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ABSTRACT

This Research deals with “Miscue Analysis in Reading Aloud By Indonesian English Foreign Learner.” This research focuses on diagnostics tool in reading by using miscue analysis has been studied less extensively. The goal of this research is to check learners’ reading comprehension on text by using diagnostic tool. Therefore, this research is undertaken to investigate the features of miscues produced by the Indonesian EFL learners in the process of orally reading English text. The method is focused to explicate participant, research data, research instruments, data collection and data analysis. There are various miscues occur in this study, such as mispronunciation, insertion, omission, calls for help, hesitation, repetition, and self correction. It can be concluded that Reading aloud can make learners have good pronunciation. It means that their dialect can be corrected while they are reading aloud. Reading speed influences reading comprehension.
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A. INTRODUCTION

Reading is defined as an activity of interacting and getting a meaning from a written language. It is in line with Allen (1976) who proposes the aim of reading is to get meaning of the passage or to grasp comprehension. Comprehension is the purpose of reading, and it is a vital component to reading (Thiele, __; Fancher, 2007). Comprehension refers to thinking what are learning by knowing the message of the text (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000). Reading comprehension isthe ability to read text and understanding its meaning by involving thinking process (Block, Gambrell & Pressley, 2002; Farzaneh, 2016). Further, Yuko (2009) states that learners have difficulty achieving academically if they cannot comprehend what they read. Various of reading have been mentioned by some experts in education area. Brown (2001) classifies two types of reading in classroom reading performance; silent reading and oral reading. “Oral reading is better than silent reading” (Goodman & Goodman, 1982, p. 381). Some researchers indicate oral reading as reading aloud (Ilona, 2009; Kinash, 2012). Reading aloud defines as “The process during which the learner utters a printed text out loud in the English language lesson. The text pronounced by the learner is a printed passage in the learner's textbook and is unknown to him or her” (Ilona, 2009, p. 169). The relation between reading skill and learners have been always indicated to various of teaching approach, teaching method, and teaching strategy in education field. For instances, examining, finding, and using appropriate method or strategy in teaching reading. It occurs because reading regards as a complex process which involves threemental processes; eyes, tongue, and mind (Alshehri, 2014), “reading is a crucial skill in learning and communication”
(Alshumaemeri, 2011, p. 186), and “reading is important to help students gain access to many different kinds of knowledge, information, and ideas” (Al-shehri, 2014, p. 8).

Conducting research in finding and using appropriate teaching methods and strategy of text reading comprehension has been a common issue in the field of research. (Alshumaemeri, 2011; Al-mansour & Al-shorman, 2011; Al-shehri, 2014) reading aloud is regarded as an effective way and an appropriate strategy in developing and improving English foreign language learner reading comprehension. (Oueini, Bahous, & Nabhani) mention that by using reading aloud, learners are able to use the new vocabulary words and engaged in analysis and synthesis (2008). (Wadsworth, 2008) found out several instructional purposes of reading aloud strategy that can make it powerful in influencing learners’ reading comprehension. Some advantages of using reading aloud are also proposed by some researchers as Amer (1997) who found out that reading aloud can encourage students to progress to higher levels of comprehension and helping readers to hear text as a whole, with various levels of meaning, and Medgyes (1997, as cited in Ilona, 2009) states that reading aloud can help teachers to see whether the learners understand the meaning of the words, the sentences, and the discourse. In the other hand, Fujinaga argues that there is no major differences between oral reading and silent reading on comprehension performance.

However, most reading studies focus on type of method and strategy that can increase students’ ability in reading comprehension. To date, in term of conducting research which focuses on diagnostics tool in reading by using miscue analysis has been studied less extensively. The purpose in using this diagnostics tool is to check learners’ reading comprehension on text. Therefore, this study is undertaken to investigate the features of miscues produced by the Indonesian EFL learners in the process of orally reading English text.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading is regarded as one of psycholinguistics process because of the use of language. There is a process in comprehending a written language. The process involves two points, there are thought and language. It is commonly suggested that miscue is used to measure text reading comprehension (Allen, 1976; Argyle, 1989; Goodman & Burke, 1972; Ilona, 2009; Ebe, 2010; Qiuyan & Junju, 2011; Kinasih, 2012; Huang, 2015).

“The miscues are revealing of the strategies each student tends to rely on when difficulties arise” (Hoffman & Baker, 1981, p. 908). Miscue deals with the errors that appear while the reader reads the text (Nunan, 1999). Further, if the written language has higher level than the level of readers’ ability. It means that the errors cannot be avoided by readers when reading orally (Ilona, 2009). In the other hand, Goodman & Goodman (1978) disagree with the term error in process reading aloud, because error has no good perception in education field, so they prefer to use term miscue. “Miscue analysis is a technique of identifying reading problems by having the readers read text aloud, recording the reader while reading, and then documenting and analyzing miscues from the text” (Kinasih, 2012, p. 10). It means that listeners or teachers can encourage readers difficulties in sounding written language. In addition, Kinasih mentions that miscues will emerge while reading aloud (2012). The goal of miscue is “to determine primarily the degree of comprehension that the student
demonstrate since the goal of reading is, above all, the ability to extract meaning from a passage” (Allen, 1976, p. 564). Hoffman & Baker (1981) propose types of miscue. They are insertion, omission, substitution, mispronunciation, calls for help, hesitation, repetition. In compiling theory on the findings, I select one of miscue that is proposed by Allen (1976), it is self correction.

Insertion is adding a word or words that are not existed in the text (the learner inserted an extravord or phrase during their reading aloud). Omission has definition as omitting a word or words that are existed in the text, and it effects the meaning of the sentence in the text changed. Substitution deals with ER (Expected Response) is substituted by another word or phrase during the learner’s reading out loud. Mispronunciation refers to pronounce a word or words that are intended incorrectly. Calls for help is to ask the teacher directly for helping them. Hesitation occurs while the readers stop to read immediately, and it is indicated with pause. Further, Hoffman & Clement (1984, p. 425) add definition of hesitation: “Hesitation are coded in those instances where the students comes to a text word and makes no overt response for at least 3 seconds or the teacher interrupts before the students can make any overt attempt at the text word. Hesitations are similar to the refusals”

Repetition means the readers repeat one word, or part of it, or a phrase one or more times. Self correction shows that the readers try to correct the reading to make sense the meaning. Some studies on miscue conduct different focus. Ilona (2008) investigates quality and quantity of reading miscue produce by English foreign language learner. The result shows that either good readers or weak readers substitute the text with the highest frequency. Occurrences of miscue is caused by lack of comprehension of text. The researcher also conclude that oral reading is not the best way in increasing reading comprehension. Further, Medjahdi (2015) conducts her study in finding EFL learners’ difficulness in reading comprehension. She finds out that pronunciation and ambiguous words are the factor on understanding text. Beside that, reading material and text selection have an influence on the learners’ reading achievement.

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Participants
The study is conducted in an English education programme (2nd semester) in one of university in Karawang. The students’ age ranged from 18 to 20 years. Participants’ native language background are varied: three of them (Sundanese), two of them (Javanese and Bataknese). Student’s proficiency level is intermediate level.

2. Pilot test
Pilot test is conducted to check the criteria of text that is needed for this study. The result shows that two texts (Tornadoes and Checks balances in the Constitution of the United States) are rejected as research data in this study because the content of texts is too simple to be understood, these participants have adequate vocabulary on those texts, lenght of the texts are short, and prior knowledge of both texts topic.

3. Research data
Research data refers to the crucial thing in the research. The data is used to reveal some findings that are going to answer research question. Pilot test’s result shows that one text (Vaccines) is not rejected as research data in this study. The reasons are
gained by using open-ended interview. Text (Vaccines) is selected because length of the text is longer than both texts (Tornadoes, Checks balances in the Constitution of the United States), the text provides unfamiliar vocabulary for two participants in pilot test, complex syntax (complex sentences influences the chunking in grammatical units), and the text (Vaccine) is a text that is new for them. Type of students’ miscue that occurred in oral reading in text that entitled Vaccines is regarded as research data in this study. In addition, Watson & Burke (2005, as cited in Qiuyan & Junju, 2014, p. 64), the material selected should be “difficult enough to challenge readers but not so difficult that they cannot continue independently”.

4. Research instruments

Research instruments is defined as a tool in analyzing research data. In analyzing the data, We refer to the features of miscues that are proposed by (Hoffman & Baker, 1981) and (Allen, 1976).

5. Data collection

This study passes some procedures in collecting the data, such as copying the selected text (Vaccines), finding five participants (out of two participants in pilot test), telling them that this reading aloud is not the test (by using informal Indonesia language), telling the procedures (reading aloud ‘without any preparation’ and no time limitation, retelling what the text means), and doing tape-recording.

6. Data analysis

The procedures of data analysis are coding the miscue while participants read aloud text, transcribing the utterances that reveal the miscue, summarizing the miscue of each participant, and analyzing the miscue by referring to theories (Hoffman & Baker, 1981) and (Allen, 1976).

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to investigate the features of miscues that are produced by the Indonesian EFL learner in the process of orally reading English text. This study quantifies the characteristic of miscues that is proposed by (Hoffman & Baker, 1981) and (Allen, 1976). There are seven types of miscue (Hoffman & Baker, 1981). Insertion, omission, hesitation, substitution, mispronunciation, calls for help, and repetition. In accomplishing theory to the findings, we refer to one of miscues that is proposed by (Allen, 1976). One of miscues that is referred in this findings is self correction. Based on the table 1, not all the types of miscue (Hoffman & Baker, 1981) occurs in Indonesian EFL learner while they are reading. Further, not all the participants in this study is doing self correction (Allen, 1976) while doing reading. The highest frequency of miscue is mispronunciation with 63 frequencies (59.43%). The lowest frequency of miscue is calls for help and hesitation. Each type occurs with one instances (1.88%). Meanwhile, there is no occurrences in substitution miscue. Self correction (Allen, 1976) occurs with one frequency (0.92%).
Table 1
Types of miscue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of miscue</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for help</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>39(36,11%)</td>
<td>26(24,07%)</td>
<td>16(12,96%)</td>
<td>20(18,51%)</td>
<td>8(7,40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurences of miscues that are produced by each participant can be seen in table 2. P1 tends to produce more miscues with 39 frequencies (36,11%). The second position in producing less more than P1 is P2 with 26 occurences (24,07%). P4 produces miscue less than P2 did, it is 20 miscue (18,51%). P3 tends to reduce miscue in her reading text, with the total of occurences 14 (12,96%). And the lowest frequency is in P5, with 8 frequencies (7,40%).

Table 2
The occurrence of miscue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual words</th>
<th>Type of miscue</th>
<th>Sample of miscue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaccines are prepared form harmful viruses or bacteria and administers to patients to provide immunity to specific diseases</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>Vaccines /paksin/ form/from/ viruses /piruses/ administers /administers/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The correct sound: /vækˌsiːn/ /ˈvaɪrəs/ /ədˈmɪnɪstər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A final type of vaccines . . . (line15)</td>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>The last is a final type of vaccines . . . (line15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>. . .,_________ number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid fever</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Typhoid (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typhoid (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typhoid fever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>P3: /tuberculois/ (pause)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
List of type and sample
P1 produces three mispronunciations in the first sentence of the text. Oftently, P1 has obstacle in pronouncing /v/. It cannot be denied that linguistic background of our native language can influence our second language in sounding words. Mispronunciations above the word *vaccines* and *viruses* are influenced by P1 linguistics background, Sundaness (L1). (Sudrajat, 2016) stated in his research that in general, all of students repeatedly replace the speech sound /l/ and /v/ for /p/. Furthermore, Richard refers this situation to interlanguage error situation in which there is an overlapping between native language and second language (1971). Mispronunciation is also caused by unfamiliar words or vocabulary. From the open-ended interview data, P1 states that she tends to consult herself with dictionary while she finds the new vocabulary in reading.

The second miscue that occurs frequently is insertion. The example of insertions which are taken from P2, who tends to make many insertions than the other participants, while reading the text. The insertion above occurs in the first sentence of line 15. P2 adds the verb phrase *the last is*. Further, omission is also produced more by P2. The example above is taken from one of omissions that occur in P2. P2 deletes a phrase *a large* in actual words. The omission occurs because P2 feels tired and bored of the text. These reasons appears while interview section is conducting. The other miscue is repetition. The example is taken from P2. Repetition occurs because the unfamiliar word. P2 tends to have correct pronunciation and to make sense in repeating the word *typhoid*, but in the end of text interpretation, P2 still cannot give right meaning on it.

Interestingly, there are three types of miscue in a word that is produced by P3. They are mispronunciation, calls for help and hesitation. The examples are in the table 4 with the word *tuberculosis*. Mispronunciation occurs in the first she sounds it, and then she makes calls for help, because she has unfamiliar word with *tuberculosis*. Although she tries how to sound *tuberculosis*, but she makes pause. As Hoffman and Baker (1981) state that pause indicates that the readers make hesitation on what they read. The last analysis in miscues is self correction. The theory refers to (Allen, 1976). The example is in table 4. Self correction occurs only one frequency, and it is produced by P3. The reason of correcting the words is limiting of knowing phrase. In the interview section, P3 states that it is sounded odd while reading the phrase *by which*. This oddness is caused by unfamiliar phrase *by which*. The familiar phrase for P3 from the word *which* is word *in*. Based on the findings, the miscue of substitution is not found in all participants.
The other topic that is going to describe in this findings part is text interpretation on reading. Interpretation has something to do with comprehension. As proposed by Faunceher that comprehension plays a crucial thing in reading(2007). Further, Bell states that reading speed influences reading comprehension (2001). This statement supports another findings in this study, learners’ reading comprehension in the text that they read. The findings reveal that P1, who has reading speed with 57 words/minute, has many missinterpretation in comprehending the text. It is showed when P1 retells the message in the text. For instances, sentence in second line, the various type of vaccines are classified according to the method by which they are derived. She interprets that sentence as vaksin mengklasifikasikan berbagai metode yang ada. From the open-ended interview, P1 states that she has obstacle in transferring the meaning when the form is passive, the various type of vaccines are classified, and while she finds unfamiliar vocabulary, derived. It is in line with Waren (2013) who states that passive voice is regarded as complex structure in sentence processing.

Reading speed of each participant can be seen in table 4. The score of reading speed is calculated from selecting the longest line in a text times the number of line in a text, and then the result is divided by how long each participant in reading the text, or duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Reading speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>57 words/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>95 words/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>95 words/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>95 words/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>142 words/minute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. CONCLUSION
There are various miscues occur in this study, such as mispronunciation, insertion, omission, calls for help, hesitation, repetition, and self correction. The highest miscue in this study is mispronunciation. From mispronunciation, I find two reasons; They are unfamiliar words and the differences between participants’ linguistic background and their foreign language, English. The feedback, that can be given to the learner who makes many misinterpretations, is to correct the word that sound missing by referring to available reference, such as electric dictionary that contains how the word is sounded. Further, the teacher can give the explanation of correct sound by showing the learner phonetic symbol, and teach them how to sound it by repeating that particular word at least three times. Based on this findings, one of miscues that can help teacher in correcting mispronunciation form is calls for help.

The leaners as participants in this study have different linguistics background. There are Sundanes, Javanese, and Bataknese. The way they pronounce a word in English is unrarely influenced by their linguistics background. Reading aloud can make learners have good pronunciation. It means that their dialect can be corrected while they are reading aloud. Reading speed influences reading comprehension. Based on this findings, repetition does not work on grasping the meaning. So, meaning will be comprehended by the reader not only by repeating the word, but also knowing word context.
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