

USING MISCUE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' ORAL READING PROCESS: THE CASE OF TAIWANESE ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

Esteria Hernauli Br Saragih¹, Lin Huei-Hsuan²

¹Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas, ² National Dong Hwa University

e-mail: esteriasaragihh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed to analyze the oral reading process of two Taiwanese elementary students. Particularly it focuses on students' miscues in reading the text. According to Goodman (1973) the reading miscue refers to the symptoms when a reader diverges from the assigned text. Analyzing reading miscues is significant since it reveals how a reader acquires comprehensions through reading process. Therefore, educators should not treat reading miscues simply as mistakes and dismiss them accordingly. Two Taiwanese elementary students in the fifth grade were observed in this study: One was a proficient English reader, while another was considered a struggling reader. Not only were they asked to read the text, they were engaged in unaided retelling of the story afterwards. From their retellings of the story, it was evident that both students understood the story well. But the proficient reader was able to retell in English, while the other could retell the story in Chinese. Through the miscue analysis of their readings, we were able to see that the proficient reader used the strategies of confirming, omission and substitution in reading, while the struggling reader stumbled quite often, inserted words into the text and used substitutes also. Though it appeared that the proficient reader did much better than the struggling reader. But based on the miscue analysis, the struggling reader was making effort to engage the text, and the diversion from the text did not hinder his comprehension of the text, but he was just not able to recount the story in English. Miscue analysis in this case served as a useful tool for teachers to map out students' reading process to differentiate how ways of diversions from the text influenced students' engagement with the text. In doing so, English teachers are able to better assess students' English capacities in a more detailed manner by addressing to their personal conditions.

Keywords: *Miscue analysis, Oral reading, Taiwanese elementary students, English learning*

INTRODUCTION

In addition to listening, writing, and speaking, reading is one of the language skills that can be taught and improved. The activity of reading is a complex process, which requires skill and knowledge to understand the speech sounds and predict unfamiliar words to have the ability to read fluently, a reader needs to have the vocabulary as well as contextual knowledge about the content. The National Reading Panel as cited in Hamid and Abosi (2011).

According to Goodman (1973) the readers can bring experience, attitude, concepts, cognitive, schemes to express the meaning of the text. Therefore during the reading process, readers sometimes do not read text in a word by word manner. According to Goodman (1973), these diversions are not necessarily “errors.” They are the choices made by readers, and he coined the term “cue” to refer to the unexpected word or phrase, which is something other than the exact printed text. Goodman proposes that these deviation from the text offer teachers and students of “a window into the mind of the reader.”

Miscue analysis is thus created as a tool to analyze the unexpected responses (i.e., cueing systems) of unfamiliar text which occurs in the oral reading process. Miscue analysis honors the reasons behind miscues, and considers them as strategies a readers uses to make sense of the text. It is an assessment that is intended to help a teacher identify the cueing systems used by a reader. That is, miscue analysis directs an instructor, not to focus on the mistakes made by the reader, to see what the reader is doing right. In doing so, as teachers we are able to help students to build on strategies and skills that they already possess.

Miscue analysis is concerned with types of the miscue occurred. Miscues are categorized into syntactic, semantic, and grapho-phonetic three groups, and they include the reading symptoms of substitution, omission, insertion, and addition. Through analyzing the reading process, the researcher or teacher will get in-depth insight towards oral reading process.

The first of this paper is an educational master student at National Dong Hwa University. As a partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Whole Language Course, I was introduced into a local Taiwanese Elementary School to assist an English teacher to understand how the students engaged the text during reading process. A miscue analysis was called for.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Oral Reading Process

Reading is a psycholinguistics process for comprehending the text to get the meaning. According to Goodman (1973) states that reading is the process of interaction between thought and language. It means the thought works and constructs to process the language for getting the meaning.

Miscue

A miscue is not an error but miscue is reading process by expecting a response because it is never or seldom heard, seen by the reader. According to Paulson and Mason (2007) said that miscue is a tool to avoid the negative connotation of error or mistake so the readers will produce an unexpected response when the readers read an unfamiliar text.

The readers produce the miscue because the readers never hear or see the content of the text, so when the reader is faced with text so the reader will use miscue for reading or getting understanding and giving the meaning of the text. A

miscue is holistic. It includes into syntax, semantic, and graphic phonic. Through miscue analysis, the readers are observed to watch and know the readers' ability to use the reading strategies when they read the text and say what they learn from the text.

Miscue Analysis

Miscue analysis had been begun Goodman, and the scholar (1962). According to Goodman (1973) in miscue analysis refers to the tools to develop the comprehensive understanding in students' reading, and miscue analysis also a concern to reading as psycholinguistic in oral reading to make the interaction between language and thought. In miscue analysis, the students will know their own strength or weakness in reading process.

When the student reading the text according to miscue analysis, the students do not give the error but the students produce the miscue or there is the mistake while students reading. According to Hamid and Abosi (2011), miscue analysis is a tool to investigate the readers' miscues in their oral reading by using cueing systems which incorporate graphic-phonics, syntax, and semantics. The strategy of miscue analysis refers to cuing system includes semantics, syntactics, and grapha-phonics (Goodman & Marek, 1966) in Black (2004). According to Goodman, Martens, and Flurkey (2016) said that the procedure for assessing the students' reading into the strategy in miscue analysis which includes, substitution, omission, repetition, insertion, correction, and reversal. When the students produce the miscue, the students will remember and become aware on three cutting system. The students get the insight how they learn and understanding the meaning, having self-correcting of the miscue to expand students' strength in reading process and understanding of reading. Goodman, Marten, & Flurkey (2016) and develop students' self-confidence (Flurkey & Goodman, 2000; Goodman, Martens, & Flurkey, 2014; Martens, 1998; Martens & Doyle, 2011; Moore & Gilles, 2005) in Goodman, Marten, & Flurkey (2016).

The Previous of the Study

To add the literature, the researcher had read from source. It is from Hamid and Abosi (2011) "Miscue Analysis of Oral Reading among Less Proficient Readers in Primary Schools in Brunei Darussalam". Miscue is an unexpected response that readers make their oral reading (Davenport, 2002) in Hamid and Abosi (2011). According to Tolistefl (2007) in Hamid and Abosi (2011), the types of the miscue in oral reading consists of seven. They are:

1. Substitutions mean the reader attempts another word in place of the correct word.
2. Omission means the reader leaves a word out quickly.
3. Insertion means the reader adds a word that is not the text.
4. Repetition means the reader repeats the word.
5. Refusal means that pauses on a word for three to five seconds but does not make any attempt to read it.

6. Hesitation means the reader pauses more than five seconds after attempting to read a word and self-correction to refer the reader correct the word.

The result of this study is founded in readers' graphic-phonics cues compared syntax and semantics cues and the miscues do not make failure in readers' oral reading comprehension questions.

RESEARCH METHOD

The Participants

The researchers decide pseudonyms for the participants. The participants are Taiwanese. There are 15 students in the fifth-grade class. Since the researchers were new to the class, the English teacher helped to choose one high proficient reader and one less proficient reader for the analysis. The teacher also paid attention to have one female student and one male student. Even though gender did not serve as a silent factor in terms of how students engaged the text, the choices of balancing the gender participation was honored.

Dewi

For higher proficient reader is Dewi. She is Dewi. A female student, she is eleven years old. Based on the report of English teacher, for Dewi has been active in class. She began to learn English since she was a student in preschool. She has an above average level of vocabulary, and can read on her own. It is not surprise that she also likes English a lot.

Miki

Miki, the male student, on the other hand is less proficient in English reading. According to the English teacher, Miki has been a quiet student in the classroom. Unlike Dewi, he started to learn English since he was a third-grader. We also interviewed him and learned that he also joined cram school to improve his English because he thought that English was difficult. Miki considered himself not a good reader.

The Description of Setting

The researchers conducted the reading session to collect the original data collection from Dewi on Friday, October 14, 2016. Then, Miki on the following Friday, October 21, 2016. Both session took place from 12:30 until 1:15 p.m. This elementary school is located outside Dong Hwa University, has a long history of cooperating with the university. Therefore, both the students and teachers were familiar with the presence of students and faculty members of the university to conduct research project with them.

The reading sessions took place in a room at library, which is the office of the headmaster's room. The researcher chose the quiet room with the hope that readers could focus on their reading and the researcher also would be able to focus on observing the readers.

The Material

Based on Goodman, Watson, and Burke (2005) cited in Erin (2015), when the researcher takes miscue on participants' reading, the participants read the unfamiliar story but they might be familiar with the concept and most importantly the story has a clear storyline. Then, need to be challenged to reading the material but it is not too difficult for them. For this level of young students, according to Goodman, Watson, and Burke (2005) cited in Erin (2015) the words consist of at least 500 words and it thus produces a sufficient number of miscues. The researcher chooses the reading material includes 325 words, 33 sentences in 17 pages.

The Data Collection

The researcher takes the data collection according to Sturman (1997) in Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007). There are unstructured field note and unstructured interview refers to qualitative data and structured refers to quantitative data. The researcher takes the data collection by observation and unstructured interview.

Observation

The researcher takes the data from each participant. Before the researcher takes the data the researcher asks the participants to read story loud. The researcher collects the miscue based on types of miscues, miscue interpretations include Q1: syntactic acceptability, Q2: semantic acceptability, Q3: meaning change, Q4: graphic similarity. The researcher records the readers' reading. Then the researcher observes the readers' miscue and observes the participants' action when they read the text. After the researcher observe participants' miscue and action in reading, the researcher will ask the participants to retell the story as a retelling the story.

Unstructured interview

The researcher also takes interview by unstructured interview from the participants and the English Teacher. The researcher interviews the participants' background English skill, the perception of reading, and the attitude of reading process.

The Procedure

The researcher adopts the outline of collection and analysis data into Goodman (1973). The researcher collects and analyzes miscues data by these instructions:

1. Selecting an appropriate reading material selection for the readers
2. Preparing reading material
3. Recording the readers' uninterrupted reading of selection
4. Recording the readers' uninterrupted retelling of the story
5. Preparing transcript
6. Replaying the recording to mark the miscues
7. Doing the data analysis as marking the readers' miscues
8. Studying the patterns of the readers' strategy indicated by miscues

9. Retelling story

The Data Analysis

The researcher uses the instruction to analyze data according to Goodman, Watson, and Burke. The researcher computes the miscues by MPHWS (miscues per hundred words). The researcher computes MPHWS, the researcher counts the total number of miscues, divide by the number of words read, and multiply by 100 (Goodman, Watson, and Burke, 1972). The researcher has prepared the transcript. The researcher replayed the participants' recording to mark the miscue. The researchers marked the miscue then the researcher gave the coding from each marked miscue and analyzed the code miscues.

There are the explanations about Y, N, P, H, and S. The syntactic and semantic acceptability show Y means yes. The readers produce syntactic and semantic acceptable, N means no. The readers do not produce syntactically acceptable or the readers produce the partial acceptability. The meaning change shows Y means yes. The readers change the meaning of a major idea from the text. P means partial. The readers change the meaning of a minor idea from the text. N means no. The readers do not change the meaning of the selections from the text. The graphic similarity shows H means high. There is the highest degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text. S means there is some degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text. And N means there is not the degree of graphic similarity between miscue and text.

RESEARCH FINDING

Table 1. Miscue Analysis: Dewi

Interpretation	Syntactic and Semantic		Meaning change			Graphic similarity			Duration
	Y	N	Y	P	N	H	S	N	
Q1 (Syntactic acceptability)	30	3							07.04"
Q2 (Semantic acceptability)	30	3							
Q3 (Meaning change)			3	6	22				
Q 4 (Graphic similarity)						29	5	5	

Statistical Profile

	Syntactic Acceptability	
Yes		91%
No		12%
	Semantic Acceptability	
Yes		91%
No		9%

	Meaning Change	
Yes		10%
Partial		19%
No		70%
	Graphic Similarity	
High		74%
Some		13%
None		13%

} 87%

Table 2. Miscue Analysis: Miki

Interpretation	Syntactic and Semantic		Meaning change			Graphic similarity			Duration
	Y	N	Y	P	N	H	S	N	
Q1 (Syntactic acceptability)	29	4							09.05
Q2 (Semantic acceptability)	26	7							
Q3 (Meaning change)			4	11	15				

Statistical Profile

	Syntactic Acceptability	
Yes		88%
No		12%
	Semantic Acceptability	
Yes		79%
No		21%
	Meaning Change	
Yes		13%
Partial		37%
No		50%
	Graphic Similarity	
High		68%
Some		16%
None		16%

} 84%

Discussion

This study has shown that two readers have almost same achievement in syntactic acceptability. Dewi can achieve syntactic acceptability in 91%. This reader is more capable of producing the sentences from the original text. Then Miki can achieve syntactic acceptability in 88% but Miki is not more capable of producing the sentence from the original text. Then Dewi is more comprehensible than Miki. Dewi can produce the sense from the sentence of text. Dewi can show the semantic acceptability of 91%. Miki can produce the semantic acceptability of 79%. Besides, Dewi and Miki have almost similar achievement but Dewi and Miki also show the different oral reading process. Dewi can read the text during 07.04 minutes without change much meaning in 70%. Dewi also gave miscues but Dewi has inconsistency to get and produce the meaning from the text but Dewi read the text continuously. Dewi used repetition when Dewi had difficulty read the word, but for the stopped reading when Miki could not read a word then the reader was helped to read a word until Miki continue to read the text. Miki needed 09.05 minutes to read the text. The reader read the text by producing inconsistency. Miki could read the text without change the meaning in 50%. After that, Dewi and Miki did the little mistake to pronounce the words of the text. Dewi has the highest graphic similarity in 87% means Dewi can pronounce the words are the highest similar with the original words. Then Miki can achieve graphic similarity in 84%. Miki can pronounce which almost similar to the original words.

Dewi

Dewi produced miscue consists of omission and substitution. The reader omitted the word "then", then substituted that become article "the".

- | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Text sentence (1402) | : | and discovered that Elfie | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">The</div> |
| Omission | : | and | <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">then</div> discovered that Elfie |
| | | The other example reader produced the substitution | |
| Text sentence (0203) | : | I loved resting my head on her warm | |
| Substitution | : | I loved reading my head on her warm | |

Dewi has a good strategy for reading the text. Dewi continuously read the text well, but when Dewi did not know how to pronounce the word. She took confirming strategy by applying self-correction and repetition. This finding supported by Goodman (2015), said that Dewi took relation to predicting, confirming, and self-correcting by purposing to construct the meaningful text.

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Text sentence (0103) | : | in the whole world |
| Predicting | : | in the world whole |
| Confirming | : | in the whole world |
| Text sentence (0202) | : | much faster than I did |
| Predicting | : | much faster than I be |

Confirming : **much faster than I did**

Dewi took the role of predicting the word and the confirming the word by repetition. Dewi knew that she has pronounced the right word and it has given syntactic and semantic acceptability of the sentence.

But beside Dewi confirming strategy, sometimes Dewi confirmed the miscue by giving quite sound to word “into”. Even though Dewi was unaware about the miscue, Dewi did not give the correct pronunciation and Dewi continued reading. For reality, based on Marek (1996) in Goodman (2015) claimed there was other finding that proficient reader also confirms the miscue without correction.

Text Sentence (0703) : with Elfie when she got into mischief

Reader’s confirming : with Elfie when she go into mischief

Dewi gave the main idea of the story that is “He loves the dog”. Then, the researcher aided retelling. The researcher told what Dewi said, then Dewi begun to remember about the story, she answered, “The dog become older,” the boy get another dog”. Then, the researcher gave an open-ended question like “How do family respond to the dog?”. Dewi answered, “They love the dog.” But reader missed part of the story that is why does boy get another dog or animal?” The reader did not use the picture to help her for retelling the story. She likes English moreover she enjoys reading the book which has many pictures, even though she liked picture in English book, she exactly focused on the sentences of that story.

Miki

Miki also produced miscue in substitutions, for example

Text sentence (0701) : Sometimes my family would get very angry.

Substitution : Sometimes my **friend** would get very angry.

Miki also always produced insertion miscue which has article “the”. For example:

Text sentence (0301) : My brother and sister loved

Insertion : My brother and sister loved

Then, Miki also produced the intonation shifts. Miki used his accent mark to the following the stressed syllable. Miki change the word “my” by intonation shift become “no..”. So Miki had made substitution that is from the word “my” become “no” Miki could not tell the story in English, Miki just retell in Chinese. My partner helped me to interpret it into English. The reader answered the retelling story, “the boy has the dog, then the dog died, and later they have a lot of animals.

CONCLUSION

The researchers give the implications for students and teacher. The teacher can conduct the students' reading strategies to improve the students' understanding the meaning on the text. According to McKenna and Picard (2006) Let the students give the explicit aims of students' instructional and independent level. The teacher allows the students self-correction when the students have self-correction in reading and retelling, it can help them for their reading in the future. So let the students produce their miscue in their reading, even though the students produce miscue of their reading, miscue analysis can be a facilitator for the teacher to teach, and guide the students to read well, understand and get the meaning of the reading text, and help the students improve the reading skill. And English teacher has to develop strategies for teaching reading. The researcher also suggests to the students to enrich the vocabularies by reading and speaking in English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Black, Wendy L. 2004. Assessing the Metacognitive Dimensions of Retrospective Miscue Analysis Through Discourse Analysis. *Reading Horizons*. Illinois State University.
- Cohen, M., M. 2007. Research Methods in Education. USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Erin, Mikulec. 2015. Reading in Two Language: A comparative Miscue Analysis. Pp 143-157.
- Goodman, Kenneth, S. 1973. *Miscue Analysis: Applications to Reading Instructions*. Urbana: ERIC.
- Goodman, Martens, Flurkey. 2016. Revaluing Readers: Learning from Zachary. Language Arts.
- Goodman, Watson, and Burke. 1972. *Reading Miscue Inventor: Alternative Procedures*. Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
- Goodman, Yetta, M. 2015. Miscue Analysis: A Transformative Tool for Researcher, Teachers, and Readers. Literacy Research Theory: SAGE. doi:10.1177/2381336915617619.
- Hamid and Abosi. 2011. Miscue Analysis of Oral Reading among Less Proficient in Primary Schools in Brunei Darussalam. *The Journal of Interaction Association of Special Education*.
- Larson, and Janskins. 1978. Center for the study reading: Evaluating error correcting procedure for oral reading. *University of Illinois: At Urbana-champaign*.
- McKenna, M. C, and Picard, M., C. 2006. Revisiting the role of miscue analysis ineffective teaching. *International Reading Association*. Pp 378-380.
- Paulson and Mason. 2007. Restrospective Miscue Analysis for Struggling Postsecondary Readers. *Development Education*.