**Chapter 7: Simple View of Reading Video Transcript**

(Female voice)

Hi! this presentation describes a simple view of reading. If you understand what the simple view is, it's going to serve as a framework for all that you do, when you teach or assess reading. So, let's get started!

If you watch or have watched any of the other presentations in this series, you know that I like to start by showing the text or materials that influence the materials in the presentation; or I start with some easy to access information, so you can go back to learn more once the presentation is complete.

For this chapter Recommendations presentation on a simple view of reading, I'm going to suggest two chapters that I wrote for an open access—meaning—free, literacy textbook. The chapters here are directly related to the simple view of reading, and they're in a service or resource to provide some evidence-based instructional strategies you can use based on what you learn here. So, if you want to go back to check them out, that's where you can find them; they're online for free. I don't think anyone involved in literacy education would disagree if the goal, when we teach them to read, is that they learn to read well enough for the comprehend text. It's all about the meaning; we all agree with that; we want them to comprehend what they read in school; whatever they might choose to read for pleasure, so comprehension is the pot of gold at the end of the literacy education rainbow. Right?

This presentation, I hope, will show you the simple view of reading and help you understand it. It is research-validated framework. It shows that there are two major components necessary for reading comprehension. The simple view has been researched or at least mentioned in over a hundred studies. It's important for you to know about, because as an educator, it will serve you so well. It's kind of like an overarching guide for how you assess, and how you instruct. It is absolutely enlightening for instructors once they know about it. One instructor very recently told me, it's so pleasingly logical. It does have appeal, logic; it's prevalent, and yet despite all this, many people have never even heard of the simple view of reading. What is it? All right!

It is very well-known not just to researchers though but to policymakers, and I just want to talk about it. In fact, ten years ago, in 2006, UK or the United Kingdom, adopted this simple view of reading into its primary national reading strategy, as part of word reading related to helping children learn to decode verses instructional methods that lead to guessing. The part here is in alignment with the simple view as you will see. New Zealand is supposed to be doing something similar for students that have dyslexia, and here in the US, some of our core curriculum that we use in classrooms, is an alignment with a simple view but you might not have ever recognized it but it is there.

 Since 1986, two researchers Gough and Turner, came up with a simple view of Reading; they wrote about it; it's a formula for what's needed for reading comprehension. Simply put, if you can't decode and by decoding, they meant reading words outside of context, if you

can't get the words off a page or off paper, there's not going to be any reading comprehension. And similarly, if comprehension of language is missing, and by that they were talking about the ability to derive meaning from spoken words as they are in a sentence or in discourse; this includes receptive vocabulary, hearing words, understanding grammar, and understanding discourse. So, what is that? Here it is in yellow. If language comprehension is missing for a passage, comprehension won’t occur. But some people get confused when they see language comprehension and reading comprehension, here on the yellow and the pot of gold. Reading comprehensions represents print. Mathematically, then you know, if reading comprehensions is the goal, it's the product of decoding and language comprehension. You need to be able to understand the words and you need to be able to decode the words. If one of those components is lacking, reading comprehension is going to be negatively impacted.

The simple view helps us as educators by pointing to where we need to teach. This is a

quick example: Here are some words in Hebrew Arabic and a couple other scripts

if you can't read these because you don't know how to decode those languages. You're going to have to plug in a 0 for D for decoding, and as a result, let's do the mathematical math or a formula here, and you're not going to be able to comprehend it, you also get a zero for reading comprehension. Look at this simulation. I'll pause here for a few seconds.

Here, it's likely that you can decode and read these words, and you might even be able

to answer a couple of the questions correctly, but again, there's no reading comprehension; because this time, even if I read it to you, you don't comprehend the words; there's no language comprehension of these words or the sentences.

At this point, I’m going to remind you why it's called the simple view of reading. This is an illustration from Hollis Scarborough, 2001. It's very widely depicted in the reading research world; it's probably in the number of books sitting here, and it is seen in a lot in articles and chapters in textbooks. It breaks down the various components that lead to skilled reading which is pictured here as fluent execution and coordination of word recognition and text code. The ropes in this illustration represent the underlying skills and elements that come together and form the two necessary braids representing those two essential components of reading comprehension: Word recognition or decoding and language comprehension. When we think about it, it's simple because we see that reading comprehension requires automatic reading of words- the bottom braid you see there, and strategic application of what we know about our language.

A researcher did a great job in 2007 pointing out that something that isn't obvious in this illustration, something that people tend to miss. He reminded us that word recognition is a teachable skill. If we can teach the underline skill required for it, we can teach them phonological awareness, alphabet pieces, sounds; we can have them recognize word by sight; and this all happens with increased automaticity. That is something that students learn in their first few years of school, and they become increasingly automatic and fluid and easy as kids master each one. Note that the arrow at the bottom says increasingly automatic. This is because typical readers brains become able to notice and manipulate phonemes automatically. They see letters and automatically notice that those are the sounds in words, and they develop a large pool of words that they can read automatically. They even start to learn to read never seen words automatically.

Conversely, the elements needed for language comprehensions aren't skills per se; they are mental processes, and they're difficult to teach. They develop over our entire lifetime. Kami, I don’t know if I am pronouncing it right, pointed out that comprehending our language is made even more of a complex task because it's really domain specific. We probably comprehend the words and language in a text about farm animals a lot more easily than we would a text about how amino acids form proteins. We can teach comprehension strategies all day long but if the content and the words aren’t familiar, comprehension is going to be minimal. So, this is why-- the best predictor of reading comprehension-- isn't reading comprehension strategies, but content domain. So, what's the book about? What’s the text about? According to Willingham, language comprehension, background knowledge, vocabulary knowledge, and knowledge of language structures, verbal reasoning- all these things here-- they develop over time. So, as they develop, the reader must become increasingly strategic when they apply them to this text versus that text to comprehend each one. So, one grade is—the skills become automatic, and the other grade-- is that the aspects become more strategic.

Okay! The simple view is very valuable for assessment. On previous slides here, we had inserted a 0 or a 1 for decoding, or a 0 or a 1 for language comprehension. It's not realistic as students aren't going to get a 0 in something, or a perfect score on something; they're going to be, you know, pretty good or good.

Here are few scenarios: Student A can decode and get most words correct despite taking a lot of effort; for this reason, she gets a 45% on decoding test. Her vocabulary and language comprehension are fantastic. She scores a 95% in this area. We multiply the two and we see she's going to do poorly on a comprehension test; because of the simple view, we can see why?

 Student B has difficulty with language comprehension. When a story is read to him, he has difficulty understanding it. But he can decode and read words accurately. So, his scores if we multiply them together, also predict a lower comprehension score as a result. Because of the simple view, the mathematical model, we can readily see why student B has difficulty and we can plan our assessments and our instructions accordingly.

 Finally, student C is kind of low in both component areas. Can we predict a 65 on comprehension tests? No, because if we multiply .65 times .65, we get 0.42; it is a compound effect so both of those being low is like a double whammy on the reading comprehension. This makes sense when you think of students who have difficulty reading words and difficulty knowing the word, what the words mean and the language in the text. Their reading comprehension is hit from both sides, so as to speak. Kind of clever and cool!

The last slide- the simple view is also valuable when specifying the reasons why a student's reading comprehension is good or poor. For both components--word recognition or language comprehension--it is on a continuum. You can see the horizontal axis. Students word recognition ability can be low or good. The axes in the diagram are arrows representing each component. Students are going to fall somewhere along each axis for word recognition or language comprehension.

If you look in the upper right-hand corner, the student is strong in both components. We would consider this, what they call, a typical reader in the research.

If you look in the lower right corner, this is a rare profile, where a student can read words automatically but has language comprehension difficulty. They would probably have difficulty comprehending text even if it was read to them. They can read text at a higher grade level than they can comprehend it. Students with this profile might be those who have a speech or language impairment or an intellectual disability such as Down syndrome.

 In the upper right corner, we now see student whose language comprehension is fine but reading words is difficult. This profile is typical of students with dyslexia or students who are referred to as compensating readers. Both their language comprehension and word recognition abilities are in the average range. Kilpatrick, in this book here, according to him: Families and teachers know something's not quite right; they're not performing according to their true abilities; and, they are usually compensated for some weakness early on in their reading difficulty by memorizing words, for example. So, if you want more explanation on this type of student or if you are working with someone and want to know more, check that out.

In upper lower left-hand corner here, students have difficulty with both components required for reading comprehension. Okay, so poor language comprehension, poor word reading. So, now we see that simple view of reading can help us understand why a student's reading comprehension

isn't where it should be for their grade level. We wonder all the time about students. So, we can go back to the simple view and see what it means for instruction.

Let's look at another way of looking at the simple view. There is a pot of gold on the right. It's where we're all aiming to get our students, and just to the left of the pot are two reading comprehension goals that we've covered: automatic word recognition and language comprehension.

There are two keys under those boxes to signify that reading comprehensions really like a two-lock box. You need both keys to turn to free up reading comprehension. So, here's how this math works. First, we ask ourselves this question: Does this student understand texts if I read them to him? Can he answer comprehension after he's been read to? If yeah, we would probably be okay in thinking that language comprehension for the student is not the primary issue with why they're not comprehending text. Next question, when this student reads out loud does it sound effortless or there are there a lot of errors, hesitations, self-corrections, are they repeating a lot? Are there pauses? is there a flat expression? If the answer to this question is yes, then we would be correct to say that automatic word recognition is not happening for the student.

Now, it's the blue arrows pointing to the left above automatic word recognition. This means that we must dig deeper now to see why that students’ word recognition is taking so much effort? Keep going to the left. Why is that student not able to have a pool of words that can just be read by sight? See the presentation in the series on orthographic mapping and sights words and what we mean by that- mapping words to memory and how that happens. Can’t do it in this presentation.

But like Scarborough’s rope of the simple view that we saw a few slides ago, if we keep working backwards, we now must face some more questions about-- how proficient is the student in phonemic-proficiency? Not just by segmenting and blending if they are past first grade either, even if they're in elementary or middle school or higher? Are they able to respond correctly and automatically if you ask them, say “croak”, now say “crook” but instead of /r/ say /oo/, would they be able to automatically tell you “cook”? I really recommend that you check this book out for more on that.

Moving on, how is the student’s letter-sound proficiency? Ask yourself that question- can they look at letters and letter combinations in a word- “au” say, and instantly pronounce

the correct sound? or is there a delay? and they look at and go “um um..” it should be /aw/ quick, and also how is their decoding ability? Do they know how to attack an unknown word? and sound it out using phonics elements like syllable types, the silent e, and r controlled vowels, and so on and so forth. Another presentation is on that. So, here's your teach- ask yourself using your knowledge of your students, or better, some really good valid assessments, pinpoint your instruction to address those issues (all the way on the left).

There's no way to leapfrog to the pot of gold if the frogs’ underlined lives are weak. If you'd like more information on strategies for these underlying issues, read the chapter suggested at the beginning of the presentation. That's where there are some instructional bites. And please remember that we can influence fluency building activities and teach reading comprehension strategies until the proverbial cows come home, but unless those underlying skills that actually create fluency and comprehension are firmly developed, we're probably misplaced in our efforts.

 All right! Okay! That was a quick one- thank you for participating in this knowledge series. It's great that you're here. I hope you continue to invest in your knowledge as an educator, and I welcome you to contact me at any time for further information. I hope you watch other presentations here, and a lot of them are very tied together taking part and one might lead to an “aha” moment and the next one. Okay, thanks a lot!