READING MISCUE ANALYSIS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO GROUPS FROM THIRD SEMESTER STUDENTS IN STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA

THESIS

BY
NURINTAN PURWANDANIK
NIM. 115110107111035

STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
FACULTY OF CULTURAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA
2015

ABSTRACT

Purwandanik, Nurintan (2015). **Reading Miscue Analysis: A Comparative Study of Two Groups from Third Semester Students in Study Program of English Universitas Brawijaya**. Study Program of English, Universitas Brawijaya. Supervisor: Fatimah. Co-supervisor: Tantri Refa Indhiarti.

Keywords: Reading, Miscue Analysis, Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA), Good Readers, Poor Readers.

Reading is one of basic human skills beside listening, speaking, and writing which functions for helping people to gain new information. Miscue Analysis is a method which attempt to analyze the unexpected responses of unfamiliar text which occurs in oral reading. Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) was used in this study by comprising reading text aloud, retelling and discussion session. These steps helped the readers develop their reading skills. This study was conducted to find out the answer to what the oral reading miscue types are produced by the good and poor readers from third semester students in Study Program of English Universitas Brawijaya and what the factors are contributing the miscue production.

In achieving the purposes of the study, the writer applied theories of Types of Miscue (Goodman and Burke, 1973), Three Cueing Systems (Goodman, 1969), and Factors Contributing Miscues Production (Kern, 1988). The data were originated from all utterances of six participants divided into two groups encompass good readers group and poor readers group. The data were taken by recording process, and they were transcribed into transcription.

The results showed the good readers group made 23 (47%) omissions, 9 (19%) substitutions, 7 (14%) insertions, 6 (12%) self-repetitions, and 4 (8%) repetitions. Then, the results of factors contributing miscues production showed the two students were influenced by linguistic and affective factor. Meanwhile, one student was influenced by linguistic, affective, and cognitive factor. Besides, the poor readers group made 87 (44%) omissions, 49 (25%) substitutions, 33 (17%) repetitions, 19 (10%) self-corrections, and 8 (4%) insertions. Moreover, the results of factors indicating miscue production showed linguistic, affective, and cognitive factor were the three factors contributing miscue production of the three students. The result of the study showed that the good readers and poor readers made miscues in their oral reading, although the good readers made fewer miscues than the poor readers.

The writer suggests for the further writer who wants to conduct a study in the same field of RMA to use different subjects and instruments. Then, the writer suggests for the lecturers to develop their strategy of teaching reading for the students.

ABSTRAK

Purwandanik, Nurintan. (2015). **Analisa Kekeliruan Membaca: Sebuah Studi Perbandingan dari Dua Kelompok pada Mahasiswa Semester Tiga di Program Studi Sastra Inggris Universitas Brawijaya**. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Brawijaya. Pembimbing (I) Fatimah, (II) Tantri Refa Indhiarti.

Kata Kunci: Membaca, Analisa Kekeliruan, *Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA)*, Pembaca yang Baik, Pembaca yang Buruk.

Membaca adalah salah satu keterampilan dasar manusia selain mendengarkan, berbicara, dan menulis yang berfungsi untuk membantu manusia untuk mendapatkan informasi baru. Analisa kekeliruan adalah metode yang mencoba menganalisa respon tak terduga dari teks yang tidak dikenal dalam membaca keras. *Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA)* digunakan dalam penelitian ini yang terdiri dari membaca teks dengan keras, sesi menceritakan kembali dan diskusi. Langkah-langkah ini membantu pembaca mengembangkan kemampuan membaca mereka. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui jawaban terhadap apa jenis-jenis kekeliruan membaca keras yang dihasilkan oleh pembaca yang baik dan buruk dari mahasiswa semester tiga di Program Studi Bahasa Inggris Universitas Brawijaya dan faktor-faktor apa yang mempengaruhi produksi kekeliruan.

Dalam mencapai tujuan penelitian, penulis menerapkan teori-teori dari Jenis-Jenis Kekeliruan (Goodman dan Burke, 1973), Tiga Sistem Isyarat (Goodman, 1969), dan Faktor-Faktor yang Memproduksi Kekeliruan (Kern, 1988). Data berasal dari seluruh ucapan enam peserta dibagi menjadi dua kelompok mencakup kelompok pembaca yang baik dan kelompok pembaca yang buruk. Data diambil dengan proses rekaman, dan mereka ditulis menjadi transkrip.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan kelompok pembaca yang baik membuat 23 (47%) penghilangan, 9 (19%) penggantian, 7 (14%) sisipan, 6 (12%) pembenaran sendiri, dan 4 (8%) pengulangan. Kemudian, hasil faktor yang memproduksi kekeliruan menunjukkan dua siswa dipengaruhi oleh faktor linguistik dan afektif. Sementara itu, satu siswa dipengaruhi oleh faktor linguistik, afektif, dan kognitif. Selain itu, kelompok pembaca yang buruk membuat 87 (44%) penghilangan, 49 (25%) penggantian, 33 (17%) pengulangan, 19 (10%) pembenaran sendiri, dan 8 (4%) sisipan. Selain itu, hasil dari faktor-faktor yang menunjukkan produksi kekeliruan menunjukkan faktor linguistik, afektif, dan kognitif adalah tiga faktor yang memengaruhi produksi kekeliruan dari tiga siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa, pembaca yang baik dan pembaca yang buruk membuat kekeliruan dalam membaca keras, meskipun pembaca yang baik membuat sedikit kekeliruan dibandingkan pembaca yang buruk.

Penulis menyarankan kepada penulis berikutnya yang ingin melakukan penelitian di bidang yang sama tentang *RMA* untuk menggunakan subyek dan instrumen yang berbeda. Kemudian, penulis menyarankan kepada guru dan dosen untuk membangun strategi mereka dalam mengajar membaca kepada siswa.

REFERENCES

Adelman, C., Jenkins, D., Kemmis, S. (1976). Rethinking case study: notes from the second Cambridge conference. *Cambridge journal of education: Volume 6, Issue 3, p. 139-150.*

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Soresen, C., and Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Astiwidya, V. D. A. (2014). English reading miscue analysis on Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) students at the inclusive school Galuh Handayani Surabaya: a case study. Unpublished thesis, Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beyer, J. (2007). Strategies for helping struggling readers comprehend expository text. *Strategies for Comprehending Expository Texts, p. 1-18.*

Born, M., Curtis, R. (2013). (Re) Discovering retrospective miscue analysis: an action research exploration using recorded readings to improve third-grade sudents' reading fluency. *Inquiry in education: Volume 4 , Issue 2, Article 4*. West Virginia University.

Deleo, D. (2013). Influence of retrospective miscue analysis on a student's perception of himself as a reader. *Journal of Education and Development, paper 324.*

Department for education and skills. *Miscue analysis*. Retrieved on October 8th, 2014 from http:// rwp.excellencegateway.org.uk /resource/ Diagnostic+ assessment %3A+literacy%3A +materials+for+assessing + reading+ using+ miscue+ analysis/pdf/.

Durgunoglu, A. Y., Hanchin-Bhatt, B. J. (1992). *The role of first language in the second-language reading process.* Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library.

Elangovan, S. (2012). A cognitive equation of reading process for students with autism. *The Journal of Reading and Literacy Vol. 4 p. 48-78.*

Ferguson, A., Harding, E., Helmer, K., and Suh, S. J. (2003). Miscue analysis of native and non-native speakers. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT Student Association, vol.10.*

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: a theoritical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5(3), p.239-256.*

Goodman, K. S. (1969). *Analysis of oral reading miscues: applied psycholinguistic. Read. Res. Quarts. 5:9-30.* Detroit: Wayne State University.

Goodman. K. S. (1970). Psycholinguistic universal in the reading process. *The Journal of Typo-Graphic Research, 4, 103-110.*

Goodman, K. S., Burke, C. L. (1973). *Appendix for theoretically based studies of patterns of miscues in oral reading performance.* Detroit: Wayne State University, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Goodman, K. S. (1973). *Miscue analysis: applications to reading instruction.* Washington D.C.: ERIC and NCTE.

Goodman, K. S. (1976). *Reading: a psycholinguistic guessing game.* International Reading Association.

Goodman, Y. M. (1996). Revaluing readers while readers revalue themselves: Retrospective Miscue Analysis. *Reading Teacher*, *49*(8), p.600-609.

Goodman, Y. M. (2008). *Retrospective miscue analysis: an overview.* Retrieved on October 11st 2014 from https:// www.rcowen.com/ WordDocs / RMA-Overview Chapter.doc.

Hammond, D., Birdyshaw, D., Paris, S., and Sulzby, E. (2000). *Oral Reading. MLPP Second Edition.*

Hapsari, D. S. (2013). Reading miscue analysis of second semester students in study program of English Universitas Brawijaya. Unpublished thesis, Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.

Heilprin, J. (2014). *WHO: Ebola vaccine trials W. Africa January.* Retrieved on October 22nd 2014 from http://www.thejakartapost.com/ news/2014/10/22/who-ebola-vaccine-trials-w-africa-january.html.

Hoffman, J. V., Goodman, Y. (2009). *Changing literacies for changing time, on historical perspective on the future of reading research, public policy, and classroom practices*. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Huckin, T. N., Olsen, L. A. (1991). *Technical writing and professional communication for nonnative speakers of English*. New York: Mc. Graw-Hill, Inc.

Huszti, I. (2008). The micro level of reading miscues: case studies of six Learners. *Journal of WoPaLP Vol. 2*.

Huszti, I. (2009). *The use of learner reading aloud in the English session: a look at the micro and macro levels of oral reading*. Ungvar: Poliprint.

Idrus, A. (2014). *Mangrove restoration to save sembilang national park*. Retrieved on October 9th 2014 from http://www.thejakartapost.com /news/2014/10/07/ mangrove - restoration safeguard sembilang national park. html.

Johnson, A. P. (n.d.). *Chapter 1: Reading and your brain – the transactive model.* Retrieved on October 11st 2014 from http://www.opdt-johnson.com/ Ch_1_Understanding_Reading. pdf.

Kern, R. G. (1988). Foreign language reading: linguistic, cognitive, and affective factors which influence comprehension. *Educational Resources Information Center*. Barkley: University of California.

LAW, J. S. P. (2012). Getting children from low-income families to read: what works. *The Journal of Reading and Literacy Vol. 4 p. 7-22*.

Mante, J. S. (2006). Reflecting on miscues in context area readings: a case of two learners. *The Asia-Pasific Education Research, 15(1) 183-206*.

Moore, R. A., Brantingham, K. L. (2003). Nathan: a case study in reader response and retrospective miscue analysis. *The Reading Teacher, Vol. 56, No. 5 pp. 466-474*.

Moore, R. A., and Gilles, C. (2005). *Reading conversation: retrospective miscue analysis with struggling reader*. United States of America: Heinemann.

Moss, B. (2004). Teaching expository text structures through information trade book retellings. *International Reading Association, p.710-718*.

Otto, J. (1977). Reading cue utilization by low-achieving college freshmen. *Journal of Reading Behavior IX, 1*.

Qiuyan, Y. Junju, W. (2011). Investigating the miscue-reflected EFL oral reading process: a case study. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics Vol. 34 No. 2*.

Schemm, P., Bellaoualli, S. (2014). *Morocco mulls legal pot growing, breaking taboo*. Retrieved on October 9th 2014 from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/10/07/morocco-mulls-legal-pot-growing-breaking-taboo.html.

Smith, F. (2004). *Understanding reading a psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Walker, L. (1975). Newfounland dialect interference in oral reading. *Journal of Reading Behaviour.*Vol.*VII, 1*.

Wolfe, M. B. W., Mienko, J. A. (2007). Learning and memory of factual content from narrative and expository text. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, p.541-564*.