



## Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School

Michael Jude T. Casaljay<sup>1,2</sup>, Gerald T. Malabarbas<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Clarencio Calagos Memorial School of Fisheries, Sta. Margarita, Samar, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Christ the King College, Calbayog City, Samar, Philippines

<sup>3</sup>University of Antique, Sibalom, Antique, Philippines

### ABSTRACT

\*Published Online: 19 July 2022

Reading is important because it's a way to get messages or information, and through reading, we can understand it and use it in the future. This paper used a descriptive research design and content analysis to determine oral reading miscues of Grade 11 senior high school students in Sta. Margarita, Samar, Philippines. Findings disclosed that 11th graders' English performance is considered satisfactory but does not reflect oral communication and modern literature competence. Students from Electrical Installation and Maintenance have the most oral mistakes. They are not particular about academics, especially reading, because they prefer technical-vocational skills. Since their track is not meticulous about vowel and consonant sounds, they self-correct their mispronounced words. The EIM class has trouble recognizing and understanding content words, and verbs are the hardest for them to read. Errors in reading verbs may have affected their understanding of the text because they change sentence meaning. They had trouble recognizing personal pronouns in the text, unlike academically inclined GA students. Oral reading miscues committed by Grade 11 students have no significant effect on their academic performance in Oral Communication and are not the direct cause of low grades in the subject. As oral communication performance activities are required to pass the subject, anxiety must have affected their performance. Oral reading fluency is not required to understand literature texts, so their oral reading miscues are not the direct cause of their low grades in 21st Century Literature. Results also disclosed that oral reading miscues committed by the students have no significant impact on their overall academic performance in English, but differences in learners' learning styles do. Researchers recommend that students and English teachers provide intensive oral and silent reading exercises in the classroom to improve academic performance in Oral Communication and 21st Century Literature, especially those TVL-EIM students.

### Keywords:

Miscues, Reading, Reading Performance, Technical-Vocational Students

### I. INTRODUCTION

Reading helps clarify a text's meaning. Word recognition, understanding, fluency, and motivation are involved (Leipzig, 2001). It is the ability to read printed words silently or aloud. It is a key skill for understanding other participants, and good readers understand the text better. Reading is an active receptive skill. It helps in language learning, communication, and idea exchange.

**Corresponding Author: Gerald T. Malabarbas**

*\*Cite this Article: Michael Jude T. Casaljay, Gerald T. Malabarbas (2022). Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 2(7), 272-280*

Reading enables wisdom, delight, and 80% of our everyday activities involve reading (Villamin, 1984). Filling out an order, application, or enrollment form requires reading. Moreover, reading is most learning's backbone. Everything starts with writing, including math, science, and home economics. As students progress through school, participants become more dense and challenging, requiring more reading. The difficulty level only rises (Philstar, 2010). Globally, students' reading performance has declined alarmingly over the years. In 2015, 12th-grade students averaged 287 on the NAEP 0–500 reading scale. This data was similar to 2013's average but lower than 1992's. No racial/ethnic group's or gender's average reading score changed significantly from 2013 to 2014 (NAEP, 2019). In 2015, 18,700 12th-graders

## Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School

took the NAEP reading test. Their performance can be compared to 2013 and all previous reading assessments dating back to 1992 (NAEP, 2019). Still, from the report of NAEP, 37% of 12th graders were Proficient or above in reading in 2015. The percentage of students scoring proficient or above ranged from 17% for Black students to 49% for Asian students. Half of White, Asian, and two or more races students performed at or above proficient, and one-quarter of Hispanic and American Indian/Alaska Native students did. In 2015, White, Asian, and two or more races students performed better than Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska native students. No racial/ethnic group's percentage of proficient or above students changed significantly from 2013 to 2014.

On the other hand, the National Achievement Test (NAT) administered by the Department of Education (DepEd) in the Philippines through the National Education Testing and Research Center (NETRC) revealed Filipino students' poor reading ability. Fourth-year high school students in the Philippines scored 51.33 on the NAT in 2004-2005. It fell to 47.73 in 2005-2006 and rose to 51.80 in 2011-2012, 0.092% of the previous year. Fourth-year high school students scored 48.90 on the 2012 NAT, an improvement from 44.33 in 2006 and 46.80 in 2005. (de Dios, 2013). The Philippine Star (2010) reported that public school students' performance on the National Achievement Tests (NAT) was appalling. From 2006 to 2009, NAT results rose 21.36 percent, according to DepEd. The 2009 NAT MPS rose to 66.33% from 54.66% in 2006, an 11.67% improvement. All subject areas showed percentage gains, indicating a steady improvement in public primary education (Philstar, 2010). In the Eastern Visayas Region of the country, the fourth-year high school NAT result in 2005 was reported at 59.69, lower than the 75-percent standard. Based on the report of the NETRC, the performance gains in MPS in English, which is -1.43, were so disheartening. In 2012, the NAT MPS dropped to 55.38 (de Dios, 2013). In a 2007 interview, Dr. Quijano, head of the DepEd's Bureau of Elementary Education, attributed "reading problems as the main culprit for the poor performance of some students in the NAT" (Philstar, 2010).

As pointed out in the interview with Dr. Quijano, students' performance in NAT can be traced to their low reading performance, affecting their reading comprehension capabilities. One of the reading disorders common among learners today that might impact their reading performance is the so-called reading miscue. Reading miscue is when a person says something different from what is on the page and what he or she is actually saying. A miscue in reading is a common problem for today's students, especially when they are not exposed to various reading activities. The development of control in pupils' reading processes can be examined and evaluated using the successful technique of miscue analysis. It is a methodical process for evaluating how well pupils infer meaning from the written word and exhibit

the information that a student brings to the text (Goodman, 1996). Concerns about reading proficiency among both adults and children are growing. Students at the secondary level who struggle with reading nowadays are unlikely to thrive in further education. In addition, poor readers have difficulty finding employment (National Research Council, 1988).

Specifically, Clarendio Calagos Memorial School of Fisheries, one of the public technical-vocational schools, also experienced a declining performance in the National Achievement Test in English in the last five (5) years. In 2009-2010, the fourth year NAT MPS of the school was 80.24, 81.29 in 2010-2011, and dropped by 12.26% from 71.32 in 2011-2012. From 2012-2013, the NAT MPS in English slightly recovered by increasing by 8.75% at 77.56. Unfortunately, in 2013-2014, the school's fourth-year NAT MPS in English dropped to its lowest point at 70.56, a 12.06% decrease from 2009-2010 (CCMSF SBM Hub, 2019). Today, most fourth-year students in the school who took the NAT in 2014 are now at Grade 11 Senior High School. Looking into the academic performance in English participants as affected by poor reading performance, for the First Semester of the School Year 2018-2019, the MPS of Grade 11 Senior High School Students in these English participants was reported at 73.94 for Oral Communication and 78.78 for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Literature (School Data Gathering Tool, 2019).

In this light, the researchers have decided to conduct this research to identify the oral reading miscues of the Grade 11 senior high school students of Clarendio Calagos Memorial School of Fisheries, Sta. Margarita, Samar, to their academic performance in their English participants. Moreover, it also aimed to advance an oral reading remediation program in English to improve the students' performance in the said participants.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading decodes symbols to derive meaning. It helps in language acquisition, communication, and sharing information and ideas. Visual (written, printed) or tactile symbols are used (Braille). It is a complicated interplay between text and reader, shaped by prior knowledge, experiences, attitude, and the culturally and socially positioned language community. Reading comprehension determines success. Reading takes practice, refinement, and development. Reading takes imagination and analysis. Literature readers deviate from literal words to create images of unfamiliar places. Reading is complex and cannot be limited to one or two interpretations. Reading has no rules; it allows readers to create introspectively. This deepens text interpretation (De Certeau, 1984). Readers use a variety of decoding and comprehension strategies. The context can interpret unknown words. Readers incorporate what they have read into their schema. Essberger (2019) says reading is interpreting written symbols. When we read, our eyes receive written symbols (letters, punctuation marks, and spaces), and

## Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School

our brains convert them into words, sentences, and paragraphs. We can read silently or aloud (so that other people can hear). Through it, we receive information. Reading requires speaking skills to pronounce the words we read. Reading is productive because we receive and transmit information (even to ourselves) (Rasplica & Cummings, 2013).

Oral reading fluency is reading aloud with ease. Oral reading fluency involves quickly, accurately, and expressively reading connected text. Decoding the page requires no cognitive effort. Reading comprehension requires oral reading fluency. Students who read automatically, accurately, and properly can focus on the text's meaning (Rasplica & Cummings, 2013). Verbal reading proficiency is one of the most common, reliable, and efficient reading comprehension indicators (Reschly et al., 2009; Wayman, Wallace, Wiley, Tichá, & Espin, 2007). Oral reading fluency tests predict high-stakes reading comprehension tasks as well as or better than many comprehensive reading tests (Baker et al., 2008). Because reading fluency tasks are brief, reliable, and repeatable, they are good for universal early intervention screening in grades 1–6. (Reschly et al., 2009). In addition, reading fluency tasks are used to monitor at-risk students' progress.

Consequently, identifying mistakes in students' oral reading performance is done to correct problems quickly. Oral Reading Errors refer to the mistakes made by students while learning to read orally. A reading error is an unanticipated reaction when the reader's knowledge of the language and world concepts does not match the text (Goodman, 1996). Miscues occur in oral reading when a reader reads a text in a manner that the listener would not anticipate (Mahmud & Gopal, 2018).

Watson (2018) describes the following mistake patterns: (1) Fix. A correction is a mistake the student fixes to make sense of the statement. Excellent! Self-correction is key. Is the reader rushing? Does the reader misread? If so, the reader does not consider himself a 'good' reader. Insertion. A child's insertion(s) are words not in the text. Does the word add meaning? If not, the reader makes sense but inserts. Too quick reading is another possibility. If finished is substituted for finish, fix it. (3) Omission – During oral reading, the learner omits a keyword. Omitting words may reduce visual tracking. Check if the passage's meaning changes. Inattention or reading too quickly can also cause omissions. It may also indicate a lesser visual vocabulary. Repetition. The student repeats the text. Repetition may signal a tough text. When hesitant, readers will repeat words to keep the flow going as they regroup. Reversal – A youngster reverses print or words (from instead of form, etc.). Beware of ambiguity. High-frequency words reverse for young readers. It may also mean the learner has trouble reading left-to-right. Substitute. A child substitutes a word that may or may not make sense. When a child does not understand a word, they may

substitute. Is the replacement logical? Is it logical? If the substitution does not modify the meaning, it can assist the youngster focus on accuracy by reading from meaning, the most crucial skill.

Oral reading errors can change the meaning of sentences. Mispronunciation affects grammar. Miscued words are often content or function words. Meaningful content terms. They are like structural, grammatical words. Content words include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Grammar includes auxiliaries, pronouns, articles, and prepositions. On the other hand, content words name things and their qualities. They represent living things (dog, cat, etc.), family members, natural phenomena (snow, Sun), actions (do, make, come, eat, etc.), and characteristics (young, cold, dark, etc.). Content words are nouns, verbs, adjectives, and some adverbs. They contrast with function words, which have little substantive meaning and denote grammatical relationships between content words, such as prepositions (in, out, under, etc.), pronouns (I, you, he, who, etc.), conjunctions (and, but, till, as, etc). (Reneschmauder, Morris, & Poynor, 2000). Content and grammatical words sound differently. Content words are emphasized, while grammatical words are often shortened or pronounced with a schwa. This practice can be provided in listening comprehension activities that require reconstruction (British Council, n.d).

Conversely, function words, also called functors, have little or ambiguous lexical meaning and express grammatical relationships within a sentence or the speaker's attitude or mood. They show word structure and hold sentences together. They are crucial to sentence structure (Klammer, Schulz, & Volpe, 2000). Closed-class function words include prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, and particles. Interjections are function words but open-class words. Inflected or affixed function words are possible (Nordquist, 2019). Function words are a closed class in grammar, so it is rare to create new ones during speech. Open class words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) can easily add new words (such as slang words, technical terms, and adoptions and adaptations of foreign words). Each function word provides grammatical information on other words or cannot be isolated. It may indicate the speaker's mental model (Nordquist, 2019).

Grammatical and content words have different phonological properties. Grammar words do not always use all language sounds. Most content words in Khoisan languages begin with clicks, but few function words do (Westphal, 2017). English function words may have fewer than three letters 'I', 'an', 'in' while non-function words usually have three or more 'eye', 'Ann', 'inn.' Here are function words (Westphal, 2017): The, 'a' in some inflected languages, articles take on the noun's declension. English inflected pronouns (he, she, etc.); uninflected adpositions and conjunctions. Auxiliary verbs are always inflected and part of

**Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School**

the main verb's conjugation. Interjections and particles - if, then, well, thus, etc. Expletives and pro-sentences replace sentences. Determiners, conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, modals, and qualifiers are function words. Nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs are content words (those without helping verbs). The sly brown fox jumped gracefully over the lazy dog and cat (main verb). The, over, and (conjunction). Without function words, sentences would make less sense (Nordquist, 2019). Articles, possessive pronouns, quantifiers, demonstratives, and numbers are determiners. They modify nouns like adjectives and go before a noun to show whether it's specific or general, as in "that coat" vs. "a coat" (Nordquist, 2019).

She could not think of a better book when teachers and schools are asked to document students' reading and math progress. She uses the Reading Miscue Inventory in middle school to support struggling readers. Even when she was not completing a formal miscue analysis, she listened to readers (Pierce, 2009). This authentic assessment shows how readers engage with reading to make meaning and reveals disconnects when reading is difficult. Reading Miscue Inventory gives teachers insights to help readers succeed, unlike most reading assessments (Kasten et al., 2005). Reading miscue inventory restores professionalism to teacher assessment and hope for our nation's readers in an era of high-stakes testing and commercial classroom reading tests. This new edition makes our most powerful tool for revealing readers' strengths and needs more accessible, with clear

implementation, interpretation, and instructional applications. These literacy luminaries shine again (Altwerger, 2005). Goodman, Watson, & Burke's detailed procedure uses the reading miscue inventory tool (2005). This procedure explored reader miscues within a sentence or the entire story. The passage was typed and duplicated. One was for the participant, and the other was a code sheet for the researchers. Each line in the code sheet was numbered to identify errors.

**III. METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design**

This paper employed a descriptive research design using the content analysis technique since the study focused on determining the oral reading miscues of Grade 11 senior high school students of Clarenco Calagos Memorial School of Fisheries, Sta. Margarita, Samar, Philippines

**Population and Sampling**

This research employed combined or mixed purposive-random sampling. First, the researchers purposively selected the Grade 11 Senior High School students with grades of 85 below in their English participants during the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester of School Year 2018-2019. Next, the low-performing students in English of each strand were randomly selected. Table 1 presents the frequency distribution and percentage of Grade 11 senior high school students.

**Table 1. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Grade 11 Senior High School Students**

<b>Strand</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
General Academic (GA)	3	7.14
Computer Systems Servicing (CSS)	4	9.52
Electrical Installation and Maintenance (EIM)	16	38.10
Bread and Pastry Production (BPP), Cookery, Food and Beverages Services (FBS)	19	45.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100.00</b>

There were only three (3) or 7.14% GA students who served as participants in the study, while there were four (4) or 9.52% CSS students who participated, 16 or 38.10% participants who come from EIM class, and 19 or 45.24% from the BPP, Cookery, and FBS. Totalling, there were 42 Grade 11 Senior High School students who participated in the conduct of this study.

**Data Collection and Instrumentation**

The researchers started the collection of needed data by securing permission through a letter from the school head to administer the research instruments to the selected Grade 11 students. Having granted the permission, they then

distributed consent forms to the identified respondents stating that the reading inventory results were for research purposes only and would remain confidential. Further, the researchers used a two-chapter reading selection as part of the Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI) tool. Finally, the researchers personally administered the reading inventory tool to the participants. In administering the RMI tool, the participants orally read the passages. At the same time, the researchers observed and marked all the deviations from the text through a cueing system prescribed in the RMI coding sheets.

The coding system is shown in Table 2, adapted from Argyle (1989) for miscue patterns such as omission, insertion, hesitation, substitution, repetition, and correction.



Table 2. Coding System for the Oral Reading Miscue Inventory (Argyle, 1989)

Omission	the <u>old</u> tree
Insertion	the old ^ tree
Hesitation	the /old / tree
Substitution	<i>Dray</i> the old tree
Repetition	the old <u>tree</u>
Correction	<i>Tray</i> the old tree

Before recording data, the researchers checked the reading inventory results to ensure the completeness of the necessary data. During the process of gathering data, the researchers gathered the final grades of the selected participants in their English subject in the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester of School Year 2018-2019 with the permission of their advisers and English teachers.

**Statistical Treatment**

The data gathered were treated using the following statistical tools. First, the mean was used to identify the profile of the participants in terms of their academic performance in their English classes in Oral Communication

and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Literature. Then, frequency and arithmetic mean were used to identify the oral miscues of Grade 11 students in terms of omission, insertion, hesitation, substitution, repetition, and correction. Finally, the same tool still was used to describe the oral miscues of the students in terms of content and function words.

**IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Academic Performance of Grade 11 Students in their English Classes**

Table 3 is the Academic Performance of Grade 11 Senior High School students in their English classes.

Table 3. Academic Performance of Grade 11 Students in their English Classes

Strand	Oral Communication	21st Century Literature	Mean	Description
GA	81.67	84.33	83.00	Satisfactory
CSS	83.00	82.50	82.75	Satisfactory
EIM	83.13	82.69	82.91	Satisfactory
BPP, Cookery, FBS	83.74	81.95	82.84	Satisfactory
<b>Mean</b>	<b>82.88</b>	<b>82.87</b>	<b>82.87</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

  

Rating	Description
96-100	Superior
91-95	Excellent
86-90	Very Satisfactory
81-85	Satisfactory
76-80	Unsatisfactory
70-75	Very Unsatisfactory

Table 3 revealed that the participants from the General Academic class have the highest mean academic rating of 83.00, which is described as “satisfactory” academic performance. Similarly, the participants coming from Computer Systems Servicing have the lowest mean of 82.75, described as “satisfactory” academic performance. Generally, the participants from the four (4) senior high school classes have a mean academic rating of 82.87, described as “satisfactory” academic performance.

Based on this data, Grade 11 senior high school students' English grades seem good enough to pass according to the Department of Education Philippines' passing standard of 75%. Even though their academic performance is good, it does not mean that they will be competitive in oral communication and modern literature. However, these students should always keep in mind that a good grade point average could help them in many ways, both as students and as professionals in the future. According to the study by Cristobal and Lasaten (2018), there is a strong link between

## Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School

how anxious 7th graders are about oral communication and how well they do in English, Math, and Science. This means that students are more likely to do well in English, Math, and Science if they are less afraid of communicating with others. Nevertheless, if they are worried about speaking in front of people, they tend to do worse in English, Math, and Science.

### Oral Reading Miscues of Grade 11 Senior High School Students

Table 4 is on the frequency distribution and mean of the oral reading miscues of the Grade 11 senior high school students.

**Table 4. Frequency Counts and Mean of the Oral Reading Miscues of the Grade 11 Students**

Strands	Oral Reading Miscues						Total	n	Mean
	Omission	Insertion	Hesitation	Substitution	Repetition	Correction			
GA		1	11	5	6	6	29	3	9.67
CSS	3	1	12	4	8	17	45	4	11.25
EIM	50	5	49	86	68	101	359	16	22.44
BPP, C, FBS	36	6	51	72	60	119	344	19	18.11
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>18.50</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>5.79</b>	<b>18.50</b>		

As seen in Table 4, the participants from the EIM class obtained the highest total of oral reading miscues of 359 or a mean of 22.44, while those from the GA class got the lowest number of oral reading miscues of 29 or a mean of 9.67. Among the classifications of oral reading miscues, correction posted the highest sum of 243 or a mean of 5.79, while insertion got the lowest total of 13 or a mean of 0.31.

This finding implies that the participants coming from the EIM class are not very particular with their academics, specifically their status in reading, as their inclination is toward technical-vocational skills. Though not academically inclined, they are still aware of the correct pronunciation of the words, so they self-correct their miscues. On the other hand, those coming from the GA class have the less oral reading miscues as these students are academically inclined and are more conscious of their reading performance, specifically their pronunciation. Correction seems to be the most prevalent oral reading error since participants are not diligent about vowel and consonant sounds. Erroneous sound production causes word replacement or correction. They self-correct mispronounced words. A competent reader corrects a mistake to make sense of the sentence (Watson, 20118). The

reader may read too quickly and focus on word shape before meaning (Excellence Gateway, 2019). Poor readers read too fast, mispronounce words, and self-correct (Watson, 20118).

Gilakjani (2011) studied why ESL speakers mispronounce English words (ESL). Non-native English speakers have a distinct accent from native English speakers (Gilakjani, Ahmadi, S., & Ahmadi, M., 2011). Environment and motivation may be more important than the age at acquisition in developing native-like pronunciation (Marinova-Todd, Marshall, & Snow, 2000). Stress, rhythm, and intonation are also common mispronunciation causes, though heavily accented speech is sometimes intelligible. Stress, intonation, and rhythm errors affect intelligibility (Gilakjani et al., 2011).

### Oral Reading Miscues of Grade 11 Students in Terms of Content Words

Table 5 shows the frequency counts and mean of the oral reading miscues of the Grade 11 students in terms of content words.

**Table 5. Frequency Counts and Mean of the Oral Reading Miscues of the Grade 11 Students in Terms of Content Words**

Strands	Content Words (Open Word Class)				Total	n	Mean
	Verb	Adjective	Adverb	Noun			
GA	4	1	0	6	11	3	3.67
CSS	8	6	2	14	30	4	7.50
EIM	120	40	12	99	271	16	16.94
BPP, C, FBS	112	48	6	122	288	19	15.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>14.29</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.81</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>5.74</b>	<b>14.29</b>		

In terms of content words (open word class), the data tell that the participants coming from the EIM class have the highest number of oral reading miscues of 271 or a mean of 16.94,

while those from the GA class have the lowest sum of 11 or a mean of 3.67. Among the content words, verbs recorded the highest sum of 244 or a mean of 5.81, while adverbs posted

**Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School**

the lowest sum of 20 or 0.48 across all classes. This result means that the participants from the EIM class have difficulty recognizing and understanding content words and that verbs for them are the most difficult to identify and read. In addition, miscues in the content words, particularly verbs, may result in changes in the meaning of the sentence, affecting the understanding of the whole text.

When dealing with verbs in a text, there are two main causes for the difficulties. First, unlike articles and prepositions, verbs are more challenging to identify in a text because they are frequently confused with other parts of speech. It is well-known that processing tools are more prone to error in data

containing a high background noise level in English as a Second Language (ESL) (Nagata & Sakaguchi, 2016). The second reason that verbs are more difficult to write correctly is that they have multiple grammatical purposes, and they are more prone to numerous errors (Rozovskaya & Roth, 2014).

**Oral Reading Miscues of Grade 11 Students in Terms of Function Words**

Table 6 presents the frequency counts and mean of the oral reading miscues of Grade 11 students in terms of function words.

**Table 6. Frequency Counts and Mean of the Oral Reading Miscues of the Grade 11 Students in Terms of Function Words**

Strands	Function Words (Close Word Class)				Total	n	Mean
	Conj.	Prep.	Pronoun	Article			
GA	6	0	6	3	15	3	5.00
CSS	2	2	8	3	15	4	3.75
EIM	16	7	45	20	88	16	5.50
BPP, C, FBS	8	8	29	11	56	19	2.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4.14</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>4.14</b>		

In terms of oral reading errors on function words (near word class), the EIM class participants scored the highest with 88 errors, or a mean of 5.50, while the CSS class participants scored the lowest with 15 errors or a mean of 3.50. Among function words, pronouns had the highest amount of errors, 88, or an average of 2.10, while prepositions had the lowest, 17, or an average of 0.40. The statistics indicate that participants in the EIM class find it significantly more difficult to distinguish pronouns in text than participants in other classes. Consequently, readers frequently make mistakes with personal pronouns, although errors with other types of pronouns are not as significant. In Hughes and Heah's (2006) grammatical reference, these four forms of pronouns (personal, reflexive, relative, and possessive) are also common errors Malaysians commit. In addition, Seow and Tay (2004) discovered that "possessive pronouns are consistently more difficult for students to acquire than personal pronouns [e.g. me, we, you]" and that "within the possessive pronouns, those with the nominal function (e.g., mine, yours, ours) are typically more problematic than those with the determiner function (e.g., my, your, our)" even though the study by Seow and Tay (2004) was conducted with elementary school kids, several of the participants in this study continue to struggle with the proper usage of personal pronouns.

**V. CONCLUSION**

The researchers conclude that Grade 11 students' English academic performance is satisfactory but does not reflect competence and excellence in oral communication and modern literature. Among the different classes, the EIM class has committed many oral miscues. After all, they are not very particular with their academics, especially their reading skill, because their inclination is toward technical-vocational skills. The correction appears to be the most common oral reading miscue among the subjects because they are not very meticulous about the sounds of the vowels and consonants, resulting in self-correction of their mispronounced words. Further, the EIM class has trouble recognizing and understanding content words and that verbs are the hardest for them to identify and read; errors in reading verbs may have affected their understanding of the text as this may change the meaning of the sentence. They also found it difficult to recognize pronouns in the text compared to academically inclined subjects from GA class, who often make errors on personal pronouns. The study also revealed that oral reading miscues committed by Grade 11 students have no significant effect on their academic performance in Oral Communication and are not the direct reasons for having low grades in the said subject. As oral communication performance activities are required to pass the subject, psychological factors such as higher anxiety levels must have caused them to perform lower. Similarly, their oral reading miscues are not the direct reason for their low grades in 21st

## Michael Jude T. Casaljay et al, Oral Reading Miscues among Grade 11 Students in a Technical-Vocational High School

Century Literature, as oral reading fluency is not required to understand literature texts. However, silent reading fluency is, and the oral reading miscues committed by the Grade 11 students have no significant bearing on their overall academic performance in their English subjects but factors such as, according to research: differences in learners' learning styles. Researchers recommend that students and English teachers work together to improve academic performance in Oral Communication and 21st Century Literature by providing intensive oral and silent reading exercises in the classroom. Students from the Technical-Vocational and Livelihood track, especially those in EIM, maybe focus on intensive oral and silent reading exercises to improve their reading performance and reading comprehension. Lessons, classroom activities, and exercises on content words may be given focus in English classes, particularly to TVL-EIM students, to master the skills in recognizing, comprehending, and using content words. Oral Communication teachers may set a child-friendly and enjoyable teaching-learning environment in the classroom where students are welcomed and motivated to participate in oral communication classroom activities and exercises.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers wholeheartedly pay their gratitude to the school head for allowing them to conduct the study and, most especially, to the participants who gave consent and actively participated in it.

### REFERENCES

1. Altwerger, A. (2005). *Reading for Profit: How the Bottom Line Leaves Kids Behind*. Towson University.  
<https://www.heinemann.com/products/e00792.aspx>
2. Baker, S. K., Smolkowski, K., Katz, R., Fien, H., Seeley, J. R., Kame'enui, E. J., et al. (2008). Reading fluency as a predictor of reading proficiency in low-performing, high-poverty schools. *School Psychology Review*, 37(1), 18–37.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2008.12087905>
3. British Council. (n.d.) Content words. *Teaching English*. British Council.  
<https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/content-words>
4. Carnap, R. (2022). The logical syntax of language. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.).  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/carnap/>
5. Cristobal, J. & Lasaten, R. (2018). Oral communication apprehensions and academic performance of Grade 7 students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(3), 5-16.  
<http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/APJMR-2018.6.3.02a.pdf>
6. De Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley, USA.
7. de Dios, A. (2013, July 20). The national achievement test in the Philippines. *Philippine Basic Education*.  
<https://www.philippinesbasiceducation.us/2013/07/the-national-achievement-test-in.html>
8. Essberger, J. (2019). What is reading?. English Club.  
<https://www.englishclub.com/reading/what.htm>
9. Gilakjani, A. P., Ahmadi, S., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). Why is pronunciation so difficult to learn?. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 74-83.  
<https://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/11877>
10. Goodman, K. S. (1996). *On Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. pp. 118-125
11. Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (2005). *Reading miscue inventory: From evaluation to instruction* (2nd ed.). Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen Publishers.
12. Kasten, W.C., Kristo, J. V., McClure, A. A., & Garthwait, A. (2005). Living literature: Using children's literature to support reading and language arts. *Faculty and Staff Monograph Publications*. 96.  
[https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/fac\\_monographs/96](https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/fac_monographs/96)
13. Klammer, T., Schulz, M., & Volpe, A. D. (2000). *Analyzing English Grammar*. Boston: Pearson Publisher, USA.
14. Leipzig, D. H. (2001, January). What is reading? Reading Rockets.  
<https://www.readingrockets.org/article/what-reading>
15. Mahmud, C. & Gopal, R. (2018). Miscue analysis: A glimpse into the reading process. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(1), 12-24.  
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i1.9927>
16. Marinova-Todd, S. H., Marshall, D. B., & Snow, C. E. (2000). Three misconceptions about age and L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 9-34.  
[https://personal.utdallas.edu/~assmann/hcs6367/marinova\\_todd\\_marshall\\_snow00.pdf](https://personal.utdallas.edu/~assmann/hcs6367/marinova_todd_marshall_snow00.pdf)
17. Nagata, R. & Sakaguchi, K. (2016). Phrase structure annotation and parsing for learner English. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp. 1837–1847.  
<https://aclanthology.org/P16-1173>
18. National Research Council (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*.



- Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.17226/6023>
19. Nordquist, R. (2019, June 28). The role of interjections in English grammar. ThoughtCo.  
<https://www.thoughtco.com/notes-on-interjections-1692680>
20. Rasplica, C., & Cummings, K. (2013). Oral reading fluency. <https://council-for-learningdisabilities.org/what-is-oral-reading-fluency-verbal-reading-proficiency>
21. Reneschmauder, A., Morris, R., & Poynor, D. (2000). Lexical processing and text integration of function and content words: Evidence from priming and eye fixations. *Memory & Cognition*, 28(7), 1098-1108.  
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.3758/BF03211811.pdf>
22. Reschly, A., Busch, T., Betts, J., Deno, S., & Long, J. (2009). Curriculum-based measurement oral reading as an indicator of reading achievement: A meta-analysis of the correlational evidence. *Journal of Psychology*, 47(6), 427-469.  
DOI: [10.1016/j.jsp.2009.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2009.07.001)
23. Rozovskaya, A. & Roth, D. (2010). Annotating ESL errors: Challenges and rewards. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 Fifth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pp. 28–36. <https://aclanthology.org/W10-1004.pdf>
24. Seow, A. & Tay, G. (2004). The acquisition of English personal and possessive pronouns in two classroom learning environments. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language TESL-EJ*, 8(3), 1-16. <http://tesl-ej.org/ej31/a1.html>
25. Philippine Star. (2010, May 2). How do Filipino students rate in reading. *Philstar Global*.  
<https://www.philstar.com/lifestyle/health-and-family/2010/03/02/553720/how-do-filipino-students-rate-reading>
26. Pierce, K.M. (2009). Standards for the assessment of reading and writing. Joint Task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English (Revised Edition), IRA/NCTE.
27. Villamin, A. (1984). Innovative strategies in teaching. Phoenix Publication House, Quezon City, Philippines.
28. [Watson](#), S. (2019, July 7). Miscue analysis for diagnosing reading skills. ThoughtCo.  
<https://www.thoughtco.com/miscue-analysis-for-diagnosing-reading-difficulties-3111062>
29. Wayman, M., Wallace, T., Wiley, H. I., Ticha, R., & Espin, C. A. (2007). Literature synthesis on Curriculum-Based Measurement in reading. *Journal of Special Education*, 41, 85–120.  
<http://sed.sagepub.com>.  
DOI: [10.1177/00224669070410020401](https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669070410020401)
30. Westphal, E. (2017). The click languages of southern and eastern Africa. *Linguistics in Sub-Saharan Africa*, edited by Jack Berry and Thomas Albert Sebeok, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 367-420.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111562520-013>