

Working Papers in Language Pedagogy

The members of the Editorial Board are:

Katalin BRÓZIK PINIEL	Edit KONTRA	Francis J. PRESCOTT
Kata CSIZÉR	Ildikó LÁZÁR	Éva SZABÓ
Gergely DÁVID	Éva MAJOR	Margit SZESZTAY
Dorottya HOLLÓ	Péter MEDGYES	Gyula TANKÓ
Éva ILLÉS	Enikő ÖVEGES	Tímea TIBOLDI
Krisztina KÁROLY	Uwe POHL	Dávid VELJANOVSKI

The members of the Advisory Board are:

Charles ALDERSON (University of Lancaster, UK)
Mária BAKTI (University of Szeged, HU)
Jenő BÁRDOS (Eszterházy Károly College, Eger, HU)
Ildikó CSÉPES (Debrecen University, HU)
Réka ESZENYI (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, HU)
Ágota FÓRIS (Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, HU)
Judit HEITZMANN (Béla III Secondary School, Baja, HU)
Pál HELTAI (Kodolányi János College, Budapest, HU)
Roz IVANIČ (University of Lancaster, UK)
Andrea KÁRPÁTI (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, HU)
Kinga KLAUDY (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, HU)
Zsuzsa KURTÁN (Pannon University, Veszprém, HU)
Ágnes MAGNUCZNÉ GODÓ (University of Miskolc, HU)
Špela MEŽEK (Linnaeus University, Sweden)
Ildikó NÉMETHNÉ HOCK (Pannon University, Veszprém, HU)
István OTTÓ (Regional Public Administration Office for Southern Transdanubia, Kaposvár, HU)
Bojana PETRIĆ (Birkbeck, University of London, UK)
Andrea REMÉNYI (Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Piliscsaba, HU)
Zoltán POÓR (Pannon University, Veszprém, HU)
Gábor SZABÓ (University of Pécs, HU)
Rita SZASZKÓ (Eszterházy Károly University, Jászberény, HU)
Zsuzsa TÓTH (Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Piliscsaba, HU)
Tamás VÁRADI (Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, HU)

The editors of *WoPaLP* are:

Gergely A. DÁVID and Francis J. PRESCOTT

Website copyright ©

Working Papers in Language Pedagogy, and
the Language Pedagogy PhD Programme, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.
Individual authors retain copyright privileges.

HU ISSN 1789-3607

Contents

Volume 2, 2008

Articles

Gyula Tankó & Gergely J. Tamási: A Comprehensive Taxonomy of Argumentative Thesis Statements: A Preliminary Pilot Study

Ildikó Furka: The Curriculum Vitae and the Motivational Letter: A Rhetorical and Cultural Analysis

Anna Trébits: English Lexis in the Documents of the European Union – A Corpus-Based Exploratory Study

Zsuzsa Tóth: A Foreign Language Anxiety Scale for Hungarian Learners of English

Gabriella Mezei: Motivation and Self-regulated Learning: A Case Study of a Pre-intermediate and an Upper-intermediate Adult Student

Ilona Huszti: The Micro Level of Reading Miscues: Case Studies of Six Learners

Adrienn Menyhárt: Teachers or Lecturers? The Motivational Profile of University Teachers of English

THE MICRO LEVEL OF READING MISCUES: CASE STUDIES OF SIX LEARNERS

Husztli Ilona

II. Rákóczi Ferenc Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education
husztli@kmf.uz.ua

Abstract: The present paper aims to report six case studies of six Transcarpathian Hungarian learners—three successful readers and three unsuccessful ones—when reading aloud in English as a foreign language. The study described in this article is part of a large-scale investigation into the quality and quantity of reading miscues made by non-native readers during oral reading. Findings suggest that both successful and unsuccessful readers make substitution miscues most frequently, and these miscues resemble the Expected Response (ER)—i.e. the printed text—grapho-phonemically. However, weak readers make more miscues than strong readers.

Keywords: reading aloud / oral reading; strong readers; weak readers; reading miscues

1 Introduction

In Transcarpathian Hungarian schools in Ukraine, it is common practice among English teachers to apply the technique of learners reading aloud in the English lessons (Husztli, 2002, 2003a, 2003b). Some researchers (e.g., Helgesen & Gakuin, 1993) warn against the extensive use of this technique, but their claim is usually not based on any empirical research findings. Because the traditional learner oral reading is a widely applied technique in the lessons of English in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools, it deserves some attention on the part of the research community.

The need for conducting the present study arose from the absence of an empirical investigation examining Hungarian learners' English reading miscues in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools. Because this topic does not receive sufficient attention, this investigation is believed to fill the gap.

Based on the rationale, the following research questions have been set:

- What miscue types occur when Transcarpathian Hungarian learners read aloud in English?
- Do successful readers differ from unsuccessful ones in terms of miscue frequency?
- How does oral reading influence learners' reading comprehension?

2 Theoretical background

Reading aloud is mentioned in the academic literature by some of the researchers as an assessment technique by which reading is tested (Alderson, 2000; Fordham, Holland & Millican, 1995), while others attach importance to it in a different way. Panova (1989) says

that reading a text aloud is important for maintaining and perfecting the pronouncing skills of the learners. Panova's view supports that of Klychnikova (1972), according to whom by means of oral reading it is possible to master the sound system of a foreign language and it strengthens the phonetic ability to re-code signals at the letter level, as well as at the level of word, sentence and text. She argues that at the elementary stage of language learning, reading aloud is an important means of developing phonic reading in learners, while at the advanced level it mainly plays the role of expressive reading. This is also emphasised by Kontra (2006), who says that "although reading is normally done silently, teachers often find that most students enjoy reading out literary texts. Reading aloud can increase the impact of a text, can dramatise action and can reveal points, e.g. humour, that might otherwise remain hidden" (p.92).

In contrast, Dwyer (1983) has objections to the teaching of oral reading. She believes that:

- * it reinforces the idea that reading and pronunciation are related, thereby strengthening the tendency to subvocalise when reading silently;
- * it slows down reading by forcing the student to focus on each word;
- * when reading aloud, a student may lose all sense of the meaning of what he is reading, a fact that defeats the very purpose of reading;
- * when students mispronounce and misread some words, the teacher interrupts the reading to correct miscues, thereby further impeding the flow of meaning extraction.

Despite these objections against its use, oral reading continues to be used extensively in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools. Also, it is common that learners make errors when reading aloud. Such errors should not be considered errors because, as Goodman and Goodman (1978) indicate, the term 'error' has a negative connotation in education. Therefore, they prefer to use the term 'miscue', suggesting that the response to the written text uttered by the reader is not necessarily erroneous. Rather, it can show how the reader processes information obtained via visual input.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

The participants of the study were twelve-year-old Transcarpathian Hungarian-speaking Form 6 learners studying English as a foreign language (EFL) for the second year from five different schools. There were three successful readers (two girls and one boy) and three unsuccessful readers (two girls and one boy). Their school grades in English reading ranged from 6 to 10 with 12 being the highest possible grade. They were selected from a pool of 44 pupils who participated in a large-scale study on reading miscues. The basic intention in the selection of a mix of strong and weak learners was to demonstrate the differences in reading—in terms of miscues—of those learners who showed good comprehension of the essence of the stories they had to read aloud and those pupils who comprehended very little of the texts. This is reflected in the comprehension scores of the learners shown in Table 1. The learners were assigned pseudonyms to protect their personalities and ensure anonymity.

Learner	Type of reader	Comprehension score
Margit	strong	75%
Angéla	strong	81.25%
István	strong	87.5%
Emília	weak	25%
Dávid	weak	6.25%
Erzsébet	weak	12.5%

Table 1. Comprehension scores of strong and weak readers

3.2 Instruments

The participants were expected to read aloud two previously piloted texts with a total word count of 480 words. The texts were selected on the following criteria adapted from previous research on reading miscues (Goodman & Burke, 1973; Hudelson, 1980; Mott, 1980; Rha, 2002; Rigg, 1988; Tatlonghari, 1984): texts should represent narratives and dialogues in order to avoid text effect; texts should represent story format materials as children are hypothesized to understand and remember story sequences better than informational materials; the selected texts should constitute a semantically complete unit; the reading time of one text should not exceed ten minutes so that the task should not exhaust the learners and thus lose their interest in the whole process; the selected texts must be unfamiliar to the participants. As a teacher, I could not help including a seventh factor as a selection criterion, namely, that the texts should end with a moral which may contribute to achieving the educational objective of the teaching process: to educate learners to become good and friendly people. The texts can be read in the worksheet copies in the Appendix.

Two piloted comprehension measures were applied during the research to check the learners' understanding of the main messages of the texts they had read. After reading the texts out loud, the research participants were expected to retell what they understood from the texts. Then they were asked to answer comprehension questions to further measure how well the research subjects understood the texts. Both comprehension test procedures were conducted in Hungarian, the learners' native language.

Interviews were conducted with the learners after they read the texts and their comprehension was tested with the help of the two measures. The questions asked about the difficulties that learners encountered when trying to understand the meaning of the texts, their perceived reasons why they made miscues, how oral reading had an impact on their understanding, etc. A detailed discussion of the interview results can be found in Husztí (2007).

3.3 Procedures

Learners' reading miscues were recorded during the first semester of the 2003/2004 school year. The data were coded between June and December, 2004 using a miscue coding system devised for the purposes of the study.

Learners' reading aloud was sampled in the traditional way, i.e., the pupils were allowed to look briefly through the texts they were expected to read aloud. Two minutes were

provided for the students to glance at each text. This short span of time was believed to be necessary for the learners to familiarize themselves with the unknown texts. Most often, the learners indicated they had finished looking through the texts before the two-minute preparation time was over.

The learners were told to read aloud the texts and then retell as much of the plot as they could. Also, after retelling, some questions were asked about the characters and events of the stories. Each learner's performance – reading aloud the texts, retelling, and answering the questions – was tape-recorded for later analysis. Besides tape-recording the learners, I marked the miscues on a separate worksheet of the texts as suggested by Goodman and Burke (1973).

4 Findings and discussion: miscues of the six learners

Seven miscue types were singled out during the oral reading performance of the six participants of the study. The categorization of miscues was done on the basis of Goodman and Burke (1973). Substitution meant that the ER was substituted by another word or phrase during the learner's reading out loud. The substituted word was written above the line of the text in the researcher's copies of the texts. Insertion meant that the learner inserted an extra word or phrase during their reading aloud. This inserted word or phrase was indicated in the official researcher's worksheet by a caret, and also, the inserted item(s) was/were written above the caret. Omission was considered to be a case when the reader omitted a word or phrase in the printed text. In the worksheet such omitted items were circled. Reversal miscues were departures from the printed text when the reader reversed the order of letters in a word or words in a phrase, or phrases in a sentence. Reversals were indicated in the worksheet with the help of a curved line. Repetition miscues were the ones when the child repeated one word, or part of it, or a phrase once or more times. In the researcher's worksheet, repetitions were shown by underlining the repeated word or phrase as many times as it was repeated. Correction meant that the pupil misread a word or made a deviation from the print, but then noticed this and corrected himself or herself. The miscue was written above the word that was misread and it was marked 'C' (corrected) if the child corrected the miscue and 'UC'—uncorrected—if the child did not correct it.

Table 2 shows the types and number of miscues the selected six learners made in both texts. The Appendix contains two sample worksheet copies with the miscues made while reading the texts out loud.

Learner	Learner type	Correction			Repetition	Omission	Insertion	Substitution			Reversal	Pronunciation		TOTAL
		Corrected	Uncorrected	Good to wrong				Non-word	A	NA		Stress	Intonation	
Margit	S	1						15	1	2		1	1	21
Angéla	S				1			8	1			1	2	13
István	S	1				1		1	1			1		5
Emília	W			1	3			27	3	13	1		1	49
Dávid	W	1	7		8	1	3	25		7	1		5	58
Erzsébet	W	3						23	2	9	1	1		39
TOTAL		6	7	1	12	2	3	99	8	31	3	4	9	185

Table 2. Number and types of miscues committed by learners (n=6) (S=strong, W=weak, A=acceptable substitution, NA=non-acceptable substitution)

First, the miscues of strong pupils are presented and then those of the three weak ones. In the Observed Responses (OR) of the learners the miscues are underlined for easier recognition. Also, the types of miscues are indicated in brackets.

1) Margit

Although her reading was not fluent and several substitution miscues and some mother tongue intonation patterns occurred, Margit's comprehension score (75%) indicates that she understood the stories quite well. Her substitution miscues were often graphically similar to the Expected Response (ER), for example:

ER ... the ant got into the water. OR ... the ant got into the weather. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER 'What shall we do?' asked Polly the Parrot. OR 'Wat shall we do?' asked Polly the Parrot. [SUBSTITUTION]

Margit showed the tendency of beginning readers to use graphic clues extensively (Southgate, Arnold, & Johnson, 1981). This was proved by the fact that most of the substitutions she made grapho-phonemically resembled the ERs.

When asked about the reason why she substituted 'wat' for 'what', Margit answered that there was a rule that in closed syllables ending in a consonant, letter 'a' must be read as in 'bat' or 'rat'. This shows that the learner knew the rule but was not fully aware of its application in practice.

She also used a Hungarian intonation pattern in 'wh'-questions, for example:

ER 'But who will pull it out?' OR 'But who will pull it ↑out?' [PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

Once she noticed that her miscue did not make sense, Margit went back and corrected it:

ER An ant had its home under the same tree. OR An aunt / an ant had its home under the same tree. [SUBSTITUTION]

This was a sign that she was aware of the context.

2) Angéla

Throughout the two texts Angéla's reading was slow but accurate. She made only a few miscues. It was evident from the way she read that she understood both texts. This claim is supported by Angéla's comprehension score (81.25%).

In one case Angéla substituted the verb 'put' with a non-word 'paht'. For example,

ER ... he put a net under the tree. OR ... he paht a net under the tree. [SUBSTITUTION]

She was asked why she read the vowel 'u' as in the word 'but'. She answered that they learned a reading rule which said that 'u' in closed syllables should be read as in 'but'. In this case, the pupil generalized a rule she had learned without being aware of the existence of exceptions.

Although the pace of her reading was very slow, Angéla managed to maintain a natural intonation. In two cases, Angéla used a typical Hungarian intonation pattern in 'wh'-questions, although these miscues did not disturb her in understanding because the question marks as graphical clues indicated that these were interrogative sentences.

ER ‘What is wrong?’ they asked. OR ‘What is ↑wrong?’ they asked.
[PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

ER ‘Why is Harry moaning and groaning so loudly?’ OR ‘Why is Harry moaning and groaning so ↑loudly?’ [PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

3) István

István’s reading was fluent, although he made several substitution, reversal and omission miscues. However, he understood the meaning of the stories best. This is proved by his comprehension score of 87.5%. His substitutions were graphically similar to the ER but unacceptable both syntactically and semantically, for example:

ER An ant had its home under the same tree. OR An ant had its home under the some tree. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER The pigeon and the ant were good friends. OR The pigeon and the ant where good friends. [SUBSTITUTION]

István read relatively quickly, which might have caused his omission miscues. He tended to omit short words or suffixes which basically did not alter the meaning of the text, therefore were accepted semantically:

ER ... and brought the ant safely on the land. OR ... and brought_{ant} safely on the land. [OMISSION]

ER He wanted to catch the pigeon. OR He want_{to} catch the pigeon. [OMISSION]

Southgate, Arnold and Johnson (1981) also consider that when short elements of the text are omitted, it possibly means that the reader was processing the content too quickly for accurate oral reproduction.

A typical intonation miscue that occurred in all the schools was also made by István. This is using a Hungarian intonation pattern in a ‘wh’-question. For example:

ER ‘What is wrong?’ they asked. OR ‘What is ↑wrong?’ they asked.
[PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

4) Emília

Most of the miscues that Emília made were substitutions (comprehension score: 25%). There were 43 such miscues out of which there were 27 non-words, 13 substitutions that were acceptable neither syntactically nor semantically, and 3 words that fitted the context and could be accepted semantically and syntactically, although grammatically represented incorrect forms. These were mainly tense forms as demonstrated in the following examples:

ER Then the ant ran to the pigeon ... OR Then the ant run to the pigeon ... [SUBSTITUTION]

ER Later, Polly came back with Ella, the Elephant. OR Later, Polly come back with Ella, the Elephant. [SUBSTITUTION]

Non-word substitutions included such examples as:

ER Then the ant flew down, picked up the leaf, and brought the ant safely on the land.

OR Then the ant flew down, picked up the leaf, and brok the ant safely on the land. [SUBSTITUTION]

Emília made some substitutions that were unacceptable both syntactically and semantically. For example,

ER A friend in need is a friend indeed. OR A friend is need is a friend indeed. [SUBSTITUTION]

Emília made three repetition miscues that possibly showed her anxiety and eagerness to get over the task of reading aloud quickly.

ER The pigeon and the ant were good friends. OR The pigeon pigeon and the ant were good friends. [REPETITION]

ER ... and the ant got into the water. OR ... and the ant got into into the water. [REPETITION]

Emília's other miscues were: one reversal, one intonation as a pronunciation subtype, and one good to wrong correction. For example,

ER He saw the hunter ... OR He was the hunter ... [REVERSAL]

ER Harry moaned and groaned. OR Harry moaned and ↑groaned. [PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

ER A friend in need is a friend indeed. OR A friend freend in need is a friend indeed. [CORRECTION]

Out of the 49 miscues Emília made, only seven did not disturb her comprehension of the text: three repetitions, three acceptable substitutions and one intonation miscue. All the others, especially the 27 non-words, can be considered to have had a negative and harmful effect on Emília's text comprehension that was proved by her comprehension score of only 25% as well.

5) Dávid

Dávid's extremely low comprehension score (6.25%) indicates how little he understood from the texts he read. His most frequent type of miscue was substitution, with 27 non-words and 7 unacceptable substitutions. The following examples present such miscues:

ER The pigeon saw the ant in the water ... OR The pigeon saw the int in the water. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER My friend is in trouble, I must help him. OR My friend is in trool, I moosht help him. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER I have a better idea ... OR I have a Erzsébet idea ... [SUBSTITUTION]

ER He threw a leaf in the water and told the ant to climb on it. OR He threw a leaf in the weather and told the ant to child on it. [SUBSTITUTIONS]

Dávid made a relatively large number of repetition miscues (8) compared to the other pupils selected for this detailed analysis. He usually repeated short one-syllable words. This might be explained by his great anxiety before the task of oral reading.

ER You saved my life. OR You saved my my life. [REPETITION]

ER My friend will be in trouble ... OR My friend friend will be in trouble ... [REPETITION]

ER Then out of the jungle crept a mouse. OR Then out of the jungle crept crept a mouse. [REPETITION]

Altogether 87.5% of Dávid's correction miscues were left uncorrected. It means that he attempted words at least twice, in the first case producing a response different from the expected one, and in the second case either repeating the wrong response or coming up with another variant which did not resemble the ER, either. For example:

ER They pushed the rock over the cliff. OR They parshed pusheed the rock over the cliff. [CORRECTION]

ER Harry stopped moaning and groaning. OR Harry stopped moaning and grooning
grunning. [CORRECTION]

Only once did Dávid manage to correct his miscue successfully, i.e., he first produced a miscue, immediately realized it, went back in reading and corrected his own words; for example:

ER ... and she flew off. OR ... and see she flew off.
[CORRECTION]

Dávid also inserted three words in the texts he read and reversed the order of syllables in one word.

ER The pigeon flew away. OR The pigeon flew and away.
[INSERTION]

ER One day a hunter came to their tree. OR One day a terhun came to their tree.
[REVERSAL]

The number of Dávid's intonation miscues was relatively high (5) compared to his total number of miscues; although when asked about them in the retrospective interview, he admitted he had not even noticed them. Also, he did not feel these intonation miscues disturbed his understanding of the stories.

ER They tied the vine to Ella. OR They tied the vine to ↑Ella.
[PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

ER Ella saw the mouse and took off running very fast. OR Ella saw the mouse and took off running very ↑fast. [PRONUNCIATION, INTONATION SUBTYPE]

6) Erzsébet

It was interesting to note that during the retrospective interview Erzsébet perceived her reading as very problematic in terms of accuracy and fluency, but she claimed that understanding was easy for her. However, her comprehension score (12.5%) does not support this view of hers.

It is true that Erzsébet had difficulties with accuracy and fluency. She made 23 non-word substitutions; for example:

ER I have a horrible, terrible toothache. OR I have a horrible, terrible touthy.
[SUBSTITUTION]

ER Milly went off to find a vine. OR Milly went off to find a veeny.
[SUBSTITUTION]

Besides these non-words, Erzsébet produced two acceptable and nine non-acceptable substitutions. For example:

ER The pigeon flew away. OR The pigeon fly away.
[SUBSTITUTION]

ER Then the ant ran to the pigeon ... OR Then the ant run to the pigeon ...
[SUBSTITUTION]

Although these substitutions are grammatically incorrect—the *-s* inflexion of 3rd person singular is missing in both cases—semantically they are acceptable as the verb forms 'fly' and 'flew' have the similar meaning of 'moving in the air with wings', as well as 'run' and 'ran' express similar meanings: 'go faster than walk'.

Non-acceptable substitutions by Erzsébet included:

ER An ant had its home under the same tree. OR An aunt had its home under the some tree. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER The pigeon and the ant were good friends. OR He pigeon and the ant were good friends. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER ... the ant got into the water. OR ... the ant got into the weather. [SUBSTITUTION]

ER ... picked up the leaf ... OR ... picked up the life ... [SUBSTITUTION]

Erzsébet managed to correct three miscues when she noticed she had made them. In all three instances she stopped reading, went back in the text and tried to re-read the words, this time successfully.

ER Harry Hippo awoke early one morning. OR Harry Hippo awoke early on one morning. [CORRECTION]

ER The pigeon and the ant were good friends. OR The pigeon and he the ant were good friends. [CORRECTION]

ER You saved my life. OR You saved me my life. [CORRECTION]

Erzsébet made one reversal miscue, for example: ER ‘I will,’ said Milly the Gorilla. OR ‘I will,’ said Milly the Gloria [REVERSAL]. In this reversal miscue the pupil changed the sequence of sounds in a word and got another one, with full meaning—a female name. What is interesting about this reversal miscue is that during the retelling, Erzsébet consistently spoke about Gloria as a character of the story together with Milly, Harry, Ella and Polly.

Erzsébet also made one miscue in stress—ER ‘I have an idea,’ said Milly. OR “I have an ‘idea,’ said Milly. [PRONUNCIATION, STRESS SUBTYPE]—, but it did not cause problems in understanding because it occurred due to the fact that Erzsébet was unfamiliar with this word. So, the main problem was not caused by the improper use of the stress, but by the lack of knowledge of the vocabulary item.

In summary, the six learners introduced here ranged from poor (Emília, Dávid and Erzsébet) to good comprehenders (Margit, Angéla and István). Their reading can be characterized along a continuum, at the one end of which is sporadic, not fluent and inaccurate oral reading, and at the other end is fluent and accurate reading aloud. The miscues committed by the learners were of seven types: correction, repetition, omission, substitution, reversal, insertion, pronunciation. The most frequent miscues committed by the six selected learners were substitutions: non-words, non-acceptable words and acceptable ones. This result corresponds with the findings obtained in the main miscue study of 44 learners. Table 3 presents the total number of miscues for strong compared with weak readers.

	Correction	Repetition	Omission	Insertion	Substitution	Reversal	Pronunciation	TOTAL
Strong readers	2	1	1	0	29	0	6	39
Weak readers	12	11	1	3	109	3	7	146

Table 3. Total number of miscues of strong and weak readers

5 Conclusions and Ppedagogical implications

The final conclusions of this descriptive analysis can be drawn as follows:

- The most frequent miscues were substitutions, for both weak and strong pupils alike.
- However, strong readers make far fewer miscues than weak readers.
- These substitution miscues most often resemble the Expected Response graphophonemically.
- Omissions are usually short one-syllable words or inflexions, e.g., the past simple ending *-ed* of regular verbs.
- Such omissions are usually semantically acceptable; therefore, they do not alter the meaning of a text greatly.
- Intonation miscues—e.g., using Hungarian intonation patterns in questions—do not usually disturb learners in comprehension as they have graphical clues—like question marks—at their disposal that can help in understanding.
- Learners' stress miscues always involved placing the greatest emphasis on the first syllable of words. This is the typical Hungarian stress pattern which is fixed, not flexible as in English. So the reason for these miscues was that when learners were not sure of the stress of a word, they followed the tendency of stressing syllables like they do in their mother tongue.
- It is evident from the results that strong readers understand texts better.

Based on the above conclusions it is possible to specify the pedagogical implications of the research.

It seems that most of the miscues made by the learners were caused by their incomprehension of the texts. If the reason for making so many — mainly substitution — miscues is the unfamiliarity of the learners with certain words, then teachers must do everything possible to teach vocabulary items to learners and check their knowledge of the words thoroughly.

Learners made a lot of insertions during reading aloud. These were words that occurred later in the same line of a text. It means that learners inspected and decoded words faster than they could pronounce them. This is a clear proof that reading aloud slows down the reading process (Dwyer, 1983). If learners read silently, teachers could save valuable classroom time for other activities in the lessons.

Learners' stressing the first syllable of a polysyllabic word implies that teachers should raise the learners' awareness of the differences between English and Hungarian stress. Teachers should provide exercises in which learners practise various word stress patterns — e.g. using the traditional large circle for a stressed syllable, and a small one for an unstressed syllable.

The situation is similar with intonation. Learners' intonation miscues were mainly those in which they used the tone of Hungarian yes-no questions. Teachers claimed that the aim of reading aloud was to teach learners to pronounce words and phrases correctly. But intonation is closely connected to pronunciation. So teachers must pay more attention to teaching it and developing learners' intonation skills.

The results of the six case studies prove that oral reading is not the best or most appropriate technique to use for developing reading comprehension. Because the results of the comprehension measures are not comforting and cannot be accepted as adequate, teachers should do their best to teach learners how to try to comprehend more and how to be effective

in decoding the writer's message. Finally it can be safely claimed that the aim of reading is comprehension; reading aloud to achieve this aim is quite useless.

References:

- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dwyer, M. (1983). Some strategies for improving reading efficiency. *FORUM*, 12, 5-10.
- Fordham, P., Holland, D., & Millican, J. (1995). *Adult literacy: A handbook for development workers*. Oxford: Oxfam/Voluntary Service Overseas.
- Goodman, K. S., & Burke, C. L. (1973). *Appendix for theoretically based studies of patterns of miscues in oral reading performance*. Wayne State University, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. (1978). Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. In L. J. Chapman, & P. Czerniewska (Eds.), *Reading: From process to practice* (pp. 126-145). London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Helgesen, M., & Gakuin, M. (1993). Oral reading — a fresh look. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *New ways in teaching reading* (pp. 261-262). Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL.
- Hudelson, S. (1980). An investigation of the oral reading behaviors of native Spanish speakers reading Spanish. In S. Hudelson (Ed.), *Learning to read in different languages* (pp. 10-20). Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Huszti, I. (2002). *Using learners' reading aloud in the English lessons in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools*. Unpublished seminar paper. Budapest: ELTE University.
- Huszti, I. (2003a). Why teachers of English in Transcarpathian Hungarian schools apply the oral reading technique at the English lessons. *Acta Beregsasiensis*, 3, 35-42.
- Huszti, I. (Густі І.) (2003b). Чому вчителі англійської мови Закарпатських угорськомовних шкіл використовують читання вголос на уроках англійської мови? [Reasons for applying the technique of reading aloud in the English lessons by teachers of English of Transcarpathian Hungarian schools] *Молодь, освіта, наука, культура і національна самосвідомість* [Youth, education, science, culture and national identity] (pp. 83-86). Kyiv: European University Press.
- Huszti, I. (2007). *The use of learner reading aloud in the English lesson: a look at the micro and macro levels of oral reading*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Budapest: ELTE University.
- Клычникова, З. И. (Клычникова, З. И.) (1972). *Психологические особенности обучения чтению на иностранном языке* [Psychological peculiarities of teaching reading in a foreign language] Москва: Просвещение.
- Kontra, E. H. (2006). *Topics in the methodology of teaching EFL*. Budapest: OKKER.
- Mott, B. W. (1980). A miscue analysis of German speakers reading in German and English. In S. Hudelson (Ed.), *Learning to read in different languages* (pp. 54-68). Washington DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Панова, Л. С. (Панова, Л. С.) (1989). *Обучение иностранному языку в школе* [Teaching foreign languages at school]. Киев: Радянська Школа.
- Rha, K. H. (2002). Reading miscue analysis of an English language learner's reading comprehension: A case study. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 1, 1-30.
- Rigg, P. (1988). The Miscue-ESL project. In P. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 206-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Southgate, V., Arnold, H., & Johnson, S. (1981). *Extending beginning reading*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Tatlonghari, M. A. (1984). Miscue analysis in an ESL context. *RELC Journal*, 15, 44-60.

APPENDIX

Worksheet copies with reading miscues of one successful reader (Margit – C10) and one unsuccessful one (Dávid – C7)

The ant and the pigeon

A pigeon lived on a tree. An ^{ant} had its home under the ^{same} tree. The pigeon and the ant were good friends. One day it ^{rained} and ^{rained}. There was much water under the tree and the ant got into the water.

The pigeon saw the ant in the water and thought, 'My friend is in trouble, I must help him.'

He threw a leaf in the water and told the ant to climb on it. Then the pigeon flew down, picked up the leaf and brought the ant safely on the land.

One day a hunter came to their tree. He wanted to catch the pigeon and he put a net under the tree. He put some grains near the net. The pigeon saw the grains. He came down from the tree and was going to eat the grains.

The ant saw it and thought, 'My friend will be in trouble if he goes near the grains. I must stop him.'

Then the ant ran to the pigeon and pricked him in his foot. The pigeon flew away. He saw the hunter and said to the ant, 'You saved my ^{life}. Thank you, dear ant. A friend in need is a friend indeed.'

LEARNER: C10

NOTES: more or less proper reading and accurate reading

Hippo's toothache

Harry Hippo awoke early ^{in the} one morning.

'OWWWW!' he moaned. 'I have a horrible, terrible ^{tootitch} toothache.'

Harry ^{moaned} moaned and ^{groaned} groaned. He ^{moaned} moaned and ^{groaned} groaned so loudly he ^{woke} woke everyone up.

'What is ^{wroong} wrong?' they asked. 'Why is Harry ^{wroong} moaning and ^{wroong} groaning so loudly?'

'Harry has a toothache,' said his wife, Harriet.

'What shall we do?' asked Polly the Parrot.

'We will have to pull out the tooth,' said Harriet.

'But who will pull it out?' asked Polly.

'I will,' said Milly the ^GGrilla.

'But how will you pull it out?' asked Ziggy the Lion.

Milly went off to ^{find} find a vine She ^{fed} tied the vine to Harry's tooth, and she ^{shit} pulled on the vine.

She ^{pulled} pulled and ^{pulled} pulled, but the tooth did not come out.

'Let ^{my CU} me help,' said Ziggy. 1. deed 2. died CU

So Ziggy and Milly pulled but the tooth did not come out.

'What will we do now?' asked Polly.

'I have an idea,' said Milly.

They ^{took} took Harry to a cliff and ^{slit} tied the vine to a ^{bigue} big rock. They ^{1. parsheed CU} ^{2. pusheed} pushed the rock over the cliff. But Harry's tooth did not come out.

'Now what?' asked Ziggy.

'I have a better idea,' said Polly, and ^{Betty} she ^{see C} flew off.

Harry moaned and groaned even ^{1. louder CU} ^{2. louder} louder. Later, Polly came back with Ella, the Elephant.

'Ella will help us pull Harry's tooth,' said Polly.

They tied the vine to [↑]Ella. She pulled and pulled, but the tooth did not come out. Then out of the jungle [↑]crept a mouse. Ella saw the mouse and took off running very [↑]fast. Out came Harry's tooth. Harry ^{shstopped} stopped moaning and ^{1. groaning CU} ^{2. grunny} groaning. Once again the jungle was quiet. Everyone was happy, especially Harry.

LEARNER: C7

NOTES: Very poor reading, almost no understanding