There were no identifiable benefits to the participants for being in the study except the possible benefit of their own reflection as already required and outlined in the course syllabus. Participants were not compensated. Precautions to avoid risks to privacy were taken by finalizing data analysis after the course was complete and by protecting the participant generated data with unidentifiable coding that was not shared with others. The identity of my students and key participants was only known to me. Additionally, final narrative construction and findings were recorded and reported using pseudonyms for the names of the college, the program, and the students. Pseudonyms were generated by using a Random Name Generator found at http://quick-name-generator.com/ which generates male and female names from the U.S. Census.

For this study, the data included digital recordings of lectures, conversations, and interviews as well as the collection of journals and artifacts relevant to the context of one developmental reading course at a community college.

Classroom Instruction Procedures

In this section I will first discuss the content of the college developmental reading course. Then, I will describe my direct-transactional model of instruction.

Course content. Course content encompasses learning strategies for college-level reading, with an emphasis on vocabulary development, comprehension of implied ideas and, identification of author's purpose and point of view, analysis of relationships, critical reasoning, and study skills. The course design provided reading opportunities and strategies to prepare students for college reading and to address individual skill deficiencies in reading as determined by TSI assessment. When instructing, I asked students to identify main ideas, details, facts, patterns, types, and themes to demonstrate reading comprehension.   I also asked them to demonstrate critical reasoning and interpret and integrate new concepts with their prior knowledge and experiences. This course was also designed to strengthen the student's ability to interpret charts, tables, and graphs to condense, interpret, and/or summarize written information. Students are required to take notes that demonstrate listening, learning, and remembering. Furthermore, students were asked to apply basic study skills to improve test-taking strategies. To show satisfactory completion of the state mandates (TSI, 2003) students were required to pass their developmental reading course work with at least a B, or to re-test and gain a passing Accuplacer score.

Transactional model of direct instruction. My classroom instruction was based

on a transactional model of direct instruction which not only focused on the expected

teacher behaviors, but also required the interaction of myself and the students throughout

the lesson. As noted by Rosenshine (1971), increased teacher/student interaction has

been linked to an increase in student achievement. Once per week, at the beginning of

class, I provided students with the opportunity to recall what they learned in the previous

lesson by providing students with a short 5-10 quiz which required students to provide

written responses about the knowledge and processes. After students submitted their

response a brief discussion was held whereby students shared their responses and

received the correct answers. Then, I would reiterate the relevance of the previous

information in relation to reading success and explain how the information from the

previous learning tied into the new concepts to be explored for the day. I would then ask

students to share what they already knew about the new topic and share the page numbers

students would need to review prior to the next exam.

After the quiz and introduction, I presented the specific concept by displaying a

PowerPoint of the reading concept for the day. For instance, in week four we began

discussing the concept of vocabulary. Students were asked to share what they knew

about vocabulary and how they would normally proceed if they wanted to memorize a

new term, or if they encountered an unknown word. After their response a PowerPoint

was displayed that gave brief statistics about the benefits of vocabulary and then defined

the concept of vocabulary as well as it subcategories (fluency, connotation, denotation,

word parts, and context clues). For each subcategory, strategies were recommended and

a single practice questions prompted students' interaction in guided practice so that

students could be supervised while developing proficiency of the skills and strategies by completing a few short tasks together as a class unit (Caldwell, Huitt, & French, 1981). As a class, students would attempt to determine the correct answer, and then I would model the process of selecting or correcting the answer. After explaining the concepts, skills, and strategies, I asked students to offer their verbal summarization of what they understood from the PowerPoint, usually by asking them to relay what information they should be sure they captured in a paraphrased form in their own notebooks. This allowed students to demonstration knowledge and understanding of the concepts and skills. If time permitted, the instruction was followed by independent practice during the same class-period. If time did not permit, then the following class period would be devoted to an independent practice session for the continuation of the content that was covered.

During independent practice sessions, I asked students to read a section independently and then complete assignments that followed. At times, these practice sets came from student textbooks. Occasionally, they came from supplemental handouts that I had created to correspond with short readings I had selected. Independent practice activities were followed by 5-10 questions depending on the given day and difficulty of the reading. While students completed their activities, I closely supervised their work by circling around the room. I asked questions that would help students adjust their responses and provided them with reminders and directions that would help them focus and sustain their learning. At times, I assessed their work with formative measures and offered corrective instruction as necessary (Caldwell, Huitt, & French, 1981). When I saw a student who needed re-direction, I asked them questions about how they came to

select the answer and offered them advice for redirecting their thoughts, or reconsidering answers when necessary.

Each week, I asked students to complete an online assignment using their Aplia account at www.cengagebrain.com, a supplemental resource offered by the textbook publishing company. Aplia is a digital learning solution designed to engage students with the content of their textbook by providing an e text, pre and post diagnostic skills assessments, tutorials, as well as chapter reading selections and assignments that provide automatic feedback intended to help students correct their errors (*Improving Student Learning Using Aplia*, 2013). In order to demonstrate their knowledge and application of the concepts that had been taught as well as their proficiency levels, Aplia assignments were completed as a form of summative assessment each week.

Group discussion.   To facilitate student thinking and inform my practice, I conducted student-moderated discussion groups on five class occasions. One week prior to the group discussion, students were introduced to a reading strategy and given an independent activity to practice. Discussions revolved around the following: the use of strategies for students with different learning styles, annotating as a strategy, SQ3R as a strategy, using general and specific sentences to help find main ideas, and overcoming reading challenges. Students' responses to their independent reading activity and their thoughts about the usefulness of the strategies became the focus of group discussions. Because I wanted to meet learning needs of my students and scaffold instruction for optimum results, the exact wording of the individual response questions were determined according to what I observed as they completed their independent activities. However, some guiding questions were created prior to the activity. Much like an ascribed focus

group, there were five questions: two were designed to engage students in the topic of discussion and focused on sharing personal responses with the group, two were designed to assess students understanding and thinking about the context matter that had been presented. The final two questions were used to determine the need, if any, for instructional clarification.

On discussion dates, students were organized into heterogeneous groups of varying ages using a random selection method to prevent cliques from forming and detracting from the process. Students were asked to count off in groups of three or four depending on attendance for the discussion date and organized according to their group number. Each group was required to have a moderator to help facilitate the discussion as well as a note-taker responsible for documenting group responses and assuring that the digital recording was collected for the 20-30 minute duration and if necessary, a writer to relay information on the whiteboard in the front of the room. I selected the group moderator and note taker based on the students' demonstrated ability to complete such tasks in other less formal instances of class discussion and their comfort with completing the tasks. Primarily, I observed group discussions by circling around the room. If needed I promoted participation in the group discussions clarifying content or instructions, or by asking follow up questions about student conversations that would further extend the groups' conversation.

Data Collection and Procedures

Data collection was a part of the regular and normal conduct of the class and took place during 10 weeks of the 16 week semester-long course. According to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), narrative inquiry is both a phenomena and method that pulls from

various data sources such as family or personal stories, autobiographies, journals, field

notes, lectures, conversations, interviews, and artifacts. Most of these data sources are

familiar to those who practice auto-ethnography (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Additionally, the qualitative researcher uses "in depth data collection involving multiple

sources of information rich in context" to describe what is happening in the context

(Creswell, 1998, p. 61). The multiple sources of data provided the necessary details for

re-creating a picture of the contextual experience in a developmental reading course for

myself and college learners. Also, the data addressed the research questions by capturing

what students revealed about their metacognition in a community college developmental

reading course and how their thinking could inform instructional practice.

This section will describe the data collection: documents, digital audio

recordings, interviews, conferences, final narratives and portfolios, researcher's reflective

journal, observation field notes, and memos.

Documents respective of the informal conversations prior to or after the

instructional periods were collected, as well as of the formal exchanges in class;

Reflective instructor's journal: Journaling captured thoughts, insights, ideas and

responses to what was observed during the instructional practices, of the student's

practices, during student/teacher conference sessions, and in hallway passing prior to and

after the instructional period; Interviews: At the end of term, students were asked to

participate voluntarily in a final interview that centered on students' reflection of

themselves as readers during and at the end of the course. Interviews were audio-

recorded and transcribed.

Data were cited in the following ways: Digital Recordings (DR, LINE #, p.#), transcribed student responses in discussion (SDIS, student pseudonym, LINE #, p. #), student responses or writings generated in response to instruction or other documents/class assignments (SD#, student pseudonym, LINE #, p. #), student conferences (C, student pseudonym, LINE #, p., #), reflective journal (RJ, LINE #, p. #), observation field journal (OBS, LINE#, p. #), and interviews (IN, student pseudonym, LINE #, p.#).   By citing the data in this way, I established a dependability audit trail that traces back to the raw data allowing the reader to recognize the management and form interpretations of the data themselves.

Documents. Student data generated as a response to instruction was collected and scanned including in-class assignments, homework assignments and any asynchronous data (email exchanges between instructor and students). In terms of documents, I included those modes of student response used for assessing student understanding, informing my instructional practice, and aiding in reflective thinking. Since I was not always aware of what might prompt my reflections, I collected and documented everything students generated in class including in class activity responses, written responses, quizzes, exams, assignments, and discussion notes. Other student-generated documents included other products of learning, exams, written responses in warm-ups, reflective written responses, exit slips, presentation materials, Nelson Denny score sheets, E-Lassi score sheets, and Aplia Diagnostic scores sheets that helped me capture student perceptions and understandings about reading and the ways in which my practice and approaches could be informed.

Because I wanted to annotate and sometimes code within the documents, a hard copy and an electronic file of each document was made to reference when I wanted to take a fresh look at the raw data. Once documents were collected, I copied and scanned the original to create a digital file. When students turned in ungraded or anonymous work, the original was kept. Otherwise, the original was graded and returned to the student. The hard copies of the documents were placed into a folder, labeled 'SD' for student document, and were given a number according to the order of collection. For instance, the first document collected was a demographics survey completed during class. On these surveys names were optional and grades were not assigned, therefore the originals were not returned. The originals were copied and scanned, and the copies were placed into a folder that was labeled SD-1, for Student Document 1. Then, for each document, I wrote up an activity description which explained the purpose of the document and the process or event surrounding the collection of that document set in order to account for my instructional practices and assist with the reflective process when I returned to my researcher's journal.

When all data documents were collected, I developed a data reduction chart to assist me with the selection of key participants. Once the key participants were identified, I printed the scanned version of their documents and created a separate file for each key student. Then, I began transcribing their responses word for word, line by line. When answering or responding in writing students sometimes expressed their thoughts in a series of words or phrases. Other times, they responded by expressing their thoughts in a single sentence. If several sentences were intended to support one another they were treated as one thought in the transcription process. As I transcribed, I cited the source

using an end text format that indicated the source, student pseudonym, line number, and page number. Once finished, I had typed six individual narrative, or textual accountings of the key students' documents and I still retained a collection of documents that represented the class as a whole. This meant that I could document sets for the whole class as a set, and then look back at the individual students without moving documents back and forth.

Documents were used to describe the personal and androgogical experiences and complexities and illuminate the perceptions and understandings of teaching and learning in a community college developmental reading course. These documents often became a source for prompting reflection and to determine if students were or were not grasping the ideas and strategies of reading.

Digital audio recordings and transcripts. Digital recordings were made of the lectures, discussions, class events, and conferencing sessions. Recording conversations and lectures was common class practice (as outlined in the syllabus). Digital recordings assisted with the collection of what was verbalized by individuals and helped to capture the dynamics of group discussions while still allowing me to participate in the events. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) noted the importance of recording classroom activities when the teacher and researcher are one in the same. They contended that "it would be difficult to capture the interpersonal exchange dynamics. In addition, the tape recorder frees the researcher to participate in the conversation" (p. 109). A recording device was placed on the podium and four others were placed in the center of the groups' table on discussion dates. Recordings were essential to counter the difficulty of writing field texts in descriptive detail while simultaneously teaching in face-to-face meetings.

I recognized that the presence of an audio device in a face-to-face classroom might be a distraction and could influence participant contributions to group discussions. While this was a real and significant possibility, the risks were minimal as the syllabus addressed permissions and limitations of audio usage. Furthermore, students were accustomed to the presence of such technologies because they were frequently employed in the classroom. I believed that the benefits of using audio recordings to generate field texts outweighed the potential problems related to participant distraction.

I recorded all of my class sessions resulting in 20 digital recordings of lectures and class activities. On five occasions, lecture was followed by a break out session for students who gathered in four groups to discuss their thinking about the strategies they had been exploring and practicing. Digital recordings were assistive devices that captured the collective reflection of students in these group discussions, contributing an additional 20 digital recordings. Student conference sessions were also recorded in my office and provided 11 additional recordings. All but one student verbally approved the use of digital recordings during their conference session. He asked not to be audio taped due a lack of confidence in his language abilities. He was excluded from digital recordings as requested and subsequently from the study. At the end of term, students were asked to return to campus voluntarily to participate in a final recorded interview. Three students participated, resulting in additional recordings. When all of the digital recordings were combined, class sessions, group discussions, conference sessions, and follow up interview recordings, a total of 54 digital files had been collected, and transcribed.

Figure 3.2

A table of digital file collection is below including frequency, event, and duration.

Frequency	Event	Duration
20	Class Session	1hr 15 minutes
4 groups on 5 occasions (20)	Group Discussion	35 minutes
11	Individual Conference Session	20 minutes
3	Individual Optional Interview	30 minutes
TOTAL 54		

When digital recordings were transcribed, special attention was paid to collecting the students' responses, comments, questions, and conversations occurring in class events and group discussions. I searched through the transcriptions for evidence of students' emerging understandings and misunderstandings and to inform my teaching plans. The audio recordings were used to verify the accuracy of documentation, to account for what may have been missed in the field texts, to assist with my reflection process, and to inform my subsequent instruction.

Follow up interviews. Patton (2002) argued that we "interview to find out what is in and on someone else's mind [and] to gather their stories" (p. 341). After the end of the semester, when grades had already been posted, students were asked if they would volunteer for follow up interviews in order to assist me with constructing the story of our

reading course. Out of the key participants, three of the key participants volunteered for final interviews.

Semi structured interviews of 30 minutes took place in my office. For these interview sessions, I developed a basic set of questions (see Appendix E) focused on capturing students' metacognition (thinking about thinking) in response to the reading course, strategies and content, as well as the students current situations and future expectations of reading. For each student, additional questions were devised from observations and field texts taken throughout the semester. Patton (2002) noted the importance of using open ended questions with a pre-determined sequence. He claimed, "The truly open-ended question permits those being interviewed to take whatever words they want to express what they have to say" (Patton, 2002, p. 354). Additionally, an open ended format allows the researcher to modify the wording to fit the nature of the participant's previous responses.

The primary purpose of the follow up interview was to facilitate member checking. During the final interview sessions students were given a verbal summary of my perceptions about their reading abilities, behaviors, and their metacognitive awareness of such and they were given the opportunity to ask questions, comment, or make suggestions.

For the three key students who volunteered, interviews were recorded on a digital recorder with their permission. All audio files obtained were stored in a secure computer and transcriptions were locked in a filing cabinet. However, because the course had come to an end, additional assurances of confidentiality were given to the student at the

start of the interview and verbal permissions were requested. Digital recordings of interviews were later transcribed.

Individual conference sessions. Students were required to attend one conference session toward the end of the semester in lieu of coming to class on one specified date. Conferences took place in my office for 30 minutes and were digitally recorded. Students were accustomed to the presence of such technologies because they were frequently employed as instructional devices in course. Nonetheless, verbal permission was requested and assurances of confidentiality were given to the student at the start of the conference session.

During this conference session, students reflected on their performance in the current reading class as well as in other classes for which they might be required to read. This conference conversation was an important piece of my research as it constructed the students' narrative account of experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) noted that "conversation is more often a way of composing a field text in face-to-face encounters between pairs" (p. 108). To promote conversation during conference sessions that would focus students' reflections on their own metacognitive states, a guiding set of questions was asked (see Appendix F). Additional questions were derived from my observations and perceptions of the student's progress in class.

Final narrative and portfolio. At the end of the semester, students were asked to create a final reflective portfolio. The final portfolio consisted of (1) selected readings from college texts or pleasure reading (2) a final narrative constructed from their elaborations of their response journals, and (3) student collected materials from the course or from their research which they found to be specifically useful in relation to the

reading process. These items were placed in a 3 ring binder and were arranged in a specific order based on these categories: attention, understanding, confusion, and concluding thoughts (see Appendix G).

The primary purpose of the final portfolio was to ask students to think about how they paid attention to reading, to what their understandings of reading were, and about any confusion that occurred when reading in any setting that came to their mind. Specifically, students were also asked to review their materials for our developmental reading course and to think reflectively about what they had learned and how their knowledge contributed to their abilities and behaviors in any of their reading experiences. The secondary purpose of the final portfolio was to ask students to return to their thinking about reading prior to the term, throughout the term, and to think about reading in the future. Students were asked to reflect on their own position as students in a developmental reading course and on their reading experiences in college.

Bases for portfolio entries were students' response journals written on a weekly basis for the duration of the study. Sixteen written responses (journal entries) were collected. Alvermann (2001) contended that the response journal helps students to refine, extend, and support their own responses to literary texts and class discussions. For this reason, I often referred to the response journal as a metacognition activity, warm-up, or quiz in my discussions with students.

At the end of the semester, I asked students to use their journal entries and to construct new writings that would help them to compile a final written narrative account of their experiences. That is, the journals were only small pieces of one large personal reflective narrative. As researchers recommended, students' final narratives (Lesley,

2004; Morgan-Fleming, Riegle, & Fryer, 2007; Willis, 2000) asked them to discuss their perspectives about reading and the ways in which they have grown or changed over time. Their final narratives required them to think about what they had learned and applied as readers, as well as what they would need to continue working on for future reading success. (Lesley, 2004; Morgan-Fleming, Riegle, & Fryer, 2007; Willis, 2000) indicated that narratives are an important beginning place for reading students as they allow students to tell their story and think reflectively about their strengths and struggles.

Narratives are an important beginning for data analysis which help educators "expand the hegemonic versions of history," "respect the voices and silences of participants," as well as "engage in conversations and then interpret this talk to make educative meaning of our and others' lives and situations" (Morgan-Fleming, Riegle, & Fryer, 2007, p. 77). The students' journal responses which became a part of their final narrative permitted me to gain perspective about student thinking while also allowing students to be active in the metacognitive processes of reading. Final reflective portfolios were used as representations of the key participants' voices when constructing my own narrative accountings of the data. They not only contributed to details that could not be captured in recorded conversations but also assisted with the triangulation of data.

Researcher's reflective journal. Representation of the research as a storied experience was developed through written reflection (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). A reflective instructor's journal captured thoughts, insights, ideas, and responses to what was observed during the instructional practices, in the students' responses, during student/teacher conference sessions, and in hallway passing prior to and after the instructional period. In research where narrative inquiry is employed, "journals are a

powerful way for individuals to give accounts of their experience" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 102). Because journal writing gives an account of experiences by blending field texts and reflections about experiences in a particular setting (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), the reflective journal revisited and depicted data from events and interactions depicted in "field text [of] face to face encounters between pairs or among groups of individuals" (p. 108). The journal was primarily used for recreating classroom events and for fortifying a narrative account of teaching and learning.

One hour before class, I prepared and reflected on my intentions for the days' events. I outlined the intended classroom events using the syllabus and instructional materials as a guide to document anticipated events. Planned reflections were collected in a blue composition notebook and were recorded on the right hand pages (front side only). A total of 20 planned reflective entries were composed. All were transcribed using Dragon Naturally Speaking 12.0.

To optimize reflection opportunities I kept my journal with me at all times. This enabled me to not only reflect during planning sessions, but also to reflect spontaneously, to look backward and forward in ways the planned reflection could not. Unlike the planned reflections, spontaneous reflections were written on the left hand pages and dated accordingly. Originally, I had intended to transcribe spontaneous reflections as a separate set of documents, but I found the reflections to be more valuable within the journal. They contributed to a reflective process which enabled me to constantly compare my reflections. Leaving them in the journal allowed me to align notes within the margins of my original reflective text, to add memos to margins near their corresponding text, and to

color code emerging themes or significant events with ease and as they emerged in a very continuous process.

All reflections, as well as Observation field notes and memos, were revisited to further promote reflective thought and to engage in the beginnings of data analysis (constant comparative analysis). The entries were revisited, searched for emerging categories and continually reflected upon to in attempt to answer the research questions.

Observation field journal. During class I occasionally documented Observation field notes in a second notebook, a red composition notebook (titled observation field journal). I took the observation notebook with me to each class period in order to take advantage of any observation periods when students were engaged in group discussion, or when they were working on independent activities in order to capture respective notes of the formal exchanges in class and my reflective thinking. When not able to collect observation field notes due to a more active and direct instructional role, I collected memos.

Memos. Memos were constructed on sticky notes and consisted of single words, sentences, or phrases that documented experiences, perceptions, and understandings. During class instances, memos were specifically documented to capture verbal exchanges of importance and to document "turning points in the conversations" (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, pp. 5). Specifically, I used memos when I wanted to return to an idea or event in class because I was too actively involved in course events to stop and formally construct an Observation field journal. For the most part, memos were collected on multi-colored sticky notes, were dated, and placed into their corresponding date positions in the observation or reflection notebook upon returning to my office after class.

Ironically, I found the most reflective times in my profession to be those that occurred in the car as I was moving between school, work, and personal spaces. During these more spontaneous reflective times, I utilized the voice recorder on my cell phone to capture those thoughts that I was unable to write. More often, memos resulting from these spontaneous reflective times functioned as "memory signposts" when creating an "interpretation of the story" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, pp. 142–143). When I was no longer traveling, or teaching, I would take the sticky note memos or audio memos I had recorded and transcribe them into either my observation field journal or reflective journal so that I could return to the ideas during my planned reflection time.

During class sessions, a total of 26 memos were recorded on sticky notes. While "on the go," 10 digital memos were recorded using an audio recording device. In the end, a total of 36 memos were transcribed using Dragon Naturally Speaking 12.0.

For both forms of memo-ing, the primary purpose was to assist with the reflective process and aid in constructing a narrative. From the memos, I created additional observation field notes in the red composition notebook which I referred to when writing in my reflective journal. Observation field notes constructed from these memos were an important part of the narrative inquiry process (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Schaafsma, Pagnucci, Wallace, & Stock, 2007) because they helped to capture and relay the nature of experience in the context of the developmental reading course. Moreover, John Dewey (1958) contended that use of reflective processes validates the nature of experience.

Data Analysis

A constant comparative analysis method of data analysis was used. As the themes emerged, they were evaluated and discussed using a constant comparative method

(Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In an ongoing manner, I intuitively analyzed the documents and my two journals in search of emerging themes and the relationships between themes. To facilitate constant comparative analysis, I first started with an open coding process in which I began to "annotate the studies for stance, content, and method and then identify[y] the recurrent themes and methods across" the data forms (Hollingsworth & Dybdahl, 2007, p. 153). I did this (open coding) prior to applying any specific codes to assist with the development of emerging themes and to help me track my own thoughts and possible research claims. The documents and journals were annotated, chunked, and represented with color coding that was applied with neon highlighters and those were later compared to the emerging themes for the six key participants in order to identify potential categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The categories provided examples of a shared narrative discourse between teacher and students embedded in the experience of teaching and learning in a developmental reading course.

At the end of the term, I transcribed my researcher's journal. If I found my initially emerging categories had led me astray, I would refer to the transcribed copy of the reflective researcher's journal to clear my mind of any unnecessary reflections and begin anew. This allowed me to step away from the emerging themes and categories and to confirm that I had not overlooked any relevant details.

Some modified case analysis methods (Patton, 1990) were also used to construct individual student narratives for the key participants. Once the key participants were selected, the written responses from documents were transcribed line by line for each of the key participants, resulting in six individual textual accountings of the key students'

data.   What emerged was a written accounting for each student of their strategy knowledge and use early in the term, in the middle of the term, and at the end of the term. These accountings were essential when creating the individual student profiles.

A-priori codes were applied when I went back through the written accountings for the key participants. The a priori codes were based on the themes from my literature review which accounted for works that made note of the importance of students thinking about thinking, or metacognition. The literature also accounted for the importance of students' past, present, and future experiences in reading. I used these ideas of thinking, experience, and sequential order as the basis for my codes: thinking, early-term, mid-term, and final-term. Since I wanted to know if my students gained knowledge and increased their use of the strategies commonly employed by good readers, I analyzed my key students' thinking about strategies during these three points. This helped me to focus on the students' understanding and use of good reading strategies and helped me to develop a narrative accounting of the students thinking throughout the developmental reading course.

After the narrative accountings were written for the key participants, inductive coding was used. When searching for inductive codes, I noted that students' made mention of their ability or inability to pay attention, to avoid or clarify their confusion, and of their comprehension of reading. These strands (attention, confusion, and comprehension) appeared due to direct examination of the data.

Furthermore, there were times when my instructional goal was to help students gain knowledge and apply strategies for the concepts of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. These were applied as facesheet codes and were applied only to the relevant

documents for which they were applicable. For instance, when a document had been

collected to determine students' understanding of main ideas, main idea became the

facesheet code. Other facesheet codes included learning styles, behaviors, context clues,

connotation, denotation, synonyms & antonyms, SQ3R, outlining, main ideas, implied

main ideas, general sentences, specific sentences, and supporting details. Because these

codes aligned with the content covered in the course, they were mostly relevant to my

tracking of students' content knowledge, but also assisted with the analysis process from

time to time when they were co-occurring and completely overlapped with the a priori

codes or inductive codes that had been applied.

After coding, I organized the data into the non-hierarchical categories of teaching

and learning relevant to my research questions that addressed what was revealed about

students' metacognition, and how the students' revelations informed my instruction.

Trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) contend that trustworthiness is

established in the process of data analysis by means of "credibility," "transferability,"

"dependability" and "confirmability" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, P. 300).

Credibility.   When discussing credibility criteria, Allen, Erlandson, Skipper &

Harris (1993) noted the importance of peer debriefing, reporting of negative case

analysis, and member checks. While I had no immediate peer available in my actual

classroom, I frequently discussed approaches and findings with my colleagues as we

collectively determined curriculum and department approaches. When these discussions

occurred, I documented them in my reflective journal, or printed any corresponding e

mails. In peer debriefing discussions no specific students were named. Additionally,

another instructor in my department was completing her dissertation, and we met together to read through my reporting of the study.

Additionally, negative case analysis was employed. When selecting my key participants I purposefully chose one high achieving and one low achieving individual. These students were included to introduce themes I needed to consider as well as data that did not fit into the typical case scenario. Their performance provides alternative interpretations of the data. The high achieving student tested out of the course (by retaking his Accuplacer) toward the end of term and was not required to complete the final reflective activity or final interview. Despite not having those two final documents from him, his data provided an alternative interpretation, specifically in relation to his performance. On the opposite end of the spectrum, another student who did not pass the course and was repeating the course for a third time was included as a key participant. His performance was below that of typical. More often than not, his data did not fit into my emerging themes; therefore, his was a negative case scenario.

Furthermore, credibility or internal validity was established through my persistent observation at the research site and my time with the participants. Because of the direct access to students for an entire semester, I was able to compare the observational data and the documents, to interview data. I employed data triangulation by gathering multiple types of data including observations, interviews, and documents that would help me to identify both the emerging and sustaining themes (Creswell, 1994). The data was gathered and reviewed for emerging themes that could be discussed with students at the beginning of class periods and during conference periods. Students were also engaged in discussion groups where they were allowed to revise, confirm, and refine upon the

themes. Most often, member checks corroborated evidence of such emerging themes and were done in the process of class activities. During interviews and student conference sessions, member checking was completed when I rephrased or restructured sentences to in the form of questions to confirm the students' statement, or gather clarification of their statements.

Triangulation. Patton argued triangulation was essential because it "strengthens a study" (p. 247). While there are many modes of triangulating (e.g., multiple researchers, mixed methods of study) data triangulation has long been one of the most effective and widely applied in research. According Stake (2010), "triangulation is a form of confirmation and validation" (p. 123). Additionally, Denzin (1989) described data triangulation as the use of multiple sources of data in a research study. For this study, in order to confirm and validate emerging theories, multiple data sources were used and compared.

Transferability. Transferability is the level of probability that the findings of an inquiry can be applied into other contexts and with other research participants. Qualitative data is not to be proven, but the researcher can provide details so that the reader may identify shared connections between similar settings and contexts. Researchers must consider this data as it may or may not apply to them. According to Denzin (1989), readers can determine transferability of research by examining data description. Thick description that "produces[s] the feeling that they have experienced, or could experience, the events" helps researchers to determine whether findings will be transferable into other settings (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 129). In this study, I aimed

to create descriptive cases that would relay both the experiences of the students and myself utilizing thick description of both the setting and context of study.

Dependability and confirmability. To provide evidence that a study with similar participants and context could provide the same outcome, an audit trail was applied. Each data piece was labeled with the data type (interview, document, asynchronous data, and audio transcript) as well as with the page number and date. Data specifically generated by students (such as documents) were also recorded with the student pseudonyms. I established a dependability audit trail that traces back to the raw data allowing the reader to recognize the management and form interpretations of the data themselves.

Generalizability. Reflective journals and focus groups are highly subjective. The argument could be made that resulting data could only be applicable to the particular individuals in the selected context of study. However, the procedural methods and multiple data forms allow for triangulation through a comparison of perspectives and understanding, thus allowing for more reliability in the data. Other limitations relate to the use of self reported data and generalizability and are addressed in terms of generalizability. Because this study uses purposeful sampling, the results may not generalize beyond the particular context of the students, college, or state. Nevertheless, the research may provide direction, raise questions, or clarify approaches for implementing changes that will better help to accomplish the teaching of reading.

Significance of the Study

Students who struggle with reading and are not ready for college need help with the strategies necessary for success. Despite the prevalence of developmental reading

courses and programs, teachers lack effective ways to help them succeed. Thinking about their performance can help students to implement the strategies of good readers. The study describes what was revealed about students' metacognition and provides insight into instructional practices that can help students become reflective thinkers that achieve in the task of reading.

Summary

Through qualitative narrative inquiry, this study examined the teaching delivered in a developmental reading course in one southwestern community college. The class was designed to assist students with learning and using effective reading strategies for understanding reading. The developmental reading course was held two times weekly for the duration of 1 hour and 15 minutes in a face-to-face classroom setting. Data collection, originating from either the instructor or the student, was part of the regular and normal part of the conduct of the class. Data collection took place during 10 weeks of the semester-long course.

Digital recording of the class time was common practice as outlined in the syllabus; recordings assisted with instructional planning and reflection. Audio recordings encompassed lectures, discussions, and activities, for individuals and groups in the course. All class recordings were transcribed. Unique to this study, I maintained a daily reflective journal capturing students' thoughts, insights, ideas, and responses to the instructional practices as well as their growing awareness of the process of becoming a more proficient reader.

Data was integral to the regular delivery of the course: asynchronous data (email exchanges between instructor and students and discussion board posts), in-class

assignments, and homework assignments were collected and Xeroxed or transcribed. Notes (memos) were taken routinely to capture the informal conversations of instructor/student. Conferences were recorded and transcribed. Outside of course requirements, one additional data set was collected at the end of the semester. After the grades were posted, students volunteered to participate in a final interview. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

A constant comparative analysis method of data analysis was used to evaluate themes as they emerged beginning with open coding. Potential categories or recurring themes from the data were annotated, chunked, and then represented with color coding using neon highlighters. I did open coding prior to applying any specific codes to assist with the development of emerging themes and to help me track my own thoughts and possible research claims. The a priori codes, early-term, mid-term, and end-of term were determined in order to track growth or change in students' thinking and to formulate a written accountings of the key students. These accountings were re-examined for the inductive codes, attention, comprehension, and confusion. Data was organized into non-hierarchical categories of teaching and learning in order to depict what was revealed about students' metacognition, and how the students' revelations informed my instruction.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Developmental reading students question why they are in the class or may not perceive themselves to be remedial readers. Thus, they often have low self-esteem about their abilities, limited understandings about reading, and may lack the motivation to engage themselves with effective reading strategies. Key participants in this study included six students enrolled in one community college developmental reading course that met two times weekly for the duration of one hour and 15 minutes in a face-to-face classroom setting. State and local college readiness mandates and the course syllabus outlined the students' required participation in the course. Classroom instruction revolved around assisting college students with learning and using effective reading strategies and understanding the reading and study skills which would prepare them to succeed at the college level.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to describe what was revealed by students about their metacognition in order to gain insight and give instructional recommendations for helping students become reflective thinkers that better achieve the task of college reading. The following research questions framed the study: (1) What do students reveal about their metacognition in the context of a community college developmental reading course? (2) How does understanding the students' reading metacognition inform the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course?

Data collection was a part of the regular and normal conduct of the class and took place during 10 weeks of the 16 week semester-long course. Digital recordings (common

to class practice) encompassing lectures, discussions, student conference sessions, and activities (both individual and group), and final voluntary interviews were data sources. Student data generated in response to instruction was collected including in-class assignments, homework assignments, and any asynchronous data (email exchanges between instructor and students). Researcher's memos of informal conversations prior to or after the instructional periods were created, as well as the notes of formal exchanges in class. A reflective researcher's journal captured thoughts, insights, ideas, and responses to what was observed during instructional practices. At the end of term, students were asked to volunteer for a final interview that centered on students' thoughts of themselves as readers.

Throughout the semester I collected documents including worksheets, students' written responses to both formal and informal instruction, and homework. Once submitted, I made a copy of the students' document for myself and scanned the original to create a digital file as a backup. The original was graded and returned. Hard copies of documents were grouped together with like documents and placed in a folder that was labeled as a Student Document (SD) and a document number.

During the semester, constant comparative analysis method of data analysis was used to evaluate themes as they emerged (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) as well as open coding to identify potential categories or recurring themes. A data chart was created to assist with data tracking and management and with the process of data reduction used to identify key participants in the study.

As noted in chapter three, Brown and Dowling (1998) discussed the process of selecting participants for an educational study. After examining several methodologies

they noted that methodologies which utilized case studies were disadvantageous because there was less consideration for the context and because "a dialogue, by definition involves more than one voice" (p. 167). The specific problem, they noted was that educators do not set out to instruct a select few, but an entire class. They further argued:

> Educational researchers attempt to put a gloss of deliberation onto their opportunity samples by referring to them as case studies. We have difficulties with this expression […] Essentially; all research is case study research insofar as it makes claims about one or more specific cases of or in relation to a broader field of instances or phenomena (p. 30).

Additionally, unlike K-12 educators, there is difficulty for college educators who seek to identify cases at the beginning of the term because of optional attendance, enrollment, and completion rates. For these reasons, I decided to use key participants and selected them at the end of the semester using a data reduction process. Obviously, I could not limit my instruction to a select few. Brown and Dowling (1998) discussed the use of key participants who assist in the telling of the stories in a setting "for which practitioners who seek to transformations in their own practices" (p. 152).

Thus, I kept my reflective journal and observation field journal on a regular basis to the extent possible for all of the students enrolled and my ability to capture what occurred. I often talked in to my tape recorder on my long drive home to flesh out my journals. I kept documents for all the students across the semester. At the end of the term, I chose the people for the focus of my study. My criteria for the selection of the key participants were detailed in chapter three.

Once the key participants were selected, their documents were pulled from my collection of data and then keyed into six individual files, one for each student. These textual accountings were essential when creating the individual student profiles and assisted with the comparative analysis of the key participants. After the end of the semester, when key participants had been selected, I went back through the written accountings and applied early-term, mid-term, and end-of-term codes in order to arrange the data for better analysis. For each of the key participants, I examined the textual accountings for similarities and or differences to begin the process of identifying recurring themes and categories by closely examining what they had to say about using strategies to pay attention, confusion, and comprehension. Once all codes were assigned, I organized the data into non-hierarchical categories of teaching and learning in order to depict what was revealed about students' metacognition and how the students' revelations informed my instruction.

Key Participant Profiles

I began by asking students to provide demographics so that I could begin developing a holistic picture of the students. From the responses I learned that my students ranged in age from 18-21, and two of my students were above the age of 22. I also learned that although all of my students were English speakers, some were second language learners whose primary languages included Mandarin, Jamaican, Korean, and Spanish. Additionally, I asked students to report on their past experiences as recipients of reading assistance. They identified any learning assistance they had received in elementary, middle, or high school as well as the type of help they had received. Not only did I want to know about the help they had with reading in the past, but I wanted to

know about their initial thoughts of being in a developmental college reading course.

The demographics survey was a starting point for gaining an understanding about

students and for establishing a plan for teaching that would honor their diverse

experiences and backgrounds. Information from the survey not only assisted with

developing an understanding of the class as a whole, but also for forming the narrative

accounting of profiles for the key participants in the study.

     Marvin's profile. Marvin was an 18 year old English speaking Hispanic Male

born within a 30 mile radius of the Panhandle Community College (SD11, Marvin, 1-5,

p. 1). Marvin was a traditional college student who after receiving a high school

diploma, immediately enrolled in college as a full-time student. It was his first time

attending college, and he had never been in any dual credit high school courses (SD11, 5-

7, p. 1). He indicated he had never received any special assistance in elementary, middle

school, or high school for reading. Marvin also had never before been in intervention

courses, tutoring, pull out programs, special education, or ESL courses designed to

address reading deficiencies (SD11, 8-13, p. 1). Perhaps this is why he indicated that he

did not believe that he would need help with reading in college, though he gave no

justification for his thoughts (SD11, 1-15, p.1). His only identifiable risk factor was that

no one in his immediate family had ever attended or graduated from a college or

university (SD11, Marvin, 16-18, p.2). Marvin's data revealed that his family was the

primary motivating factor behind his desire to succeed in reading (and thereby in college)

despite his status as a first generation college student. The remainder of the narrative

pieces about Marvin that are layered throughout this chapter helped to relay his thinking

about motivation, about his newly found auditory strategy used for reading success, and about his engagement with reading through improved attention.

Bridget's profile. Bridget was a 21 year old English speaking Caucasian female who was born in a Texas suburban area (SD11, Bridget, 1-5, p. 1). She reported that she received special help with reading in elementary, middle, and high school through a full inclusion special education program (8-13, p.1). She had received her high school diploma from a traditional high school and began college immediately after high school (SD11, Bridget, 16-18, p.2). Bridget indicated that she was enrolled in her third semester of college at the time of the study (SD11, Bridget, 1-5, p.1). Because she had a history of receiving reading help and she had already experienced reading in college, Bridget noted that she would also need help with college reading "because there might be some words I might not understand" (SD11, Bridget, 14-15, p.1). She was a first generation college student, meaning that her parents had not earned a college degree but her brother had obtained a degree from a 2-year college and was a positive influence on her (SD11, Bridget, 16-18, p.2). I received documentation from the support services office on campus which specified that Bridget was to receive note-taking assistance and extended time on her examinations (Email, Bridget/Disability Services, p. 1-2). Throughout the term, she elected not to utilize the extended time on examinations and printed her own notes from our online support site (RJ, 3-4, p. 26). The remainder of the narrative pieces about Bridget relay her thoughts about what she believed she needed to do to be a good reader and showed how she moved away from her initial focus on improving her vocabulary skills toward an acceptance of strategies that would improve her comprehension and attention.

Josyln's Profile. Joslyn was a 19 year old who was born and raised in Jamaica (SD11, Joslyn, 1-4, p. 1). Joslyn was a traditional college student who after receiving her high school diploma moved to the States to enroll in college full time. It was her first semester attending the community college and she had not attended any other college. She also did not have any prior dual credit courses (SD11, Joslyn, 5-7, p. 1). Joslyn reported that she did not have any special help with reading in elementary, middle, or high school. But, she had willingly attended tutoring afterschool for many of her classes (SD11, Joslyn, 8-13, p. 1).   She also indicated that she was a first generation college student. Her parents had not attended, nor graduated college. However, she had one sibling, an older sister, who had graduated from a four year university (SD11, Joslyn, 17-18, p.2). Joslyn explained that Jamaicans "speak broken English" that is "different" than American English (SD11, Joslyn, 19-21, p. 2). Despite this indication, she indicated that she would not need help with reading in college by marking "no" and supported this claim by sharing that she thought she could "pronounce words properly" (SD11, Joslyn, 14-15, p. 1).   Throughout this chapter, Joslyn's responses show her emerging understanding of what constitutes reading and reveals a return in her reading processes to those strategies which she, as a child, had enjoyed and found useful for comprehension.

Kyle's profile. Kyle was an 18 year old English speaking Asian male, born in the country of China (SD11, Kyle, 1-5, p.1). Kyle was a traditional college student who received a high school diploma in his country and then enrolled in college full time. It was his first semester attending college, and he had never been in any dual credit high school courses (SD11, Kyle, 5-7, p.1). He also noted that no one in his immediate family had ever attended college or graduated from a university (SD11, Kyle, 16-18, p.2). Kyle

reported that he had only been speaking English for one year but that he spoke and wrote Mandarin very well (SD11, Kyle, 19-22, p. 2). He also indicated that he never received any special assistance in elementary, middle school, or high school for reading. Because he was successful in reading his native language (Mandarin), he had never before been in intervention courses, tutoring, pull out programs, or special education courses (SD11, Kyle, 8-13, p.). However, when he decided to come to the United States for college, Kyle participated in a sixth month English Language Learners (ELL) course that was offered in China to help students read, write, and speak in English. He did not feel he would need extensive help with reading for college, but he recognized that his skills were still developing in English reading. The narrative that evolved from Kyle's data indicated that his intention to learn more about American culture helped him to focus his attention when reading.

Caleb's profile. Caleb was an 18 year old Spanish speaking male, who was born and raised in Mexico (SD11, Caleb, 1-5, p. 1). Caleb was not enrolled in dual credit courses for high school students, he had not previously attended any other college, and he was enrolled in his second semester at PCC (SD11, Caleb, 5-7, p. 1). Prior to attending the community college, Caleb had received special help with reading in both elementary and high school. In elementary school, he specifically recalled his mother's role in his learning about reading. When asked to share his childhood reading experiences, Caleb indicated that his mother played an important role in developing his reading habits. He shared that "I remember that when I start[ed] reading, I start[ed] reading in Spanish and my mother read with me, books, and she made me read a lot" (SD4, Caleb, 29-20, p.1). The assistance he received in high school included tutoring and support services for

English language learners (SD11, Caleb, 13-14, p. 1). Although he needed assistance in elementary and high school, he did not recall needing help with reading in middle school (SD11, Caleb, 5-12, p. 1). Caleb was a first generation college student who received a traditional high school diploma in the United States despite beginning as an English speaker only one year prior to his attendance in the community college developmental reading course, at age of seventeen (SD11, Caleb, 16-22, p. 1). Because he believed he had limited experiences with speaking the English language, he believed he would need help with reading in college. He attributed this thought to his challenges when making meaning or comprehending: "because […] I don't understand" (SD11, Caleb, 15, p. 1). While Caleb's primary concern had been focused on increasing his vocabulary skills, he had demonstrated in assessment that his vocabulary skills were not as limited as he believed. He needed practice to gain confidence in his reading and begin to rely on his thought processes rather than on the meaning of words alone.

Gregory's profile. Gregory was a 22 year old English speaking Caucasian who was born in Texas in a suburban area (SD11, Gregory, 1-5, p. 1). He reported that he received special help with reading in elementary, middle, and high school through a full inclusion special education program as well as tutoring services (8-13, p.1). He had received his high school diploma from a traditional high school and began college immediately after high school (SD11, Gregory, 16-18, p.2). Gregory had been enrolled at PCC for at least 5 semesters. He selected "5 semesters or beyond" (SD11, Gregory, 1-5, p.1). He noted that he would need help with reading because he was dyslexic, and he felt he read too slowly (SD11, Bridget, 14-15, p.1). Unlike Marvin, Joslyn, Bridget, Caleb, and Kyle, Gregory was repeating my class for the third time. At the beginning of the

term, I encouraged Gregory to consider taking the course with another instructor: "Have you thought about taking the course with another one of the instructors here? It is your choice, but you have already heard my lessons and you've seen my activities and assignments. Perhaps you need to learn from someone with a different teaching style?" Despite my offer to move him into one of the many developmental reading courses offered at the same time, Gregory declined on the basis that he just lacked motivation, and he believed that he would finish the course "this time" and complete the work on our supplemental technology site (RJ, 20-22, p. 18). Later, in hallway passing another instructor saw him leave my classroom. This led to a conversation in her office. I learned that he had taken the course two other times prior to enrolling with me, each time with a different instructor. This meant he was taking developmental college reading for the fifth time! (M, Gregory/Enrollment, 9-27). Despite his previous failures with taking developmental reading for college students, Gregory did not use the services that were provided for him per the agreement with the support services office on campus (E-mail, Gregory/Disability Services, p. 1-2). He elected not to utilize the extended time on examinations, and he did not log in to blackboard (an online support site) to print notes or lectures for our course (RJ, 7-9, p. 26). His written responses, individual conference session, and final voluntary interview, however, supported his belief that a lack of motivation was the main factor working against his success in the course and in reading for college. An anomaly in the review of documents also revealed that at the end of the term he out performed his peers in his ability to understand reading structure (identifying main ideas and supporting details), his ability to recognize patters of organization, his knowledge of connotation and denotation, and some, but not all of his critical reading

skills. Despite his inability to pass the course, Gregory's increased ability to discuss the readings was a positive improvement for him, especially because he found enjoyment in reading.

Findings From the Study

In the next sections, I will discuss the findings in terms of why students believe they attend class, promotion of metacognitive reflection and tracking, implementation of self-discovery activities, practicing strategies, and informing instruction.

Why Students Believe They Attend Class

Students had clearly been placed in the developmental reading class for a reason, but I wanted to obtain their perspective on their enrollment in the course. This section of findings includes what students initially revealed about their thinking as documented in their demographic survey. In the survey, I asked students to share their thinking about their participation in the developmental college reading course. If they thought they would need help in college reading they indicated a response of "yes" on their demographics survey. If they did not, they indicated "no" by circling their answer. Then they were prompted to share their thoughts by providing a written explanation of their answer.

Interestingly, each student who reported that they had no past instances of receiving help with reading also thought that they would not need assistance with college reading. Ten of the 21 students enrolled believed that they did not need help with college reading because they had no previous experiences of receiving assistance (SD11). As one student suggested, she thought that her past experiences without assistance in reading provided evidence that she would not need help in college reading: "I think I know how

to read well enough without any help from anyone. I've never had to have help

throughout any of my years in school" (SD11, Anonymous 4, 15, p.1). For this student

the implication was clear, she thought she did not need my help, or the course.

Despite their placement in the course, those students who had no history of

receiving assistance responded to the question, "Do you think you need help with reading

in college?" by saying 'no.' For instance, Marvin claimed he never received help with

reading, and he had never been in any special programs to assist with reading (SD11, 8-

13, p. 1). When asked if he would need help with reading in college, Marvin simply

responded, "No" (SD11, 1-15, p.1) without any further explanation as to his thinking.

Other students in the class who said "no" offered varied explanations for their thoughts.

Some students supported the claim that they would not need help with reading by

describing their positive habits as students. One student claimed, "If I study and focus on

school, I should be fine, but if I need help, I'll ask" (SD11, Anonymous 1, 15, p. 1).

Some students supported the claim that they would not need help with reading by

referring to their skills and abilities in reading, which they believed were adequate for

college reading. This was the case for Joslyn who claimed that she did not think she

would need reading help in college "because I think I can pronounce words properly"

(SD11, Joslyn, 14-15, p. 1). In Joslyn's opinion her vocabulary strengths made her a

good reader. This was the case even though she shared that she spoke "broken English"

from Jamaica that is "different" from American English (SD11, Joslyn, 19-21, p. 2). As

her teacher, I wondered if she spoke broken English, how it was that she came to think

her pronunciation was proper, and why she thought this negated her need for reading

help. By sharing her thoughts about her participation in reading, Joslyn demonstrated

some knowledge of the act of reading. She thought that pronouncing words or saying them was important, but that did not mean that she was a good reader. Her thoughts negated the importance of the other aspects of reading such as fluency, comprehension, and critical thinking and their role in her reading success.

Other students supported their thoughts about not needing assistance by mentioning of their self-perceived abilities. One student checked "no," "because I am capable of writing and reading" (SD11, Anonymous 2, 15, p.1).   This is true; at some levels these students are capable of reading. Their completion of a high school degree indicates they have at least basic reading abilities. However, this does not mean that they had the necessary knowledge or skills that are required for reading success in college.

Students without experiences as recipients of reading help believed that their placement in the course was directly linked to a flaw with the college entrance exam, or that they attributed their placement in the developmental course to a problem with their own test taking abilities. When students thought they were good readers, but bad test takers they did not feel they needed help with college reading. One student reasoned she would not need help because "I thought I was good at reading but my TAKS score wasn't high enough" (SD11, Anonymous 3, 15, p.1).

Contrary to those students who did not believe they would need help in reading, those students who reported a history of receiving help in reading also indicated they would need help with reading in college. *Every* student who previously needed assistance in early school experiences, middle school, or high school, indicated 'yes,' that they would need help with reading in college.

The type of help students thought they would need in college reading was dependent upon the type of reading assistance they had previously received. Some students claimed they thought they needed help focusing on a specific set of reading skills or abilities. One student thought she needed help with reading for college because of comprehension and she related this to her course goal: "I want to make an A or B and reading is a complicated subject for me. It's hard for me to understand what I read at times" (SD11, Isabel, 15, p.1). Another student wrote about her limited fluency skills when explaining that she would need help with reading "because I read a little slower" (SD11, Kara, 15, p. 1). Two students who were self-identified as Dyslexic also showed concern about their reading speed (SD11, Landon, 15, p. 1; SD11, Gregory, 15, p. 1). When asked why he thought he would need help with reading in college, Gregory specifically stated, "I'm dyslexic and my reading speed is a little slow" (SD11, Gregory, 15, p.1).

For students like Bridget who had attended pull out programs that were designed to reinforce what was being taught in class, the focus was on vocabulary as it related to comprehension. Bridget indicated she thought she needed reading help "because there might be some words I might not understand" (SD11, Bridget, 14-15, p.1). Kyle had a similar response when he attributed the need to get help with reading to his limited knowledge of English words, "because [there are] too many meaning[s] that I don't understand" (SD11, Caleb, 15, p. 1). Furthermore, some students who reported that they would need help with reading associated their reading success when reading books. One such student indicated he thought he needed reading assistance because, "I haven't read a book since 6th grade," (SD11, Alford, 15, p.1). Either this student lacked the opportunities

to develop as a reader, or he had not embraced reading opportunities in the past. Students who recognized that they lacked reading opportunities and/or experiences to complete reading thought they would need help with reading in college.

When I examined the students' reported demographics I began formulating a better picture of their reading experiences, their emerging thoughts about their participation in a developmental reading course, and their initial thoughts about their reading needs. But after doing so, I was left with more questions about them as readers.

This informed my instruction because I began to ask questions of myself that aided in reflection:

If students did not think they needed help with reading, why did they think they were here [in a college developmental reading course]? And, for students who thought they were good readers, "what did they think needed to learn about college reading?" (RJ, 1-3, p. 20). More importantly, "how did students think I could help them, or how did they think they could help themselves?" (RJ, 4-5, p. 20). Other questions became apparent as I continued to reflect. For one student, a history of past experiences without assistance in reading provided the proof she needed to support the thought that she did not need help with college reading, and thereby, she did not need my help. I wondered: "How would students stay motivated and engaged with the reading strategies and practices deemed necessary for college success, if they did not think they needed help with reading?" (RJ, 9-12, p. 20).

Students' inability to articulate their thinking. At this point in the term, I observed students thinking and noted that they did not appear to have a true metacognitive awareness of their needs and abilities as students in a college

developmental reading course. Students like Joslyn and Marvin, who did not have a history of needing help thought they knew how to read, but they didn't. They were not reading successfully, as indicated by their low placement scores. Students who had fewer experiences with being helped were confused about why they were required to take the developmental reading course because they viewed themselves as good readers but felt there was a flaw with the entrance exam or their test taking abilities (SD11, Anonymous 3, 15, p.1). Some students thought that book reading (SD11, Alford, 15, p.1) or saying words out loud constituted reading (SD11, Joslyn, 15, p. 1). This was the case for Joslyn, who completely negated other important aspects of reading by focusing on her pronunciation abilities. This informed my instruction because I began to ask questions of myself that aided in reflection:

> If students did not think they needed help with reading, why did they think they
> were here [in a college developmental reading course]? And, for students who
> thought they were good readers, "what did they think needed to learn about
> college reading?" (RJ, 1-3, p. 20).

I looked back to the thoughts revealed on the demographics survey by students like Marvin so as to reflect on the ways that I might help those students who do not actually think they needed help. By examining their thoughts, I confirmed that at the very least, these students needed help to express their thoughts about reading. When I re-examined the responses from the demographics survey for students like Marvin who provided no explanation as to why he thought he did not need help in college reading, I questioned if he (and others) had the ability to communicate his (their) thoughts about reading. This was concern was documented in my researcher's journal:

In my observations today (OBS, 10-11, p. 12), I noted that many students struggle when they are trying to express their thinking verbally or in writing. This is especially true after I model my thinking. Students adopt these thoughts as their own or regurgitate the words that they can recall which they use as their own expression of thought, rather than interpreting what I have said, instead of paraphrasing the information (RJ, 16-21, p. 61; RJ, 1-10, p. 62).

Therefore, I provided Marvin with the option of verbalizing his response. However, when I provided him the opportunity to verbalize his answer by asking him why he thought he did not need help with reading in college and prompting him in class to "tell me more." He responded: "I don't know. I just don't think I need help." In my reflections I noted:

Implementing a focus on metacognition has helped me. Students claim to be thinking about their thinking and at many times, know they are thinking because I can see it in their faces. But, I cannot observe what they are thinking. When I began to ask them to share their thinking, I found that they were unable to express their thoughts verbally or in writing (RJ, 1-18, p. 95).

Either he did not have the verbal communication skills to support his thinking, or he did not have enough knowledge about reading for college to engage in a written response or a discussion that would support his thoughts. Either way, his thoughts reflected an inaccuracy about his reading needs.

Those students who needed help also needed help expressing their thoughts about reading, the knowledge they had in reading, and the skills and abilities they needed to develop in reading. I reflected on this response of one student who had indicated she did

not need help with reading because she felt she had reading and writing abilities (SD11,

Anonymous 2, 15, p.1) and wondered how I could best help students to understand that

while they are capable of reading and writing at some level (this is implied by their

completion of high school reading,) their placement in the course indicated they did not

have the required reading skills necessary for college success (RJ, 1-10, p. 103). This

was also true for other students who reflected inaccuracies when expressing their

thoughts about their reading needs. For example, Joslyn indicated that she thought she

did not need help with reading because she could pronounce the words accurately, and

then contradicted what she had said when discussing her language abilities by sharing

that she spoke "broken English," a clear indicator that she did not pronounce words

correctly. Moreover, pronunciation does not constitute college reading. This led me to

question what students thought they needed to learn in our college reading course. I

noted my newly emerged question in my researchers' journal (RJ, 1-13, p. 94) and began

to develop a worksheet of questions for students to complete during their next class

period (SD1).

Developing a course plan. I needed to get students to think about their thinking

so that students who did not think they needed help could revise their thoughts about

participating in a developmental college reading course. Likewise, those students who

did think they needed help could clarify their own needs and understand their own

abilities. Students needed a more accurate metacognitive awareness of their needs so that

they could be more accepting of their role as students in the developmental reading class.

I decided the best way to help them realize what they needed to succeed was to tell them

explicitly what was expected of readers in college and to have them engage in a metacognitive reflection activity before and after the lecture.

Therefore, I set out to develop an instructional plan that centered on my reflections: "I am going to ask students how they would respond to their experiences and situation again as a warm up next week" (RJ, 1-4, p. 5). In order to so, I created my instructional materials. I developed a power-point designed to define the state testing requirements, help students interpret their standardized assessment scores, and to relate students' participation in a college reading course to their success in college. I included expectations of college readers, definitions of success, statistics about developmental education, and a brief overview of the concepts that we would cover in the course with the intention of lecturing for ten minutes (Instructional Document, Power-Point: Introduction to Developmental Education, p. 1-12). To help promote metacognitive reflection and ready students for the short ten minute lecture I had planned for the introduction of the course, I also developed a worksheet of questions which stemmed from my reflection of students' thinking (SD 1). Those questions I had been asking myself about why students believed they were in the course, what they thought they needed to learn, how I might help them learn, and how they might help themselves, became the basis for the student handout that I created and titled Metacognitive Reflection Handout:

1. Why do you think you are here?

2. What do you think you need to learn about reading in college?

3. What do you think I can teach you?

4. What do you think will be a challenge? Why?

5. How do you think I can help you?

6. How do you think you can help yourself with reading in college?

7. How do you think you will stay motivated?

8. How do you see yourself as a reader? Why?

9. How do you think you will succeed?

10. What did you learn today?

11. Today you have listened to a short lecture. You have also watched a video of students who talk about reading. You have also shared your responses with your peers in a group discussion. How has your thinking for questions 1-9 changed? What did you revisit in order to revise (change) or clarify (add to and make better)? (RJ, 1-13, p. 4; SD1).

This worksheet was the first document that I used to promote students' metacognitive tracking and reflection for the purpose of clarifying or revising their thoughts about reading.

Additionally, students' thoughts prompted me to state my instructional goals for the term. During our initial activities together they had been asking questions. I noted in my reflective journal that "students' questions about their assignments thus far are related to my lack of clarification" (RJ, 13-15, p. 1). I decided there was no better way to clarify things for students than to be sure I had done so for myself.

When I examined the students' reported demographics I began formulating a better picture of their reading experiences, as well as their thoughts about their needs in reading. I gained insight about my students' thinking that helped me not only to

formulate a plan for teaching, but also to establish personal goals for instructing my

students which I continually added to my research journal. Our syllabus addressed the

course goals defined by the institution, but I felt it was important to think about making

those goals relevant to the learning for this group of students and more specifically, to the

ways that I would attempt to achieve those goals defined in the course syllabus.

Therefore, I reflected and developed instructional goals that would help me teach

students who did not think they needed reading to determine their learning needs so that

they could find purpose in the course. The goals also addressed the strategies for

increasing the students skills and abilities in the areas for those students who expressed

they needed help (RJ, 10-20, p. 9). For those students who had not been actively engaged

as readers (like the student who had not read a book since 6th grade) practice

opportunities and reading experiences were included. In my researcher's journal I noted:

> Since it is my desire to teach students the strategies necessary to develop their
>
> vocabulary and fluency skills, as well as to improve their comprehension, I need
>
> to provide students with the practice for them to do so. If I do not provide the
>
> practice, it is unlikely students will apply the strategies in the future successfully
>
> (RJ, 10-20, p. 9).

Therefore, these became my stated instructional goals: (1) To promote metacognitive

tracking and reflection for the purpose of clarifying or revising thoughts, (2) To

implement self-discovery processes designed to increase students' metacognitive

awareness of their learning needs, preferences, and styles, (3) To develop students'

knowledge of vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension using direct transactional methods

of instruction intended to engage students in the process of learning reading content, and

(4) To provide practice opportunities to experience and explore the use of reading

strategies already proven to improve students' reading success (RJ, 12-19, p. 8). During

the course, I continued to reflect and interpret students' thoughts in order to gauge what

processes and knowledge they needed to know and how to help them practice.

Promotion of Metacognitive Reflection and Tracking

Part of metacognition, thinking about your thinking, is having an awareness of

one's self, and self performance. I did not believe students could have this awareness,

and therefore be metacognitive thinkers, if they were mis-informed, resistant, or did not

know and share the plan for addressing their learning needs in reading (RJ, 1-5, p. 2).

After I reflected on the students' initial revelations about reading, I wanted to dispel the

myths about developmental reading placement, to clarify the purpose of taking a

developmental reading college course, and to highlight the benefits of our reading course

(RJ, 7-15, p. 2; Instructional Document, Power-point: Introduction to Developmental

Education, p. 1-12).

Developmental students who do not think they need help with reading need to

revise their thoughts about participating in a college developmental reading course.

Students who think they need help with reading should clarify what they need to know.

Instructional materials were designed to assist students with metacognitive reflection and

to provide them with the explicit content knowledge they need to be successful readers

(SD1; Instructional Document, Power-Point: Introduction to Developmental Education,

p. 1-12). I developed a power-point designed to define the state testing requirements,

help students interpret their standardized assessment scores, and to relate students'

participation in a college reading course to their success in college (RJ, 10-20, p. 9). To

help promote metacognitive reflection and ready students for the short ten-minute lecture

I had planned for the introduction of the course, I also developed a worksheet of

questions for students. Prior to the lecture, students were asked to answer questions one

through eight: Why do you think you are here? What do you think you need to learn

about reading in college? What do you think I can teach you? What do you think will be

a challenge? Why? How do you think I can help you? How do you think you can help

yourself with reading in college? How do you think you will stay motivated? How do

you see yourself as a reader? Why? (SD1, 1-8, p. 1). Students were then placed in groups

to share their responses with one another and look for similarities between the group

members. After sharing their group members' commonalities with the class, I displayed

a power-point. As I presented the slides I asked students questions in order to promote

their participation as I relayed the research evidence about their purpose for taking the

course, the instructional content from the syllabus, and the statistical data about

developmental readers. Then students watched a short video of college. When the

viewing was complete, I asked students to return to their worksheet and complete the last

questions: How do you think you will succeed? What did you learn today? (SD1, 9-10,

p. 1). Additionally students were prompted to complete the final question:

> Today you have listened to a short lecture. You have also watched a video of
>
> students who talk about reading. You have also shared your responses with your
>
> peers in a group discussion. How has your thinking for questions 1-9 changed?
>
> What did you revisit in order to revise (change) or clarify (add to and make
>
> better)? (SD1, 11, p. 1).

This next section discusses what students revealed about their thinking when prompted to answer these questions and the ways their thinking about thinking informed my instruction.

Students' purpose and goals. At the beginning of one class, I distributed the metacognitive reflection handout that I made (SD1). Students were instructed to write complete thoughts or sentences in order to prevent them from writing single word responses. The questions were designed to gather students' thinking about the content of the course, their needs as readers, what they knew about staying motivated, and what they thought they would need to succeed in the course, as well as in college reading. After students wrote their responses they were asked to discuss their answers with their group members. They were instructed:

> You don't need to read your answer, just talk about what you said. Keep notes about the things that you might have in common with your group members, and the things that are unique about your group members. We'll share your group's response with the class" (OBS, 1-18, p. 154; DR, 0.38, p. 2).

When asked why they were "here," students reflected on their purpose for participating in a developmental college reading course. Their responses indicated that students thought about the requirement of taking a developmental class and related that requirement to their educational and career goals. For instance, Bridget wrote, "I have to take this course, so I can get a good job to make a living in this world" (SD1, Bridget, 1-4, p. 1). Similarly, Caleb noted, "I am here because I need the skills in Reading and I need to learn or get ready to take my college classes and I am here at [sic] college because I want to be a doctor, and that's my goal" (SD1, Caleb, 1-4, p. 1). Kyle also

thought about his goals and related them to his reading skills, and considered his status as an English language learner. Kyle claimed: "I'm here at [PCC] because I want to go to [a nearby four year institution], but I don't think my English skills are good enough. And since I haven't enrolled in college before, I'd like to give myself a [sic] extra step between high school in China and University in U.S." (SD1, Kyle, 1-3, p.1). Asking students to think about why they "are here" helped them to relate their developmental college reading course to their long term educational and career goals as evident by the discussion that was opened up.

When students finished with their discussion, I asked one group member to share some of the reasons why their peers said they thought they were in the developmental reading course. In no particular order, group leaders volunteered the responses they had documented for their group:

Mrs. Vice: What kind of responses did you get?

Group 1: "because I don't speak English"

Group 3: "because I didn't do good on the TAKS"

Group 4: "because I need help in writing and reading"

Group 5: "for my bad English!"

Group 6 "to get a good education, and walk on to the track team as a long jumper"

Group 1: "Someone in our group said track, too. She said, coach put me in the class"

Mrs. Vice: Okay, so to increase language skills. How many of you, by a show of hands think that you might need help with language skills because you speak another language? Seven students. Anyone else? No. Okay, great, we can work

on increasing your language experiences in English. Thank you, for sharing. And

how many of you are here because a coach or someone else referred you to my

class to build your skills? Two students. Anyone else? Good, thank you for

sharing. Group two, do you have any type of response that is different from what

we have heard from your classmates today?

Group 2: "to get a degree in landscape architecture"

Mrs. Vice: To get a degree. And group six, you said "to get an education." How

many of you are here to get an education? Raise your hand.   Nine of you? That's

better. All of you, right? How many of you are here to get a degree, or even a

certificate?

Kyle: I want to transfer, does that count?

Mrs. Vice: You want to get a degree after you transfer? Then, yes! Yes, it does

count. It seems that you are all thinking about different reasons for being here,

running track, learning English, getting a degree, and transferring. You're

thoughts all have one thing in common. Do you know what your thoughts have in

common?

Caleb: They're your goals?

Mrs. Vice: Yes, they are. They are your goals. Today, I have a brief power-point

presentation for you that will help you think about what you think you need to

know about reading if you want to meet your goals. I also have a short video for

you to watch. When we finish we can discuss the ways that I can help you meet

or exceed your goals with reading, and the ways that you can help yourself (DR,

0.22-0.46, p. 1).

In their written responses that I later reviewed, students also shared their thinking about what they thought they needed to know for reading in college. Kyle also noted his challenge in reading: "I have to say vocabulary" (SD1, Kyle, 15-16, p.1). He said he also needed to learn "they way Americans show their thoughts on paper" (SD1, Kyle, 7-8, p.1). Here, Kyle indicated that he recognized that English and Chinese reading differs. Additionally, the rules for putting words down on paper, the way the author shows their purpose for reading by providing supporting details written in different organizational patterns is different (SD1, Kyle, 7-10, p. 1). His comments re-enforced my previous assumptions about developmental students: They did not have the communication abilities to express what they know about reading, especially in writing. More importantly, his reporting shows that he has some awareness of the importance of interpreting written communication, even though he has trouble structuring his thoughts.

Students thought of their needs in terms of gaining or increasing vocabulary or fluency skills. Even Marvin who had previously indicated that he did not think he would need help with reading in college made a claim about increasing his skills: "I'm here to learn how to read better, faster and how to focus more while I'm reading" (SD1, Marvin, 1-3, p. 1). He also noted that he needed to learn how to "analyze what I'm reading" (SD1, Marvin, 6-9, p. 1). This was the first indication from Marvin that he had begun to understand that he would need help with reading, especially with reading comprehension if he was going to be successful in college reading.

When asked what she needed to learn about reading, Bridget also revised her initial thoughts. She had indicated that she thought she would need help in reading because there were words she did not understand. Bridget revised her response,

expanding the focus on vocabulary to include grammatical functions (spelling) and

speech functions (pronunciation) which she believed were her deficiencies. She claimed,

> I need to learn correct spelling, how to say words the way they are suppose to
>
> sound. I need to know how to read at the college level so in the future I would
>
> already know the words I learned in college (SD1, Bridget, 6-9, p.1).

Bridget continued to refer to vocabulary when thinking about her needs as a reader.

Examples of her primary concerns in reading included the need to improve her

"understanding of the words," "how to say words," and "figuring out the correct sounds

of words" (SD1, Bridget, 12-16). Bridget needed to extend her concept of reading to

include the content and strategies that help students become good readers. Particularly,

she needed to recognize the importance of thinking, and thinking about thinking, when

reading.

Joslyn, who had previously stated that she did not think she needed help with

college reading because she could "pronounce words," revised her thinking. But like

Bridget, she still fixated on the concept of vocabulary at first.   She wrote: "Well, I'm

here because I want to read better and pronounce my words properly and also to get a

degree in my major" (SD1, 1-4, p. 1). She also explained: "I think you will teach me

how to read and pronounce my words properly" (SD1, Joslyn, 11-14, p. 1). While

vocabulary was her initial focus, Joslyn on the section of the metacognitive reflection

worksheet designed to get her to revise or clarify her previous thoughts, begins to be able

to expand her thoughts to another important aspect of reading: comprehension. She

explained that her challenge in reading was her need to improve reading comprehension

by explaining that her challenge would be "understanding the books we have gotten to

read, not just reading but reading and understanding it" (SD1, 17-19, p.1). Here, Joslyn distinguishes between the actions of reading (seeing and saying words on a page) and the understanding that should emerge from those actions. She also revised her thinking about reading to include not only her vocabulary needs, but also her comprehension (understanding) needs in reading.

After sharing their thoughts about being in the college developmental reading course and their thoughts about their reading needs, students expressed their written thoughts about their challenges. Some challenges referred back to their needs as readers and included responses like, "understanding completely," (SD1, Kerri, 16, p. 1) "focusing on reading," (SD1, Carli, 16, p. 1) "tests," (SD1, Mikel, 16, p.1) and "assignments" (SD1, Kurtis, 16, p. 1). Other students thought about the challenge of adhering to the structure and course requirements, as indicated: "Handing assignments on time is going to be a challenge. I'm not one to get all my work done online and submitting assignments there will be a challenge" (SD1, Sandra, 16-20, p. 1). Others discussed their external challenges; challenges from circumstances outside of the content of the course that they thought would interfere with their college success. Specifically, Caleb struggled with managing his time, coursework, and reading load because of his personal responsibilities outside of class. He explained, "Last semester I took classes and in all my classes they gave me homework, and I have a part-time job, so it's kind of hard" (SD1, Caleb, 6-9, p. 1). Like Caleb, students in a developmental reading course need to find ways to manage time and stress in order to focus their attention on the tasks of college readers.

Additionally students need to find ways to stay motivated when reading. When discussing how they thought they would stay motivated in a college developmental

reading course, students admitted that they had difficulty thinking about reading longer texts like novels. For instance, Bridget noted, "I have a hard time getting motivated about reading a book sometimes" (SD1, Bridget, 18-19, p.2). Unlike Bridget, who thought she had trouble when getting motivated to read books, Gregory, consistently expressed that he lacked motivation. He once wrote me a note that said, "I am sorry, I did not look up the word parts for the extra credit fun word, supercalifragilistic, because I was lazy" (M, Gregory/Motivation, 9/30). Despite his lack of motivation, Gregory loved to talk about books as discussed in the final section of this chapter. He also enjoyed technology, especially computers. As a result, his family tried to motivate him extrinsically by promising to buy him technological gadgets if he could pass the class. He wrote: "If I pass everything I could get an Iphone 4s. If the five has the same default connector and all of the apple products, then I might go for the apple five" (SD1, Gregory, 21-25, p. 1). Gregory's responses about motivation were very different that those expressed by other students in the course.

Students were motivated by their backgrounds, their lives, and their goals. Some students shared their thoughts about motivation: "I will stay motivated by remembering where I came from and where I want to be in life" (SD1, Mikel, 21-25, p. 1). And, "I want to transfer to […] because all of my relatives are there and my sister is doing her last semester there" (SD1, Tara, 21-23, p. 1). In this case, the student thought about her goal in life, and its relation to her family, both of which were important motivational factors. Many students in the developmental college reading course thought family a motivating factor behind their desire to succeed in reading, college, and beyond. For instance, Joslyn noted that even though she was on an athletic scholarship at PCC, she

wanted her family to be proud of her academic success as well. She shared: "I want my parents to be proud of me, not only for track" (SD1, Joslyn, 35-37, p.1). Similarly, Marvin indicated that he thought his motivation came from "family, friends, also through teachers" (SD1, Marvin, 6 & 19-20, p.1). Marvin continued to return to thoughts of his family discussing his experiences in reading, and thinking about his reading success. Students' family backgrounds had formed their self-perceptions.

When sharing their self-perceived thoughts about being readers, a few students who did not believe that they needed the course dared to say "I'm a very good reader" (SD1, Lia, 26, p. 1), "I see myself as an average reader" (SD1, Sandra, 26, p. 1), a "I see myself as a somewhat good reader" (SD1, Kaden, 26, p. 1), or "I'm a pretty good reader" (SD1, Olivia, 26, p. 1). However, some of those students who had previously indicated they did not think they would need help in reading accurately thought about themselves as readers. For example, Marvin shared: "I really don't see myself [as] too much of a reader. I like to read good stuff, but if it's boring, I probably won't read it" (SD1, Marvin, 20-22, p.1). Students' thoughts about how they perceived themselves as readers were not only related to motivational factors, but also to their learning styles and preferences. Kyle also did not think of himself as a "good reader" because of his preference for visual and/or auditory stimulation (SD1, Kyle, 20-22, p. 1). He explained, "I'm not a good reader, I do prefer to watch a movie instead of reading the original novel. And, well, I do appreciate a showing of feeling by [sic] music or stories through movies" (SD1, Kyle, 20-22, p.1). Students like Kyle need to know how to apply visual and auditory strategies to their reading process in order to maximize their reading.

Creating materials and selecting activities for self-discovery. This section discusses how students' thoughts informed the instructional practices and the ways their thinking prompted me to create materials and select activities that would help them with self-discovery processes to increase their level of awareness about learning and reading.

Students related their thoughts about educational and career goals to their thoughts about their participation in a college developmental reading course. Caleb realized the importance of having strong reading skills in the medical field and that being a doctor required him to be college ready. Similarly, Bridget recognized the financial value of an educational degree which would be easier gained with the proper reading skills (Sd1, Bridget, 1-4, p. 1). For students like Kyle, thinking about learning to read in English was an early equivalent to learning more about American culture (SD1, Kyle, 7-10, p. 1). The metacognitive worksheet that was developed helped students to express these thoughts and provided documentation that even students like Marvin, who had previously believed he did not need the course, could establish a purpose for attending after thinking about his thinking (SD1, Margin, 1-3, p.1; SD1, Marvin, 6-9, p. 1). Even as student thinking progressed, their needs remained. Students needed to discover ways to meet their reading needs independently. I observed that students thought their needs in reading varied. Students like Bridget and Joslyn thought they needed help with vocabulary skills, or students like Gregory thought (and I agreed) he lacked internal motivation which required a more creative instructional approach (SD1, Gregory, 21-25, p. 1). My in class observations helped me further clarify the needs that students might not have been thinking about. For example, I noted that Bridget seemed to be reserved in

class and that her preference for introverted work was inhibiting her success when trying

to confirm or clarify her understandings in a group setting:

> [Bridget] doesn't talk much to her peers. When work shopping in groups she
>
> flips quietly back and forth between the pages. Her social interactions are limited
>
> to single word responses when responding to her peers (OBS, Bridget, 13-17, p.
>
> 11).

This was the case despite the fact that she often benefitted from verbal instruction or was

prompted by her others' actions. Her introverted characteristics outweighed her need to

participate with the other students.

My instruction was informed when students' thoughts showed concern about their

learning goals and their behaviors as students. Students like Kyle, who believed that his

visual and auditory preferences deemed him a poor reader, needed to think about their

sensory learning styles and consider how they might become strength, rather than a

weakness. Furthermore, students like Caleb expressed concern for time management,

and Gregory thought about his limited motivation. My students' reported thoughts led

me to re-assert my beliefs about learning, specifically, that students need to exercise

metacognition, thinking about thinking to help them overcome their learning challenges

by gaining an improved awareness of themselves, how they learn, and what they need to

learn (OBS, 12-14, p. 138). What resulted was a plan for providing students with in-class

opportunities of self-discovery which were selected to help students reflect.

Additionally, a reflective written assignment designed to help students think about how

they might overcome any reading challenges by relying on their strengths or by

overcoming their weaknesses resulted.

After reflecting and determining what would be useful for these students, I created an explicit instructional power-point to be used for four short ten-minute lectures over a two week span. The power-point introduced students to the terms and theorists relevant to the concepts of active learning, sensory learning styles, multiple intelligences, and personality traits.

Then I selected the activities that would be used to engage students' thinking about these concepts and help them develop a more accurate awareness of themselves. Those activities selected included the VAK assessment, Felder and Soloman's Learning Styles Index, Jung's Typology Test, the E-Lassi, and the MARSI reading strategies inventory. These activities were selected to help students begin to think about how to overcome any challenges they had with learning and improving their reading skills and abilities. To facilitate metacognitive awareness, I wanted students to go beyond their reported results, to think about their thinking of the results, and to relate their thinking and results to their success in reading (RJ, 1-4, p. 99). Then, I created a reflective written assignment that asked students to revisit their results, think about their results, and to revise or clarify their thoughts about the ways that they can become good readers. A three page paper assignment was developed for this purpose:

> You will examine yourself, discover more about yourself, analyze and synthesis what you have learned about yourself. Think about what you have learned from these self-discovery processes, what it means about your learning styles, personality, and personal preferences and determine how you can use that information to help you read, and succeed in college (ID, Self-Discovery Written Assignment, 10-14, p. 1).

Employing instructional activities like these helped students with self-discovery. They could determine how to manage time, reduce stress, and to use their strengths and weaknesses to help them with reading in college. Moreover, when reflection follows self-discovery activities, students develop a more accurate awareness of themselves as readers by gaining clarity about their needs and the strategies they can use to help them succeed.

The written assignment required students to examine their results and formulate an interpretation of their learning styles, personality and personal preferences in order to determine how the information they discovered could help them become good readers (ID, Self-Discovery Written Assignment, 10-14, p. 1; SD5). Each class period students also completed warm up responses designed to help them reflect on reading. The reflective prompts helped students go through a process of self-discovery and to think more about their thinking. Students were asked to "tell me what you remember reading as a child," "about your reading experiences in high school" and "about your recent reading experiences" (SD4).

Observation of thought fixations. At the beginning of the term, students had been asked to share their thoughts about needing help in reading and of their reading needs in college. Those justifications and statements became the basis for students' thought fixations. I searched literature to help me understand what I was observing but did not find reference to thought fixations. Instead, I found references to eye-fixations in reading and a study which examined eye movement for miscues to determine where the breakdown between one's monitoring, attending to reading, or one's understanding occurred. Miholic (1994) suggests teachers lack ways to help students with monitoring:

Methods of studying comprehension monitoring, or its archenemy, metacognitive breakdown-that which makes our eyes move but our brain to channel elsewhere-have ranged from miscue analysis and error detection tasks to eye movement monitoring. Still, few instructional applications have emerged to aid us in teaching students to be aware of metacognitive strategies (p. 84).

Unfortunately, for my students who were not reading aloud, a miscue analysis was not appropriate. However, it this find made me question if there was a way that I might examine their thought processes to determine where this type of breakdown occurred. More importantly, I noted that my reading students eyes might move across the words as they should, but their thinking focuses elsewhere so metacognitive strategies are necessary in promoting regulation.

While those *thought fixations* were beneficial because they helped students to focus on their reading goals, they also prohibited them from recognizing the need to increase their skills and abilities for the other aspects of reading. Self-discovery activities helped students to further explore their thought fixations in order to revise their original thinking about needing help in college reading. Students' thoughts about their reading experiences as a child, in high school, and during the term of study revealed that students' continued to fixate their thoughts on one aspect of reading that they had relayed when thinking about the need to attend a college developmental reading course. Bridget's thoughts fixated on vocabulary, Joslyn's on pronunciation, Kyle's on American culture, Caleb's on time management, and Marvin's on family support and motivation. Students' thought fixations were not necessarily negative. However, their thoughts

needed to evolve in order to focus on the other important aspects of reading if they wanted to grow as readers.

Writing warm up responses helped students to go through a process of self-discovery, whereby their reflections led them to reconsider their areas of fixation in order to address the ways they might overcome any reading challenges. Furthermore, their responses to warm-ups provided evidence that they thought their childhood reading experiences were positive, but they viewed their high school experiences as a declining point in their reading experiences.

When asked to respond to three prompts about his reading experiences and to think about what he could recall of his reading as a child, in high school, and recently, Marvin indicated that he had limited memories of his childhood reading experiences. However, he clearly recalled his mother's role:

> To be honest, I really don't remember much about reading as a child. What I do remember is my mom reading to me when I was a child. My reading experiences in high school didn't really go so well. My freshman year we had to read three books, since then, I never read. My recent reading experiences consist of reading my speech book and a lot of text messages (SD4, Marvin, 1-12, p.1).

When asked to clarify his thoughts about his limited reading experiences since high school he noted that in his high school classes students "just sat in our chairs, and listened to books on tape" (C, Marvin, 4, p. 1). Here, Marvin reflected on his mother's role in his past reading experiences. His thoughts relay his fixation on thoughts of motivation. They also help him to expand his thoughts about motivation because he notes a change in his interest and engagement with reading. Marvin's reading interest and engagement

with reading was attributed to inactive reading experiences that did not engage students

with the reading strategies necessary for success.

Bridget also thought about her positive learning experiences as a child because of

one specific book about an "old woman who swallowed a fly." She thought her success

in reading had taken a turn because there was a significant increase in middle school

reading demands:

> My reading experience in middle school was a lot to handle, in reading class we
>
> read novels, fiction and non-fiction, then in my science class we had to read, in
>
> English class we had to read different books. The kind of interesting book I read
>
> in middle school was called to *Kill a Mockingbird* (SD4, Bridget, 1-13, p. 1).

Bridget noted that despite the increased demand in middle school, there was significant

reduction in her reading experiences in high school. Moreover, aside from reading for

my course, her "recent" reading experiences were limited to what was on the internet.

However, Bridget reported the summer prior to beginning college; she read several books

on her own accord:

> My recent reading experience was reading what was on the internet, but I did
>
> some reading over the summer. I read, *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas*, half of
>
> the *Catcher and the Rye*, *Anne Frank: the Children of the Holocaust*, and *Anne*
>
> *Frank: the Diary of a Young Girl*. I don't know why, but I think once I read the
>
> book I couldn't stop reading it. I guess it was one of those books that once you
>
> read it, you couldn't put it down (SD4, Bridget, 19-31, p.1).

Bridget's thoughts about reading are evidence that teachers need to assure they are not

overloading students with unrealistic reading demands, but that at the same time, they

should be expected to read something other than "the internet." By spending her summer

reading, Bridget was proactive in readying herself for college reading.

Like Bridget, Kyle thought about his experiences in reading and relayed that he

read a variety of books relevant to his reading interests prior to our course. He was an

avid reader, and his reading interests referred to his thought fixation, reading to learn

American culture:

> Most of reading of mine is from Chinese textbook. I don't know what are English
>
> textbooks [sic/what English textbooks are] like in U.S., but Chinese textbooks
>
> basically are all about reading. So I started reading from first grade. Since those
>
> books are required to read, I did read a lot of stuff like ancient Chinese novels,
>
> westerns dramas even scientific journeys. When I was in high school, being
>
> affected by my friends I started to read extra novels. Most of them are adventure
>
> novels, because I do like real stories. But, all of the reading was in Chinese.
>
> When I came to U.S., I attended the ESL program. I have read two non-fictional
>
> books in five months and finished two essays about American religion (SD4,
>
> Kyle, 1-12, p.1).

Like Marvin and Bridget, Joslyn also reported that as a child, her childhood experiences

of reading were positive. Joslyn specifically enjoyed imagining or visualizing when

reading as a child. However, she had reduced her visualization practices and her use of

imagining in high school when pictures were no longer available and words became too

difficult to visualize:

> Most of all I enjoyed Cinderella. I would look at the pictures and imagine myself
>
> as that princess. Well, in my high school I had to read a lot and it wasn't fun

because all the pictures that had once looked at in the story books were no more

and the words became harder to pronounce. I had to try really hard at

understanding the books (SD4, Joslyn, 6-13, p.1).

When talking about reading as a child, Joslyn made the connection between

understanding and visualizing in an imaginative way. Unfortunately, Joslyn did not

retain her interest in reading throughout high school due to a negative reading experience

that accounted for her concern (thought fixation) for pronunciation. Early in the term,

Joslyn had claimed that she thought she did not need help with reading because she could

"pronounce words correctly," but her response was likely a defense mechanism related to

a previous reading experience. She thought back about her thinking when she responded

to a self-discovery warm up:

> When I was in high school, some embarrassing thing happened to me. I was
>
> suppose to read a biology book and while I was reading I came up on some words
>
> that I couldn't pronounce and while I was trying to do so, the students started to
>
> laugh at me. I felt embarrassed (SD26, Joslyn, 1-5, p. 1).

Joslyn's thought fixation on pronunciation had emerged because of a negative reading

experience whereby her visualization strategies failed her and this was her turning point

away from positive reading experiences. While at first Joslyn had denied needing

assistance in reading, she came to realize that she could use some assistance after

reflecting on her reading experiences.

By reflecting on their past, present, and future reading experiences students

engaged in a self discovery process that can help them return to strategies they had

abandoned overtime and strategies they had previously found to engage them with the

tasks of reading. Through reflection, Joslyn began to recognize that her preferred

childhood strategies could be applied to her adult reading habits. She noted that in

college she discovered that she could use visualization and imagination to read,

especially to read books with visual elements "like comic books" (SD4, Joslyn, 23-24,

p.1). Joslyn felt that the pictures helped with visualization and imagining which would

"keep us occupied" or more importantly, help her to concentrate (SD4, Joslyn, 23, p.1).

Similarly, Marvin's self-discovery written assignment helped him to think about

his thought fixation, motivation. The concern he had for his mother's well being was an

internally motivating factor for him, one that drove his goal of reading for college and

career success:

> My family has been through a lot but by hard work and dedication, they get things
>
> done. I plan to follow in their footsteps, and graduate college. By doing that, it
>
> will help me own my business and take care of my mom which [sic] was a single
>
> parent. I want to do the things she did for me and everything I can to keep her
>
> happy (SD5, Marvin, 23-26, p.1).

He also revealed his thoughts about the reading strategies that he previously reported he

did not apply. Marvin had previously reported that he did not draw diagrams, use study

aides, or look up unknown words. He wrote:

> My weakest areas would be study aids because I really don't concentrate on what
>
> I study because of distractions. I think they are my weakest areas because I don't
>
> try hard on them. I also really don't focus on some of the things I do in the
>
> classroom. [..] I can do a lot of work to fix my weakness as in study harder, work
>
> harder and even pay more attention in class (SD5, Marvin, 5-8 & 13, p.1).

While Marvin recognized he had areas where growth was needed, he did not yet make use of all possible strategies early in the semester because his thinking was distracted by his inability to focus and pay attention as previously noted.

Similarly, Joslyn realized that her concentration was limited and at the same time necessary for success. She shared her thoughts:

I think that my weakest area would be concentration as I'm easily distracted most of the time by simple things. I would want to change that because the more concentrated I am towards my school work, the better and easier it will become. It [concentration] would make my subjects easier and more interesting (SD5, Joslyn, 9-18, p.1).

She also added that she felt reading strategies would help her to assure she was concentrating. Joslyn explained,

I want to improve my strategies so that I can improve more and be successful in my studying and reading. I'm glad I took this test to see where my level is and [...] I'm pushing myself to concentrate more on my school work (SD5, Joslyn, 19-28, p.1).

After taking the E-Lassi and completing other self discovery activities, Joslyn was able to identify a reading need other than pronunciation, namely the need to concentrate.

Kyle revealed that he had a strong awareness of his strengths and weaknesses as well as the ways in which his language barrier impacted his success in reading. Specifically, he noted:

My strongest area is Information Processing. I believe it is because English is not my mother tongue then I have to translate everything I heard and read into

Chinese. Another reason why I am good at IP [Information Processing] is, I love

movies; however, most of the wonderful movies are from a successful novel. I

always try to read the original novel before I go to the cinema to see that movie.

(SD5, Kyle, 1-4, p.1).

When thinking further about motivation and reading, Kyle referred back to the

differences in his cultural experiences. He added:

Looking back to the report, my motivation score is the lowest one. Well, that is

not surprising; lack of motivation has always been my problem in school life. I

think the reason is I went to high school in China, and teachers in China always

push their students to go forward. Sometimes they pushed so much that students

do not find their own direction. Once you lose your way to success, you lose the

motivation. It looks like an excuse, but I am finding my own goal, which can

really inspire me to move on (SD5, Kyle, 5-10, p.1).

For Kyle, the goal was cultural transition.

Caleb also referred to this goal many times throughout the semester and thought

about the relationship between reading and what he would need to do to achieve the goal

of attaining a college degree. After taking an online E- Lassi assessment, Caleb reflected

on his results and shared:

I want to be a doctor I'm going to […] college. I'm enrolled in classes like this

one, in developmental reading, that is a course where they show you different

skills to improve in reading and knowledge. When I took the E- Lassi test about

skills and performance, I answered correctly and honestly to my own self-

satisfaction. The test [results] says [sic] that if I got a grade of 80 or 100 my

strategy [use] in those areas were not good. That is true. That is what I got in self-

testing and information processing. The reason that is true [is because] sometimes

I am reading or studying the things that I'm going to read, and I cannot

understand and I go back multiple times. Sometimes I get frustrated and I quit, so

that is one of my biggest problem[s]. [It] is something that I want to learn how to

fix (SD5, Caleb, 1-9, p.1).

Although Caleb struggled as he learned to read English, he was observant of his own

involvement in the reading process, specifically in relation to his management of time.

Caleb thought back to the moment when he began monitoring his reading time: "I

remember when I start[ed] reading English. Almost all of the words, for me, don't mean

nothing [sic] and I never understand what it means. But, one time I started reading and

started reading slower, taking my time" (SD4, Caleb, 5-9, p.1). He explained, "When

I'm doing something I think about it and [I have] a little problem when I try to figure it

out. I'm thinking I have trouble in all areas [my challenges are] stress, time-management,

concentration" (SD5, Caleb, 11-13, p.1). He noted how limited time impacted how he

read for his current reading courses: "In some classes, I need to read and I do, but when I

read I read too much and I get confused, or I read fast and I don't understand what the

book [is] try[ing] to tell me, or what the paragraph means" (SD4, Caleb, 13-16, p. 1).

Caleb added that prior to our developmental course he had only been speaking English

for a little over one year (SD4, Caleb, 2-4, p.1). He particularly recalled that he felt

discouraged when asked to read out loud by his teachers. He explained, "I was so bad

[at] reading at school, when teachers tell me [to] read the paragraph, I read so slow[ly]

and sometimes I got stuck in a word. [It] was terrible. That was one of my fears in

school, reading, especially long paragraphs [sic]" (SD29, Caleb, 1-5, p. 1). Caleb thought

about his struggles in high school as well. He shared: "My reading experience in high

school was super hard because I don't know English. I come from Mexico, to the states

of [sic] 17 years old, so I work and work more when I read" (SD4, Caleb, 31-32, p. 1).

Caleb thought he was not a good reader because he needed more reading practice with

English language skills: "I think that my reading is so bad. First, because I don't like it

[sic]. And second, because I don't practice too much. I hope this class helps me to read

and be a […] good student" (SD4, Caleb, 25-28, p. 1). In response to a written activity

which I required students to write about what they remembered about reading as a child,

in high school, and in their recent experiences, Caleb elaborated on his experiences as an

English speaker. He shared, "I come from Mexico. I am Mexican, and I arrived in high

school speaking only Spanish. I arrived when I was in the 11th grade, so I was need[ing]

practice" (SD4, Caleb, 2-4, p.1). "My goals for my reading class and past this class are to

learn new reading skills and be a better reader and student, and to have more good

experiences in reading" (SD33, Caleb, 17-19, p. 1). Caleb's thoughts about his needs in

reading confirmed one of my claims: Students need experiences with college reading

including those opportunities to practice the reading strategies that will help them achieve

in reading. This was something that resonated from his shared thoughts about reading:

"Now, I know that I am not perfect, but I can try and study and practice more. Honestly,

I don't read too much. But, if I need to I try to do the best and sometimes I work on it

and practice" (SD29, Caleb, 10-16, p. 1).

      Affirming the need for strategy practice. Reflection on their thoughts about the

self-discovery activities helped students develop a more accurate awareness of their

personality and learning styles so they could begin thinking about the behaviors they would need to change or develop in order to become good readers. Even those students who had previously indicated they would not need help with college reading needed practice and experience with reading strategies. From the beginning I was thinking about how to teach students to overcome the deficiencies they believed they had, as well as how to address those I observed. Also, I had to think about how to motivate and engage them with effective strategies for reading to assure their remediation was successful. Students had a repertoire of reading terms they had learned, including main idea, fluency, and context clues as well as some of the basic rules about using those terms for reading. But, they still weren't good readers. They often attributed their poor reading skills to boredom or inability to pay attention. Although some students knew that fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension were important to their reading success, students' could not express what strategies would best help them improve their reading skills, much less apply those strategies. Students needed to know the strategies and apply them in ways that can help them become good readers. What is needed is the time and experience that will allow students to practice the strategies of good readers, as indicated by Caleb: "I think I need more practice" (SD16, Caleb, 1-2, p. 2).

Practicing Reading

Student's thoughts informed the instruction by prompting me to delve deeper into students' thinking by providing metacognitive activities, and by promoting the inclusion strategy practice during class time. Students early semester responses and their self-discovery activities revealed they needed help with vocabulary and fluency skills,

comprehension, and with motivation. The observation of students can help teachers to identify the self-discovery activities that reveal more about what students need. Good readers not only know the content of aspects like vocabulary and fluency, but can apply those strategies that improve their comprehension, motivation, and engagement through interaction with the text.

Students were asked to reflect about their own use of strategies including any questioning strategies, marking and annotating, or other vocabulary strategies they may have used. In my request, I was asking not only for an understanding of the content of reading, but also for the students' ability to explicitly express what they did or could do to help them read.

Annotating. The benefits of marking and annotating included making marginal summarizations of the reading, identifying unknown vocabulary, defining those terms, and examining the patterns of individual paragraphs as they relate to one another in a text. While these were strategies that Joslyn had indicated she did not use, she found value in the strategy after a class practice was provided. Furthermore, when completing this practice exercise, Joslyn's experience was more positive because she returned to a childhood strategy which she had previously enjoyed, visualizing/imagining.

Students read an adapted selection from *The Mayor of Casterbridge* by Thomas Hardy (1886). On first reading, students were instructed to read it without taking any notes. Then there were asked to share what they could recall. When you read the story, "The Mayor of Casterbridge" the first time, what were you thinking? Caleb wrote, "It was complicated. I saw a story about a town where someone killed someone. And, I tried to focus but I don't understand all the passage" (SD16, Caleb, 1-3, p. 1). Gregory

responded: "It means that old execution was brutal" (SD16, Gregory, 1, p. 1). Responses like these were examples of the students' inability to locate main ideas because they were distracted by the more interesting supporting details.

Students thought they could identify the main idea in the passage, but instead focused their thoughts on the most interesting section of the text, which turned out to be a minor supporting detail. They needed direct instruction that can help them learn to interpret the entire text, as a whole, to better understand the role of supporting details and to avoid selecting the juicy bits as the overall main idea. I stopped to look at what type of sentence they were all paying attention to. I asked them about it, and then I told them what kind of sentence it was, and what its role was in the reading. Together we came to the realization that this was an error they frequently made: to target the most interesting thing and relate that piece of information back in some way to the main idea. They were looking at the specific sentences, not at the relation of the specific to the general. I used this opportunity to build upon the importance of learning to identify the pattern of organization and relating this back to the authors' purpose for writing and 'what it does' as a sentence, or paragraph to support the writers' idea.

Joslyn embraced the opportunity to visualize and imagine. She wrote, "When the author said that the woman's heart jump [sic] out of her body, I visualize [sic] a cartoon of the heart with evil eyes staring on at the people who were watching" (SD8, Joslyn, 17-20. p. 2). Like every other student in the class that day, Joslyn clung to her understanding of three facts: (1) a woman murdered her husband, (2) her heart jumped out of her body and, (3) people were watching. However, when asked to recall the main idea and purpose of the selection, she like the other students, remained quiet and looked around with

anguish and anticipation, awaiting the response (OBS, 3-4, p. 26). When asked to record her answer in writing to the question "what does it mean," Joslyn wrote that the passage was about "a woman who murdered her husband and for her punishment they burn[ed] her where thousands of spectators come [sic/came] to watch and to their amazement while burning, her heart came out of her body" (SD8, Joslyn, 1-5, p.2). Her response, just as the other students in the course, was an accurate retelling of three sentences. However, her answer neglected to collect any meaning from the remaining 14 sentences where the main ideas and major supporting details were included. Thus, the main idea of the passage was lost. I made an instructional noting of these phenomena:

Students skip the general sentences because they aren't detailed enough and/or they don't stand out in their minds. They are also more difficult because they are unspecific. When they skip these general sentences, they are also skipping the questioning process (M, All Students, 10/26).

Additionally, Joslyn's retelling of the meaning relied heavily on the actual language in the passage indicating that she was unable to summarize those ideas in her own words on the first reading. Students like Joslyn need practice with summarization in order to have an understanding of what they are reading. Additionally, they need to know what to do to gain meaning whey they are confronted with a text full of unknown vocabulary. As a strategy, annotating helps students to practice their summarization skills and to define unknown vocabulary words in the margins of the text. After students read the passage and recorded their first response, I asked them to talk about what was difficult in the passage. Voices came up from all over the room. Among them were the responses, "words" and "vocabulary." Students were asked to respond with a show of

hands if they had skipped unknown words. *Every* student in the room raised their hand (OBS, 16-19, p. 27).

I introduced the concept of marking and annotating to students. I explained that while there might be rules for annotating, the process has to become personal. Students have to find a marking and annotating system that works for them. I offered to share my system if they would follow along and repeat the process themselves. I wrote basic instructions on the board.

1. Box Setting information.

2. Circle people.

3. Replace unknown or sticky words (OBS, 16-21, p. 27).

Then, I explained each step with more detail.

Setting information includes dates, times, and places. Sometimes a setting is described with phrases like, in the past, nowadays, or even 'once upon a time.' People might be officially named. Mrs. Vice would be circled as would be woman, wife, mother, and teacher. A thesaurus as we have already talked about helps you to find synonyms and antonyms for words. Even if you know what a word means, but you don't use it often, it is helpful to replace the word with one that is easy for you. That means you use a word that has the same meaning, but one that you would actually say if you were talking. I know what the word 'cheerfullest' means, but it isn't a word I will use often. So, I cross out the word and place 'happiest' above it. Later when I re-read the sentence with the new words, it will make more sense (DIS, 13-29, p.2).

After clarifying the steps, students worked individually on locating the setting, people, and to replace the unknown or "sticky" words. After the students worked on their own, they compared their results with one another to see if their neighbors could add meaning to what they had marked.

Within minutes they were ready to share. A full screen reading was projected. Students shared the words they replaced on their own offering them verbally. Joslyn added that 'terror' meant 'fear.' She had also boxed the words 'past', 'scores of years, 'recent dates,' and 'mid-day.' To assist with the metacognitive process, I asked students to document how the identification of setting details helped them gain some understanding and what is now known. They had to document their responses again in writing. Joslyn wrote,

> I underlined all the words that I didn't understand and found the meaning for them
> and now I have a better understanding of the passage. While going through the
> dates, it tells me about the history, it's [the meaning of the story] like going back
> in the past (SD8, Joslyn, 6-9, p.2).

Other students also added knowledge to their understanding. Gregory wrote, "1705 is the medieval era, more like the 13 colonies" (SD8, 6, p. 2).   By initializing the annotating process, students began to develop a concept of the setting behind the story they were reading, capturing details they had not previously noted.

After students documented their thoughts in writing again, I asked the class to revisit their previous thoughts about the reading. If all these clues in the story have to deal with time, and we can see there is a history there, then how could the story be about one woman who murdered her husband? That only happened one time, on one specific

date. Students readied themselves for researching, they began flipping through the reading, and looking back to the sentences where the historical clues had been found to interpret what they had read (OBS, 21-25, p. 27).

Students were then directed to re-read the piece using the new words. They were asked to paraphrase what was happening in the margins as they read. Then they were directed to construct a written response to the prompt, "Now you have marked and annotated your text. Likely if you were doing so for class you would go back and discuss the reading, or you would have a written assignment. So, tell me what you would say. What does this mean? What is the reading about? What is happening? When, where, why, how?" (SD8). Joslyn wrote:

> The story is about a land a long time ago where persons use to go and watch
>
> games which were bloody, like fighting. But people believe that the land was
>
> cursed so they stopped going to this place because something bad had happened.
>
> Persons were punished on the land by hanging or burning. A visual example is
>
> the lady who was being hanged, and then was burned (SD8, Joslyn, 9-13, p. 2). .

From the process, Joslyn realized that the story was intended to reveal the history of a place and the terrible events that had happened there. She also was able to recognize that the woman who murdered her husband was not the focus of the piece, but only an example, intended to help readers understand the violent history of the place.

When asked to share her thinking about her process and the marking and annotating strategy, Joslyn wrote:

> Before you, Miss Vice taught me how to annotate I just read the passage two or
>
> three times. I would just read it again, so it took up a lot of time because I would

have ways have to read and even at the end of the day, I still wouldn't understand

the passage (SD 16, Joslyn, 1-7, p. 1).

When I asked, "While you were annotating the story and looking for vocabulary words

and their meanings, what were you thinking?" Joslyn responded:

After looking through the passage and underlining and finding vocabulary words I

found that it was much easier to understand and because to take notes, I

understood the passage more and could easily write a summary about it (SD16,

Joslyn, 12-17, p.1).

And, Joslyn responded with enthusiasm to the question "after you applied the techniques

of the marking and annotating strategy what were you thinking?"

I was thinking, Wow! I'm understanding how to take notes. I felt good about

myself and knowing that for the first [time] in my life I was understanding a

difficult passage (SD16, Joslyn, 18-22, p.1).

More frequently, Joslyn's responses to questions about her thinking began to reveal her

increasing confidence in her reading skills. After annotating in class she attempted to try

the strategy at home and expressed success: "I felt great about myself and I just wanted

to read a passage and try to annotate to see if I would do a good job, and I did" (SD16,

Joslyn, 1-4, p. 2). Here, Joslyn integrated reading strategies, annotating with

visualization, and thought she had reading success as a result. She returned to her

childhood strategies of using her imagination to visualize and help her read. She also

continued to work on note-taking strategies such as annotating and summarizing to

increase her understanding. Like Joslyn, students can be encouraged to return to

previously abandoned strategies when they will help them succeed in reading.

Metacognition as a strategy of reading. Students don't know what it means to think, much less to think about their thinking. When asked why or how they have completed a reading task, students cannot explain their thoughts because they have not practiced the monitoring of their thoughts. After being formally assessed in class with an examination, students were asked to respond to written prompts to reveal their past thinking about the assessment. When asked the question, "What were you thinking when I first gave you the [reading] test?" Bridget stated, "My brain wasn't wanting to think about some of the questions" (SD18, Bridget, 6, p.1).   I asked students to share why they didn't utilize the reading strategies we had learned in class (Annotating and SQ3R) to help them with reading. Caleb exclaimed: "I don't know. I never thought about it!" (SD18, Caleb, 6, p. 1). Unlike Caleb, who admitted he didn't have any thoughts of strategies during class, Bridget claimed she was trying to make her brain work, or think, but was struggling with the process. Students like Caleb or Bridget benefited from the explicit instruction of metacognition, as well as from activities that require them to pay attention to their thoughts.

One such activity required students to stop and write each time they heard a single hand clap. At that very moment they were to record their thinking. I used this activity to introduce the term metacognition. I showed students an example of a singer who was trying out on a popular television show who was not aware of her level of talent. Students first watched a You Tube video of some singers who lacked musical ability and had been video recorded on their try out for American Idol. Marvin responded: "They are thinking they got it in the bag, and that they are the best, they are thinking they are going somewhere. They think they can sing" (SD21, Marvin, 2, p.1). Students watched

the facial expressions and thoughts about how deeply a popular violinist was thinking in a

You Tube video. Marvin reported the following:

> I was thinking that she was trying to get to the point, practice makes perfect. And
>
> even as a professional you still have to practice to be good. I was thinking about
>
> how she was thinking, I see what she says, about what students call practice by
>
> the look of her face and gestures and what it means to focus on what you are
>
> doing (SD21, Marvin, 6-8, p.1).

Caleb adds: "She proves that she is thinking about her thinking because she says, "I have

to practice for my job, and practice every day. It's not really the hours, but the quality of

work that needs to be done" (SD17, Caleb, 16-18, p.1). "I look at the way she moves

during the process of playing music, I see her feelings" (SD17, Caleb, 22-23, p.1). He

continued, "she shows us that you need to think about the quality of work that needs to be

done" (SD17, Caleb, 19-20).

After this activity, students were asked to relay what they had learned that could

apply to reading. Marvin noted that reading required "thinking about your thinking,

thinking outside of the box, MORE than thinking" (SD21, Marvin, 3, p.1). He also noted

that it was important for him to "pay more attention, listen to what you're reading, and at

the end to think about what you read" (SD21, Marvin, 10, p.1). In his responses Caleb

wrote that metacognition is "thinking about your thinking, but it is not all, you need to

act" (SD17, Caleb, 3-5, p. 1). "It's [being] focused on what or something you want to

think about. It's your self-reasoning" (SD17, Caleb, 7-9, p. 1). He explained, "I think

that this is an example of thinking because if you have a textbook open, it doesn't mean

you are studying" (SD17, Caleb, 12-15, p. 1). Caleb thinks about how metacognition can

help him be a better reader. He says, "I see that I need to practice myself, thinking. To work and practice all the work by improving and making better the quality of my work" (SD17, Caleb, 1-4, p. 2).

After students reflected on these two visual examples of thinking about thinking, I asked them to help me redefine the term, metacognition, as it would apply to us as readers. I asked them to call out the words they felt should be included in our definition. I made a request for shout outs and students began to call out:

Gregory: Focus.

Kyle: Pay attention!

Horace: Have organization.

Mrs. Vice: Okay, what else?

Bridget: Awareness?

Mrs. Vice: Yes, awareness. Good! What else?

Gregory: Skills.

Caleb: Be watching.

Kyle: Passion.

Joslyn: Desire…

Caleb: Use time wisely, and to practice!

Mrs. Vice: Great! Now, did we forget anything important?

Landon: Thinking! (RJ, 1-14, p. 138).

I encouraged students to work in their groups to construct a definition from these terms that they thought best expressed what thinking about thinking meant. Each group created a definition and shared it with the class. They synthesized the ideas in a logical way that

would best express the term as it applied to them as readers. We compiled their

definitions and students took the lead in combining them into one new definition together

as a class:

> Metacognition means having the passion or desire to be watching or listening with
>
> self-sustaining motivation and awareness while using time wisely with patience
>
> and focus so that you can practice your thinking skills (RJ, 14-20, p. 138).

The resulting definition was left on the board as a reminder of our collective learning.

SQ3R. Earlier in the term, Kyle had indicated that he did not ask questions of the

text as he read, look for patterns of organization, or break sentences into parts (SD3,

Kyle, 1-15, p.1).   However, mid point in the study, students were asked to read John

Meacham's article, "Keeping the Dream Alive" from *Time*. Kyle developed questions,

jotting down both "What is the history of the dream, what happened?" and "Why should

we restore the dream?" But he also engaged in thinking about organizational patterns by

comparing and contrasting as he questioned. He wrote, "How do the dream and reality

work against each other here?" During the in-class reading, I recorded the following note

on the right hand page of my researcher's journal:

> While many students lingered on the first page of reading, glancing it over
>
> continuously, Kyle moved quickly through the processes of reading, created
>
> thoughtful questions and found meaning. He was enthusiastic in his approaches
>
> and in his discussion in class (RJ, 7-11, p. 26).

In the observation notes from my journal I wrote "Kyle was the only student in class that

day that could verbally define and describe each of the strategies. Despite the language

barriers he professes, his critical thinking skills and memory skills are strong" (RJ, 1-13,

p.6). While Kyle grasped an understanding of SQ3R, other students struggled with

applying the entire strategy. Gregory struggled with staying motivated during the process

and became off-topic easily.   Bridget later relayed concern because she still needed to

know how to develop questions, despite the advice to turn headings into questions which

we practiced in class (C, Bridget, 6, p. 1). Caleb noted he would need more "time and

more practice" (SD18, Caleb, 14, p. 1). Students need more practice with the theoretical

constructs of Bloom's higher order thinking terms in order to develop those deep

questions that can guide them to a better understanding.

Students who hesitate to incorporate reading strategies because of time constraints

need more practice to develop automatic reading practices for reading achievement, or

they need to recognize the value of the aspects of the strategy that provided some benefit

for them in order to think about how to develop a process that works. For instance, when

Caleb reflected on the use of the SQ3R strategy he recognized the advantage but thought

also of the time required to complete the process. Students were asked, what do you

think will happen if you go through the SQ3R process and read the beginning again?

Caleb responded: "It's going to take time, but I can understand the passage better"

(SD19, Caleb, 6, p. 1). Marvin also claimed that he has difficulty envisioning how the

SQ3R strategy would help him become a good reader because of the time that the tasks

would take to complete: "I don't think this [SQ3R] will help me be a better reader

because it takes a lot of time, and it's very hard to concentrate on what we're doing. The

advantage is it helped me with vocabulary" (DS19, Marvin, 1-5, p.1). Bridget noted the

relationship with time and sustaining her motivation when using the SQ3R, "It takes

forever to read sometimes especially if you don't like to read" (SD37, Bridget, 2-3, p.1).

Their concerns for time were related to their priorities outside of the classroom. Bridget

referred to the difficulty of having time to complete homework and reading and her

inability to retain motivation for the latter: "I plan my reading time after I do my

homework" (SD23, Bridget, 1-2, p.1). Caleb referred to his thoughts about managing his

time for reading with the other demands in his life. He noted that time management was

one of his weakest areas because he was a full time student and was employed.

> One of the serious problems is what I do with my time, because when I get out of
>
> school and I go to work and when I go to work my mind is clear and when I go
>
> home I get tired and I want to do relax. Sometimes I have an hour free. I take a
>
> break instead of study [sic]. The only time that I study and I do my homework is
>
> at night after work that is why I feel tired all the time, because I don't sleep too
>
> much and that is a problem for me (SD5, Caleb, 17-24, p. 1).

Teachers need to help students find strategies that will benefit them, notwithstanding time

constraint.

Profiles of Student Growth

After our semester of work students completed their fifteen strategies survey

again. They looked back at their own written responses to our work in class, as well as

their self-discovery activities. From these they constructed final reflective portfolios

where they provided a new narrative reflection of how the course helped them to increase

their reading achievement. These portfolios were annotated to aid in the development of

student profiles that would reflect their progression of learning across the semester (see

Appendix I). Students' progression of learning is discussed next.

Marvin's strategy development. When asked what reading strategies he

utilized, Marvin indicated that he would re-read passages, refer to illustrations of a texts,

visualize, re-read introductions, skip to the last page to read summaries, and imagine

similar situations. However, he noted that he did not draw diagrams, read out loud, read

slowly word for word, look up unfamiliar words, ask questions about the text, discuss the

text, paraphrase, look for patterns like cause and effect or compare and contrast, or break

sentences into individual parts (SD3, Marvin, 1-15, p.1). While Marvin had previously

indicated he did not draw diagrams, read out loud, read slowly word for word, look up

unfamiliar words, ask questions about the text, discuss the text, paraphrase, look for

patterns like cause and effect or compare and contrast, or break sentences into individual

parts (SD3, Marvin, 1-15, p.1), he later indicated that he began to modify his reading

behaviors and do most of those things and more!

Despite his reading challenges in school, Marvin reported that he had begun to

apply some of the strategies that had been discussed in the developmental reading course.

Unlike his reporting of the strategies he had used during the beginning of term, Marvin

indicated that he had begun to "read the introductory and summary paragraphs," "recite

the main idea," and "read or skim the chapter before class" (SD23, Marvin, 1-3, p.1). He

also indicated that he was more likely to try and "take notes and make questions" in order

to become a more efficient reader (SD23, Marvin, 6, p.1). Marvin reported that he

thought he still needed to know how to take notes and make questions.

Marvin attempted to ask questions about the text and tried looking up unfamiliar

words. When discussing approaches that can be used with reading articles, Marvin noted

that he was thinking about relying on pre-reading strategies to help him develop

questions that would help him engage in and pay attention to reading. A written prompt

posed the question: "What do you think you need to do before you read this article?" In

response, Marvin wrote, "I think I need to read the title and headings of all the paragraphs

[to create questions]" (SD19, Marvin, 1-2, p.1). While he accepted the idea of

developing questions prior to reading, an unsolicited written response from Marvin on the

back of an assignment expressed that he did not see value of marking and annotating, but

he did see the benefit of looking up unknown words and replacing them with known

words in the text as previously mentioned (DS19, Marvin, 1-5, p.1). On a vocabulary

quiz prompt that asked students to discuss the importance of vocabulary strategies

specific to their own reading needs he noted: "Some devices that I think will help me

with vocabulary in reading would be to make flash cards of the one's that appear as I'm

reading other than just make in a list at the beginning" (SD22, Marvin, 35, p.1).

Additionally, Marvin began to utilize diagram drawing as his preferred method of note

taking. I noted this as I observed: "Marvin stops to draw an illustration, rather than

making annotations in the margins or writing a summary at the end" (RJ, 1-5 & 12-15, p.

26). Not only did Marvin begin to draw diagrams, look up unfamiliar words, ask

questions about the text, and look for patterns like cause and effect or compare and

contrast but also, he began to read slowly word for word out loud. In fact, he reported

that this was his preferred reading strategy and proclaimed that he'd finally found "my

strategy."   At the end of the term, students were provided their final Nelson Denny

assessment scores. They were asked to reflect on what they did to increase or decrease

their scores. Marvin's score increased so he responded to the question "what did you do

or learn this semester that helped you to bring this score up?" Marvin accounted for the

increase by claiming that his success could be attributed to that fact that he had begun to use reading strategies consistently.

> Towards the end, I found a new technique [whisper reading] and I think if I would have done it earlier it would have been higher. I learned how to take good notes and new reading techniques that will help me in the long run (SD46, Marvin, 1-6, p.1)

This idea, that he now had 'ownership' of a specific strategy was one that he reiterated in the final reflective activity, on responses to the final assessment, and in the final interview.

At the end of the semester, students were asked to write a final reflective narrative piece that stemmed from their journal responses over the term. They put these pieces into their final portfolio. Some basic questions were provided as an outline but students were given the verbal instructions to respond to the prompts they felt were most relevant to relaying their thinking of thinking and of reading. Marvin revealed that even though he originally did not think he would need help with reading, he had run into some challenging situations during which he relied on what he had learned in our class. Marvin decided to take responsibility for his learning when he faced reading challenges. When he discovers that he has no prior knowledge of the reading topic, he becomes confused: "It was a bit confusing to understand where the city is and how it is listed as being in the middle of a Moran, Sunset National Park." He thought about his thinking and noted what it was that made the reading a challenge: "It was confusing because I am not familiar with your geography of Australia. That was one of the only problems I had while reading the article was stopping to research Mildura, Australia" (SD50, Marvin, 16,

p. 1). After noting that he needed more background knowledge about the reading to comprehend, he implemented a strategy we had discussed, that of doing research to get background knowledge: "When I was confused about the city location in Australia, I stopped and use MapQuest to locate the city and the park to see how far apart these two places really are" (SD, Marvin, 17, p. 1).

When selecting a reading for personal enjoyment, Marvin thought about his personal interests and selected an article "*Sox Leave Nashville with Two Additions to Lineup*" by Brown (2012). He chose the article because he believed it would help him maintain his motivation: "I find this article topic fun and exciting because when I read about the Red Sox or any sports team, it captures my attention and I don't think about anything else" (SD50, Marvin, 3, p. 1). He notes that despite engaging his personal interests he still has to think about maintaining focus and relies on strategies we had practiced in class to help him, i.e., "to pay attention, I have to sit down and whisper to myself." He indicated that he chose to use whisper reading, a strategy he had discovered worked well with his auditory learning style. He explained, "The strategy I use when reading is whispering to myself so that I can understand and stay on track when reading" (SD50, Marvin, 10, p. 1). When sharing what he learned during the reading experience he notes: "I have learned that reading aloud to myself helps me to understand the reading more effectively" (SD50, Marvin, p. 1). Marvin's revelations relate to the final thoughts he shared during his interview. He noted that he enjoyed the activity "when we tried to read all the different ways, by whispering, by reading together in groups, and by imitating you" and that as a result, he had tried it at home. He said, "I found my strategy! My

strategy is whisper reading" (IN, Marvin, 1:06-1.15). When I asked him what else he would like to say at the end of our time together he added:

> I think you should do that earlier, because if I had known it was okay to whisper while I read, I would have done it all semester long. I do it now, but I could have done it from the very beginning (IN, Marvin, 1:07-1:15).

This was a sentiment he reiterated from his portfolio: "Something that I will do in the future is whisper read to myself earlier in the year. This year, I just found out about my strategy, and I wish I would've known earlier" (SD50, Marvin, 15, p. 1). He adds: "I think this strategy will be very helpful because when I discovered it was improving my writing. I began to read a lot faster and understand what I was reading" (SD50, Marvin, 18, p. 1). At the end of the term, Marvin realized that he thought he did not help with reading because he did not know what reading was, but he had since amended his thoughts. He explained:

> Prior to this class, I thought reading was just as simple as it sounds. Read the words on the page and hope that you understand it. I felt like reading was something I did just to get what I needed to know about a particular subject matter. Understanding what helps me read better will help me ensure that I am successful in the future. (SD50, Marvin, 41, p. 1).

Bridget's strategy development. Bridget indicated that she read aloud, read very slowly word for word, visualized while reading, discussed text with others, and imagined situations (SD3, Bridget, 1-15, p.1). However, Bridget did not do the following: re-read the same passage intentionally, draw diagrams, refer to illustrations, re-read the introduction, read the summary, look up unfamiliar words, ask questions,

paraphrase, look for patterns, or break individual sentences into parts (SD3, Bridget, 1-15, p.1).   She later confessed: "I used none of these strategies because the teacher never went over them in high school" (SD38, Bridget, 1-2, p.1). Although Bridget's initial reading focus was limited to her thoughts about vocabulary and motivation, she began to develop a more holistic approach toward reading by thinking about what to do during all three stages of reading. When asked to relay her thoughts about reading, Bridget noted a change in her own processes prior to reading: "I have a purpose in mind when I am reading because in high school I never had a purpose in mind when I read. The teacher would just say read these, and we would have a test over it sometimes" (SD33, Bridget, 1-5, p.1). Bridget also indicated that she began thinking about strategies such as note taking and questioning during reading. She explained: "My goal for reading in class is paying attention to what I am reading, taking notes while I read and ask[ing] questions while I am reading so I can get a better understanding about what I am reading" (SD33, 14-18, p. 1). When documenting her thoughts about reading, Bridget's point of reference was the difference between her college reading processes and her high school reading practices. Her thoughts reveal that she thought she had grown as a reader. She noted: "I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it. [My reading] has improved because in high school we never really went over the book. We just read over them until we were done with the book" (SD33, 6-10, p.1).

Her knowledge about approaching reading textbooks was emerging, and she was expanding on what she had learned in her previous experiences about reading novels. When asked to share her thinking about reading novels, Bridget relayed that "I have learned you should always use the theme to give you clues about the novel. And, that

there are a bunch of different types of characters, flat, round, main, and minor" (SD37, Bridget, 6-11, p.1). Periodically throughout the class, students would be asked to relay what they still needed to know about certain required reading skills and/or strategies. On one occasion Bridget declared: "I don't know anything about bias" (SD40, Bridget, 3, p.1). Later she responded to the question "what do you still need to know about novels?" by stating "I have no idea" (SD37, Bridget, 4-5, p.1). In this case, Bridget knew she needed to know more, but didn't know what it was she needed to learn or couldn't express what she needed to learn.

Unlike her responses in the beginning of the term, her midterm responses no longer referred to her vocabulary deficiency. She continued to revise her thinking about her reading and began making connections between reading and success. When I asked her to reflect on her Pre E-Lassi assessment and other self-discovery activities scores she noted:

> I lack some study skills I need to succeed. I need some improvement in self-
> assessment and knowing what I need to study more on. I need to work on
> anxiety, especially when it comes to testing. If I don't know anything about a
> test, what to study for, then, I start to panic (SD5, Bridget, 2-5, p.1).

Despite thinking about the strategies and processes of reading, Bridget's thinking revealed her own insecurities about testing and motivation. She noted, "I am going to do horribly on this test" (SD18, Bridget, 7, p.1). Bridget's thinking about her reading needs led her to consider what strategies she might implement that could help her achieve in reading. She stated "The longer the class is, the less my brain gets to working. What I need is a shorter study period" (SD5, Bridget, 9-10, p.1). She added "I am going to take

notes while I read to help me understand what I am reading so I can pass this class and read better in the future" (SD38, Bridget, 3-6, p.1). Not only could she demonstrate more knowledge about reading, but Bridget was also thinking about her thinking, thinking about strategies she could use to achieve, and she was tying her thinking about reading to college success.

To help students overcome their reading challenges they were asked to reflect on their reading experiences again at the end of the term. They were also asked to accept responsibility for the outcome of those reading experiences and to reflect on how their behaviors contributed to their reading difficulties. Students were asked to think of a time when they were not happy with a reading experience and to consider what they did or could have done to overcome the reading challenge. Bridget noted:

> "When I was in middle school, I had a reading class where we had to read biography books. Of course, I didn't like reading to begin with and that was the worst reading I ever had to do. I didn't like reading about peoples' lives especially before they died. […] I would read a page and then do it over and over till the bell rang. (SD29, Bridget, 1-10, p.1).

Bridget was not re-reading to clarify meaning; instead she was repeating the passage to actively avoid the other tasks of reading. From her reading challenges she learned that she needed to arrange her time and space if she wanted to improve her reading outcomes. She noted:

> What I did was go home, went to my room, sat on the floor, and just read aloud to myself and as I did that the book became real interesting for me to read , and now I love to read biographies" (SD29, Bridget, 11-16, p.1).

Bridget noted that thinking about her thinking impacted her knowledge and

understanding about being a reader. When asked how her knowledge of what to do as a

reader had improved, Bridget explained:

> Before I never knew how to be a smart reader. During this class, I was thinking
>
> about it and I was thinking, WOW! I could really use this [the strategies taught in
>
> class]. I think I will get a better understanding about what I am reading (SD38,
>
> Bridget, 7-11, p.1).

As a result, her advice to other students was to "think about your reading" SD19, Bridget,

2, p.1).

More importantly, at the end of the term, Bridget reported she had not previously

used many strategies for reading. She indicated that she did not learn the strategies

"*because the teacher never went over them in high school*" (SD38, Bridget, 1-2, p.1).

Students need direct instruction as well as practice opportunities for those strategies that

can help them be successful in college reading. Specifically, she had reported that she

did not re-read the same passage repeatedly, draw diagrams, refer to illustrations, re-read

the introduction, read the summary, look up unfamiliar words, ask questions, paraphrase,

look for patterns, or break individual sentences into parts (SD3, Bridget, 1-15, p.1). At

the end of term, she had added these to her repertoire of reading strategies.

Bridget began to paraphrase, question, and look up the meaning of unfamiliar

words. Bridget claimed she had practiced and used marking and annotating, a note taking

system where students paraphrase the reading, pose questions for clarification, and record

the definitions of terms in the margins of the text. When discussing the value of marking

and annotating she pointed out two advantages and one minor disadvantage: "You will

have a better understanding about the reading" (SD19, Bridget, 6, p.1). She went on to

say:

> It helps you understand what the author is trying to say to you, and it helps you
>
> understand what you are reading. The advantages are you have a better
>
> understanding of your reading. The disadvantage is you tend to run out of room
>
> on your paper for notes and writing the meaning of words (SD19, Bridget, 1-6,
>
> p.2).

Not only did Bridget begin to use a note taking strategy that encompassed paraphrasing,

questioning, and defining unfamiliar words, but she also began to exercise re-reading as a

means of clarifying meaning. For instance, when asked to discuss the strategies or steps

that could be taken when finding main ideas, she said she would "read through the

passage and find hints that will give you the topic" (SD36, Bridget, 4, p.1). She would

then "read the passage again and look for key points in the passage to find the main idea"

(SD36, Bridget, 4, p.1).

In the beginning of the semester, Bridget claimed she did not previously look up

words or break words into parts to determine the meaning even though she knew she was

often challenged by unknown vocabulary words. However, by the end of the term,

Bridget indicated that while she had been accustomed to people telling her the meaning

of the words in previous reading experiences, she had begun to take personal

responsibility for approaching unknown vocabulary words by using context clues and by

examining word parts. I observed that she was also using the SQ3R strategy, one which

specifies that students locate and define bold or italicized words in the preview phase,

prior to reading the text. This was confirmed during our midterm conference (see

Appendix H). Some of the responses to questions during her conference indicate these
changes in her reading approaches as well as her thinking about thinking:

> Mrs. Vice: Thinking back to before you started this class, how did you feel about
>
> yourself as a reader?
>
> Bridget: I felt like it was going to be kind of hard because it's not the kind of
>
> reading I'm use to.
>
> Mrs. Vice: What kind of reading are you use to?
>
> Bridget: Like people kind of helping me with the meaning of the words.
>
> Mrs. Vice: What do you do now when you see a word you've never heard of?
>
> Bridget: I just try to figure it out, pretty much; I just look at all the words around
>
> it or break apart the word meanings. It's getting better.
>
> Mrs. Vice: What do you think you are doing now, that has made you a better
>
> reader?
>
> Bridget: I'm using the SQ3R. It helps me think about what I need to do and what
>
> I'm doing (Individual Conference, Bridget, 1-15, p. 1).

Moreover, Bridget tied her SQ3R strategy use and metacognition to her improved
comprehension.

> Mrs. Vice: How do you think that thinking about what your doing can help you?
>
> Bridget: Um, like helping me understand what I read, find the main ideas. It will
>
> help me find the main ideas and the important information. I don't have to read
>
> for my other classes.
>
> Mrs. Vice: Do you think you will continue using the SQ3R strategy?
>
> Bridget: YES! [With excitement] Ha…!

After practicing strategies for reading in the classroom, Bridget indicated that she

enjoyed experimenting with the strategies and practicing them on her own.

> Mrs. Vice: Is there anything specific that you would like to see us do in class?
>
> Bridget: Just what we are already doing pretty much. I know that long word that
>
> you taught us, I tried learning like that. I liked that.
>
> Mrs. Vice: Yeah, that word Pneumonoultramicroscopicsilicovolcanokoniosis?
>
> Are you breaking words into their Latin and Greek word parts to help you with
>
> the meaning?
>
> Bridget: Yeah, I'm trying that. It's getting better.

Although her conference remarks reveal that Bridget is utilizing the SQ3R strategy her

final comments in the discussion and in one document disclose her need to learn more

about how to develop questions for monitoring her reading (SD 38).

> **Joslyn's strategy development**. When asked to share her thinking and reflect on

her reading habits prior to taking the course, and at the end of the course, Joslyn indicated

she thinks about her purpose for reading. She noted this was different for her:

> I have a purpose in mind when I read. What I was younger I just read because I
>
> had to do it, I didn't really have a purpose. I just read, because I had to (SD38,
>
> Joslyn, 1-3, p. 1).

Joslyn's thinking about reading with a purpose is something that had been emerging.

Earlier when given an article in class to read and share her thinking in writing, she

expressed: "I'm thinking about the topic of the story, *History of a Dream,* the things I

will read about it. It's the whole concept of trying to build a better country like Martin

Luther King [sic]" (SD19, Joslyn, 6-9, p.1). In this instance, she was activating her prior knowledge and her thoughts about reading, readying her mind.

She continually referred to setting a purpose for reading as a newly emerged process in her thinking: "Now, I read the summary to get an understanding of what a passage will be about" (SD23, Joslyn, 1-4 p. 1). She also associated this type of thinking with the actions that she began to feel were necessary to gain comprehension. Joslyn stated: "I think about what the topic is about and write characteristics of the topic, and as I read, I try to find things that can enhance or prove the topic" (SD36, Joslyn, 12-14, p.1). Here, Joslyn was thinking about the relationship between sentences to determine if they were intended to be supporting details and using that information to help her determine main ideas. In addition to thinking about getting her mind ready for reading, Joslyn indicated she had developed habits that would help her to focus her thinking. When asked earlier in the term what she thought would help her become a better reader, Joslyn responded: "I can put down words in my own meaning and that would help me understand more about the passage and become a better reader" (SD22, Joslyn, 10-14, p. 3). She not only referenced paraphrasing, but also note-taking as a way to increase her understanding.

Later, Joslyn shared her thinking about her progress: "I think I have improved the way I read. Now I'm taking notes and understanding more about reading" (SD38, Joslyn, 9-12, p.1). For Joslyn, note-taking and paraphrasing helped her stay engaged in the reading process. She stated "I never use to take notes, but not I'm doing it on my own because Miss Vice has taught me, and it made my learning easier and more exciting" (SD38, Joslyn, 5-8, p.1). I confirmed this during an observation. When reading a piece

on memory in class I noticed that Joslyn was taking extensive notes and effectively summarizing the main points of the reading.

At the end of the term when students were reading the novel, *The Glass Castle* by Jeanette Walls, they were required to write summaries of their reading. I noted something particularly unique about Joslyn's summaries. They not only effectively captured the novel, but they also began to reference concepts about reading that had been previously taught in class, such as patterns of organization, fact and opinion, or tone. For Joslyn, I felt this meant she found value in my lessons. I confirmed this by asking her to share what she thought she had learned about reading that was valuable to her. Joslyn reported:

> Well I think this is important- I have learned about the difference between facts
>
> and opinion and what are a purpose, tone, and bias. Mrs. Vice told us that a fact
>
> is something that can be proven for everyone […]. The boy's name is Roy.
>
> That's a fact because it is true and we can prove it. She also told us that opinions
>
> are tied to personal beliefs and values, something we think or feel but cannot
>
> prove it. For example, 'I think the president is a kind man' is an opinion. You
>
> don't know if the president is kind to everyone, you just think so. I think I also
>
> learned more about the different types of writing. Informative writing that
>
> appears in news papers or research articles and so on. I also learned about
>
> persuasive writing, when the writer is telling you to do something or feel
>
> something. And, I learned about the patterns of organization (SD40, 15-34, p.1-2).

Here, Joslyn had insights about reading that she would not have had if she had not been told. Direct instruction helped Joslyn to connect the strategies of reading (how to do) and

the content of reading (what is a pattern, opinion, purpose etc.). She wrote summaries

and thoughts about the reading topic but also about the writer's intention and

organizational structure. By doing so, she had a better understanding of the text.

For instance, when summarizing the novel, Joslyn recognized the descriptive

pattern of organization, a pattern used by writers to help readers evoke a visualization of

the narrative.   Joslyn not only relied on this pattern, but recognized it as such and was

able to communicate the relevance and importance of that organizational pattern in

helping her to understand the text. Joslyn wrote about the descriptive pattern of

organization used by the writer: "Jeanette walls started off by using a description of her

mother" (SD41, Joslyn, 1, p.1). After noting the pattern of organization, Joslyn

references the section in the novel where the description appears by quoting the author's

physical description of the scene and the main characters mother. Joslyn then interprets

the importance of the description to the novel:

> When Jeannette saw her mom in this state she was comparing her to herself. She
>
> was not only embarrassed by her mother but of herself, knowing she was living an
>
> almost perfect life while her mother was homeless and eating out of the dumpster
>
> (SD41, Joslyn, 1-12, p. 1).

This descriptive pattern helped Joslyn to return to a reading strategy which she had

enjoyed as a child, but had lost because readings no longer presented the type of visual

stimulation she had once enjoyed. However, at the end of the term, she once again re-

relied on her imagination: "Just image a little baby of the age of three cooking hot dogs

by herself with the dog watching" (SD 41, Joslyn, 5-9, p.1). Joslyn uses details from the

story to support her visualized understandings: "She caught fire and almost burned to

death. In my imagination, the mother was careless, not providing motherly support for her baby girl. The mother was outside painting" (SD41, Joslyn, 10-14, p. 2). As the semester came to an end, Joslyn had embraced note taking, summarizing, and had returned to visualization. Despite these gains, Joslyn indicated she thought she still needed to add to her repertoire of vocabulary words due to the limitations of her English dialect. Joslyn referred back to pronunciation, her old fixation of thought: "I still need to think about how I can adjust to this English form, because in my country our English is more broken so sometimes it's hard to formulate the words or ideas properly" (SD38, Joslyn, 13-16, p. 1).

Kyle's strategy development. When asked what reading strategies he utilized, Kyle indicated he would draw diagrams of the steps or stages, refer to illustrations of a text, read very slowly word for word, visualize, read the summary first, look up unfamiliar words, discuss the text with a friend or instructor, imagine situations, and paraphrase or translate the author's words into his own. Although Kyle admitted to using more than half of the strategies for reading discussed in the questionnaire, he relied heavily on those that required him to visualize. He noted that he did not re-read the passage, read aloud, re-read the introduction, ask questions of the text as he read, look for patterns of organization, or break sentences into parts (SD3, Kyle, 1-15, p.1). During the middle of the term, students were asked to begin reflecting on their past experiences of reading both inside and outside of the classroom. When asked to "think back about your experiences in reading as a child and describe some problem you faced for your classes or at home," Kyle explained that his need to be actively engaged in some kinesthetic way was in disagreement with what he had experienced as a reader. He claimed: "I like

playing with models, but I don't like to read about construction. I prefer to discover myself" (SD29, Kyle, 5-6, p.1). Kyle also indicated that his learning style was often at odds with the teacher's methodology. He explained that "I don't like to read a book full of new words. That is why I haven't finished any of the *Harry Potter* books. I hate when the teacher tells me to recite after reading [to verbally explain] because I don't like to read under pressure" (SD29, Kyle, 1-4, p.1). When asked what he could do to react to his reading situations, Kyle noted the importance of reading with an open mind. He explained: "I may need to try and think or understand those different ideas. Maybe they are not wrong or maybe it will widen my thoughts" (SD26, Kyle, 5-6, p.1). Here, Kyle notes that he thinks about thinking so that he can expand on his knowledge or clarify his understandings.

After taking an exam, Kyle was asked to think about his test taking strategies, successes, or limitations in reading. When asked what he was thinking when he read through the test questions he noted that "I was thinking. Some of them [test questions] did show up on Aplia [a technological set of course activities/companion to the textbook] and I knew the big picture so I just went with the logic of the textbook when I was reading the questions" (SD18, Kyle, 7-8, p.1). He also noted that "I think I still don't have enough patience to read, so I wish I could be calm when I read because I was pretty nervous" (SD18, Kyle, 12, p.1).

When asked to think about reading strategies before taking the course in comparison to the end of the course Kyle claimed that before "I used pictures to help me understand the context because I can arrange the details as a scene which I can really see from my mind" (SD38, Kyle, 1-3, p.1). While he continued to use visualization

strategies and images to assist him, Kyle also noted that "because I seldom took notes before, since I learned these strategies, I found they really helped with my study. I try to use the strategies in my real study processes as much as I can" (SD38, Kyle, 4-8, p.1). When asked what he still needed to think about and learn to be a good reader at the end of the term he responded, "Vocabulary [words]! A lot of them!" (SD38, Kyle, 9, p.1). He added: "My goal is that I can read the textbooks and understand them as deeply and quickly as American students" (SD38, Kyle, 1-2, p.2). During his voluntary interview, Caleb shared that he was using social learning opportunities to help him discuss readings. He had identified his social learning preference during the self-discovery activities. He noted the only challenge was that his peers were not as motivated about being students and reading as he was and they would sometimes be discouraged by his need to converse about what he had read for fun (IN, Kyle, 16-19. p. 1). Furthermore, he added that he had been trying to think about his thinking by tracing his thoughts from one to another. He found that it was a challenge because he felt his mind moved from idea to idea quickly. He made a sound effect and rolled his head around to help him communicate the challenge. He added: "I never thought my mind worked like this, until I paid attention to my thinking" (IN, Kyle, 23-27, p. 1). He was trying to share with me the speed of the processes he was undergoing as he translated information from English to Chinese and back again to gain meaning.

Caleb's strategy development. When the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002) was distributed, Caleb indicated that of the 30 reading strategies mentioned, he regularly used nine of them before taking the course. At the beginning of the term, Caleb reported that he re-read passages two to three

times, drew diagrams of steps and stages, referred to illustrations, read slowly word for word, skipped to the last page to read the summary or key points, imagined situations described, paraphrased, looked for cause and effect or other patterns, and broke sentences into parts (SD3, Caleb, 1-15, p. 1). The strategies he used were highly visual. Additionally, he reported that he did not read aloud, re-read the introduction prior to reading, look up unfamiliar words, ask questions about the text such as "what is the main point or idea?," and he did not discuss the text with a friend or instructor (SD3, Caleb, 1-10, p. 1). The strategies he reportedly did not use would have provided him with valuable auditory and social learning experiences and were effective learning strategies for second language learners.

However, at the end of the course, Caleb indicated that he had changed his reading habits and usually employed nine strategies and always employed twenty one strategies, meaning his strategy use had increased dramatically. Over the course of the term he had made mention of using "survey [processes to] look for the main idea, look for vocabulary, the italicized words, make a summary of my reading, and review this [summary]" (SD23, Caleb, 7-10, p.1). He also made mention of using strategies for improving his concentrating such as "tak[ing] a visual representation of thinking about the reading" and "look[ing] for main points and important characteristics, and tak[ing] the time to read" (SD23, Caleb, 11-14, p. 1). He also shared that when reading for his physiology class he struggled with reading three chapters because he had not managed his time for reading well due to his work schedule. He shared:

> The most recent reading experience was in my physiology class. I was reading
> three chapters to take notes, test, and do my homework. That was bad, long, and I

got distracted. I needed to read the same page two times to know what the main

idea was. I was tired of reading, and with thinking about reading. All that made

me feel lazy!" (SD26, Caleb, 1-6, p. 1).

In Caleb's final portfolio he continued to reflect on his reading approaches for his other

classes and to discuss the ways he thought about thinking and implemented thinking

strategies to help him pay attention as he learned. Caleb claimed that he selected a

section from his science textbook on the topic of Natural Selection. He chose to read the

piece because it was required for another one of his classes, but he chose to reflect on the

piece because there were many of the textbook elements in the book that he could

practice using.

When I was not paying attention I was looking around and I was watching the

pictures of the page. My reading situation was a little bad. But, I get easily the

main idea and recognize that it was hard for me to pay attention which is why I

chose this page. I had [trouble with paying attention] because I'm a visual

think[er] (SD50, Caleb, 1-8, p. 1).

He did note that at one time, the extra support materials included in the text caused him to

be distracted from the words on the page, but he was able to gain meaning by examining

the pictures. Caleb also discussed his use of metacognition to complete reading tasks for

his other classes in a way that would help him assure he had comprehension. He had

selected to read the first chapter of his strategies success textbook from his college

success courses. He noted the similarity between the text and some of the things we had

discussed in our own reading class. The similarities helped him to stay focused. He

noted:

It was like a review of me to know what I need to do to be a better student and to

be successful in my areas of study. When I finished the reading I was thinking

and what I want to do to make this [a college degree] possible and [to] make the

steps and information work. The strategy that I used was to think about my

thinking to be more accurate in what I know and what I should be learning.

At the end of the term, Caleb reflected on his overall growth in reading skills and

strategies. He explained:

My strategies improved because before I was reading or in classes, I needed to

use reading, but I was in the blank. But, now I understand I am more active,

doing a great work [sic] because of these strategies [like] annotation. All that I

am learning is great, now I can read for a test easy or homework, study, and try to

find the main idea, or know the meaning of the words that give me ideas. I think

these strategies are going good now. I'm strong in making words and phrases, in

understanding concepts and remembering reading. I'm doing things to

understand more about the reading, underlining, interpreting, and going back to

read. Instead of ignoring text reading, [I'm] using context clues. [It] is good to

know how much I am learning in this class! (SD33, Caleb, 1-16, p. 1).

Gregory's strategy development. Students' expressed thoughts also led me to

question how I could best help students who were continually unsuccessful. Gregory was

unlike my other students. He participated in class, and he made basic contributions.

However, he failed to complete assignments that would help me to determine if he could

read or not. Assisting Gregory was challenging because in our conversations together he

would talk about all of the books he loved to read or was currently reading; However, he

would also jump from topic to topic, often relating a thought about reading to something

he ate, or a computer part which made me question his comprehension abilities. For

instance, when talking about poverty he once said: "I've been thinking about this fake

system component, you have to install a virtual box" (C, Gregory, 0.09, p. 1) for which I

could offer no logical response. More importantly, neither could he. About school

reading he often said that he was "excited to read" if the topic was on computers, but

otherwise he didn't read for school (C, Gregory, 0.13, p. 1). "There's times when I take

notes, when I don't I don't. I don't like re-reading" (C, Gregory, 0.21, p. 1). Gregory had

experienced an increase of two grade levels on his Nelson Denny score each semester

with me. During this term he reached the 9th grade reading level. However, I could not

attribute his growth to my instruction because of the familiarity he had with the course

content. What I do know is that the quality of his responses had improved drastically

during this term when I explicitly instructed the class on metacognition. Still, he was not

succeeding as a reader in college. I want to how to more effectively help students like

Gregory, who lack motivation. Gregory's responses helped me to confirm that self-

discovery places are a good place to begin.

Informing Instruction

Students' expressed thoughts helped me to determine what students know and

need to know. Additionally, their thoughts helped me to plan for activities that would

better help them record and track their thinking. I used the questions I developed from

my observations to prompt students to write in their journals, and I asked students to

reflect on their writings at the end of the term to promote more thinking about thinking. I

also taught students explicitly what metacognition was and gave them the opportunity to

practice and experience how thinking about reading strategies could help them. What resulted were more developed thoughts about being in reading, needing to learn in reading, and using strategies for reading. When I asked students to think about how metacognition had helped them some of their final shared thoughts continued to inform me. Marvin explained:

> Metacognition has helped me most. I never thought about thinking before when I read. But, I realized I already do this in my martial arts classes. I practice. I think about the boxer's purpose, I anticipate my opponent's moves, I make a plan, think about thinking! Now, I can do that for reading too. I think about a purpose when I am reading. It helps me to stay focused and feel like I am accomplishing something" (IN, Marvin, 1.04, p. 2).

Joslyn also indicated that thinking helped her to stay focused and active during reading:

> I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading. Instead of moving on to the next paragraph I can make sure I understand before moving forward to see if I need to re-read the information. I preview the chapters, titles, headings, subheadings, and read the introduction and end summary. During the reading I circle and underline and take notes. It helps me stay focused and actively involved in the reading assignment. It has helped me because I don't have to study as long before a test because I have done more frequent reviews throughout" (IN, Joslyn, 0.21, p. 1).

Prior to intentionally teaching students about metacognition, I wondered if students would know how to apply their strategies outside of the context of the course because I did not feel a grade in the course could accurately reflect what students would be able to

do in the future. Students' thoughts have helped me to confirm that they are recognizing the value of these strategies. Hopefully, they will be impacted by their experiences in reading in a way that will transfer over into other college course settings. Bridget explained: "Now [after] taking this class, I use writing notes when I am reading. It keeps me doing something, and I am not just looking at a book with words. I use it in my classes" (IN, Bridget, 0. 19, p. 1).

Moreover, students' expressed thoughts provided me with insights in order to meet their challenges with strategic practice. I had observed that students all thought "the woman killed her husband," was the main point when annotating a practice text. I knew students would respond this way, but I needed to investigate the cause. Only in providing students the practice to engage with the strategies, and by closely examining their responses was I able to determine that they were narrowing in on more specific supporting details in the text rather than on the main ideas: Now I know and students know that this can be challenging: "Sometimes, I still get confused about finding the main idea, the topic sentence because general and specific is hard for me" (Joslyn, IN, 0.24, p. 1). I had to evaluate my practice and think about how to relay this information to students in order to help them improve their comprehension. This of course, is something I am still working on.

Summary

Many students do not believe they will need help with college reading. Those that do believe they need help can only vaguely express what kind of help they might need. Students need help recognizing and expressing their reading needs so that they can begin to learn about and utilize reading strategies for success. Self-discovery practices can help

students to develop a more accurate awareness of themselves so they may begin to connect their learning needs to those strategies that are most useful. Additionally, students cannot find value in strategies if they are left to apply them without any guidance. Practice and experiences can help students build up confidence in the application of strategies so that students' will be more inclined to consider their use.

The students' expressions of metacognition informs the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course because student's thoughts help teachers to identify the ways which students are mis-informed and the ways which they might become resistant to learning as well as what their learning needs may be. With this information, instructors can begin to develop instructional goals and plans. Implementing direct instruction of metacognition provides opportunities for teachers to observe more of students thinking so that they may identify ways to help students return to, revise, or clarify their thoughts about reading.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Only fifty-two percent of all high school students taking entrance exams were college ready in reading (ACT, 2012). For students who do not have the required reading skills to succeed, remediation is offered by means of developmental education, a field within higher education consisting of programs and services to address preparedness, course placement, and strategy development (National Association for Developmental Education/NADE, 2011). The field encompasses "tutoring, mentoring, and supplemental instruction, personal, academic, and career counseling, academic advisement, and coursework" (p. 1) that should promote "cognitive and affective growth" (p. 1). Developing the necessary skills and attitudes for success that enhance students' educational opportunities and retention rates is crucial.

Because the efforts of remediating students in specific skill sets (vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) are believed to be ineffective independently, developmental education intensifies efforts by pairing support services with skill intervention. Trends that hold promise for benefiting the students who are not proficient in developmental reading emerged from research (Gee, 2008; Bean, Birdyshaw, Moore & Rycik, 1999; Rassool, 1999; Weiner, 2002). These include noting the importance of multiple literacies, technology implementation, and content area reading instruction. Researchers emphasized the importance of integrating social, emotional, cultural and ideological contexts in the classroom (Chiu-hui and Cody, 2010) for the purpose of deconstructing negative feelings (Lesley, 2001) and for reconstructing literacy identities (Gee, 2001; Lesley, 2004) for those students with a history of developmental experiences. More

importantly, researchers examined metacognition, a component of thinking necessary for improving the abilities and behaviors needed for reading (Conley, 2007). Metacognitive behaviors related to self-management, time management, strategic study skills, persistence and an awareness of one's true performance are essential for the development reading student (Conley 2007). Self-management behaviors require students to monitor, regulate, evaluate, and direct their thinking (Ritchhart, 2002).

The community college accepts responsibility for accessing, placing, tutoring, and supporting developmental education students in programs which often consist of course-work designed to address student deficiencies (Bailey, 2009). However, the exact components of remedial courses may vary according to institutional requirements and the approaches of the remedial reading instructors who accept the challenge of readying those students who lack the necessary skills. Notably, when students fail to complete developmental education courses, or sequences of courses, the cost for students, colleges, and the public can be high (Bailey, 2009) which has forced colleges to examine program effectiveness, instructional practice, and the diverse learning needs of students (Bailey, 2009; Kever, 2010). Reading educators should challenge these criticisms through study and exploration into the field (Boylan, 1999) and into the beliefs and understandings that drive instructional practices (Richardson, 1996).

The challenge for educators in developmental college reading is to engage and motivate students with educational methods that create an awareness and understanding of reading. By using strategies and practices appropriate for students' diverse educational needs, teachers can help developmental readers achieve. What may influence an instructor's ability to deliver appropriate instruction begins not only with the

instructor's perceived understanding of student needs, capabilities, and behaviors in reading, but also builds upon the students' own perceived understandings about these factors. The fact that students need to have an awareness of their own performance in order to have more precise/accurate understandings further illustrates a strong correlation between reading and metacognitive skills, and reading and metacognitive behaviors. The problem is that college students enrolled in a developmental reading program may not perceive themselves as remedial readers, have low self-esteem about their abilities, or have a limited understanding of reading behaviors; therefore, they may lack the motivation to engage themselves in effective reading strategies and consequently fail to improve their reading skills.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to describe what was revealed by students about their metacognition in order to gain insight and give instructional recommendations for helping students become reflective thinkers that better achieve the task of college reading. The following research questions framed the study: What do students reveal about their metacognition in the context of a community college developmental reading course? How does understanding the students' reading metacognition inform the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course?

In the subsequent sections, the findings will be discussed in terms of the following: Students think they know, but they don't, a more extensive definition of reading, "smart" reading and "wow" moments, helping students find and own what works, and self-discovery as the starting point for metacognition. I conclude the chapter with implications and recommendations.

Students Think They Know, But They Don't

In regards to thinking and knowing, I observed a disconnect between what students think they know and what they actually know about their own abilities and behaviors in reading. To be successful readers, students need a true awareness, one gained through thinking about thinking, or metacognition which includes thinking about the knowledge and behaviors necessary for reading achievement. There are two main constituents of metacognition: one's knowledge about cognition and one's self-monitoring of cognition (Flavell, 1979; Paris & Winograd, 1990). Flavell (1979) specifically categorized three types of knowledge about cognition. Those types include knowledge about one's beliefs or "person," knowledge about "tasks," and the "strategy" knowledge relevant to the use and application of processes.

At the beginning of the term, student's self-reporting of their thinking indicated students who did not have experiences with reading assistance, believed they did not need help with college reading. Each student who reported that they had no past instances of receiving help with reading also thought that they would not need assistance with college reading. Ten of the 21 students enrolled believed that they did not need help with college reading and this was linked to the fact that they had no past experiences as recipients of reading assistance. A closer examination of key participants revealed more about this phenomenon. Marvin thought he did not need the course, but was unable to express why he thought so even when verbally prompted to reflect back on his thinking. Schraw, Crippen, & Harley's (2006) work on metacognition offers the explanation that cognitive knowledge develops in the late ages of childhood, yet some adults are still unable to articulate their knowledge, or explain what they know about their thinking. When

explaining their thinking, other students offer explanations that are illogical. This was

the case for Joslyn, who reported that she did not need the course because she could

"pronounce" words, contrary to the claim that she spoke "broken English." Despite their

claims, those students who thought they would not need help with reading lacked the

skills and abilities necessary for college reading success as indicated by their placement

in the course. From an observation standpoint, these students had inaccurate thoughts

about their placement in the course, and thereby of their skills and abilities in reading

which would make them prone to reject the learning experiences provided in a

developmental reading course. Therefore, an instructional plan that could help them to

develop a true awareness of themselves in order to accept their status, as well as develop

an accurate awareness of the needs and abilities in reading was developed.

On the other hand, those students who did believe they needed help with college

reading also expressed their thoughts about their limited fluency and vocabulary skills.

These thoughts stemmed from their previous experiences as recipients of assistance in

skills based programs or with skills based tutorial services. For example, Bridget noted

of college reading: "I felt like it was going to be kind of hard because it's not the kind of

reading I'm use to." Her thoughts about college reading were impacted by her past

experiences of people "helping me with the meaning of the words." Bridget had years of

experiences in reading with programs and people who assisted her. However, that

assistance focused only on skills based instruction, primarily of vocabulary skills. What

reading teachers need to know is that the type of help described by Bridget has been

proven ineffective when provided independent of the other important factors of reading.

Kuhn and Stahl (2003) indicate the importance of increasing skills, but they also note that

improvement in students' reading cannot be attributed only to a skill set. Similarly, Ivey

and Baker (2004) maintained that isolated skill instruction proves limited in affecting

student readers' abilities and behaviors. Therefore, those students who fixate on

increasing a specific skill set or ability close themselves off to the other processes

relevant to reading achievement.

Students' thoughts about their reading experiences as a child, in high school, and

during the term of study revealed that they continued to fixate their thoughts on one

aspect of reading.   Bridget fixated her thoughts on vocabulary, Joslyn on pronunciation,

Kyle on American culture, Caleb on time management, and Marvin on family support

and motivation. Students' thought fixations were not necessarily negative. However,

their thoughts needed to evolve in order to focus on the other important aspects of

reading if they wanted to experience growth in their understandings. While they could at

a very basic level express what they thought they needed to know about reading, their

articulations were limited in scope and did not include many of the other factors that are

required of good readers.

A More Extensive Definition of Reading

Early in the term, Joslyn shared her thought about participating in developmental

reading by explaining, "I can pronounce words." Joslyn can read! But, reading is not

enough. Students need to be informed of the greater definition of reading, which includes

not only the skills, but considers the cognitive and affective domains including those that

stem from the students personal, social, cultural and emotional experiences of reading.

Their completion of a high school degree indicates they have at least basic reading

abilities, that is, if verbally pronouncing words on a page constitutes reading. Students

know that reading includes the act of pronouncing words on a page, but they don't know what else reading entails.

Students need intervention methods that combine the skill building and strategy practice with higher order thinking strategies that students need for comprehension. Providing students the experience of thinking about their reading is essential. The value of thinking derives from reflection and critical thoughts about a specific event (Dewey, 1916) of learning derived from one's experiences (Eldridge, 1998). Furthermore, thinking is the way by which knowing occurs (Parodi, 1939). Therefore, in order to get students to know reading, they must have opportunities and experiences that prompt them to think of reading. To help students recognize what they don't know, they need to be confronted with tasks that require them to think about what they know. Specifically, they need to be asked 'what' they know, 'why' they know it, and most importantly 'how' they can apply their knowledge. Questions can be developed and provided to students at the beginning of class. Often I called them quizzes or metacognitive warm ups. Students need opportunities and practice of monitoring their thoughts in order to revise or clarify their knowledge when reading. When students revisit their responses at the end of the class period, or even at the end of the semester they revise or clarify their thinking of reading. This was the case for Marvin who at the end of the term admitted that he thought he knew reading, but he didn't really know:

> Prior to this class, I thought reading was just as simple as it sounds; Read the
> words on the page and hope that you understand it. I felt like reading was
> something I did just to get what I needed to know about a particular subject

matter. Understanding what helps me read better will help me ensure that I am

successful in the future (SD50, Marvin, 41, p. 1).

Without thinking and reflection, developmental readers in college do not distinguish

between the basic acts of reading, and what it actually means to be a good reader.

"Smart" Reading and "WOW" Moments

Baker and Brown (1984) contend that good readers know reading strategies and

can determine when and where those strategies should be applied; this is their

metacognitive knowledge about reading. Pressley and Afflerbach (1995) catalogued the

strategies and responses that good readers reported and applied during the three stages of

reading. He outlined the cognitive strategies exhibited by effective readers: activating,

inferring, monitoring/clarifying, questioning, searching/selecting, summarizing, and

visualizing/ organizing. These cognitive processes are essential for constructing meaning

and creating knowledge in long term memory systems. Unfortunately, struggling readers

do not know what strategies 'good readers' use (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000; Tovani, 2000),

and when given strategies in intervention settings the skills that are learned do not always

transfer into the general classroom. Students need explicit instruction followed by

modeling, guided practice, and independent practice that integrates reader-text

transactions to help them to learn the strategies of good readers. Furthermore, they need

to be encouraged to practice these skills outside of the classroom and provide an

accounting of such to help them practice the transfer of strategies into their other reading

contexts. Practice opportunities of the strategies for reading help students to develop task

automaticity which increases the likelihood of students' strategy use.

Students initial thoughts about what they needed as readers failed to consider the strategies necessary for monitoring of their "cognitive experiences" (Flavell, 1979). This means, students' thoughts did not specifically refer to those strategies which could be used to regulate their learning. In fact, students used less than half of the strategies that were available to them. For instance Bridget indicated that she exercised reading aloud, reading very slowly word for word, visualizing while reading, discussing text with others, and imagining situations. However, she did not re-read the same passage intentionally, draw diagrams, refer to illustrations, re-read the introduction, read the summary, look up unfamiliar words, ask questions, paraphrase, look for patterns, or break individual sentences into parts. Ironically, many of the strategies she did not use, such as looking up unfamiliar words, were those most likely to help her with her main concern, vocabulary. Bridget reported that she had not previously used many strategies for reading "*because the teacher never went over them in high school,*" an indicator that Bridget thought she had never encountered a teachers' direct instruction of these strategies.

Central to cognitive regulation (the regulation of one's thoughts) is planning through the identification and selection of appropriate strategies or resources (Paris & Winograd, 1990). In regard to the instructional approaches to teaching metacognition, researchers have documented the importance of providing explicit or direct instruction on the required cognitive knowledge and cognitive regulation. Cross and Paris (1988) urge the instruction of direct approaches for declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge. Similarly, Schraw (1988) recommends explicit instruction of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, specifically that which helps students to identify the benefits of using strategies as well as how, when, and why they can be used.

Pressley and Gaskins' (2006) recommend that in order to improve reading comprehension, explicit teaching of the "strategies is followed by years of practice applying the strategies to a wide variety of texts for a wide variety of purposes" (p. 107). This is the same sentiment sounded by students like Caleb: "I think I need more practice." This was confirmed: Students need direct instruction as well as practice opportunities of those strategies that can help them be successful in college reading, including those that help them with metacognition.

Key to Pressley and Gaskins' (2006) conversation on the theory of 'metacognition learning' is their discussion of what a reader does as they monitor their own reading, as monitoring is an action of metacognition, itself. Good readers recognize when they have trouble with reading, and when they need to adjust their speed, slow down, or gather background information to help them with reading. When outlining the after reading process, Pressley and Gaskins noted the importance of self questioning as well as a "very systematic review and notating and reflective juggling of the ideas" which is necessary for students to organize and interpret what they have read (p. 101). Their expanded version of what good readers 'do' became synonymous with what they deem to be "metacognitive competent reading" (p. 101). Additionally, good readers look for the important components of reading such by attempting to identify topic paragraphs, main ideas and important vocabulary words. These strategies of a good reader resemble those required for the execution of the SQ3R strategy.

After practice with the SQ3R strategy, Bridget had her "WOW" moment, the moment when she realized she was a "smart reader." Bridget noted that thinking about

her thinking impacted her knowledge and understanding about being a reader. When

asked how her knowledge of what to do as a reader had improved, Bridget explained:

> Before I never knew how to be a smart reader. During this class, I was thinking
>
> about it and I was thinking, WOW! I could really use this [the strategies taught in
>
> class]. I think I will get a better understanding about what I am reading.

Although Bridget's initial reading focus was limited to her thoughts about vocabulary and

motivation, she began to develop a more holistic approach toward reading by thinking

about what to do during all three reading stages of reading. The in-class practice helped

Bridget to change her own processes as a reader by implementing the processes of a good

reader. When documenting her change in reading, Bridget references her high school

reading processes for comparison. She discussed these differences: "I have a purpose in

mind when I am reading because in high school I never had a purpose in mind when I

read, the teacher would just say read these and we would have a test over it, sometimes."

She added: "I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it [my reading] has

improved because in high school we never really went over the book. We just read over

them until we were done with the book." Rather than focusing on her need to increase

vocabulary, Bridget indicated that she began thinking about strategies such as note

taking, and questioning during reading. These strategies were directly related to her new

goal for reading: "My goal for reading in class is paying attention to what I am reading,

taking notes while I read and ask[ing] questions while I am reading so I can get a better

understanding about what I am reading." More importantly, when students build

confidence they are more likely to try implement strategic reading procedures. Bridget

indicated she was "reading at home out loud to myself and answering questions about the book."

Good readers react to text by generating images and by making predictions which enable them to respond to the reading with their own ideas, inferences, and reactions (Rosenblatt, 1978). Good readers' responses strongly relate to their own experiences as well as their prior knowledge (Anderson and Pearson, 1984). During a practice session of the annotating strategy, Joslyn was also able to transact with the text in a way that allowed her to inference, or make predictions, generate images, and revise and clarify her responses. Joslyn's "WOW" moment when practicing the annotating strategy was one of those events when a student notably gained confidence because of the application of learning strategies. When reflecting on her thinking, Joslyn wrote:

> Before you, Miss Vice, taught me how to annotate I just read the passage two or three times. I would just read it again, so it took up a lot of time because I would have ways have to read and even at the end of the day, I still wouldn't understand the passage.

Joslyn recounted her process and understandings that resulted from the annotation process:

> After looking through the passage and underlining and underlining and finding vocabulary words I found that it was much easier to understand and because I took notes, I understood the passage more and could easily write a summary about it.

After the annotation practice Joslyn expressed her enthusiasm and gained confidence:

I was thinking, Wow! I'm understanding how to take notes. I felt good about

myself and knowing that for the first [time] in my life I was understanding a

difficult passage.

More frequently, Joslyn's responses to questions about her thinking began to reveal her

increasing confidence in her reading skills. After annotating in class she attempted to try

the strategy at home and expressed success. She commented, "I felt great about myself

and I just wanted to read a passage and try to annotate to see if I would do a good job,

and I did" (SD16, Joslyn, 1-4, p. 2). Students who have success in class, like Joslyn, with

these reading strategies are more likely to apply them in other contexts. Joslyn's and

Bridget's "WOW" moments mark the moment when they had a change in their thinking

about the usefulness of the reading strategies applied; at those moments, the women

recognized that they too could be good readers. Developmental students who successfully

implement the strategies of good readers experience not only a gain in their reading

abilities, but also in their confidence. Moreover, when reflecting on their thinking about

the use of reading strategies outside of the context of the developmental reading course,

for personal reading or for other classes, students shared that they took up the

responsibility for learning and practiced the skills outside of the class.

"My Strategy": Helping Students Find and Own What Works

Students need direct transactional instruction that allows for strategy practice such

as implementing metacognitive handouts whereby students were prompted to examine

their thinking about thinking before, during, and after their reading. Similar activities

promoting students thinking across the duration of the semester were beneficial. The

purpose of the final reflective portfolio was to ask students to reflect on what they had

learned and experienced as readers and to practice applying and reflecting on those strategies that can help them achieve.

Kuhn and Stahl (2003) argue that when implementing the instruction of metacognitive strategies, those strategies which help students to think about thinking, the focus should be on the students' awareness of their thinking, rather than on their performance of certain tasks. The portfolio process helped students to reflect on their thinking about their thinking during which students revealed a sense of ownership for the strategies they had employed. This was the case for Marvin, who reported that he'd found his perfect reading strategy, one he was not even aware that he was looking for. After reflecting on his increased Nelson Denny examination scores, Marvin attributed all of his success to his newly found strategy: "I found my strategy! My strategy is whisper reading." Reading became personal for Marvin. Students need to make these personal connections to reading and the strategies of reading in order to begin employing those processes that work in contexts outside of the developmental reading course. More importantly, teachers need to help them find these strategies by providing them the opportunities to try them out, reflect on their benefits, and even modify them. Marvin helped me to confirm this when he noted that he had found his strategy because of an activity I had done in class as a warm up. Originally, the activity was intended to provide students with a fun, open, non-confrontational oral reading experience. I asked them to read sentences several different ways, by whispering, choral reading, group reading, and by imitating the teacher. I gave them permission to read out-loud, when so many of the students had been advised against doing so, or had been jaded by their read aloud experiences in earlier years. And while researchers who advise that students need to read

silently might have cringed, I advocated for students to try everything and consider that they must do whatever it takes to be successful in reading, even if that meant they needed to read their chapters out-loud at home alone. No longer was there a concern for the performance of the task of reading, rather, I asked them to focus on their awareness of what they thought worked or didn't work for them. For Marvin, who had been told not to read aloud as a child, this worked. He aligned the fun practice activity with that of his needs as an auditory learner and decided to try it at home.

His reflections in his final portfolio share his thoughts about applying the strategy to read personal selections on his favorite subjects, baseball and cars. This is when he discovered that whisper reading was his strategy: "Towards the end, I found a new technique [whisper reading] and I think if I would have done it earlier it [reading abilities] would have been higher." At the end of the term, I asked students if there is anything else they would like to talk about, or if they have any final thoughts. Marvin's advice to me: "Teach reading out-loud right away. Do it early so that we know it's okay." The translation is that students need direct instruction and practice for as many strategies as possible because they are looking for ways to help themselves succeed. More importantly, the time to implement instruction and practice is now. He shared:

> Something that I will do in the future is whisper read to myself earlier in the year.
> This year, I just found out about my strategy, and I wish I would've known
> earlier."

For students to develop a sense of ownership of the strategies and processes of readers they must also recognize that strategy application is flexible; that is, students must learn

to modify and adapt strategies to fit the different reading contexts they may encounter outside of the classroom.

During the course of this study, I used self discovery and practice opportunities to help students recognize their active role in the interpretation and application of reading strategies.   Such activities required to students to transact with the texts and helped to reinforce their role as active constructors of knowledge. For instance, students were encouraged to paraphrase during direct instructional lectures rather than recording the denotations of the reading concepts from my presentation materials. Lecture was always followed other opportunities to expand on learning from short video clips, group discussion, strategy practice, or problem solving practice with peers. Follow up class discussion allowed students to combine, clarify and revise their understandings of reading as was the case when they developed their own definition of metacognition:

> Metacognition means having the passion or desire to be watching or listening with
> self-sustaining motivation and awareness while using time wisely with patience
> and focus so that you can practice your thinking skills.

Students were also encouraged to develop rules or to chart the steps in a process of reading. More often the creation of the rules or the development of step by step instructions was the result of a phenomenon. For instance, when I discovered that all of the students in the class had identified a minor supporting detail, we set out as a class to clarify the ways that students could determine the difference between main idea and supporting details.   We explored the rules and applied the newly developed rules to other readings. What resulted was a flexible rule: If something really stands out to you, because it's exciting or it's clearer than everything else in the reading, then it is likely *not*

the main idea. Other phenomena existed and resulted in the creation of flexible rules

which students developed and from which my newest students have had the benefit.

Teachers need to implement transactional activities into their developmental reading

course that allow students to explore and practice the strategies of reading, and if possible

encourage them to develop their own processes.

Self-Discovery as the Starting Point for Metacognition

Hennessey (1999) indicated metacognitive skills are inclusive of the consideration

of one's beliefs. Therefore, the implementation of self-discovery processes paired well

with the need to increase students' metacognition, because self-discovery allowed for the

students' exploration of their values, thoughts, beliefs, and preferences for learning. The

implementation of self-discovery activities helped students to develop their

metacognitive awareness as they address their own goal or values, learning attributions,

and self-efficacy (Schraw, 1998).   For students like Caleb, Kyle, and Joslyn, self –

discovery processes facilitated thinking processes that helped them to declare the goals

that they had for reading, which they also attributed to their life-long goals. Caleb

indicated he was in the course because he needed reading skills that would help him pass

his classes so that he could become a doctor. Kyle indicated he wanted to ready himself

for transfer into a four year college, where he would then pursue his degree and he felt

that the reading course would help him transition from Chinese school systems to an

American educational process. The exploration of goals was important for finding and

sustaining motivation as evident for students like Joslyn and Marvin. Neither of them

thought they needed the course, but their consideration of goals led them to think

differently. Joslyn was a track athlete on a scholarship, but she wanted her family to be

proud of her for something other than her athletic ability. Marvin also noted that he wanted to be able to provide for his mother, whose single parenting was an inspirational factor for his college attendance. After asking students to reflect on their self-discovery activities, students began to expand on their previous thoughts about the course and their needs. More importantly, by doing so, they were no longer limiting their experiences to learning single skills sets in reading. They were more open to those strategies which they believed could help them overcome the reading challenges they faced in their other courses or in their personal reading experiences. Schraw (1998) argued that those students who have higher levels of self-efficacy manage their effort and strategy use to "persevere when faced with challenging circumstances" (p. 122). After the implementation of practice opportunities, students reportedly implemented the strategies on their own. Bridget noted that she was using the SQ3R strategy, was taking notes, and had even tried breaking words down into parts for more meaning, all of which were strategies she had never used before. I reveled in students' excitement when they reported that they used strategies on their own successfully, or in their expressions of confidence. When I observed these thoughts, I confirmed my instructional approaches which combined the direct instruction or 'telling' of content knowledge with opportunities for students to practice strategies using transactional processes that allowed students to think, read, reflect, clarify, or revise thought and to do so while reporting to their peers or myself in both narrative and verbal ways.

Implications

The observation of students' metacognition informs the instructional practices in a community college developmental reading course because student's thoughts help

teachers to identify the ways which students are mis-informed and the ways which they might become resistant to learning, as well as what their learning needs may be. Unfortunately, teachers may not focus on metacognition strategies if they cannot pique students' awareness of the necessary reading behaviors for success and of those that thwart miscomprehension. Self-discovery activities can help students develop an interest in learning, and the implementation of practice time with the strategies can help them learn those processes necessary for achieving in the tasks of reading. Furthermore, when reflection follows self-discovery and/or strategy practice students are encouraged to exercise metacognition, thinking about thinking. The results illuminate students' thinking and provide insight for educators charged with meeting the challenge of engaging and motivating diverse students. Educational methods that foster awareness and understanding of reading by using the strategies and practices appropriate for students' needs and required for their achievement is illustrated through this study.

Recommendations

The findings point toward a need for further research in several areas. First, because metacognition cannot be observed, and therefore, is a matter of self-reporting teachers must create questions that prompt students to engage in the processes of thinking, and reflecting back on that thinking. Publications of resources that promote metacognitive awareness for developmental students in the community college are limited to awareness inventories and narrative essay prompts. Although inventories assist students with identifying their own metacognitive behaviors or their level of awareness, their independent use can be detrimentally inaccurate for several reasons. First, students need direct instruction that can help them to interpret the meaning of their results.

Secondly, the inventories call upon the student to reflect and it may benefit the student to repeat the task at a later date to record any increase or decrease in the use of metacognitive strategies. Because inventories require self reporting, they call upon students to honestly reveal what they do in various reading contexts, but students may not know how to express their thoughts at the beginning of the semester and therefore benefit from repeating the inventory. For teachers, careful observation is also necessary to verify the accuracy of self reports collected from students who complete metacognition inventories. More educators need to be willing to implement and test out strategies which might help students with the development of metacognitive awareness.

Second, phenomenon was observed during our course which warrants further investigation. Rosso and Emans (1981) discussed a theory of phonics generalization, the idea that students over generalize rules of pronunciation during a stage of language learning. While college developmental reading students do not have a generalization problem in terms of their pronunciation, they do exhibit one for the rules of reading. When they are told that main ideas commonly appear in the first sentence of a paragraph, they over generalize that rule. When I observed this in student's thoughts, I began to instruct students to approach rules with flexibility. While this worked for this group of students, future investigation is needed to expand this idea of generalization and to determine how to instruct what I am referring to as "strategic flexibility for reading achievement."

Furthermore, students who are second language learners have a unique set of learning needs. Those who are fluent readers in their native language have more knowledge about the processes of reading, and may be more able to transfer their good

reading strategies into English reading contexts. In this study, I did not focus on second language learners. A future study more attentive to this population would provide more insight about how to help students who are second language learners and how to help them transfer those useful strategies from their native language into English reading contexts.

Finally, when observing students thoughts, I noted that each student continually referred back to one aspect of reading, to which I referred to as the students' "thought fixation." I have searched the literature for explanation of this phenomenon with limited results. Research on fixations in reading refer to the examination of eye-movement for miscues in an attempt to determine where the breakdown between one's monitoring, attending to reading, and comprehension occurs (Miholic, 1994). For college students who are not reading aloud, a miscue analysis may not be appropriate. But the concept of fixations may still be applicable to college developmental readers. For developmental readers in college, students' eyes might move across the words as they should, but thinking fixates, focusing elsewhere so strategies are necessary in promoting metacognitive regulation. Further study and exploration would assist with the development and application of these ideas in the field.

It bears repeating that students need direct transactional instruction to develop a metacognitive awareness that allows them to monitor their comprehension and to articulate their strategy use. Practice opportunities for metacognitive reflection enhance students' ability to discuss, clarify, and revise their understandings about reading and the ways in which they can achieve in reading. The findings will be of interest to course designers, administrators, and other reading instructors or researchers who want to inform

instructional practices for students in a community college developmental reading course

and for those who want to foster growth in students' metacognitive awareness.

Summary

For students who do not have the required reading skills to succeed, remediation

is offered by means of developmental education which promotes students' cognitive and

affective growth. Developing those skills, attitudes, and behaviors that enhance students'

educational opportunities and retention rates is crucial because the efforts of remediating

students in specific skill sets (vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) are believed to be

ineffective independently;   the social, emotional, cultural and ideological contexts in

the classroom (Chiu-hui and Cody, 2010) can help students to deconstruct negative

feelings (Lesley, 2001) and reconstruct their literacy identities (Gee, 2001; Lesley, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to describe what was revealed by students about their

metacognition in order to gain insight and give instructional recommendations for

helping students become reflective thinkers that better achieve the task of college

reading. The findings indicate students think they know about reading, but they don't.

Those students without a history of developmental experiences did not think they would

need help with reading, but they could not express why or they had illogical supporting

explanations. Those students who had previously received help admitted they needed

help with college reading, but they were limited in their ability to support their thoughts.

Many students relay their reading needs they believe they need in terms of fluency or

vocabulary, but a more expanded definition of reading is necessary for student success.

For those students who can offer no explanation of their participation in the course, or

who provide illogical supporting thoughts, as well as those who are limited in their

expressions, direct instruction is required to teach those key elements that constitute the greater definition of reading. Developmental reading students also need practice with those strategies that can help them regulate their learning in order to achieve in reading. When students gain reading knowledge through direct instruction that is followed by strategy practice with a focus on metacognition encourages them to reflect in ways that develops a greater awareness of the active role of a reader, thereby helping them become "smart" readers. By pairing self-discovery activities with those that focus on metacognition, a component of thinking necessary for improving the abilities and behaviors needed for reading, teachers can piqué students' interest and help them to develop those behaviors required for achieving. Students need direct transactional instruction to develop a metacognitive awareness that allows them to monitor their comprehension and to articulate their strategy use. Moreover, when teachers provide strategy practice with metacognitive reflection processes, students gain confidence and ownership in their reading processes. Practice opportunities for metacognitive reflection enhance students' ability to discuss, clarify, and revise their understandings about reading. For course designers, administrators, and other reading instructors who want to inform instructional practices for students in a community college developmental reading course or who want to foster growth in students' metacognitive awareness, these findings will be of interest.

REFERENCES

Act., Inc. "The Condition of College & Career Readiness: 2011" Retrieved 11/23/2011. http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/cccr11/index.html

Accuplacer. College Board. Retrieved 11/23/2011.www.collegeboard.com/accuplacer

Afflerbach, P. P. (2002). The use of think-aloud protocols and verbal reports as research methodology. In M. Kamil (Ed.)., *Methods of literacy research* (pp. 87-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum Associates.

Allen, S. D., Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., & Skipper, B. L. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Alexander, P.A., & Fox, E. (2004). A historical perspective on reading research and practice. In R.B. Ruddell, & N.J. Unrau (Eds.). *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (pp. 33-68). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Alexander, P.A., & Judy, J.E. (1988). The interaction of domain-specific and strategic knowledge in academic performance. *Review of Educational Research* 58, 375-404.

Allington, R. (2011). What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research Based Programs. Pearson. (3rd ed.).

Alvermann, D. (2000). "I understood the grief": Theory-based instruction of ordinary people. In N. Karolides (ed.) *Reader Response in Secondary and College Classrooms.* (123-134), Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Alvermann, D.E. & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M.L.

Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (eds.), *Handbook of reading research* 2, 951-983. Whiteplains, NY: Longman.

Alvermann, D. E. & Safford, J. (1989). Do content area strategies have a research base? *Journal of Reading*, 32, 388-394.

Anderson, L.M. & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1995). Prospective teachers' beliefs and teacher education pedagogy: Research based on a teacher educator's practical theory. *National Center for Research on Teaching and Learning,* Research Report 95-6. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Anderson, R.C. & Pearson, P.D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading. In P.D. Pearson, R. Barr, M.L. Kamil & P. Mosentahl (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*. White Plaines, NY: Longman.

Appleman, D. (2000). "I understood the grief": Theory-based instruction of Ordinary people. In N. Karolides (ed.) *Reader Response in Secondary and College Classrooms.* (123-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ariely, D. (2008). *Predictably irrational: The hidden forces that shape our decisions.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Attewell, P., Domina, T., Lavin, D., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college remediation. *Journal of Higher Education , 77* (5), 886-924.

Attwell, N. (2006). *The reading zone: how to help kids become skilled, passionate, habitual, critical readers.* New York: Scholastic.

Bailey, T. (2009). Challenge and opportunity: Rethinking the role and function of developmental education in community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 145, 11-30.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (pp. 353-394.). New York: Longmans.

Baron, J. (2007). *Thinking and deciding* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of Behavior Modification*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barry, A. (1994). The staffing of High School remedial reading programs in the United States since 1920. *Journal of Reading*, 38(1), 14-22.

Bean, T. W., Moore, D., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). Adolescent Literacy: A position statement for the commision on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association. *International Reading Association*.

Beers, K. (2002). *When kids can't read: What teachers can do. A guide for teachers 6-12.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Beers, G.K., Probst, R.E., & Reif, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Adolescent literacy: Turning promise into practice.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Beltzer, A. (2002). "I don't crave to read": School reading and adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy.* 46 (2), 104-13.

Biancarosa, G., Deschler, D.D., Nair, M., & Palinscar, A.S., (2007). Informed choices

for struggling adolescent readers: A research based guide to instructional

programs and practices. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956). Allyn and Bacon.

---. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York. Simon & Schuster.

Boucher, M. (1998). *John Dewey: Democracy and Education*. Retrieved October 11,

2003, from Hamline University site:

http://www.hamline.edu/~mboucher/capstoneproject1998/dewey.html

Boylan, H. (1999). Exploring alternatives to remediation. *Journal of Developmental
Education*, 22(3), 2-4, 6, 8, 10.

---. (2001). Making the case for developmental education. *Research in
Developmental Education , 12* (2), 1-4.

Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B. S., & White, S. R. (1999). Developmental and remedial
education in postsecondary education. *New Directions for Higher Educaiton*, 108.

Borkowski, J.G., Pressley, M; & Schneider, W. (1987). Cognitive strategies: Good
strategy users coordinate metacognition and knowledge. *Annuals of Child
Development* .

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., and Cocking, R. R. (eds.). (2000). *How people learn:
Brain, Mind, Experience and School.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy of
Sciences.

Broussaard, S.C. & Garrison, M.E.B. (2004). The relationship between classroom
motivation and academic achievement in elementary school-aged children.
Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 33(2), 106, 120.

Brown, B. (2004). Discursive identity: Assimilation into the culture of science and its

implication for minority students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41, 810-834.

Brown & Dowling. (1998). *Doing research/reading research: A mode of interrogation for education.* London: Palmer Press.

Brown, Fischco & Hanna. (1993). *Nelson Denny Reading Test*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Caldwell, J., Huitt, W., & French, V. (1981). Research-based classroom modifications for improving student engaged time. In D. Helms, A. Graeber, J. Caldwell, & W. Huitt (Eds.). *Leader's guide for student engaged time*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Callan, P.M., Finney, J.E., Kirst, M.W., Usdan, M.D., & Venezia, A. (2006). Claiming common ground: State policymaking from probing college readiness and success. San Jose, CA:

Chiu-hui, W. & Cody, M. (2010). 'The United States is America?': A cultural perspective on READ 180 materials. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 23(2), 153-165. Doi:10.1080/07908318.2010.49732

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T., 1965.

Chomsky, Noam. *Language and Mind*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Clandinin, D., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). *Mapping a Landscape of Narrative Inquiry: Borderland Spaces and Tensions.* Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology. Sage Publications, 35-76.

Conley, D. T. (2007). Redefining college readiness. *Educational policy improvement*.
Eugene, OR: Gates Foundation.

Conley, D.T. (2005). *College knowledge: What it really takes for students to succeed
and what we can do to get them ready.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conley, J.R. Friedhoff, M. B. Sherry, & S. F. Tuckey (Eds.), *Meeting the Challenge of
Adolescent Literacy: Research We have, research we need*. NY: Guilford Press.
58-87.

Cox, S. R., Frienser, D., & Khayyam,, M. (2003). Do reading skills courses help
unprepared readers achieve academic success in college? *Journal of College
Reading and Learning*, 33(2), 170-196.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*.
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Quantitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five
traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five
approaches*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry.
Theory into Practice, 39(3), 124-130. Retrieved from
http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477543

Cross, D. R. & Paris, S. G. (1988). Developmental and instructional analyses of
children's metacognition and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational
Psychology*, 80(2).

Cubukcu, F. (2008). A study of the correlation between self- efficiency and foreign

language learning anxiety. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. 4(1).
148-158.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Demetrious, A. & Kazi, S. (2006). Self awareness in "g" (with processing efficiency and
reasoning). *Intelligence*. 34(3). 297-317.

Dewey, J. (1916, 1966). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.

Duke, N.K. & Purcell-Gates, V. (2003). Genres at home and at school: Bridging the
known to the new. *The Reading teacher*, 57(1), 30-37. NY.

Duke, N.K. & Purcell-Gates, V.(Eds.)., (2004). *Literacy Research methodologies*. New
York: Guilford Press.

Ediger, M. (1999, March). Reading and vocabulary. *Journal of Instructional
Psychology*, 26 (1), 76-15.

Ehrlich, M.F., Kurtz-Costes, B., & Lorridant, C. (1993). Cognitive and motivational
determinants of reading comprehension in good an poor readers. *Journal of
Reading Behavior*, 25, 365-381.

Elbow, P. (1991). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to freshman and
colleagues. *College English* 53(2), 135-155.

Eldridge, M. (1998). *Transforming experience: John Dewey's cultural instrumentalism.*
Vanderbilt University Press.

El-Hindi, A. E. (1997). Connecting reading and writing: College learners' metacognitive
awareness. *Journal of Developmental Education , 21* (2), 10-16.

Fischer, D. & Ivey, G. (2006). Evaluating adolescent literacy: Content area strategies at

work (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research*. 3rd Ed. Sage Publications.

London.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things*. Pantheon.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-

developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, v34 n10 p906-11 Oct 1979.

Freedman, L., & Carver, C. (2007). Preservice teacher understandings of adolsecent

literacy developmnent: Naive wonder to dawning realiztion to intellectual rigor.

Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy , 50 (8), 654-665.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York:

Basic Books.

Gee, J. (2001). Critical literacy as discourse analysis. Presentation at the 46th *Annual*

Convention of the International Association, New Orleans, LA.

Gee, J. (2002). Literacies, identities, and discourses, In Mary Schleppegrel & M. Cecilia

Colombi. Eds., *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages:*

Meaning with Power, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002, pp. 159-175.

Gee, J. (2004). Reading as situated language: A socio-cognitive perspective. In R.B.

Ruddell, & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp.

116-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Geir, V.S., Kreiner, D.S., & Natz-Gonzales, A. (2009). Harmful effects of pre-existing

inappropriate highlighting on reading comprehension and metacognitive accuracy.

Journal of General Psychology. 136(3). 287-300.

Gewertz, C. (2011). Success of College-Readiness Intervention Hard to Gauge.

Education Week, Jan 26, 2011.

Giroux, H. (1993). Literacy and the politics of difference. In C. Lankshear Et. P

McLaren. (Eds.), *Critical Literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern* (pp.

367- 378). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Glaser & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for*

qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine de Gruyter.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data

Reduction. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12*, 51-70.

Greenberg, D. Rodrigo, V., Berry, A., Brink, T., Joseph, H. (2006). Implementation of

an Extensive Reading Program with Adult Learners. *Adult Basic Education*, 16,

81-97.

Griffith, P.L., & Ruan, J. (2005). What is metacognition and what should be its role in

literacy instruction? In S.E. Israel, C.C. Block, K.L. Bauserman, & K. Kinnucan-

Welsch (Eds.), *Metacognition in literacy learning: Theory, assessment,*

instruction, and professional development (pp. 3–18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.

Kamil, R. Barr, P. Mosenthal & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*

III. (p. 403-425). New York: Longman.

Hall, L. A. (2007). Understnading the Silence: Struggling Readers Discuss Decisions

About Reading Expository Text. *The Journal of Education Research , 3*, 132-41.

Harvey, S. & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension to*

enhance understanding. Markham, Ontario, Sten-house Publishers.

Heath, S.B. (2004). New directions in research-cross disciplinary collaborations:

Learning language and strategic thinking through the arts. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 39(3), 332.

Hennessey, M.G. (1999). Probing the dimensions of metacognition: Implications for conceptual change teaching-learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting f the *National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, Boston, MA.

Hewstone, Fincham, Jaspars. *Attribution Theory and Research: Conceptual Developmental and Social Dimensions.* Academic Press, 1983.

Hinchman, K. (2008). Intervening when older youths struggle with reading: Tell me what I need to know next. M. Conley, J.R. Friedhoff, M. B. Sherry, & S. F. Tuckey (Eds.), *Meeting the Challenge of Adolescent Literacy: Research We have, research we need.* NY: Guilford Press. 11-35.

Hollingsworth, S. & Dybdahl. (2007). Talking to learn. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of Narrative Inquire Mapping a Methodology,* (pp. 146-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ivey, G., & Baker, M. (2004). Phonics instruction for older readers? Just say no. *Educational Leadership,* 61, 35-39.

Ivey, G., & Fisher, D. (2007). Creating literacy –rich schools for adolescents. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kever , J. (2010). Many in college lack basic skills: For Texas, it's a $200 million a year problem. *Houston Chronicle*. May 24th, 2010.

Lawrence, S.A., McNeal, K., & Yildiz, M. N. (2009). Summer program helps

adolescents merge technology, popular culture, reading and writing for academic purposes. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52 (6).3 International Reading Association pp. 483-494.

Lesley, M. (2001). Exploring the links between critical literacy and developmental reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* 45(3), 180-89.

Lesley, M. (2004). Refugees from reading: Students perceptions of "remedial" Literacy pedagogy. Reading Research and Instruction. 44 (1) 62-85.

Levy, S.R., Rasher, S.P., Mandernach, J.M., Bercovitz, L.S., Berbaum, M.L., & Deardorff Carter, S. (2004). Adult Literacy research and field based practice: Piloting an experimental health literacy curriculum for full scale field implementation. *Family Literacy Forum,* 3(1), 32-45.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.

Luttrell, W. and Parker, C. (2001), High school students' literacy practices and identities, and the figured world of school. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 24: 235–247. doi: 10.1111/1467-9817.00146

Jacobs, J.E.; Paris, S.G. (1987). Children's metacognition about reading: Issues in definition, measurement, and instruction. *Educational Psychologist* 22: 225–278.

Krashen, S. (1989). We a acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (4), 440-464.

Karolides, N. (Ed). *Reader response in secondary and college classrooms*. (pp. 269-286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kuhn, M.R., Stahl, S.A. (2003). *Fluency: A Review of Developmental and Remedial*

Practices. University of Georgia. http://www.ciera.org/library/reports/inquiry-2/2-008/2-008.html Accessed 12/7/2011.

Mallette, M. H., Schreiber, J. B., Caffey, C., Carpenter, T., and Hunter M. (2009). Exploring the value of a summer literacy program on the learning of at-risk adolescents. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48.2. 172-84.

McKenna, M.C. & Robinson, R. D. (2002). *Teaching through text: Reading and writing in the content areas* (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mellard, D. F., Fall, E., & Woods, K. L. (2010). A Path Analsis of Reading Comprehension for Adults with Low Literacy. *Journal of Learning Disabilities , 43* (2), 154-165.

Mellard, D., Scanlon, D., Kissam, B., & Woods, K. (2005). Adult Education instructional environments and interaction patterns between teachers and students: and eco-behavioral assessment. *Literacy and Numeracy Studies*, 14(1), 49-68.

Merriam Webster's Dictionary. (1999).

Conley, J.R. Friedhoff, M. B. Sherry, & S. F. Tuckey (Eds.), *Meeting the Challenge of Adolescent Literacy: Research We have, research we need*. NY: Guilford Press. 58-87.

Metcalfe, J., & Shimamura, A. P. (1994). *Metacognition: knowing about knowing. Cambridge,* MA: MIT Press.

Miller, B., McCardle, P, & Hernandez, R. (2010). Advances and Remaining challenges in adult literacy research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 43(2) 101-107.

Miholic, V. (1994). An inventory to pique students' metacogntive awareness of reading strategies. *International Reading Association , 38* (2), 84-86.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.*
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moje, E. B. (2006). Motivating texts, motivating contexts, motivating adolescents: An
examination of the role of motivation in adolescent literacy practices and
development. *Perspectives,* 32 (3), 10-14.

Moje, E.B. (2008). Responsive literacy teaching in secondary school content areas. M.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of
reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259.

Morgan-Fleming, B., Riegle, S., Fryer, W., (2007). Narrative Inquiry in Archival
Work. *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology*.
Sage Publications, Inc. (pp. 81-98).

Nagy, W.E., Anderson, R. C. & Herman, P.A. (1987). Learning word meaning from
Context during normal reading. *American Research Journal*, 24(2), 237-270.

National Association for Developmental Education (2011). "*About Developmental
Education*." Retrieved Dec. 7, 2011, from NADE: *The National Association for
Developmental Education:* : http://www.nade.net/AboutDevEd.html

National Association for Developmental Education (2011). "*About Developmental
Education*." Retrieved Dec. 7, 2011, from NADE: *The National Association for
Developmental Education:* : http://www.nade.net/AboutDevEd.html

Ormond, J.E. (2004). *Human learning* (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Oyserman, D. & Destin, M. (2010). Identity based motivation: Implications for
intervention. *Counseling Psychologist*. 38(7), 001-1043.

Parodi, D. (1939). Knowledge and Action in Dewey's Philosophy. In *The Philosophy of*

John Dewey (pp. 229-242.). Library of Living Philosophers, Inc.

Paris, S. G.., & Winograd, P. (1990). Promoting metacognition and motivation of

exceptional children. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(8), 7-15.

Patterson, M.B. (2005). Evaluating learner outcomes in adult education programs: An

analysis of Kansas learning gains and employment outcomes. Doctoral

dissertation, University of Kansas. http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/search

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand

Oakes, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. (3rd ed).

Pinnegar & Daynes (2007). Locating Narrative Inquiry Historically: Thematics in the

Turn to Narrative. *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology*.

Sage Publications, Inc. (pp. 3-34).

Pressley, M., & Affflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of

constructivtive and responsive reading.* Routledge.

Pressley, M., & Gaskins, I. W. (2006). Metacognitively competent reading

comprehension is constructively responsive reading: how can such reading be

developed in students? *Metaccognition Learning , 1*, 99-113.

Public Law 107-110-(2002, January 8). 107th Congress- *No Child left behind act*

(NCLB-Title I, Part B, Subpart I-Reading First, Section 1208-1212).

Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The

reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. Ruddell, M Ruddell, & H, Singer (Eds.).

Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 996-1056). Newark,

DE: International Reading Association.

Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (1997). The role of responsive teaching; focusing reader

intention and developing reader motivation. In R. Ruddell, M Ruddell, & H, Singer (Eds.). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schraw, B., & Bruning, R. (1999). How implicit models of reading affect motivation to read and rereading engagement. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5, 281-302.

Schaafsma, D. & Vinz, R. (2001). Composing Narratives for Inquiry. *English Education.* 39(4).

Schraw, G. Crippen, K. J., & Hartley, K. (2006). Promoting self-regulation in science education: Metacognition as part of a broader perspective on learning. *Research in Science Education*, 36, 111-139.

Schraw, G. & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7(4), 351-371.

Skinner, B.F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Soldner, L.B. (1997). Self assessment and the reflective reader. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*.

Rassool, N., (1999). Literacy for Sustainable development in the Age of information. Multilingual Matters. Cleveland, OH: 25-53.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Ritchhart, R. *Intellectual Character: What it is, Why it Matters, and How to get it.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of*

literary work. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenshine, B. (1971). *Teaching behaviors and student achievement*. London: National

Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.

Rosenshine, B. (1995). Advances in research on instruction. *The Journal of Educational

Research, 88*(5), 262-268.

Ruddell, R. & Unrau, N. (1997). The role of responsive teaching; focusing reader

intention and developing reader motivation. In Ruddell, R. & Unrau, N (5th Ed),

Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading (pp. 954-978). Newark, DE:

International Reading Association.

Schraw, B., & Bruning, R. (1999). How implicit models of reading affect motivation to

read and rereading engagement. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5, 281-302.

Schaafsma, D., Pagnucci, G. S., Wallace, R. M., & Stock, P. L. (2007). "Composing

storied ground: Four Generations of Narrative Inquiry." *English Education, 39*(4),

282-305.

Scott, J.A., & Nagy, W.E. (1997). Understanding the definition of unfamiliar verbs.

Reading Research Quarterly, 32 (2), 184-200.

Simpson, M.L., & Randall, S.N. (2000). Vocabulary development at the college level.

In R.F. Flippo & D.C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study

strategy research* (43-73). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stahl, S.A., & Nagy, W.E. (2006). *Teaching Word Meanings*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. New York, NY:

The Guilford Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss & Corbin, J. (eds.). (1997). *Grounded Theory in Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Tekmen, E.A., & Daloglu, A. (2006). An investigation of incidental vocabulary acquisition and relation to learn proficiency level and word frequency. *Foreign Language Annais*, 39, 220-243.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. (2010). Time to act: An agenda for advancing adolescent literacy for college and career success. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Thomas, C. N. & Wexler, J. (2007). 10 Ways to teach and support struggling adolescent readers: Using up-to-date, evidence-based strategies in the classroom, middle and high school teachers can promote literacy among adolescents. *Kappa Delta Pi.*

Texas legislature. (2007). HB2369

Tovani, C. (2002). *I read it, but I don't get it. Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Triplett, C.F. (2004). Looking for a struggle: Exploring the emotions of a middle school reader. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 48(3). 214-222.

VanOra, J. (2012). The experience of community college for developmental students: Challenges and motivations. *Community College*. 22-38.

Vitale, D. (2006). What the ACT reveals about reading readiness. *Community College Journal.* 76(6), 2-23.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Eds. and Trans). Cambridge, MA: The M.L.T. Press.

Wade, S. E., & Moje, E. B. (2000). The role of text in classroom learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 609-627).

Weiner, B. (1992), *Human Motivation: Metaphors, Theories and Research*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 0-7619-0491-3

Weiner, E. J. (2002). Beyond remediation: Ideological literacies of learning in a developmental classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46, 2. October.

Wilhelm, J.D. (2001). *Improving comprehension with think-aloud strategies: modeling what good readers do*. New York: Scholastic.

Willard, R. D. (2003). School counselors and information literacy from the perspective of Willard Daggett. *Professional School Counseling*. 6(4). 238-242.

Willis, A. I. (2000). Cultivating understanding through reader response: Dawn's responses to *The Things They Carried* and *When Heaven and Earth Changed Places*. In N. Karolides (Ed). *Reader response in secondary and college classrooms*. (pp. 269-286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Willingham, D., & Price, D. (2009, Sept. 22). Theory to practice vocabulary insturcion in community colleg edevelopmental educaiton reading classes: what the research tells us. *Journal of College Reading and Learning* .

Wyatt, M. & Pickel, M. (1993). Good teaching is good teaching: Basic beliefs of college reading instructors. *Journal of Reading.* 36(5), 340-348.

Xianming, X. (2007). A Study of Firstr-Year College Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Chiang Mai University Journal , 1* (1), 93-107.

Zimmerman, C. B. (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference: An empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 121-140.

LITERATURE CITED

Boyne, J. (2007). *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas.* London: Random House.

Connect: College Reading. (2010). 2nd Edition. Cengage Learning. Wadsworth.

Lee, H. (1960). *To Kill a Mockingbird*. New York, NY: Harper Lee.

Frank, Anne. (1933). *Anne Frank: the Children of the Holocaust.* Trans. B.M. Mooyant.
    New York: Bantam.

---. (1933). *Anne Frank: the Diary of a Young Girl.* Trans. B.M. Mooyant. New York:
    Bantam.

Hardy, T. (2004). *Mayor of Casterbridge.* New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Classics.

Walls, J. (2005). *The Glass Castle*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Salinger, J.D. (1951). *Catcher and the Rye.* Boston: Little Brown.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENTAL READING COURSE SYLLABUS

Professor: **Tasha Vice** M.A., M.Ed. Department:

Course Description: Provides preparation for college-level reading and studying, including vocabulary development, understanding implied ideas and details, identifying author's purpose, point of view and intended meaning, analyzing relationships, critical reasoning for evaluation, and study skills. Credit will not satisfy graduation requirements, but will satisfy developmental reading requirements for TSI purposes.

Course Goals: The purpose of this course is to provide opportunities and incentives for you to read by addressing students' individual skill deficiencies in reading as determined by TSI assessment, helping students gain reading experiences and skills, and preparing students to succeed with the reading requirements of the college curriculum and as lifelong readers/learners.

Course Requirements: The student should attend all classes and complete all assignments and examination, including class projects.

Prerequisites: Recommendation based on assessment.

Textbook & Required Materials: Connect: College Reading. 2nd Edition. Cengage Learning. Wadsworth. 2010. Walls, Jeannette. The Glass Castle. Scribner, New York. 2005. You will also need basic school supplies including pens, pencils, paper, an eraser, a highlighter (any color), a spiral reserved only for this class, and a three ring binder.

Student Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of this course, the student should be able to demonstrate collegiate reading skills. Students will:

1. Locate explicit textual information, draw complex inferences, and describe, analyze, and evaluate the information within and across multiple texts of varying lengths.
2. Comprehend and use vocabulary effectively in oral communication, reading, and writing.
3. Describe, analyze, and evaluate information within and across a range of texts.
4. Identify and analyze the audience, purpose, and message across a variety of texts.
5. Describe and apply insights gained from reading a variety of texts.

Assessment: Students will demonstrate these skills by attending all classes and completing all assignments and examinations, including class projects with a course grade of B or better. Students may also demonstrate these skills by scoring 12.0 or higher grade equivalency score on the "Nelson Denny Reading Test."

Academic Integrity/Plagiarism: Panhandle Community College faculty strives to foster a spirit of honesty and set a high standard of integrity. The attempt of any student to present as his or her own any work which he or she has not honestly performed is regarded by the faculty and administration as a serious offense and renders the offender liable to serious consequences, including loss of a grade, course failure, and/or possibly suspension.

Statement of Nondiscrimination: It is the policy of this instructor not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status. *Harassment of any kind is inconsistent with the educational process.*

Students with disabilities: Students with disabilities, including but not limited to physical, psychiatric, or learning disabilities, who wish to request accommodations in this class should notify the Disability Services Office early in the semester so that the appropriate arrangements may be made. In accordance with federal law, a student requesting accommodations must provide acceptable documentation of his/her disability.

GRADES/ Course Evaluation: If the student is required by the PCC Admissions Committee to take this course, the student may not be allowed to re-enroll at PCC unless he or she successfully completes this course. You must earn your grade by submitting high quality work on time, attending all class meetings, and by participating in class discussions and exercises. The grades you receive on your assignments, quizzes, and exams are indicators of your progress. Students will be asked to keep an ongoing record of these grades. There will be no curve. Course grades will be determined by the following:

GRADE	INTERPRETATION	GRADE SCALE	POINTS PER HRS
A	Excellent	90 to 100	4
B	Good	80 to 89	3
C	Average	70 to 79	2
D	Below Average	60 to 69	1
F	Failure	0-60	0
I	Incomplete		
W	Withdrawn		

Point Equivalent: Assignments = 40%   Exams and Quizzes= 40%   Participation & Attendance =10%

Assignments (40%): Each assignment is a tool to reinforce skills and material taught in the classroom. The amount of homework is carefully considered. Homework is assigned because of its vital importance to the learning process. Students are expected to complete all assignments by the due date. Homework will be posted on the board at the beginning of class as well as posted weekly on blackboard along with handouts and extra information. Assignments include one *Aplia Chapter and One Workbook chapter per week*, each week as well as select assignments to be discussed and assigned in class. Assignments are subject to change.

- **All assignments must be typed.** I will consider punctuation, spelling, and grammar in the grading process. The exercises and assignments will be graded for both style and for content. Bring completed work with you on the date assigned. Be responsible and make sure you can print before you come to class.
- **Due Dates and Late Penalties**: Assignments are due at the beginning of class. **NO LATE WORK WILL BE ACCEPTED.** If you are going to be absent, turn in your work early. If you are ill, e-mail your work or submit your work via blackboard.

Exams and Quizzes (40%): There will be **four major exams** plus the final exam. **Major exams may not be made up**. Quizzes cannot be made-up

Participation & Attendance (10%): Participation points are earned by contributing meaningful content to in class participation. This means, students who ask relevant questions, make relevant comments, and engage in the conversation with both peers and the instructor. *Participation also includes completion of in class assignments that may or may not be turned in to the instructor.* Attend all classes on time for the duration of class. Take care of personal needs before and after class. Failure to attend will decrease your grade. Only college approved excuses with WRITTEN documentation, or medical excuses with WRITTEN documentation will prevent point deduction and must be provided the first class period after the absence. Your presence in class is tracked using an attendance sheet.

- **Sign the attendance sheet.** The sign in sheet will be distributed at the beginning of class. If you are tardy, you will be required to sign in *after class*. Signing this roster is your responsibility, and absences will not be removed if neglected to sign the roster.
- **Tardiness and Leaving Class Early**: Class begins on time. Ten minutes late indicates a Tardy. Leaving class for ten minutes indicates a Tardy. Two tardy events equal one absence. Leaving class early will result in an absence.
- **Group Discussion**: Students are expected to participate in all group discussions. Your role and group number will be assigned one week prior to discussion. Group discussion is considered in your participation grade.

Student Responsibilities: *****NOTE: **Students will be asked to sign and commit to the Code of Responsibility.** Failure to uphold your responsibilities as a student detracts from learning and will result in your dismissal for one class period. Continued failure to uphold your responsibilities as a student may result in further action such as referral, or withdraw from the course. Attendance includes adhering to the CODE OF PERSONAL RESPONBILITIY by **attending**, being **prepared, respectful, honest, aware, and on task.**

Technical Course Information/Requirements: You are required to access and use technology to assist you with the learning process including internet, e mail, blackboard, Microsoft word, PowerPoint, you tube, other online video streaming processes, and Aplia. It is your responsibility to see you have access to technology and a working internet connection.

- **Aplia**: Aplia is our online supplemental homework program which will be assigned to you in class from time to time throughout the semester. You will be responsible for locating a computer with Internet access to complete these online assignments as assigned during the semester. NO LATE WORK!
- **Blackboard:** This is the tool that will contain all course announcements, assignments and handouts. You should check this site on a daily basis. Assignments will also be announced in class; however, **you are responsible for all assignments. NO LATE WORK!**
- **Email**: All students must have and check their MYPCC e mail account at least two times weekly. I check my email once in the morning, again in the afternoon, and shortly before 8:00 pm, M-Th. Please allow at least 24 hours for a response. I

do not check email between Friday and Sunday. I expect students to use professional language and tone in all communication with me, including email correspondence.

<u>Additional Course Information:</u> Your course section has been selected for a study on the teaching and learning of reading. Noting outside of the normal course requirements will be expected of you. The study will not impact your grade. I will include your comments from discussion, any writing you may do, and your assignments in the study. I will use your responses to help me decide how to best teach reading. We already record our activities in class, but I will use the recorders to help me reflect on our teaching and learning events. If you do not want your data to be included please let me know, anytime. If you would like to help me think about our teaching and learning events you may volunteer for an interview when the semester is over (after grades have been posted). Let me know if you have questions or concerns.

APPENDIX B

Code of Personal Responsibility

- **Be prepared:** Have your books and materials with you in all classes as well as any assignments that are due. Complete homework early and seek help if needed. **REMEMBER- Come to class prepared by reading all assigned segments! It is a reading class… you must read to pass.** Always bring the following to class: Text Book(s), Notebook paper/Spiral, One highlighter, any color, pen, and pencil.
- **Be respectful:** Rude or disrespectful behavior directed at *any member* of this class will not be tolerated this includes the use of disrespectful or vulgar language.
- **Be honest:** Cheating will not be tolerated; this includes sharing answers on individual work, looking at another student's test or quiz, and talking (even whispering) during a test or quiz. Plagiarism is also a form of cheating. (See Academic Integrity).
- **Be AWARE!** Do not attempt to sleep in class. Do not eat in class. Do not use electronic devices during class. **NO CELL PHONES, PAGERS, I PADS, I PODS, MP3's or NET SURFING** in class, unless otherwise directed by your instructor. *Texting during class is strictly prohibited.*
- **Be on task:** Listen, take notes, and participate with intention. There are times in class when it is appropriate to speak to your peers (i.e., during group work). However, if your instructor or a guest is speaking, you are not.
- **Digital Recordings**: I have selected this class for a study on teaching and learning. Your assignments will be collected. The events in our class will be recorded. Nothing outside of the normal requirements of the class will be expected of you. When I write up my study results pseudonyms will be used to maintain your confidentiality. If you do not want to be a part of the study, you may opt. out at any time. The study will not affect your grade.

Statement of Personal Responsibility

Successful completion of this course depends on the student accepting and abiding by the syllabus and a code of personal responsibility outlining a commitment to preparedness, respect, honesty, awareness, and attention to task.
Read and initial by the following statements acknowledging that you understand and agree:
- ○ I will follow guidelines of the syllabus and this responsibility statement.
- ○ I will attend class (arrive on time) with an attitude to actively participate in the classroom learning experience and intellectually acquire the material presented, without texting or perusing social media during class. Attendance includes being **prepared, respectful, honest, aware, and on task.** I will meet my responsibilities, or expect to be counted absent.
- ○ I will set aside adequate study time to read and prepare for classes.
- ○ I will budget sufficient time in advance of exam and assignment dates to successfully complete coursework.
- ○ I will keep track of and evaluate MY personal performance as reflected in each individual grade received and the cumulative effect of those grades on the successful completion of this course.
- ○ I will take responsibility for learning strategies and completing tasks which will improve study skills and habits.
- ○ I understand I must have access to a computer with internet to complete the course requirements.
- ○ I accept personal responsibility for the choices, actions and consequences I make as a student of this course.
- ○ I understand this course is being studied, that I do not have to participate, and that I can opt. out of the study at anytime, and the study is not part of my grade.

I, _____ (printed name), have read the entire syllabus for this course, and understand the contents, requirements and obligations. I agree to accept personal responsibility for my performance as a student in this course and the consequences for my decisions and actions. I understand that failure to uphold my responsibilities as a student detracts from learning and will result in my dismissal for one class period. Continued failure to uphold my responsibilities as a student may result in further action such as referral, or withdraw from the course. (Signature) _____Date _____ Course, Section
_____

This signed Statement of Personal Responsibility must be returned to the instructor by the end of class on _____. Failure to return the signed Statement may result in the student being dropped from the class with an "X" on or about the Official 4th Class Day. If you have any questions regarding the syllabus and course requirements, please contact your instructor. Examine the syllabus thoroughly to ensure you will have no conflicts which may prevent successful completion of all the course requirements. Please let me know if you do not want to be a part of the study that is being conducted.

APPENDIX C

Tentative Agenda/Course of Study

WEEK	Reading List	Lecture Notes	Tentative Assignments
2	Chapter 1 Connecting to the Reading Process	The Reading Process; Motivation; Learning Styles; Reading Stages; Purpose for Reading; Prior Knowledge; Interaction 1-7;	**Homework: Literacy Narrative** **SQ3R Strategy Practice**
3	Setting Up Aplia Accounts *DO NOT BE ABSENT!*	Setting Up Aplia Accounts *DO NOT BE ABSENT!*	**Aplia Introduction, Diagnostic, & Chapter One** **Self Discovery Activities**
4	Chapter 2 Asking Questions	Establish purpose; Find Answers; Improve Your Thinking; Critical Thinking Levels; Headings; Proper Highlighting; Interaction 2-1; 2-2; 2-3; 2-5;	**Aplia Chapter Two** **Group Discussion Self Discovery Written Response**
5	Chapter 3 Vocabulary	Vocabulary Strategies; Prefixes, Suffixes, Roots; Connotation, Denotation & Dictionary Skills; Synonyms, Antonyms, Homonyms; Context Clues; Punctuation Clues;	**Aplia Chapter Three** **Homework: Pages 147-156**
6	**Review** **EXAM 1 (Ch's 1, 2, 3)**	**Review** **EXAM 1**	**Review** **EXAM 1**
7	Chapter 4 Main Ideas	Topic vs. Main Idea; Paragraph Main Idea; Paper Main Idea; Theme; Topic Sentence; Stated Main Idea; 4-1/Handout Supporting Details; Major Details; Minor Details; Thesis Statement; Interaction; 4-5; 4-7;	**Aplia Chapter Four** **Metacognition Strategy Practice Homework Pages: 199-215**

8	Chapter 5 Implied Main Ideas	Unstated Main Idea; Implied Main Idea; In Class Activity/Handout	**Aplia Chapter Five Group Discussion** **Homework: Pages 262-273**
9	Chapter 7 Reading and Taking Notes on Textbook Chapters	Focus Questions; Annotating; Marking; Visual Maps; Cornell Notes; Chapter Outline; Summarizing 355-363. Outlining; Mapping; (pg. 194 Critical Reading- Marking and Annotating Activity/Handout	**Aplia Chapter 7** **Group Discussion Annotating Strategy Practice**
10	**EXAM 2 (Chapters 4, 5 & 7)**	**Begin Novel** **EXAM 2**	**Novel Assignment 1 (TBA)** **EXAM 2**
11	Chapter Six Recognizing Patterns of Organization Novel	Patterns of Organization; Predicting Patters; Description Pattern; Space Order; Narration; Process; Time Order; Cause and Effect; Compare and Contrast; Classification; Example; Explanation; Signal Words Novel Activity/Finding Patterns in the Narrative Novel	**Aplia Chapter Six** **Homework: Pages 308-314; 315-324**
12	Chapter 8 Distinguishing Fact and Opinion Novel	Fact; Opinion; Comparatives; Superlatives; Objective; Subjective; Chapter Summary Activity/In Class Activity Novel Activity/TBA	**Aplia Chapter 8** **Group Discussion Homework: Pages 429-449**

13	Chapter 9 Making Inferences Novel	Using Prior Knowledge and Supporting Details to Infer Novel Activity/TBA	**Aplia Chapter 9** **Homework: Pages 452-486**
14	**EXAM 3** (Ch's 6, 8, 9 & Novel)	**EXAM 3**	**EXAM 3**
15	Chapter 10 Analyzing Authors Tone Chapter 11 Evaluating the Author's Reasoning and Evidence	Revisiting Purpose, Point of View, Connotation, Denotation through Tone; Evaluating Written Evidence Novel Activity/TBA	**Aplia Chapter 10** **Aplia Chapter 11**

APPENDIX D

Verbal Script for Oral Recruitment of Participants

Good Morning! I would like to speak to you about a study I plan to conduct as partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral degree at Texas Tech University entitled, The purpose of this study is to track my responsiveness and examine the teaching delivered to learners in a developmental college reading course in order to give insight and recommendations for helping students become reflective and metacognitive thinkers.

I have purposefully selected your developmental reading class as my focus. The knowledge I will gain from this study will help me to evaluate the effectiveness of my plan and to make modifications and adjustments that will not only help clarify my thinking about teaching, but will also help me teach you.

You will not be asked to complete any additional activities outside of the normal course expectations. Your participation in this course would mean that you authorize the use of your academic and demographic background questionnaire and other data generated in the course. Other data will include observations of your verbal and written responses in the course, documents including your assignments, your group discussions, and my journals. Using a digital recorder in this class is common practice. I will use one daily to record our events and to reflect on my teaching. When I write about our time together, your information will be kept confidential by assigning codes and pseudonyms. Any consequential publications or presentations developed from this data will maintain your anonymity.

This study has been reviewed by and received ethical clearance through the Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Office of Research Services. However, the final decision to participate is completely voluntary, and you may choose to withdraw from the study at any time. There will be neither incentives nor repercussions if you elect, or do not elect to participate. Your honesty throughout the study will be encouraged and is necessary, so please be honest and open with all of your class efforts. Please feel free to discuss any questions about your participation, before, during, or after the study with myself, or my dissertation chair (Dr. Carole Janisch) at Texas Tech University.

Thank you for your attention and the opportunity to research a developmental college reading course. Again, your participation will provide insight into teacher practices and illuminate the relationship between instructional practices and student understandings. When you fill out your demographic questionnaire, please be sure to sign the informed consent form and indicate your decision (to or not to participate in the study).

APPENDIX E

Voluntary Final Interview Protocol

Interview Consent

I am asking you to be a participant in a voluntary interview for my research project on teaching and learning reading. This study will report on how I, a teacher of developmental reading in college, perceive and develop understandings about my instructional practice in response to your shared thoughts about the class and your work. I am completing the study so that I can learn more about helping my students achieve in reading.

Outside of the normal conduct of the class, students can volunteer to be interviewed. I would like to ask you questions about being in the class, of what you learned, and what you might still need to learn about reading. I would also like to record our conversation together so that I can review what we have talked about and reflect on how I might help students learn more about reading.

You do not have to complete this interview. There is no grade attached for participating because you have already received your grade for the course. Do you have any questions? Do you wish to participate in the final voluntary interview today?

If you have questions about your rights as a participant informer, feel free to contact the Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University; Lubbock, Texas 79409. Or you can call (806) 742-2884.

Yes, I would like to participate _____
                              Print   **Sign**   **Date**

No, I would not like to participate _____
                              Print   **Sign**   **Date**
This consent form is not valid after _____

Interview Questions
1. Thinking back to when you started this class for comparison, how did you feel about yourself as a reader?
2. How do you feel about yourself as a reader now?
3. What do you think you have learned about being a better reader across the semester?
4. What do you think you are doing now, that has made you a better reader?
5. How do you think that what you have learned about reading can help you be successful in your other college classes?
6. What do you think will make you successful as a reader and/or student in other future college courses?
7. What do you think you still need to learn about reading/reading at the college level?

APPENDIX F

Individual Conference Protocol

Today, you are meeting with me to conference about your performance in the class. The goal for our meeting today is to talk about what you have learned in reading and the ways I might be able to help you. Today I am going to ask you questions about your experiences in reading, about being in our class, and about what you think you might still need to learn. I would also like to record our conversation together so that I can review what we have talked about and reflect on how I might help students learn more about reading.

Our conference session is required as a part of your course, but if you are not comfortable with the digital recording I can turn the recorder off at any time. As you know, I have selected your course section for a study on students' thinking about reading in order to help me be a better teacher. Your comments today can be included in the study, unless you request that they be excluded. Part of the reason I like to do this, is that I get a chance to ask you what you have learned, what you haven't learned. There is no grade at stake at here. You are here for your conference meeting, so you get your participation points. I will use the information we talk about to help me formulate my plan for teaching the remainder of the term, and in the future. I will also use the information to help me write and research college developmental reading.

Conference Questions
Do I have your verbal consent to record and use our conversation of this conference session today?
Is there anything that you'd like to start with? Is there anything that you would like to ask me?
If you were thinking back to before you started this class, how did you feel about yourself as a reader?
　　　　What did you think about when you were reading in the past?
How do you feel about yourself as a reader, now?
　　　　What do you think about when you are reading now?
　　　　What do you think you do to help you pay attention when reading?
　　　　What do you think you do to help you understand when reading?
　　　　What do you think you do to clear up confusion when reading?
What do you think you have learned about being a reader through the semester so far?
Do you have a goal in mind for how you should feel about yourself as a reader in the end?
 What do you think you still need to learn about reading for your future courses?
　　　　What will you think about when you are reading in the future?
　　　　What do you think you will do to help you pay attention when reading?
　　　　What do you think you will do to help you understand when reading?
　　　　What do you think you will do to clear up confusion when reading?
What do you think I need to do (teach you) to help you read from here on out?
Do you have any questions for me?

APPENDIX G

The Final Project: Final Reflective Portfolio

Dear Students,

It has been a pleasure having you all in my class. I hope that you have found value in your reading experience. I would like to ask you all to complete your final project (FINAL EXAM). I am asking you to collect pieces you have read for **any class** and complete a series of reflective writings to examine your approaches toward reading this semester.   There are seven sections. You may include one or more pieces that you would like to look at for each section. You may choose pieces that have been difficult for you, and pieces that have been easy to read. Please clearly explain why you chose each piece and address the section questions in a written work. All of the written parts should be TIMES NEW ROMAN 12 pt font Double Spaced. You should neatly arrange, organize, color code, and label each piece of the project in a three ring binder.   I should be able to find your written reflections for each section easily. These can be turned in to my office, but must be turned in no later than prior to December 13th at 10:00 a.m. Please include your reading survey, name, and address so that I can return your portfolio to you.   Your final project will contain the following: (1) A final reflective narrative, (2) a section on attention, (3) a section on comprehension, (4) a section on confusion, (5) and a section for your final concluding thoughts.

(1) The Final Reflective Narrative Guidelines
A literacy narrative tells your story about your experiences with reading and/or writing. During the semester, you have been asked to think about reading and or writing events from your past, present, and those in this class; these experiences can be either positive or negative. When documenting your final reflections, you should connect your experiences past and present to your current feelings about reading and writing.

> *Example: When I was a child we didn't have cable, or video games. Instead, my mother bought us books. I remember reading through some of the same books over and over again. I especially remember "Weezer" a mouse from a purple book that was too busy working to play. She was a very serious mouse, but when winter came she was ready and all the other silly mice had to come to her for help. I think I loved the book because I could identify with Weezer. She helped me realize that being serious is positive, but also reminded me that it is okay to have fun now and then. I guess I knew then that I loved to read.*

Your literacy narrative should tell a personal story, like an autobiography, about your engagement with reading and or with writing. You have been asked to reflect on your experiences as a child, in middle school, in high school, in college, and in this class. As we went through the semester, you were asked to think about some of these parts in spontaneous writing assignments designed to help you think about where you came from as a reader, your habits, understandings, and your experiences in the past, and in this class. You will use those reflections to help you construct your final narrative. Here is a reflective narrative example:

> *I never really thought about my habits as a reader. Usually, I would just pick up a book and read. If I had to study for a test I would try to read all of the chapters at once the night before the exam. Now that I have learned more about reading I know that I should take steps before I begin to read, track my reading progress, and review the reading material later. This has helped me learn to read for this class and for my other classes.*

This is important because we bring our past experiences into the class with us and they sometimes shape the way we learn.

(2) Attention

1. Select a day, reading, or assignment from one of your classes. Provide a copy of that page, chapter, or section of reading in your portfolio. Examine the activity and write a ½ to 1 page response about how you paid attention to what you were reading. Some questions you might consider include:

   a. Why did you choose to examine this piece? (Difficult, challenging, fun?)
   b. What did you do to be sure you were paying attention while reading?
   c. What kind of notes did you take while reading?
        (Provide a copy of your notes of this piece)
   d. How did that help?
   e. What did you do when you were not paying attention to the reading?
   f. What did you learn from reading this piece?
   g. This part is difficult and requires complete courage and honesty. How did you create your reading situation? If you did not create your reading situation, how did you choose to react to it?
   h. What strategies or 'things you can do' have you learned IN OUR CLASS or through your own research that could have helped you pay attention to this reading? (Provide a copy to demonstrate more about the strategy).

(3) Comprehension

2. Select a day, reading or assignment from one of your classes. Provide a copy of that page, chapter, or section in your portfolio. Examine the activity and write a ½ to 1 page response about how you understood something you were reading. Some questions you might consider include:

   a. Why did you choose to examine this piece? (Difficult, challenging, fun?)
    b. Why do you think you understood this piece?
   c. What did you do to be sure you comprehended what you were reading?
   d. What part of the reading was clear to you? Why?
   e. Which parts did you understand easily? Why?
   f. What did you learn from reading this piece?
   g. What did you do when you finished reading this piece?
   h. This part is difficult and requires complete courage and honesty. How did you create your reading situation? If you did not create your reading situation, how did you choose to react to it?
   i. What strategies or 'things you can do' have you learned IN OUR CLASS or through your own research that could have helped you have an even better understanding with this reading?

(4) Confusion

3.   Select a day, activity, or assignment from our class or another class. Provide a copy of that page, chapter, or section in your portfolio. Examine the reading and write a ½ to 1 page response about how you what might have confused you when you were reading. Some questions you might consider include:

      a. Why did you choose to examine this piece? (Difficult, challenging, fun?)

      b. What did you do to be sure you were paying attention while reading?

      c. What did you do to be sure you comprehended what you were reading?

      d. What did you understand?

      e. At what point did you become confused and why?

      f. What was confusing?

      g. Why might this reading have been confusing to you?

      h. What specific problems did you have with this reading?

      h. What did you do when you were confused? And, how did that help?

      i. What did you learn from reading this piece?

      j. This part is difficult and requires complete courage and honesty. How did you create your reading situation?   If you did not create your reading situation, how did you choose to react to it?

      k. What strategies or 'things you can do' have you learned IN OUR CLASS or through your own research that could have helped you with this reading?

Appendix H

Sample Student Conference (Bridget/Transcribed)

Line	Teacher/Question	Student/Response
2	Thinking back to before you started this class, how did you feel about yourself as a reader?	I felt like it was going to be kind of hard because it's not the kind of reading I'm use to.
4	What kind of reading are you use to?	Like people kind of helping me with uh, the meaning of the words.
6	What do you do now when you see a word you've never heard of?	I just try to figure it out,
8	What do you do to help you figure it out?	Pretty much, I just look at all the words around it or break apart the word meanings.
10	So, how do you feel about yourself as a reader right now?	It's getting better
12	What do you think you are doing now, that has made you a better reader?	I'm using the SQ3R.
14	The SQ3R strategy, how's that helpful?	It helps me think about what I need to do and what I'm doing.
16	Do you think that what you are learning now can help you in your other classes?	Yeah.
18	How do you think so?	Um, like helping me understand what I read, find the main ideas.
20	So, thinking about your future college courses. How can what you have learned about reading help you with those classes?	It will help me find the main ideas and the important information.
22	Do you think that you will still use the SQ3R strategy?	YES![with excitement] Ha ha…!
24	Have you had a chance to use that strategy in your other classes?	Not really.
26	Why do you think that is?	I don't have to read for my other classes.
28	Is there anything specific that you would like to see us do in class?	Just what we are already doing pretty much. I know that long word that you taught us, I tried learning like that. I liked that.
30	That word Pnuemonoultramicroscopic-silicovolcanokonisis. Are you breaking words into their Latin and Greek word parts to help you with the meaning?	Yeah, I'm trying that. It's getting better.

APPENDIX I

Transcription and Annotation of a Student Portfolio Response

Marvin	Portfolio Response		
Line	**Student Response**	**Annotations**	**Theme Category**
1	I chose this piece because I'm a big Red Sox fan and I was very interested in reading the article about getting two' in' players.	The student selected an article from MLB.com entitled "Sox leave Nashville with two additions to lineup" by Ian Brown (2012). When thinking about reading, student relays the importance of a self selected reading in relation to his motivation. He thinks about his personal interests to select pieces, practice reading strategies, and reflect upon how he assures comprehension is occurring.	Selection
2	I find this article fun and exciting because when I read about the Red Sox or any sports team it captures my attention and I don't think about anything else.	When thinking about reading, student relays the importance of a self selected reading in relation to his motivation. He thinks about his personal interests to select pieces, practice reading strategies, and reflect upon how he assures comprehension is occurring.	Attention
3	To pay attention I have to sit down and whisper to myself.	When thinking about current reading experiences, Marvin indicates that he knows what strategies meet his auditory learning needs.	Attention
4	I didn't take any notes because it wasn't necessary so came in this case, it [note taking] didn't help any.	When thinking about current reading experiences, Marvin indicates that he knows what strategies meet his learning needs.	Strategies

	When I caught myself dozing or looking at the TV I had to shut off the TV and my phone. Even though it's a short reading I easily get off-topic.	When thinking about current reading experiences, he indicates he knows what causes distractions and how to modify his behaviors accordingly.	Attention
5	I learned that the Red Sox got to players from the Rangers and Dodgers.	When thinking about reading, he uses his strategies, and modifies behaviors in order to improve understandings about reading.	Understanding
6	With the two new additions the Red Sox baseball has a stronger and better team than they had 2012.		Understanding
7	I created a grand reading situation by shutting off everything in the room and by allowing myself to focus only on what I was reading.	When thinking about current reading experiences, he indicates he knows what causes distractions and how to modify his behaviors accordingly.	Action
8	The strategy I use when reading is whispering to myself so that I can understand and stay on track when reading.	When thinking about current reading experiences, he indicates he knows what strategies meet his learning needs (auditory) and modifies his behaviors in order to improve understandings about reading.	Understanding

9	I chose this reading because it was interesting and easy to read. I like reading about cars so this article was very easy to understand.	The student selected an online piece titled, "102-year-old Woman Drives her 82 Year Old Car" originally posted on AOL (September 18, 2012). When thinking about reading, student relays the importance of a self selected reading in relation to his motivation. He thinks about his personal interests to select pieces, practice reading strategies, and reflect upon how he assures he is paying attention.	Selection
10	To make sure I was able to comprehend this article I removed all distractions for myself (off the TV and put my phone away).	When thinking about current reading experiences, he indicates he knows what causes distractions and how to modify his behaviors accordingly. He understands the relationship between reading strategies, his behaviors in reading, and reading success.	Comprehension
11	The part of the article that I found easiest to understand what the section that covered the types of vehicles that she owned and how she still changes her own oil.	Gains Understanding	Understanding
12	I learned that if you take care of things that last longer in life, her 82-year-old car and the fact that she is 102 years old.	Interprets reading	Understanding

13	When I finished reading the article I researched the types of cars that she owned.	Student employs strategies discussed in class. When thinking about reading, he notes that he takes responsibility for creating more knowledge about the subject and better understanding by researching.	Strategy
14	I created a good reading situation by completely shutting out everything in the room and allowing myself to focus only on what I was reading.	When thinking about reading, the student recognizes how his behaviors impact his attention by increasing his engagement with the reading.	Focus {Attention}
15	I have learned that reading aloud to myself helps me to understand the reading more effectively.	When thinking about reading, and reflecting on what has been learned about reading, the student indicates he recognizes the relationship between reading strategies, and successful reading comprehension.	Understand
16	Overall this reading is something that interested me because of the classic cars like the 1930 AT 747 roadster, the 66 and 75 Cadillac Eldorado convertibles, and Eighth 1931 models. But the highlight was the perseverance of the 102 year old woman who can still do things on her own.		Understanding

17	I chose this reading because it was challenging to read, is about Apple Macs and how they are affecting people in Australia.	When thinking about reading, the student indicates he does not avoid challenging readings if they interest him. Instead, he increases and adjusts his behaviors, and activates strategies he feels will help him read successfully.	Selection
18	To be sure I was able to pay attention while reading, I turned off all distractions such as the TV and phone.		Attention
19	I wanted to be sure to understand how Apple Macs are causing a problem, and why the police there are calling it a "potentially life-threatening issue".	When thinking about reading, the students focus is on 'understanding' the reading. He uses strategies discussed in class to assure success when reading.	Confusion [questioning]
20	It was a bit confusing to understand where the city is and how it is listed as being in the middle of a Moran sunset national Park.	When thinking about reading, the student recognizes the importance of creating prior knowledge and connections when his comprehension is challenged. He indicates that he relies on research to create the necessary background information that he needs.	Confusion [questioning]

21	It was confusing because I am not familiar with your geography of Australia. That was one of the only problems I had while reading the article was stopping to research Mildura, Australia.		Confusion [questioning]
22	When I was confused about the city location in Australia, I stopped and use MapQuest to locate the city and the park to see how far apart these two places really are.		Confusion [questioning]
23	I have learned that technology is not perfect and we cannot rely on things such as Apple mouse to give us direction.		Understanding
24	I created a good reading situation by shutting out everything in the room and focusing only on what I was reading I have learned that reading aloud to myself helps me understand what I am reading.		Focus {Attention}

25	I included my notes from class for the reading work and research.	When thinking about reading, the student notes he uses a variety of strategies, in a variety of reading contexts to increase reading. He admits to trying many strategies, and finding two (research to create background knowledge, and reading out loud to be essential in most cases) and the others to be helpful.	Strategy
26	I found these notes to be very helpful in learning how to break down difficult passages and understand what is being said.		Understanding
27	I found the SQ3R reading method the most helpful while reading.		Strategies
28	I have also learned that I am more of an auditory learner and it has helped me understand things better.	When thinking about reading, the student shares that self-awareness of his learning styles is beneficial in determining what strategies he might try.	Understanding
29	There are lots of things I would like to read in the future, mostly sports articles and books related to school.		Selection

32	some of the challenges I have been reading our thinking about other things and communicating with other people.		Challenges
33	Some of the strategies that I can use our whispering to myself while reading and just paying attention to what I'm reading.	When thinking about reading, the student notes the importance of thinking about his reading and "just paying attention"	Attention
34	Something that I will do in the future is whisper read to myself earlier in the year.		Future
35	This year I just found out about my strategy and wish I would've known earlier.	When thinking about reading, the student reflects on the past, and indicates disappointment in only learning these strategies now. He looks forward to moving on with his new found strategies.	Past
36	I think this strategy will be very helpful because when I discovered it was already improving in my writing and began to read a lot faster and understand what I was reading.	When thinking about reading, he student recognizes how his reading strategies have helped him in other content areas, specifically writing, He also notices an improvement in his fluency and comprehension.	Understand

37	I will be more than sure that I will have a great reading skills in the future because I found something that I like and when I use that I understand a lot more than what I used to.	When thinking about reading for the future, the student is hopeful and motivated for learning.	Future
38	I can stay focused by turning my phone off than just having it on vibrate. I can also try and disengage myself from sitting with people that talk a lot.		Focus {Attention}
39	I think I get and stay motivated by telling myself that I'm going to finish and I won't give up for anything.		Motivation
40	I want to finish school and I want to finish strong.		Motivation
41	Prior to this class, I thought reading was just as simple as it sounds; Read the words on the page and hope that you understand it.	When reflecting on reading, the student did not think there was much to the act of reading. He notes, he now has a better understanding of what it takes to be a good reader, and how he can go about doing so.	Understanding (Past)
42	I felt like reading was something I did just to get what I needed to know about a particular subject matter.		Past

43	I now have learned that reading isn't enough; I need to be able to comprehend the reading material so I can remember them [ideas] when needed.	When reflecting on reading, the student considers the importance of reading for college success and beyond.	Understanding
44	I found that I need to have a quiet environment in order to start reading. I have learned that I need to use an auditory method to help myself during the reading section.		Strategy
45	After reading I use parts of the SQ 3R method to ensure I retain the information I.		Strategy
46	Understanding what helps me read better will l help me ensure that I am successful in the future.		Understanding
47	I still need to learn how to stay focused and block out all distractions; For college I still need to learn how to use SQ3R method more effectively.	When thinking about reading for the future, the student feels better prepared but would like to continue working on behaviors that allow him to focus and minimize distractions. He also indicates he still has to learn how to use Sq3r in other college settings.	Focus [Attention]