Poor discourse comprehension monitoring is no methodological artifact.
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AB A. M. Glenberg and his colleagues (e.g., Glenberg and W. Epstein, see PA, Vols 73:10964 and 75:12826; Glenberg et al, see PA, Vol 74:30302) have repeatedly found that people do not accurately monitor the quality of their discourse comprehension. However, C. A. Weaver (see record 1990-13906-001) has argued that the poor monitoring in these studies was an artifact of unreliable measurement of comprehension. Objective scrutiny of Weaver's arguments and empirical evidence reveals flaws that invalidate his conclusion. An experiment with 59 undergraduates shows that comprehension monitoring is not improved even when measurement reliability is increased, implying that the latent-variable correlation of self-rated comprehension and comprehension test performance is near zero. Poor discourse comprehension monitoring is not artifactual, but has real interpretive meaning, i.e., substantive causes.