

EDPSY 520, The Psychology of Reading  
Winter 2005: T 4:30-6:50  
Office Hours: T 3:30-4:30 & by appt.

Dr. Deborah McCutchen  
312 Miller Hall, 616-6307  
mccutch@u.washington.edu

**The Psychology of Reading** is a survey of current issues in the psychological study of reading. Readings, collected from a variety of journals and books, include a variety of methodologies (e.g., behavioral and neuropsychological), as well as perspectives on reading across various languages.

The course will follow a seminar format. Class meetings will be devoted to close readings of the papers assigned for the week. Students are expected to come to class having read and thought about the papers. To provide variety and help enliven our class discussions, I will ask each of you to assume responsibility for leading the discussion for a set of papers. Although someone will have primary responsibility for facilitating discussion each week, all of us will come prepared to discuss the Theoretical Framework, Methodology and Conclusions of each paper assigned for the week (keep in mind that our “discussion” may very well involve clarifying questions we may have about the studies, methodologies, etc.). See the attached hand-out for examples of possible questions keep in mind as you read each paper.

Grades for the course will be Credit/No Credit, determined by 1) class participation and discussion of papers, 2) a short peer-reviewed paper (3-5 pages), and 3) a final seminar project, (10-15 pages), which can take a variety of forms. Projects can include (but are not limited to) a literature review on a topic of your choice, a research proposal, or a theory-based analysis of an instructional unit or lesson. Please discuss your project and its format with me in advance. More detail on formats for papers and grading criteria are provided as part of this syllabus (see attachments), and the short paper and project will be discussed further in class.

### CLASS CALENDAR

Jan 4 Overview: Cognitive Psychology in context & brief history of reading research

#### **The End of the Road: Interpretive Reading**

Jan 11 Wineburg (1991), reading history  
Peskin (1998), reading poetry

#### **Comprehension: A Predominate Model and Some Empirical Results**

Jan 18 Perfetti, Marron & Foltz (1996), college students' comprehension failures  
Oakhill & Yuill (1996), children's comprehension difficulties  
Kintsch (1998), theoretical background  
*(Read Kintsch for overview and main ideas, not mathematics of the model; try to come away with understanding of the terms textbase, situation model, schema-driven processing)*

#### **Phonological Processes in Skilled Reading**

Jan 25 Perfetti, Zhang & Berent (1992), phonological effects across languages  
Spinks et al (2000), phonological interference in reading Chinese  
Keller et al (2003), brain imaging of phonological processes during reading

#### **Phonemic Awareness in Beginning Reading**

Feb 1 Maclean, Bryant & Bradley (1988), English speakers  
Durgunoglu, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt (1995), Spanish speakers learning English  
Shu, Anderson, & Wu (2000), Chinese readers

### **Consolidation of Phonology and Orthography in Learning to Read**

Feb 8 Ehri (1997), a model of learning to read English  
Share & Gur (1999), learning to read Hebrew  
Seymour et al. (2003), differences across European languages

Feb 11 **Short paper & peer review due by noon, my office or email**

### **Brain Function Correlates of English Reading Ability and Disability**

Feb 15 Salmelin & Helenius (2004)  
Sendak et al. (2004)

Feb 22 No class; time to work on final projects

### **Issues for Second Language Learners**

Mar 1 Chiappe, Siegel, Wade-Woolley (2002), L1 & L2 beginning readers  
Wang, Koda, & Perfetti (2003), Korean & Chinese English L2 learners

### **Instruction: Interactions Between Methods and Learners**

Mar 8 Connor, Morrison & Katch (2004), beginning reading instruction  
Connor, Morrison, & Petrella (2004), comprehension instruction

Mar 15 **Seminar Projects due, my office or email**

### **Bibliography for EDPSY 520, Psychology of Reading**

- Chiappe, P., Siegel, L. S., Wade-Woolley, L. (2002). Linguistic diversity and the development of reading skills: A longitudinal study. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 6, 369-400.
- Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Katch, L. E. (2004). Beyond the Reading Wars: Exploring the effect of child-instruction interactions on growth in reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8, 306-336.
- Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Petrella, J. N. (2004). Effective reading comprehension instruction: Examining child x instruction interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 682-698.
- Durgunoglu, A. Y., Nagy, W. E., & Hancin-Bhatt, B. J. (1993). Cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 453-465.
- Ehri, L. (1997). Sight word reading in normal readers and dyslexics. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia: Implications for early intervention* (pp. 163-189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Keller, T. A., Carpenter, P. A., & Just, M. A. (2003). Brain imaging of tongue-twister sentence comprehension: Twisting the tongue and the brain. *Brain and Language*, 84, 189-203.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maclean, M., Bryant, P., & Bradley, L. (1988). Rhymes, nursery rhymes, and reading in early childhood. In K. E. Stanovich (Ed.), *Children's reading and the development of phonological awareness*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

- Oakhill, J., & Yuill, N. (1996). Higher order factors in comprehension disability: Processes and remediation. In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties: Processes and intervention* (pp. 69-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Perfetti, C. A., Marron, M. A., & Foltz, P. W. (1996). Sources of comprehension failure: Theoretical Perspectives and case studies. In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties: Processes and intervention* (pp. 137-165). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Perfetti, C. A., Zhang, S., & Berent, I. (1992). Reading in English & Chinese: Evidence for a “universal” phonological principle, pp. 227-248.. In R. Frost & L. Katz (Eds.), *Orthography, phonology, morphology, and meaning*. Elsevier.
- Peskin, J. (1998). Constructing meaning when reading poetry: An expert-novice study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 16, 235-263.
- Salmelin, R., & Helenius, P. (2004). Functional neuroanatomy of impaired reading in dyslexia. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8, 257-272.
- Sendak, R. Mencl, W. E., Frost, S. J., & Pugh, K. R. (2004). *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8, 273-292.
- Seymour, P. H. K., Aro, M., Erskine, J. M., & COST Action 8 Network. (2003). Foundation literacy acquisition in European orthographies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 143-174.
- Share, D. L., & Jaffe-Gur, T. (1999). How reading begins: A study of preschoolers’ print identification strategies. *Cognition and Instruction*., 17, 177-213.
- Shu, H., Anderson, R. C., Wu, N. (2000). Phonetic awareness: Knowledge of orthography-phonology relationships in character acquisition of Chinese children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 56-62.
- Spinks, J. A., Liu, Y., Perfetti, C. A., & Tan, L. H. (2000). Reading Chinese characters for meaning: The role of phonological information. *Cognition*, 76, B1-B11.
- Wang, M., Koda, K., & Perfetti, C. A. (2003). Alphabetic and nonalphabetic L1 effects in English word identification: A comparison of Korean and Chinese L2 learners. *Cognition*, 87, 129-149.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and the academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495-519.

EDPSY 520, The Psychology of Reading  
Short Peer-Reviewed Paper

This paper provides you experience with 1) giving a close reading to two papers and reflecting upon them, and 2) exploring the expectations for written work in this class. Both experiences will be helpful in preparing for class discussion and for the final project. **The short reflection paper is due by noon Friday, February 11, in my office (312 Miller) or email (mccutch@u.washington.edu), with an initial draft and peer review attached.**

In the short paper you are to choose two course readings that address a similar issue from somewhat different perspectives. (You may also choose one reading from this class and one from outside, but please submit with your paper a copy of any article that is not part of our course reading list.) You have considerable latitude in defining "similar" and "different" in this context. For example, the two papers may offer opposing views (theoretical or empirical) on the same topic, or the two papers may address the same issue employing different methodologies or different groups of participants. Or, one paper may focus on psychological processes and the other on instruction.

The short paper should include at least the following three components:

1. A clear statement of **the issue** on which the two papers will be compared;
2. Clear analysis of the relevant similarities and differences across the **papers as they relate to the issue** you have chosen, with the essence of each paper discussed in some depth;
3. Your conclusions (for example, can you resolve the opposing views into one coherent view; is more research needed; do you agree with one view more; etc.).

Credit on the short paper is CR/NC. Any paper not receiving CR can be revised and resubmitted, but revisions must be submitted **on or before Week 9** of the course.

## Guidelines for Seminar Projects

### IDEAL TYPES

These portraits are idealized descriptions that will not match any given paper exactly. They are broad categories that describe certain types of projects. Projects are graded on a Credit/No Credit basis.

**Literature Review.** A literature review that earns full credit (equivalent to a 4.0) is a paper that extends beyond the readings we discuss together in class, discusses relevant research in terms of a specific issue and presents a clear and cogent analysis of the issue. **The issue itself is stated clearly early in the paper, and a framework is described in which the analysis unfolds.** This is not a grocery list of "papers that I have read." This paper uses concepts from class discussions and class readings selectively, rather than in any rote or mechanistic way, to tie the analysis of the chosen issue to reading processes as we have discussed them. When theoretical concepts are introduced, they appear in the service of explanation and analysis, rather than as a proxy for explanation. Thus, reading theory sheds light on what is discussed because the author adapts theoretical concepts to fit the developing analysis. In terms of style, the paper is well written and free from proof-reading and grammatical errors. A paper in this category is modeled after articles that might be found in journals such as Educational Psychologist or Review of Educational Research.

**Research Proposal.** A research proposal briefly reviews literature (class readings and/or additional research) that sets the stage for a specific empirical study (in an Introduction section), and the design of that study is then described in detail (in a Methods section). The description of the study should include descriptions of the proposed participants, any materials needed, the research design and the proposed method(s) of analysis (.e.g., ANOVA, regressions, grounded theory). To the extent possible, hypotheses should be articulated and possible empirical outcomes discussed in terms of the theoretical implications that such outcomes would hold (e.g., if results are X, then hypothesis A would be disproven). In terms of style, the paper is well written and free from proof-reading and grammatical errors. A paper in this category is modeled after articles that might be found in journals such as Journal of Educational Psychology or Cognition and Instruction (minus the full report of actual data).

**Analysis of Curriculum.** This project applies concepts from class discussions and class readings to analyze the theoretical underpinnings of some aspect of a language arts curriculum, or some other detailed account of reading instruction. Such an analysis uses concepts from class discussions and class readings selectively, rather than in any rote or mechanistic way, to tie the analysis of the instruction to the reading process as we have discussed it, articulating places of convergence and/or divergence with reading theory, as presented in the research. When theoretical concepts from the reading research are introduced, they appear in the service of explanation and analysis, rather than as a proxy for explanation. Thus, reading theory sheds light on the instructional materials because the author applies theoretical concepts to the developing analysis. In terms of style, the paper is well written and free from proof-reading and grammatical errors.

**Other kinds of projects are possible; please discuss your ideas with me. The goal of this project is to allow you to use concepts from class to address a question that interests you.**

**FINALLY, REMEMBER "THE TWO YEAR RULE."**

## Close Reading Notes

**Reading:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Theoretical Framework:**

How have the authors framed their question and connected it to related issues and research?

What is their theory?

What are relevant predictions given that theory?

What question(s) or issue(s) are the authors trying to test, demonstrate, or argue?

Is there related research **not** mentioned? Why might that be?

---

### **Methodology:**

What are the data; how gathered? How analyzed

What are the results?

Are the methods used adequate to address the issue?

Are there questions someone might have about the research design?

Are there questions someone might have about the technology?

Are there questions someone might have about the analysis or statistics?

---

### **Conclusions:**

How do the conclusions relate to the issues raised in the Introduction?

How do the results provide evidence to support (or refute) the authors' theory & conclusions?

Do you believe the conclusions drawn by the author(s) based on the data?

Given these results, what are some *next* questions?

---

Other comments or questions?

## Peer Response Guidelines

**Keep in mind that our goal in the peer response is to help the author clarify her/his presentation of ideas by providing an account of our reactions as a reader. We are not trying to arrive at a single "right answer;" that is, two authors could compare the same two articles and not say the same thing.**

Identify the author's main issue, the theme that the author sees running through the readings that are discussed. Paraphrase it, if you can. If you can't, try to explain your difficulty to the author.

After reading the paper, identify sections that strike you as especially interesting --that is, places where you learn something new. This "something new" can be an application of ideas we've discussed or read, an extension of issues we've touched on, or something else.

Identify any places that confuse you or places that seem ambiguous or unclear. Are there any places where you are not sure what the author is trying to tell you? Are there questions that you would like the author to answer for you? Try to articulate the source of your difficulties.

**Deal with content. Don't spend time copyediting. If the paper needs attention in the area of mechanics, say so and move on to ideas. Try to be specific with your comments. The author will learn little from generalities such as "this was a really good paper."**