Miscue analysis, a research procedure for analyzing unexpected responses in the oral reading of unfamiliar but cohesive texts, is presented. The Taxonomy of Oral Reading Miscues, the theoretically based system for the analysis of miscues that I developed, is discussed in detail, and, with examples of miscues from my research used to illustrate each subcategory for each of the variables. [The _SSCI_® indicates that this paper has been cited in over 90 publications.]

———————●———————

Reading Miscues—Windows on the Psycholinguistic Guessing Game

Kenneth S. Goodman
Language, Reading and Culture
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

August 22, 1988

I began doing research on reading in 1962 when I first came to Wayne State University in Detroit. The first report of this research,[1] a modest, unfunded study that established the concept of reading miscues, appeared in 1965. With some amusement to me and those who know my work well, that first research report has often been treated as a classic study.[2]

By 1969 I had done several studies of reading miscues with only small grants, and the Miscue Taxonomy had emerged. I was working at refining the research, but, more important, I was developing a theoretical, psycholinguistic model of the reading process. When this article was published, it represented the first complete version of the Taxonomy of Oral Reading Miscues. The first version of the model had already been published in 1967 in a relatively

obscure journal[3] shortly after I first presented it at the American Educational Research Association. The miscue research supported development of the model and the model served as the theoretical base of the taxonomy and the research, and, in fact, in spite of the two-year difference in publication dates, both articles were written at about the same time.

There was no explosion of miscue research following the publication of this article. But there has been a steady flow of studies, which is still continuing. At this point there are several hundred miscue analysis studies done in many languages and with many populations. A version of miscue analysis for use by teachers and diagnosticians, the Reading Miscue Inventory,[4] has been developed by my colleagues. And miscue analysis in some form is widely used by teachers in all of the English-speaking countries.

What was perhaps most important about this article in 1969 is that it was the first research tool that applied concepts and research methodology from linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics to the study of written language. It foreshadowed by almost 15 years the general shift in cognitive psychology to the study of text rather than words and the recognition that what the reader brings to the reading is as important as the text itself.

My major funded studies in miscue analysis were published after this article[5,6] and represented substantial refinements in the theory and the taxonomy. These studies involved subjects at several levels of reading proficiency and populations with varied language backgrounds.

The theory and model of reading has expanded to become a transactional view of written language, including writing as well as reading. The most complete statement of the model appeared as "Unity in reading" in a 1984 yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.[7]

1. Goodman K S. A linguistic study of cues and miscues in reading. _Elem. Engl._ 42:639-43, 1965. (Cited 95 times.)
2. Gentile L M, Kamil M L & Blanchard J S, eds. _Reading research revisited._ Columbus, OH: Merrill, 1983. 669 p.
3. Goodman K S. Reading: a psycholinguistic guessing game. _J. Read. Specialist_ 6:126-35, 1967. [Reprinted in: Singer H & Ruddell R B, eds. _Theoretical models and processes of reading._ Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1976. p. 497-509.] (Cited 230 times.)
4. Goodman Y M, Watson D J & Burke C L. _The Reading Miscue Inventory: alternative procedures._ Katonah, New York: Owen, 1987. 238 p.
5. Goodman K S. _Theoretically based studies of patterns of miscues in oral reading performance._ May 1973. 314 p. (Unpublished report.) (Cited 40 times.)
6. Goodman K S & Goodman Y M. _Reading of American children whose reading is a stable, rural dialect of English or language other than English._ August 1978. 422 p. (Unpublished report.) (Cited 5 times.)
7. Goodman K S. Unity in reading. (Purves A C & Niles O, eds.) _Becoming readers in a complex society._ Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education, 1984. p. 79-114.