READING ERRORS ANALYSIS ON ENGLISH DYSLEXIC READERS

Sovian Nisa Nurul Baeti
A Student at the University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto
sovikim411@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is to describe the patterns of reading errors made by a dyslexic child. The data of this research are obtained from YouTube channel of Stephen Round. On the video they were asked to read nine English children story books containing texts and pictures. The grade of the books began from lower grade book until on-level grade book relevant to their age.
In conducting this research, the researcher used the four reading errors types from Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001) and other findings of two researchers as analysis tools for analyzing the reading errors produced by English children. Those are the research findings of Gupta (2006) and the research findings by Rabia (2004). Based on analysis, the result of this research revealed that the reading errors in the subject 1 are error sharing orthographic overlap, error preserving the initial phoneme, errors preserving the final phoneme, scaffolding errors, phonological errors, morphological errors, omission and addition. He is hard to make connection between the letters and its correspondent sound.

Keyword: *reading errors pattern, dyslexic readers, children*

INTRODUCTION

Dyslexia is not merely just a problem with literacy. It affects other aspects and every people with dyslexia have various characteristics. Dyslexia may overlap with related conditions such as dyspraxia, attention deficit disorder with or without hyperactivity, and dysphasia (Lucid, 2006). In general, there is some problems occur in people with dyslexia such as the poor ability to remember spoken information within the short memory system, hard to retrieve words from long-term memory, and occur alongside other difficulties likes concentration, arithmetic, and motor coordination (Dyslexia action 2012). However, reading and writing are the biggest challenge that dyslexia causes in education and working life. This is understandable because reading and writing take a lead in every aspect of life as already stated before.

In reading case, dyslexia does not always refer to reading *b* as *p*. It is actually not very much related at all. It is just one of the cases that dyslexia has dealt with their system on the brain. On the other hand, the result of reading errors might lead to more various patterns or types depend on the characteristic of the language itself. Language with different orthographic might lead into different types or patterns of reading errors due to the language rules they have.

Research on reading errors of dyslexic readers had been done by Gupta in 2006. The title of the research is "*An Analysis of Reading Errors of Dyslexia Readers in Hindi and English* ". On the research, he examined the nature of reading errors made by dyslexic readers in Hindi and English. The researcher used reading errors theory proposed by Savage, Stuart and Hill. According to the theory, there are four types or reading errors. Those are errors sharing orthographic overlap, errors preserving the initial phoneme of target words, errors preserving the final phoneme of target words and scaffolding errors. This paper is a part of research report to reveal error pattern in a dyslexic child speaking English.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

The Developmental Lag of Dyslexic Readers

Many scientists assumed that the developmental lag of dyslexic reader occurs because there is a gap between their expected phonological processing level and their general intelligence. In this paragraph, the developmental lag is specific to reading and phonological processing only. Statz and Fletcher (as cited in Rabia, 2004) stated that this delay in phonological processing is attributed to slow maturation of certain areas in the central nervous system that are responsible for the phonological process ability. Furthermore, the lag of phonological process development of dyslex-

ics is causing the delay in reading skill (Snowling, as cited in Rabia, 2004). This problem affect negatively for them even though that the adult dyslexics be able to master reading and show improvement in reading skill, they fail in reading non-words, unfamiliar and irregular words (Bruck, as cited in Rabia, 2004). It indicates that they still experience difficulty in phonological processing and hiders phonological decoding ability.

English Orthography

There are three basic branches of the orthography in the world. They are alphabetic, logographic or morphophonemic and syllabic languages. In alphabetic orthography, most graphemes represent the phonemes of the language (Roman alphabet or Latin alphabet, Cyrillic alphabet, Arabic alphabet, etc.). Grapheme is a symbol of a phoneme. The symbol is in a form of letter or group of letters representing a sound. Logographic orthography the graphemes represent the morphemes of the language the example of this orthography is Chinese. The third is syllabic orthography. It lies between alphabetic and morphophonemic orthography in terms of sound-symbol representation. In this case, the graphemes of this writing system represent syllables of the language. There are two types of syllabic orthography; one has the potential phonemic representation (Korean Hangul) and the other is fully syllabic-based sound-symbol correspondence (Japanese Kana).

According to the three types of orthographic above English uses the Roman alphabet. English has 26 letters (5 vowels and 21 consonants) that represent over 40 phonemes. Venezky (as cited in Bernitz, 1978) stated that the 5 written vowels are particular varied in their mappings to speech, and there are 12 vowels digraphs, 6 of which have alternate pronunciations according to their position. In additional, he stated that consonants are more consistent in their grapheme–phoneme correspondences, with the exceptions of *c* and *g*, which are read differently according to the vowels that follow. Nevertheless, only three consonants (n, r, and v) have only one sound that cannot be produced by other combinations and is never silent.

METHODS

This study belongs to a qualitative research. It refers to the meaning, concepts, definition, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things (Berg, as cited in Center for Teaching, Research & Learning 2007). According to Creswell (2002), qualitative research is an inquiry approach in which the inquirer analyzes and codes the data for description and themes, interprets the meaning of the information drawing on personal reflections and past research, and writes the final report that includes personal biases and a flexible structure. The data of this research are only the reading errors produced by three English children. In this paper, it is only an analysis on an English child is closely observed. In this research, the researcher used the four reading errors types from Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001), the research findings of Gupta (2006) and the research findings by Rabia (2004) as analysis tools for analyzing the reading errors produced by English children.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Varieties of Reading Errors in a Dyslexic Child

This part focused on the incorrect reading of target word produced by subject 1. Then the data is further analyzed by reading errors classification proposed by Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001) who classified the errors into four types, the research findings of Gupta (2006), and the research findings by Rabia (2004). Those four reading error types are errors sharing orthographic overlap, errors preserving the initial phoneme of target word, errors preserving the final phoneme of the target word, and errors preserving both the initial, final phoneme or it can be named as scaffolding errors. Then the findings of Gupta (2006) are phonological errors and orthographic errors. Meanwhile, the finding of Rabia (2004) is morphological errors. The analysis of the reading error types and other finding are presented in the following section.

Errors Sharing Orthographic Overlap

Errors in this category retained at least one letter from target words but did not necessarily share common pronunciation. Target and error pronunciation did not share initial or terminal position phonemes. According to Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001), the example of this error is reading *bark* as *can*. In this case, subject 1 returns letter /a/ from the target word. On the other hand, according to Gupta

(2006) the example of errors sharing orthographic overlap is reading the target word *weather* as *anywhere*. In that example, the subject preserves phoneme /h/ /e/ and /r/ from the target word and the /e/ phoneme is added. Then it becomes *anywhere* instead of *weather*. The data below is the data representing errors sharing orthographic overlap.

Based on the table above, datum 1 (Floor), datum 2 (Kitchen) and datum 3 (Yes) share different error sharing orthographic overlap from one to another. Preservation of vowel letters occurs in datum 1 (Floor) and datum 3 (yes) while preservation of consonant letters occurs only in datum 2 (kitchen sink). In datum 1 (floor) only vowel letter /o/ preserved while in datum 3 (yes) the vowel letter /e/ preserved. On the other hand, consonant letter /t/ preserved in datum 2 (Kitchen Sink). In line, all of the word were produced by subject 1 is the wrong real word not nonsense word or a non-word. As stated by Wimmer and Hummer (as cited in Gupta, 2006) that errors produced by English children are largely more into the wrong real word than non-word.

Table 1. **Errors sharing orthographic overlap**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	Fl**o**or	Gr**o**und	Your pants and jacket are lying on the floor.
2	Ki**t**chen sink	Coun**t**ers	Your kitchen sink is filled with dirty dishes.
3	Y**e**s	S**e**e	Yes! Said Frog.

In datum 1 the subject is reading the target word *floor* as *ground*. Both of the words share the same position in the grammar function as a noun. In this case, the letter /o/ is preserved while the rest is deleted and changed into different letter. The initial phoneme changed into letter /g/ while the final phoneme changed into letter/r/. Still, if the word produced by the subject split apart into units of sound, it will have the similar sound as target word. Those sounds are produced by double letters /o/ in target word then letter /a/ and letter /u/ in the word produced. Double letters /o/ on the word *floor* is sounded [ou] while letter /o/ in the word *ground* is sounded [au]. So it can be concluded that the [ou] sound in the target word changes into [ɑu] sound. Furthermore, the word produced by the subject is related semantically to the target word. It is also called as Semantic guessing. It made by substituting the target word with another word related semantically to the target word (Beland and Miomouni, as cited in Rabia, 2004) the example of Semantic guessing is reading the target word to *her house* as to *her home*. While in the datum 1 the Semantic guessing is occurred by reading the target word *lying on the Floor* as *lying on the Ground*.

In datum 2 the error sharing orthographic overlap occurs by reading the target word *kitchen sink* as *Counters*. In this case letter /t/ and /e/ preserved while the other letters deleted and changed into different letter structure. On the other hand, the letter / s/, /i/, /n, and / /k/ are deleted. The word produced by the subject has far different meaning to the target word but it shares the same grammar function as noun. Kitchen sink is a thing used for washing dishes and preparing food while counter is an apparatus used for counting.

Furthermore, if the target word is changed into the word produce the sentence will be nonsense. In addition, this type of error is debatable. According to the theory proposed by Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001), datum 2 is a part of errors orthographic overlap. It is because subject 1 fails to preserve neither the initial phoneme, final phoneme nor both of them and leaving only letter /o/. On the other hand, the initial phoneme of word produced still share the same sound of the target word. So that, if both of the words split apart into a unit of sounds the letter /k/ in the target word and letter /c/ in word produced has exactly the same sound that is sound ['k]. It can be assumed that datum 2 is not only preserved the letter /o/ but also preserved the initial phoneme /k/.

In datum 3, subject 1 misread the target word *yes* as *see*. In this case, only letter

/e/ preserved while letter /y/ changed into letter /s/ and final letter /s/ changed into letter /e/. Then it becomes *yes* rather than *see*.

Errors preserving the initial phoneme of target words

Error preserving the initial phoneme of the target words is preservation the initial phoneme of the target word while the rest is deleted or changed into another letters. According to Savage Stuart and Hill (2001), the example of this error is reading *bark* as *bed*. In this case, subject 1 preserved phoneme /b/. The example of Errors preserving the initial phoneme of the target words is reading the target word *weather* as *watering* as stated by Gupta (2006). In this case, the phoneme /w/ is preserved while the rest are deleted and changed into different letter combination. In some cases, the second phoneme might be preserved, for example reading the target word *when* as *where* (Gupta, 2006). The table below is the data representing errors preserving the initial phoneme of target words.

Table 2. **Error preserving the initial phoneme of target word**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentences
1	**H**appy	**H**is Pal	Sam is Happy.
2	**W**here	**W**hat	Where are Brad and Matt playing? .
3	**W**hy	**W**ill	I am not in the dumps anymore. "Why?" asked Frog.
4	**W**hat	**W**hen	"What is that?" Asked Frog.
5	**H**ave	**H**ow	We have fun with no Sun.
6	**W**ith	**W**ill	We can have fun with no Sun.
7	**Br**ight	**Br**others	She had a bright new backpack for her books.
8	**Br**ight	**Br**and	
9	**W**alked	**W**ent	They all walked home together.
10	**G**et	**G**o	He needed to get used to it.
11	**W**hy	**W**here	Tim argued "but why can't I sit next to her?".

All of the data in the table above show the evidence of reading error types by Savage, Stuart and Hill (2001) named Error preserving the initial phoneme of the target words. Then Errors preserving the initial phoneme can be done in 2 ways. First when the subject preserved only the initial phoneme and second when the subject preserved the first and the second phoneme of the target words. The first type of error found in datum 1 (happy), datum 2 (where), datum 3 (why), datum 4 (what), datum 5 (have), datum 8 (bright), datum 10 (get) and datum 11 (why).

Errors by preserving the initial phoneme /h/ find in datum 1 (happy) and datum 5 (have). In datum 1 (happy) the subject tries to preserve the initial phoneme of the target word those are phoneme /h/ and phoneme /p/ but then fail and resulting two words with far different orthographic structure from the target words. It becomes *his pal* instead of *happy*. In datum 5 (have) only the initial phoneme preserved resulting the same amount of word but with different letter structure. In datum 5 subject 1 did semantic sentence guessing after preserved the initial phoneme of the target word. Semantic sentence guessing made as a result of semantic guessing of sentence the visual orthographic structure of the sentence (Rabia and Taha, 2004). For example of semantic sentence guessing is reading *Faya-yaumal-ahad* (once upon a time) as *faya ahad* (on Sunday) (Rabia and Taha, 2004). In this case, Subject 1 tries to connect the target word with the next word that is word *fun* and it becomes *how fun*. But when it is placed

in the target sentence it becomes *we how fun with no sun* resulting nonsense sentences.

Errors by preserving the initial phoneme /g/ occurs in datum 10 (get). In datum 10 (get) semantic sentences guessing still happens by connecting the word are produced by the subject to the previous word of the sentence that is *to*. Then it becomes *to go* rather than *to get*. But then when it connects to the next word of sentence (used) it does not make sense. The sentence will be *"He needed to go used to it"*.

Error by preserving the initial phoneme /w/ happens in datum 2 (where), datum 3 (why), datum 4(what), datum 9 (walked) and datum 11 (why). There is a common pattern of this error that is subject 1 misread w-question word with another w-question word except for datum 3 (why) datum 9 (walked) such as reading *where* as *what* (datum 2), reading *what* as *when* (datum 4), and reading datum *why* as *where* (datum11). Wh-question (*what, when, where, who, whom, which*, *whose*, *why* and *how*) usually form with wh- + auxiliary verb (be, do or have) + subject +main verb or wh- + a modal verb (*can-could, may-might, shall-should, will-would and must*) + main verb. Both of target word and word produced still follow the line. The sentence produced and target sentence has the same visual orthographic structure. In datum 2 (where) the target sentences *where are Brad and Matt playing?* is read as *what are Brad and Matt playing?*. While in datum 4 (what) the target sentence *what is that?* is read as *when is that?*. Yet the meaning of both sentences is still acceptable.

The previous explanation might lead to *semantic sentence guessing*. Semantic sentence guessing is a result of semantic guessing of sentences based on the visual orthographic structure of target sentence (Rabia, 2004). Semantic guessing still occurs in datum 11 (why). In this case, the target word *why* is read as *where*. Both of them have the same visual orthographic structure. Yet, if the target word changed into the word produced by subject 1 the meaning of the target sentences is unusual. So the sentence will be *but why can't I sit next to her?*.

On the other hand, in datum 3 (why) and datum 11 (why) the target word is same but resulting different word produced that is reading *why* as *will* (datum 3) and reading *why* as *where* (datum 11). In datum 3 (why), the aim of word *why* in target sentence is for asking further information about the statement in the previous sentence that is *I am not in the dumps anymore*. On the other hand, the word *will* in the interrogative sentence is indicating action in the future. Then, if the target word *why* changed into *will* the sentence will not connect each other. It is because the word *will* is not carrying the same aim as the word *why* in the target sentence.

The last preservation of phoneme /w/ occurs in datum 9 (walked) resulting another verb in a past form that is *went*. Both of them still related semantically. According to oxford dictionary walk means to move or go somewhere by putting one foot in front of other on the ground but without running. Then went means move from one place of point to other. It can be concluded that went is the action of moving into somewhere or some point while act is a way to go somewhere. It is also called as Semantic guessing. It made by substituting the target word with another word related semantically to the target word.

The second type of error found in datum 6 (with), datum 7 (bright) and datum 8 (bright). Errors by preserving the initial phoneme /w/ and second phoneme /i/ of target word occur in datum 6 (with). In this case the first and second phoneme preserved while the letter /t/ and letter /h/ changed into different letter that is letter /l/ resulting different word (will). The last kind of this error is preserving the initial phoneme /b/ and the second phoneme /r/. It happens in datum 7 (bright) and datum 8(bright). The target word is same but resulting different word produced, that is reading the target word *bright* as *brother* (datum 7) and reading the target word *bright* as *brand* (datum 8). In this case, only the first phoneme and the second phoneme preserved while others deleted and changed into different phoneme structure.

Errors preserving the final phoneme of target words

An error preserving the final phoneme of target words is preservation of final phoneme of the target words while the rest is deleted or changed into different phoneme structure resulting a new word or nonword. The example of errors preserving the final phoneme of target word is reading the target word *struck* as *truck* (Gupta, 2006). In this case, letter /k/ preserved. The data below is the data representing errors preserving the final phoneme of target words.

Error preserving the final phoneme of target words happens in datum 1 (him). It is done by preserving the final phoneme /m/ and middle phoneme /i/ of the target words while the final phoneme changes into phoneme /t/. It becomes *Tim*. Furthermore, this error occurs because of semantic sentence guessing. It is a result of semantic guessing of the sentence based on the visual orthographic structure of the target word (Rabia, 2004). In this case, it happens because the subject already known that the main character of the story book is Tim so that the subject assumed the target word as Tim not him. On the other hand, the word produced and the target word still related semantically.

Scaffolding Errors

Scaffolding errors is preservation both initial and final boundary phoneme of target words but the vowel digraphs which made up middle phoneme of target words were inaccurately pronounce (Savage et al., as cited in Gupta 2006). The example of scaffolding errors is reading the target word *bark* as *bank* (Savage et al, 2001). In this case, the initial phoneme /b/ and final phoneme /k/ preserved. Then, the example of scaffolding error by Gupta is reading the target word *spell* as *sapil* resulting a new word or non-word. In this case, initial phoneme /s/ and final phoneme /i/ preserved. The data below is the data representing scaffolding errors.

Table 4. **Scaffolding Errors**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	**Sun**	**Soon**	The sun is out today.
2	**Soon**	**Sun**	But soon Tina asked her back-
3	**W**atche**d**	**W**ante**d**	Tim watched.

Scaffolding errors happens in datum 1 (soon) by preserving the initial phoneme /s/ and final phoneme /n/ then double phoneme /o/ in the middle deleted and changed into phoneme /u/. Then it becomes *soon* instead of *sun*. On the other hand, it happens vice versa in datum 2 (sun). This error occurs by preserving the initial phoneme /s/ and the final phoneme /n/ yet the phoneme /u/ in the middle of target word deleted and changed into double phoneme /o/. Then it becomes *sun* instead of *soon*.

This kind of errors is as a result of inconsistency of English. English alphabetic orthographies are more into deep orthographic rather than transparent orthographic. It means that individual graphemes represent a number of different phonemes in different words, and there are many exceptions to graphemes-phoneme correspondent rules. Such as grapheme /o/ has some different mappings. For example short /o/ or [a] sound for *hop*, long /o/ or [ou] sound for *hope*, short /oo/ or [ʊ] sound for *would*, long /oo/ or [u:] sound for *boot* then it will be sounded [oi] in letter /oy/ for *boy* or it will be sounded [au] in letter /ow/ for *cow*. In contrast, transparent orthography such as German, Dutch, Spanish and Italian, in term of mapping letters to sound is much more consistent. In English orthography the underlying rules will be less consistent and more complex. Besides, it has a lot of irregular words. In line, Wimmer and Goswani (1994) stated that the transparency of orthography has direct effect on reading development in children. In language with transparent orthography with very consistent mapping from letters to sound, then grapheme-phoneme correspondences should be easier to detect and use and it will happen vice versa to language with less transparent orthography.

In datum 1(sun) and datum 2 (soon) of table 4, the word *sun* and *soon* is read inverted. The target word *sun* was reading as *soon* and the target word *soon* was reading as *sun*. In datum 1 (sun) short /u/ sound or [u] sound in the word *sun* changed into [:u] sound. Both of them have similar sound then in written form the target word becomes *soon* instead of *sun*. Then it happens vice versa for datum 2 (soon). In contrast, if the target word changed into the word produced then both sentences produced will be nonsense. It will be *the soon is out today* for datum 1 and *But sun Tina asked her backpack again* for datum 2. It indicated that the subject did not produce sentence guessing or seman-

tic guessing since both the target and the word produce are not related semantically.
Scaffolding errors by preserving phoneme w-ed occur in datum 3 (watched). In this case, the target word *watched* was reading as *wanted*. Both of them are past form of a verb. In this case, the initial phoneme /w/ and final phoneme /-ed/ preserved while others changed into another letter structure. It becomes a new real word that is *wanted*.

Phonological Errors
Phonological errors were responses that shared phonology with target words. In other word, the respond has similar sound to the target letters of the word (Gupta, 2006). According to Gupta the example of phonological errors is reading the target word *felt* as *filt*. The table below is the data representing phonological errors.

In datum 1 (sat) both the target and word produce has the same initial phoneme that is phoneme /s/. Then letter /a/ and /t/ changed into letters /a/, /i/ and /d/. Although, they have different letters structure they share similar sound. Letter /a/ is pronounced as short /a/ or [a] while letters /ai/ pronounces as short /e/ or [ɛ] and then both of them ended with consonant. The target word is ended with [t] sound and the word produced is ended with [d] sound. Then it becomes *said* [sed] instead of *sat* [sat].
In datum 2 (book), the target word *book* is read as *box*. In this case, subject 1 failed to master short double /o/ or [ʊ] sound and phoneme /k/. Then it leads to short single /o/ or [ɑ] sound for short double /o/ sound. Furthermore, the phoneme /k/ in the end of target word changed into phoneme /x/. Although, it is totally different letters it has similar sound. The letter /k/ is sounded as [k] sound while the letter x is sounded as [ks] sound.
The last is datum 3 (too). The subject misread the target word *too* as *to*. In this case, subject fails to mastered double phoneme /o/ or [u:] sound then it leads into single phoneme o or [u] sound.

Table 5. **Phonological Errors**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	S**at**	S**aid**	Toad sat on the edge of his bed.
2	B**ook**	B**ox**	She has a bright new backpack
3	T**oo**	T**o**	Since next year he was going to

In datum 1 (sat) both the target and word produce has the same initial phoneme that is phoneme /s/. Then letter /a/ and /t/ changed into letters /a/, /i/ and /d/. Although, they have different letters structure they share similar sound. Letter /a/ is pronounced as short /a/ or [a] while letters /ai/ pronounces as short /e/ or [ɛ] and then both of them ended with consonant. The target word is ended with [t] sound and the word produced is ended with [d] sound. Then it becomes *said* [sed] instead of *sat* [sat].
In datum 2 (book), the target word *book* is read as *box*. In this case, subject 1 failed to master short double /o/ or [ʊ] sound and phoneme /k/. Then it leads to short single /o/ or [ɑ] sound for short double /o/ sound. Furthermore, the phoneme /k/ in the end of target word changed into phoneme /x/. Although, it is totally different letters it has similar sound. The letter /k/ is sounded as [k] sound while the letter x is sounded as [ks] sound.
The last is datum 3 (too). The subject misread the target word *too* as *to*. In this case, subject fails to mastered double phoneme /o/ or [u:] sound then it leads into single phoneme o or [u] sound.

Orthographic Errors
Orthographic errors were incorrect responses that shared more orthography than phonology with target words. This kind of errors has visual resemblance to some of target letters of the word. The example of orthographic errors is reading the target word *huge* as *hug* (Gupta, 2006). Orthographic errors are not found in the data of subject 1.

Morphological errors
A morphological error is reading error that still related morphologically and semantically to the target word. According to Beland & Miouni (as cited in Rabia, 2004) morphological

error is actually a phonological representation that relates to the morphology of target word. The example of morphological errors is reading the target word *waiting* as *looking* or reading the target word *boy* as *boys*. The table below is the data representing orthographic errors.

All of the data on table 6 has different pattern of morphological errors. The first pattern is reading object pronoun as another object pronoun. In this case subject 1 misread the target word *him* as *her*. The form of object pronoun (him, her, me, you, it, us and them) is used when a pronoun is the subject of sentence. In semantics view both of them has meaning relation. Further, in this case, the word *her* and *him* show gender that is her for female and him for male. The target word shows *Tina let him wear the backpack*. The word *him* in here refers to Tina's brother that has been mention in the previous sentence that is . . . .*Tim listened*. Nevertheless, subject 1 misread the target word *him* as *her*.

The second, the target word *dumps* is read as *dump*. In this case, subject 1 fails to mastered plural noun form. The plural form of most of nouns is created simply by adding letter *s* (skis, balls, books and many more). Besides that, words that end in *–ch, x, s,* or *s-like* sound will require an –es for the plural (witches, boxes, gases, buses, kisses and many more). There are also several nouns that have irregular plural form and it can be called as mutated plurals for examples is children for child, women for woman, men for man, people for person and so on. In this case, subject 1 misread *dumps* as *dump*.

Table 6. **Morphological errors**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	Him	Her	Tina let him wear the backpack.
2	Dumps	Dump	I am not in the dumps anymore.

All of the data on table 6 has different pattern of morphological errors. The first pattern is reading object pronoun as another object pronoun. In this case subject 1 misread the target word *him* as *her*. The form of object pronoun (him, her, me, you, it, us and them) is used when a pronoun is the subject of sentence. In semantics view both of them has meaning relation. Further, in this case, the word *her* and *him* show gender that is her for female and him for male. The target word shows *Tina let him wear the backpack*. The word *him* in here refers to Tina's brother that has been mention in the previous sentence that is . . . .*Tim listened*. Nevertheless, subject 1 misread the target word *him* as *her*.

The second, the target word *dumps* is read as *dump*. In this case, subject 1 fails to mastered plural noun form. The plural form of most of nouns is created simply by adding letter *s* (skis, balls, books and many more). Besides that, words that end in *–ch, x, s,* or *s-like* sound will require an –es for the plural (witches, boxes, gases, buses, kisses and many more). There are also several nouns that have irregular plural form and it can be called as mutated plurals for examples is children for child, women for woman, men for man, people for person and so on. In this case, subject 1 misread *dumps* as *dump*.

Omission

Omission is elimination of target word or leaving the target word unread. According to American Dyslexia Association, dyslexic may have difficulties in letters differentiation and it is normal for them to do omission of letters or number. Then, Dyslexia Help stated that individual dyslexia that have difficulty in phonetic awareness may has difficulty in producing rhymes or recognizing words that rhyme and they may do addition, elision or addition while they are reading. The table below is the data representing omission of target words. As seen in the table, datum 1 (his) is an omission of a word. Furthermore, this kind of error can be called of omission of possessive determiner of target word because the target word belongs to possessive determiner. Pronouns used in aim to refer to possession and belonging. According to Cambridge Dictionary Grammar, there are two types of pronoun possessive. Those are possessive determiner (*my, your, his, her, its, our, their* and *one's*) and possessive pronoun (mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, and theirs. Possessive determiner used before a noun such as in the sentence *is that* ***your*** *scarf?*

While possessive pronoun used in place of noun such is in the sentence *it was my fault not* ***hers.*** In this case, the subject let the target word that is *his* belongs to possessive determiner not pronounced.

As seen in the table, datum 1 (his) is an omission of a word. Furthermore, this kind of error can be called of omission of possessive

Table 7. **Omission**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	His	-	Before mother come to get Tim

determiner of target word because the target word belongs to possessive determiner. Pronouns used in aim to refer to possession and belonging. According to Cambridge Dictionary Grammar, there are two types of pronoun possessive. Those are possessive determiner (*my, your, his, her, its, our, their* and *one's*) and possessive pronoun (mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, and theirs. Possessive determiner used before a noun such as in the sentence *is that* ***your*** *scarf*?

While possessive pronoun used in place of noun such is in the sentence *it was my fault not* ***hers.*** In this case, the subject let the target word that is *his* belongs to possessive determiner not pronounced.

Additions

Addition is adding a sound, syllable or a word into target word. According to Dyslexia Help, individual with dyslexia that has difficulty in phonetic awareness have difficulty in producing rhymes or recognizing words that rhyme and they may do addition, elision or addition while they are reading. The table below is the data representing addition of target words.

The additions in datum 1 (can) is an addition of word. In this case, the word *not* added after

Table 8. **Additions**

No	Target Word	Word Produced	Sentence
1	Can	Cannot	"You can learn to go away " said Tina.

word *can*. Then the target sentence becomes negative form.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, it can be found that the reading errors identified in the subject include sharing orthographic overlap, preserving the initial phoneme of target word, preserving the initial phoneme of target word, preserving the final phoneme of target words, scaffolding errors, phonological errors, morphological errors, omission and addition.

REFERENCES

Abu-Rabia, Salim and Haitham Tahta. (2004). Reading and Spelling Error Analysis of Native Arabic Dyslexia Readers. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal 17 (651-689). Kluwer Academic Publisher, Israel :Faculty of Education, University of Haifa.

Barnitz, John G. (1978). Interrelationship of Orthography and Phonological Structure in Learning to Read. University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign.

Creswell and John W. (2008). Principles of Qualitative Research: Designing Qualitative Study. Office of Qualitative & Mixed Methods Research, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Gupta, Ashum. (2006). An Analysis of Reading Errors of Dyslexic Readers in Hindi and English. Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal Vol.17 No.1 (73-86). University of Delhi.

Savage R, Stuart M and Hill. (2001). The Role of Scaffolding Errors in Reading Development : Evidance from a Longitudinal and a correlational Study. Br J Educ Psychol Pt. 1 (1-13)

Wimmer, Heinz, Karin Landerl and Uta Frith. (1997). The Impact of Orthographic Consistency on Dyslexia: A German-English Comparison. Department of Psychology, University of Salzburg, Hellbrunnerstr.