

Sitorus et al., 2015

Volume 1 Issue 1, pp.1367-1374

Year of Publication: 2015

DOI- <https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2015.s21.13671374>

This paper can be cited as: Sitorus, F. R., Silalahi, W. P., & Lin, H. (2015). Exploring Reading Process of Taiwanese Students: Using Miscues Analysis. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1367-1374.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

EXPLORING READING PROCESS OF TAIWANESE STUDENTS: USING MISCUES ANALYSIS

Sitorus, Friska RIA

Dept. Curriculum Design and Human Potentials Development National Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan
Friskasitorus969@yahoo.com

Silalahi, Wolter Parlindungan

Dept. Curriculum Design and Human Potentials Development National Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan
Silalahiwalter@yahoo.co.id

Lin, Huei-Hsuan

Dept. Curriculum Design and Human Potentials Development National Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan
linhh@mail.ndhu.edu.tw

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the reading process of readers' miscues in reading a text. Ken Goodman first coined the term to describe an observed response in the reading process that does not match the expected response (Goodman, 1973). The term "miscue," rather than "error" or "mistake" is used to avoid judgments. Good miscues do not change the meaning of the sentence or story and are called high quality miscues. On the other hand, miscues that do not make sense are called low quality miscues. Five Taiwanese undergraduate students were recruited to participate in this study. They were all from and demonstrated similar English competency. The participants were asked to read an unfamiliar and unpracticed text. This study used interview and retelling guide (including both un-added and added retelling) to collect data. Reading miscue analysis was employed to analyze

Taiwanese students' reading style and error patterns. The results found that all readers made more than 25 miscues in reading. All the readers made the miscues of dialect and insertion. Moreover, some readers made no words substitutions and repetitions miscues without affecting their understanding of the text.

Keywords

Reading process, Miscues analysis, and Taiwanese undergraduate student

1. Introduction

Reading analysis is a precise endeavor to understand the reading process. Reading is an interaction between thought and language and it depends on the reader's background knowledge and experience. Reading is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately (Argyle, 1989). Reading students made miscue in reading process no matter they are proficient or non-proficient readers (Goodman, 1973) When reading a text, students can bring experience, attitude, concepts, and cognitive schemes to express meaning of the text (Goodman, 1973). When giving a student a reading record, I conducted a miscue analysis to determine patterns being used as well as strategies used or ignored by the reader. The researcher conducted the The researcher conducted the miscue analysis method which pays attention to the combination of semantic, syntactic, and graph phonic cueing systems in order to gain how readers make meaning from the text. Then, this study includes the students with a view to understand their miscues. It is hoped that it will help them to see their attempts in constructing meaning and to understand which strategies are effective and which are not (DeLeo, 2013). The aim of this study was to investigate the reading process of readers' miscues in reading a text by Taiwanese students. The objectives are to identify the type of miscues made by Taiwanese undergraduate students, they demonstrated similar English competency. The research question is:

- What are the types of miscue made by Taiwanese students during reading process?
- How do the miscues affect reading process of the learners?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Reading Process

(Goodman, 1973) defines reading as a “psycholinguistic guessing game” in (Mante, 2006). It means that readers use three language cuing systems to make sense of the printed page, and these systems are the graph phonic, semantic, and the syntactic cues. Learning to

read is not a simple process. As students value the reading processes, they develop and use them to further expand reading strategies to make meaning of the text (Martens, 1998). The goal of reading instruction is to move students toward understanding and valuing their own knowledge rather than feeling defeated and deeming themselves as illiterate (Mante, 2006) & (Martens, P. 2007) note how in the process of reading and constructing meaning, all readers make miscues. In the reading process has language cueing system: semantic system, syntactic system, graph phonic system with their knowledge of the world to infer and predict meaning.

2.2 Miscue Analysis

Miscue analysis was first developed by Kenneth Goodman (Goodman, 1973). Miscues are readers' variations from the print, or something that does not match the text. Determining patterns emerged in readers' miscues can inform teachers regarding how to offer students support or scaffolds to the student. Conducting a miscue analysis reveals strategies students are using while reading. It involves analyzing the miscues made by the student as recorded on the running record or miscue analysis forms (DeLeo, 2013). Miscue analysis is a major area of whole language procedure which is designed to evaluate the learners' strategies in their reading process. Goodman and his colleagues in the 1960's were interested in the processes occurring during reading, and believed that miscues (any departure from the text by the reader) could provide a picture of the underlying cognitive processes. He used the term miscue, rather than error, reflecting the view that a departure from the text is not necessarily erroneous (Goodman, 1973). Readers' miscues include substitutions of the written word with another, additions, omissions, and alterations to the word sequence. While evaluating their reading and answering questions pertaining to the three-cueing systems, semantic (meaning), syntactic (grammar), and grapho-phonetic (sounds correlated with letters), students became aware of their miscues and their self-perception immediately changed (Argyle, 1989), (Warde, 2005) & (Gunther, 2006) . Although miscues may be associated with the term "errors" and many people misinterpret the term to be negative, during the process of retrospective miscue analysis, the term miscue is not a negative term. The term miscue is used to express a student's unconscious metacognition of their reading process (Hempenstall, 1998)

2.3 Related Study

There are seven types of miscues done by readers in oral reading process (Adeena, Pillai, & Paramasivam, 2014) & (Theurer, 2002):

1. Substitutions consist of:

- Non words: The miscue is a word that is not in our language.
- Dialect usages: A word commonly used by the reader in his dialect; it means the same as the word in the text for which it is substituted. Certain insertions and omissions can also be dialect usages
- Split syllables: Reader hesitates in the middle of a word, and then finishes the word.

1. Omission consists of:

- Words: Reader leaves out a word in the text.
- Phrases or lines: Reader leaves out several consecutive words or a line of text.
- End punctuation: Reader does not pause at the end of a sentence to indicate the recognition of end punctuation.

1. Insertion (The reader adds one or more words to the text)

2. Regressions consist of:

- Repetition: Reader reads the text correctly, then backs up and says the same word or phrase more than once
- Abandoning the correct form: Reader says what is in the text, but then backs up and reads the same word or phrase again and makes a miscue
- Unsuccessful attempts to correct: Reader tries more than once to correct a miscue, but continues to miscue on each attempt.
- Corrections: Reader makes a miscue, then backs up and reads the text correctly

1. Refusal occurs when the reader pause on a word for 3 to seconds but does not make any attempt to read it.

1. Hesitation occurs when the reader pause more than 5 seconds after attempting to read the word.

1. Self-correction occurs when the reader realized that made mistake and immediately to correct it.

Previous study was conducted by (Adeena, Pillai, & Paramasivam, 2014) in Malaysia. The participants were Malaysian learners and they made the highest miscues in omission 39.86%, followed by substitutions 35.33%, while hesitation 22.99% and the minimum miscues did in insertion 1.13% and self-correction 0.68%.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participant

The participants were the first-year five university students and they were all from the department of indigenous studies. They were chosen to participate in the study because they came from non-English major student and based on their academic record, they did not learn English at the college. They shared that they first started learning English from elementary school till senior high school and also they learned English at the cram school. Second, while they learned English through formal classroom instruction, they didn't have much exposure to English in everyday life for its communicative use.

3.2 Reading Materials

The reading materials chosen for the case study was an article which was unfamiliar to the participants. According to the criteria stated by Goodman in (Qiuyan & Junju, 2011), the material selected should be "difficult enough to challenge readers but not so difficult that they cannot continue independently". Based on that criterion, an article, "Laughter is the best medicine" (Smith & Segal, 2015), a 590-words essay was chosen. In addition, a retelling guide (including both un-added and added retelling) was used to collect data. The researcher also gave an interview to understand individual readers' experience in reading (Haertel, 2014).

3.3 Miscues Analysis

The researcher analyzes oral reading miscues data by following three steps: marking the miscues, coding the marked miscues and analyzing the coded miscues. Specifically, in marking miscues process the researcher prepared typescripts first and replayed the recordings as many times as necessary to identify and mark miscues with the pre-set symbols. Then, all the marked miscues were transferred into the miscue analysis coding form for coding. There are four parts of miscues interpretation which are graphic similarity, syntactic acceptability, semantic acceptability and meaning change (Argyle, 1989), (Warde, 2005) & (Gunther, 2006). In analyzing graphic similarity (print and sound cues), Syntactic acceptability (grammar cues) and Semantic acceptability (meaning cues). The percentage of miscues interpretation can be seen below:

Table 1: Miscues Analysis

No	Interpretation	Y	N	S	H
----	----------------	---	---	---	---

1	graphic similarity		10%	43%	47%
2	syntactic acceptability	58%	42%		
3	semantic acceptability	63%	37%		
4	meaning change	61%	39%		

Note: Y=Yes, N=No, S=Some, H=High

4. Discussion

The study shows that the learners' reading process had no graphic similarity since the score of 10% means that the learners did little mistake in pronounce non words of the text. Graphic similarity of 43% means that the learners pronounced some words which are almost similar to the ones shown in the text. The graphic similarity is the highest. the score of 47% means that the learners pronounced some words which are very similar to the original words in the text. Sometimes the leaner's read some words repeated twice or more and sometimes they didn't notice punctuation. These miscues were included into syntactic acceptability and the result is 58%. Semantic acceptability of reading process is 63% which indicates the extent that readers make sense of the printed text. on the other hand, regarding the meaning change, the score is 61%. it means that though readers made many miscues in reading process but it did not change the meaning of the text. Actually each participant has different reading process. for example, some readers read fast and ignore the process of the reading. but the efficient reader usually read about 8 minutes 10 seconds, while eff ective readers tried hard to read repeated more frequently and that's why it took them 15 minutes 40 seconds to finish. A simple solution is to use a clear plastic bookmark that does not block their peripheral view of surrounding print (Argyle, 1989). Omission and insertions were the highest miscue done by readers. In insertions the readers often inserted articles such as "the/a" and also to be "is," while in omission they miss "s/ed". It caused "negative transfer" for their mother tongue. Most of Taiwanese ignore suffix "s/ed" because in Taiwanese language there is no infinitive, past and continues verbs. But in retelling part the readers were able to retell the text by their own words and associate the text with their background knowledge.

5. Conclusion

Teachers and learners can benefit from miscues analysis in reading since it can be a

way to leads the classroom activities which add to the students' range of reading strategies. Miscues analysis can be used to help teachers make decisions about upcoming reading instruction (Argyle, 1989). Occasionally learners with puzzling reading problems present teachers with a need for more specific information about reading behavior. If the learners have done self correction in reading it can help them for the future reading. Miscues analysis already helped leaners to know their miscue in reading process and also for the teacher it can guide them to teach reading easier because they already known systematically how to examine learners weakness in reading with a hope to increase learner's interest in reading.

References

- Adeena, Pillai, A. D., & Paramasivam, S. (2014). Miscue Analysis of Oral Reading Among Non-Proficient Malaysian ESL Learners. *ournal of English Language and Literature*, 179-185.
- Argyle, S. B. (1989, January). Miscue Analysis for Classroom Use. *Reading Horizons*, pp. 91-102.
- DeLeo, D. (2013). *Influence of Retrospective Miscue Analysis on a Student's Perception of Himself as a Reader*. State University of New York: The College at Brockport.
- Goodman, K. S. (1973, October). Miscue Analysis. Urbana: ERIC .
- Gunther, J. (2006). Ongoing assessment for reading. Analyzing the miscues.
- Haertel, S. (2014). Retrospective Miscue Analysis: An Effective Intervention for Students in Grades 3-12. p. http://www.wsra.org/assets/Convention/Handouts_2014/c17%20s_haertelretrospective%20miscue%20analysis%20handout.pdf.
- Hempenstall, K. (1998). Miscue Analysis : a critique. *Australian Journal Disabilities* , 32-37.
- Mante, J. S. (2006). REFLECTING ON MISCUES IN CONTENT AREA READINGS: A CASE OF TWO LEARNERS. *journal The Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 183-206.
- Moore, R. A., & Gilles, C. (2005). *Reading Conversation*. United State of America: Heinemann.
- Qiuyan, Y., & Junju, W. (2011). Investigating the Miscue-reflected EFL Oral Reading Process: A Case Study. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Quarterly)*, 62-82.
- Theurer, J. L. (2002). *The Reading Matrix. The Power of Retrospective Miscue Analysis: One Preservice Teacher's Journey as She Reconsiders the Reading Process*.

- Warde, B. A. (2005). Reading Miscues of College Students With and Without Learning Disabilities. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 21-36. [http://dx. doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2005.10850178](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2005.10850178)
- Wixson, K. L. (1979). miscue analysis: a critical review. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 163-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10862967909547319>