Article Type: Research Paper
Article Ref. No.: 21082500728MR

Crossref

MISCUE ANALYSIS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Sangeeta Singh Hada[1]✉, Neha Vats[2]

Abstract:

Reading is a complex activity. Reading is a process of comprehension of the written text. A deviation in oral reading from the printed text counts as miscues. Kenneth S. Goodman used the term "miscue" instead of "mistakes" or "error" so the negativity of these words can be avoided. It is based on the belief that miscues and right responses in oral reading come from the similar cue system of a language; they are not just arbitrary mistakes. It is possible to assess oral reading in even greater detail by miscue analysis. This study explores the miscue analysis which has been considerable value as a source of insight into the nature of the reading process and some reading specialists recommend it as diagnostic techniques. Kenneth S. Goodman is one of the pioneer researchers in the field. This paper also presents a literature review of Miscue Analysis.

1.0 Introduction:

Reading is a complex activity. Reading is a process of comprehension of the written text. A deviation in oral reading from the printed text counts as miscues. Kenneth S. Goodman used the term "miscue" instead of "mistakes" or "error" so the negativity of these words can be avoided. It is based on the belief that miscues and right responses in oral reading come from the similar cue system of a language; they are not just arbitrary mistakes (**Goodman & Goodman, 1977**). Miscues are the "windows on the reading process" (**Goodman, 1976**).

Kenneth S. Goodman is one of the pioneer researchers in the field. Miscues are important in light of the fact that they mirror the fundamental procedures and methodologies utilized by readers to understand the text (**Goodman, 1965; 1967; 2005**) which detailed 28 different types of miscues. The psycholinguistic model of reading explains the process of creating meaning from the text. Together with numerous different analysts **(Allen, 1976; Goodman and Burke, 1972; Page, 1975)** Goodman has consistently been a solid advocate of this model. This depicts perusing as an essential bit of the reader's total language structures. Utilizing such a model, oral reading mistakes are not seen as irregular suppositions, however as reasonable endeavors at separating significance from a text.

1 [Author] ✉ [Corresponding Author] Research Scholar, School of Education, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab, INDIA. E-mail: s7hada@gmail.com

2 [Author] Assistant Professor, School of Education, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab, INDIA

Most research laborers right now to agree that our brain uses three cueing systems i.e. grapho-phonic, semantic and syntactic to construct meaning of the text (**Arnold, 1982, 1984; Pumfrey, 1985)**. **Girgin (2006)** found in his study on hearing impaired students of 8th grade that they use their knowledge of grapho-phonics, syntax and semantics during reading and there is a consistency between the miscues they made and their reading comprehension **(Davenport,2002).**

The method is similar while using any inventory. A text is given to the reader to read aloud then the miscues are counted. Three scores are given on the basis of syntactic, semantic and grapho-phonic similarities. After that means and percentages are calculated. This can be used to find out the techniques which the reader is using while reading the text to understand the meaning. Notwithstanding, a few research considers have explored the impacts of evaluation level and reading capacity on patterns of miscue of readers. It was inferred that while interpreting reader's miscue pattern, both reading capacity and grade level of the reader ought to be considered (**Christie, 1981**).

In word-acknowledgment, it has been indicated that the extent of relevant help impacts is an element of unraveling expertise. Augmentations in a difficult situation show a consonant case of presentations (**Perfetti, 1985; Stanovich, 1984**). Stanovich proposed the hypothesis of 'Compensatory Processing'. It expresses that data may be obtained from any one procedure so as to make up for inadequacies in another. Hence, poor information on the letter-sound framework prompts expanding dependence on the syntactic and semantic frameworks. An investigation of the word-acknowledgment and spelling abilities of seventeen children with dyslexia and control group of class second and third students supported the 'Compensatory Processing' theory (**Bruck, 1988**).

What is significant isn't simply the miscue, yet the nature of the miscue and how the miscue helps or upsets the reader's endeavours to recreate the meaning of the content ... research to date demonstrates that good and poor reader do make various types of miscues, and that kinds of poor readers might be recognized by different unmistakable miscue patterns (**Zutell, 1977). Allen (1976**) analyzed the miscues of thirty randomly selected third-year French pupils. From his tests and others, he presumes that the best estimation of the miscue analysis is that it encourages us to find the techniques the reader utilize. Allen accepts that the miscue analysis is qualitative as well as quantitative.

Lang (2018) found that the miscues of the three groups of reader didn't vary in graphemic or phonemic similarity however the OSD (older struggling decoders) and OMD (older struggling readers with mixed difficulties) group made more miscues that were not semantically or linguistically similarity than did the YT (younger typical reader) reader. Impaired 8thgrade students

Girgin (2006) found in his study on hearing impaired students of 8th grade that they use their knowledge of grapho-phonics, syntax and semantics during reading and there is a consistency between the miscues they made and their reading comprehension.

Prasanti (2013) contemplated the formative issue of a dyslexic and did miscue investigation.He used the Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI) and found that there are five types of miscues i.e. substitution, omission, self-correction, hesitation and repetitions. The author doesn't discover reversal and insertion miscues from miscue analysis process.

Qiuyan and Junju (2011) conducted a study to research the oral reading procedure of an EFL student using miscue analysis. He investigated miscues, the impact of content type on miscues and the other variables to miscue creation. The outcomes indicated that the member, during the

time spent importance development, used grapho-phonic, syntactic and semantic prompts just as subjective techniques, for example, testing, foreseeing and revising.

Pelatti (2010) concentrated on the contrasts between two gatherings, people with down disorder (DS) and typically developed (TD) kids with understanding troubles, while reading a credible content and consolidating the understanding instrument, miscue analysis. Results indicated that not at all like their reading coordinated friends, members with DS created increasingly generally miscues just as those that didn't keep up the creator's significance, were not grammatically adequate, and were less grapho-phonemically comparable.

Fahrenbruck (2009) concentrated over the examples of commonness and contrasts of 2nd class pupils' reading performanceobtained from the DIBELS appraisal test, i.e. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills appraisal test and the Miscue Analysis meetings. The discoveries from this analysis study showed that the writings utilized in appraisals assume a significant job in youngsters' understanding exchanges and at last impact the results.

Miscue analysis has been utilized by educators and experts for over fifty years. Its motivation is to uncover qualities and shortcomings in how youngsters process content and accordingly educate guidance for the students. But is it still a valuable methodology? The creators attest that miscue analysis can for sure be a valuable device, however not for all the reasons its promoters have declared throughout the years. Rather, teachers should utilize miscue analysis all the more barely to screen youngsters' utilization of specific techniques during reading, especially as they move from setting reliance to programmed disentangling **(Mckehnna and Picard, 2006**). It is discovered that reading deciphering troubles persevere for understudies with learning handicaps even into school, and reports the reading interpreting challenges with genuine content instead of word records (**Warde, 2005**).

Abu-Rabia and Taha (2004) explored the reading and spelling miscues of dyslexic Arabic reader contrasted and two gatherings of typical reader by matching the age and level of reading. The consequences of the reading miscue analysis uncovered an away from of the oneness of the Arabic orthography to the sorts of mistakes done by aforesaid three different gatherings The investigation of the spelling mistakes uncovered that the prevailing sort of miscue was for the most part phonetic because of the constrained orthographic vocabulary.

Laing (2002) broke down perusing miscues made by regularly creating kids and youngsters who showed beneath normal language and understanding capacities. Results suggested that normal kids made more miscues that saved the significance of the content than kids with underneath normal language and understanding capacities.

Taft and Leslie (1985) analysed the impacts of earlier information (high, low) and oral reading exactness on miscues and cognizance. It was found that students with high earlier information commit less miscue. Likewise, youngsters with high earlier information effectively responded to more cognizance inquiries of numerous kinds – literarily unequivocal, literarily verifiable and scriptally certain than kids with low earlier information. Backing for an intuitive compensatory model of reading is talked about.

Thomson (1978) worked on dyslexic student's group over their reading miscues and another student's group who have more than average reading capability was taken as control group. Goodman's Taxonomy of Oral Miscue (Goodman, 1969) was used by the researcher. For counting the miscues, the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability (Neale, 1958) was given to the students. It was contemplated that the dyslexics committed different patterns of miscues at the perceptual instead of semantic level, and didn't commit errors like beginning readers.

2.0 Conclusion:

In synopsis, Miscues are unpredicted responses to the content that reader produce when reading text aloud. The analysis writing demonstrates complex connections between the quality of reading miscue of a child and the nature of miscue done by the same child and his perception of a particular content. Analysis of oral-reading miscues will be helpful in recommending explicit mediation to improve effectiveness in reading for children. It will guarantee the scholarly accomplishment of the youngsters. Miscue analysis can be a useful instrument for instructors and understudies. They become mindful that slip-up making is essentially a characteristic piece of learning. No miscue is without esteem. In the event that educators attempt to find why the kid makes certain miscues, they will have the option to determine kids' reading issues to have more noteworthy knowledge. The writing survey shows that miscue analysis is extremely helpful method for the educators and researches and still has esteem today.

References:

Abu- Rabia S. & Taha H. (2004). Reading and spelling errors analysis of native Arabic dyslexic readers. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal,* 17,651-689.

Allen, E.D. (1976). Miscue Analysis: A New Tool for Diagnosing Oral Reading Proficiency in Foreign Languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, IX, 563-68.

Arnold, H. (1982). *Listening to Children Reading*. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.

Arnold, H. (1984).*Making Sense of It*. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.

Bruck, M. (1988).The Word Recognition and Spelling of Dyslexic Children, *Reading Research Quaterly*, 23, 70-88.

Clay, M. (1982). *Reading the patterning of complex behavior*, London, Heinemann Educational.

Davenport, M. R. (2002). *Miscues not mistakes: Reading assessment in the classroom.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Fahrenbruck, M. L. (2009). *Second Grade StudentsReading Performances on Miscue Analysis and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10150/195747

Girgin,U. (2006).Evaluation of Turkish Hearing Impaired Students' Reading Comprehension with the Miscue Analysis Inventory. *International Journal of Special Education*.21 (3) .

Goodman, K.S. (1965). A linguistic study of cues and miscues in reading. *Elementary English*,42.639-643.

Goodman, K.S. (1967). Reading : A psycholinguistic guessing of game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*. 257-264, 266-271.

Goodman, K.S.(1969) . Analysis of oral reading miscues, applied psycholinguistic .*Reading Research Quarterly*. V (1), 9-30.

Goodman, K. S. (1976) Miscues: Windows on the reading process. In Goodman, K. S. (Ed.), *Miscue analysis: Applications to reading instruction.* Urbana, Il., National Council of Teachers of English.

Goodman, Y. M., & Burke, C. (1972) .*Reading Miscue Inventory*, New York: Macmillian.

Goodman, Y.M.(1972). Reading Diagnosis- Qualitative and Quantitative. *The Reading Teacher,* 25, 32-37.

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. (1977). Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 317-333.

Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (2005). *Reading miscue inventory: from evaluation to instruction*. Katonah, N.Y.: Richard C. Owen Publishers.

James F. Christie (1981) The Effects of Grade Level and Reading Ability on Children's Miscue Patterns, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 74:6, 419-423,

DOI: 10.1080/00220671.1981.10885342

Laing, S. P. (2002). Miscue analysis in school-age children. *American Journal of   Speech-Language Pathology.*11, 407–416. https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2002/044)

Lang Beverley Margaret (2018*). A comparison of the reading miscues of older struggling readers with younger but typically developing readers: Are they different*? (Master'Thesis, Massey University, Albany, New Zealand). https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/.../01_front.pdf?...1...y

Neale, M. D. (1958). Neale Analysis of Reading Ability. Manual of Directions and Norms. London: Macmillan.

Page, W. D. (1975). *Help for the reading teacher: New directions in research*. Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English, ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communications Skills, National Institute of Education, 1975.

Pelatti, C. Y. (2010). *Miscue Analysis of Students with Down Syndrome and Typically Developing Students with Reading Difficulties* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati).

Perfetti,C.A.(1985).*Reading Ability*.NewYork:Oxford University Press.

Prasanti, F. E. (2013). Reading Miscues Analysis on a Dyslexic Student of English Study Program of Faculty of Cultural Studies: a Case Study. *JurnalIlmiahMahasiswa FIB, 2*(4).

Pumfrey,P.D.(1985).*Reading :Test and Assessment Techniques*:Sevenoaks;Hodder and Stoughton for the United Kingdom Reading Association.

Qiuyan Y.& Junju W.(2011). Investigating the Miscue-reflected EFL Oral Reading Process: A Case Study. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Quarterly) Vol. 34(2) 62-82.*

Stanovich,K.E.(1984).The Interaction-Compensatory Model of Reading :a Confluence of Developmental,Experimental and Educational Psychology.*Remadial and Special Education*,5,11-19.

Taft, M. L., & Leslie, L. (1985). The effects of Prior Knowledge and Oral Reading accuracy on Miscues and Comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 17(21), 63-179.https://doi.org/10.1080/10862968509547537

Thomson, M.E. (1978). A psycholinguistic analysis of reading errors made by dyslexics and normal readers. Journal *of Research in Reading*, 1, 7–20.

Warde, B. A. (2005). Reading miscues of college students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *36*(1), 21-36.

Zutell, J.B., Jr. (1977). Teacher Informed Response to Reader Miscue. In C.M. Galloway (Ed.). *Theory into Practice: Reading and Language.* Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 384-391.