

Revisiting the role of miscue analysis in effective teaching

[Education](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Education: Revisiting the role of miscue analysis in effective teaching

Analysis of reading Miscue is a main whole language test intended to evaluate the strategies used by children while reading or studying. Goodman and his contemporaries were in the 1960'S interested in development taking place while reading and thought that miscues (any deviation from the content by the reader) would portray a symptom of any fundamental cognitive processes. Goodman used the phrase miscue instead of error or mistake, reflecting the observation that a deviation from the reading manuscript is not essentially erroneous (Goodman, 1979). The miscues observed in readers includes omissions, alterations, and additions to the sequence of words and replacements of the printed word with another. Goodman initially came up with a Taxonomy which featured 28 various kinds of miscues (Goodman, 1969).

Developed originally for research reasons, its unwieldiness plus a need to enlarge its utilization inspired Carolyn Burke, Yetta Goodman in 1972 to establish a smaller edition made up of 9 questions to be queried about every miscue-which was a straightforward system that they reasoned would become a more manageable and helpful tool especially for teachers and clinics in the school system. Thus the authors were not so much interested in conventional quantitative measures like reading rate or reading accuracy and figured out that their qualitative method gave more fine-grained and appropriate information as compared to other methods of reading assessment. This therefore implies that using Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI)a learner's incorrect answer , in comparison to the printed word, may portray a variation in dialect, a shift in intonation, sound similarity, graphic

similarity, syntactic acceptability, grammatical similarity, semantic acceptability, self-correction having semantic acceptability and meaning change. It is clear that McKenna and her colleagues do not understand much about the analysis of miscue. Analysis of miscue continues to be accepted by teachers since it assists them comprehend how their students make sense of the written word. It is widely used in programs for educating teachers as a way of making teachers revalue the process of reading. Miscue also continues to be utilized in research since it gives a depth profile of the process of reading in use. There is no single publication of critique analysis which has proved its invalidity. McKenna and Picard and her colleagues only cite one unfunded study carried out by Goodman over 4 decades ago, which was at the very start of examination of oral reading miscues (Goodman, 1965). This very first study actually was in support of what teachers have all along been knowing: that even first graders are able to read several of the words in context that they are not able to read out of context. McKenna and colleagues claims that other scholars have been able to prove that Goodman's conclusion concerning the study about significance of reading in context was wrong. Its funny how anybody interested in reading would make an argument that words are identifiable easily out of context as while in context. It's only in real print does any word have a meaning that is definable and several can't be pronounced reliably out of context.

The two authors are also wrong in believing that every miscue is assigned to one cuing system. Thus in analysis of miscue, each miscue is analyzed on a number of diverse variables. They make an invention of a pony/horse alternative miscue example in their article. They are not able to give a

context which means that an individual cannot illustrate how the miscue would be analyzed fully. However miscues differ in type: omission, substitution, complex, reversal or insertion . For instance a complex miscue may involve shifting in numerous words in the observed or expected response, however in their illustration, pony is replaced with a horse. Miscue analysis is usually qualitative though it can also be quantitative. Miscues are not just counted; their qualities are also examined. Thus analysis of miscue could be qualitative but can also be quantitative. Miscues are not just counted their qualities are also examined. This is one reason why analysis of miscue usually gives a wealthy description of the given reading.

References

Goodman, K. (1965). A mLinguistic study of cues and miscues in reading Elementary English, 42, 639-643. New York: Hamppton Press.

Goodman, K. (1969). Analysis of oral reading miscues: Applied psycholinguistics. Reading Research Quarterly , 5, 9-30.

Goodman, K. (1979). Reading: PsycholinguisticGuessing game. Theoretical models and proceses of reading , 259-2171.