
Report

THE BENEFITS OF BIMODAL CONTENT PRESENTATION

Report

Contents

1.	Bimodal Presentation.....	3
2.	The Benefits of Bimodal Presentation.....	3
2.1.	What the Research Says	3
2.1.1.	Reading Comprehension, Word Recognition, and Information Recall	3
2.1.2.	Decoding	5
2.1.3.	Motivation and Reading Self-Confidence.....	5
3.	Populations that Can Benefit from Bimodal Presentation	6
4.	Conclusion	7
	References and Other Relevant Reports.....	8

Report

1. Bimodal Presentation

Bimodal presentation refers to information that is presented in both audio and visual formats at the same time. Bimodal reading refers to the act of reading text while hearing the words at the same time, such as when using speech synthesis software, or reading the text, hearing the words, and having the words (and/or sentences) highlighted at the same time, such as when using text-to-speech software with integrated highlighting.

2. The Benefits of Bimodal Presentation

According to the research, specific benefits of bimodal content presentation include:

- Improved word recognition skills and vocabulary
- Improved reading comprehension, fluency, accuracy, and concentration
- Improved information recall and learning/memory enhancement

Some of the lesser known and considered benefits include:

- Increased motivation and more positive attitude with regard to reading
- Increased reading self-confidence and perceived performance

2.1. What the Research Says

The following details findings from some of the currently available research.

2.1.1. Reading Comprehension, Word Recognition, and Information Recall

- Disseldorp and Chambers (2002) found that when text was presented bimodally, students were able to better understand what they had read and perform better when asked questions about content.
- In another study, Disseldorp and Chambers (July, 2002) found that comprehension improved for all types of readers and that poorer readers benefitted more than better readers.

Report

- A study by Elkind, Black, and Murray (1996) measuring the effects of bimodal presentation on college students and working adults with reading difficulties showed that the reading rate and comprehension of most of the participants increased. The participants were also able to read for a much longer period of time.
- Elkind, Cohen, and Murray (1993) tested middle school students with dyslexia using bimodal presentation. Seventy percent of the students increased their comprehension. Students with reading difficulties increased their comprehension. Poorer readers also perceived a better comprehension.
- Shany and Biemiller (1995) found that text reading rates and reading comprehension improved. Listening while reading resulted in twice the amount of reading which led to higher comprehension scores. Word recognition skills also increased.
- Hecker, Burns, and Elkind (2002) showed that with bimodal presentation, students read faster with better comprehension. Reading fatigue was reduced, and students increased their reading endurance and suffered less stress while reading.
- Leong (1995) suggested that bimodal presentation increased comprehension and motivation. This adds to a previous study by Leong (1992) that showed that late-elementary and middle school students with reading disabilities improved reading comprehension.
- Higgins and Raskind (1997) found that students with reading difficulties increased their comprehension. Poorer readers also perceived a better comprehension.
- Wise, Olson, Ansett, Andrews, Terjak, Schneider, Kostuch, and Kriho (1989) and Wise and Olson (1994) found increased word recognition and decoding.
- Other studies also found improved comprehension scores. (Higgins & Raskind, 1997; Reinking, 1988; Reinking & Schreiner, 1985)
- Mastroberardino, Santangelo, Botta, Marucci, and Belardinelli (2008) found that bimodal presentation enhanced recall.

Report

- Montali (2000) studied the effects of bimodal presentation on word recall by presenting the words aurally, visually, and bimodally. The results showed that students with lower reading abilities were able to recall more words when they were presented bimodally whether they were tested immediately or at a later time. The study showed that bimodal presentation could be useful for learning and memorizing.
- Reitsma (1988) found that students with reading disabilities improved word recognition.
- Steele, Lewandowski, and Rusling (1996) found that bimodal presentation enhanced recall, comprehension, and word recognition.
- Dolan, Hall, Banerjee, Chun, and Strangman (2005) showed that bimodal assessments can be used to better test students with disabilities.

2.1.2. Decoding

- Elbro, Rasmussen, and Spelling (1996) showed that bimodal presentation improved decoding skills.
- Olson and Wise (1992) found that students improved their word recognition skills and phonological decoding.
- Elbro, Rasmussen, and Spelling (1996) performed a study on students of various ages with reading and language disabilities using bimodal presentation. Through the text-to-speech support, the students were able to significantly improve their pronunciation skills.
- MacArthur, Ferretti, Okolo, and Cavalier (2001) found that bimodal presentation enhanced comprehension and decoding.

2.1.3. Motivation and Reading Self-Confidence

- Barker and Torgeson (1995) found that students enjoyed bimodal presentation and the increased reading time.
- According to Montali and Lewandowski (1996), less skilled readers had better comprehension with bimodal presentation. Their word recognition increased, and they felt more successful. They performed better with more accuracy and enhanced recall.

Report

- Elkind, Black, and Murray (1996) found that bimodal presentation increased comprehension, motivation, and self-confidence.
- Wise, Olson, Ansett, Andrews, Terjak, Schneider, Kostuch, and Kriho (1989) found that bimodal presentation resulted in a more positive attitude about reading.
- Pisha and Coyne (2001) found that high school students, including students with learning disabilities, appreciated the flexible presentation of content, ease of locating information, and portability.

3. **Populations that Can Benefit from Bimodal Presentation**

An underlying theme of the available research suggests that the impact of bimodal presentation depends largely on the characteristics of the individual.

- Higgins and Raskind (2005) and Olson and Wise (1992) suggested that comprehension improvement increases according to the severity of the disability.
- Poor and struggling readers benefit more than average- or better-skilled readers. (Balajthy, 2005; Disseldorp & Chambers, July, 2002)
- Lundbeg and Olofsson (1993) and Oloffson (1992) showed that bimodal presentation benefitted older students more than younger ones.

Although the effects may vary on an individual basis, the research shows that specific populations can benefit from bimodal presentation, including:

- Poor readers and those with reading and language difficulties (Elbro, Rasmussen, & Spelling, 1996; Disseldorp & Chambers, 2002; Elkind, 1998; Elkind, Black, & Murray, 1996; Higgins & Raskind, 1997)
- Those with learning and language disabilities, including dyslexia (Dolan, Hall, Banerjee, Chun, & Strangman, 2005; Raskind, 1998); Lewis, 1998; Elkind, Cohen, & Murray, 1993; Reitsma, 1988)
- Those with attention disorders (Hecker, Burns, & Elkind, 2002; Balajthy, 2005)

Report

4. Conclusion

Bimodal presentation can help struggling readers and those with learning and language difficulties, resulting in better reading comprehension and recall. Both the actual and perceived performance of the student has been shown to be improved. This results in higher motivation and self-confidence, which improves the learning experience for all concerned.

References and Other Relevant Reports

1. Anderson-Inman, L. (1999). Computer-based solutions for secondary students with learning disabilities: Emerging issues. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15, 239-249. Retrieved December 2004
2. Balajthy, E. (2005). Text-to-speech software for helping struggling readers. *Reading Online*, 8(4), 1-9.
3. Califee, R., Chambliss, M., & Beretz, M. (1991). Organizing for comprehension and composition. In W. Ellis (Ed.), *All language and the creation of literacy* (pp. 79-93). Baltimore, MD: International Dyslexia Association.
4. Disseldorp, B., & Chambers, D. (2002). Independent Access: Which students might benefit from a talking computer? In *Untangling the Web-Establishing Learning Links: Proceedings of the Australian Society for Educational Technology International Conference*. McNamara, S. & Stacey, E. (eds). July 7-10. Melbourne, ASET. Disseldorp, B., & Chambers, D. (July, 2002). *Selecting the right environment for students in a changing teaching environment: A case study*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Australian Society for Educational Technology International, Melbourne, Australia.
5. Dolan, R. P., Hall, T. E., Banerjee, M., Chun, E., & Strangman, N. (2005). Applying principles of universal design to test delivery: The effect of computer-based read-aloud on test performance of high school students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 3(7). Available from <http://www.jtla.org>
6. Elbro, C., Rasmussen, I., & Spelling, B. (1996). Teaching reading to disabled readers with language disorders: A controlled evaluation of synthetic speech feedback. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 37(2), 140-155.
7. Elkind, J. (1998). *Computer reading machines for poor readers*. Portola Valley, CA: Lexia Institute.
8. Elkind, J., Black, M. S., & Murray, C. (1996). Computer-based compensation of adult reading disabilities. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 46(1), 159-186.
9. Elkind, J., Cohen, K., & Murray, C. (1993) Using computer-based readers to improve reading comprehension of students with dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 43, 238-259.

Report

10. Hecker, L., Burns, L., & Elkind, J. (2002). Benefits of assistive reading software for students with attention disorders. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 52, 243-272.
11. Higgins, E. L. & Raskind, M. H. (1997). The compensatory effectiveness of optical character recognition/speech synthesis on reading comprehension of postsecondary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multi-disciplinary Journal* 8(2), 75-87.
12. Higgins, E. L., & Raskind, M. H. (2005). The compensatory effectiveness of the Quicktionary reading pen II on the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 20(1), 29-38.
13. Lewis, R. B. (1998). Assistive technology and learning disabilities: Today's realities and tomorrow's promises. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31(1), 16.
14. Leong, C.K. (1995). Effects of on-line reading and simultaneous DECTalk auding in helping below-average and poor readers comprehend and summarize text. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 18, 101-116.
15. Leong, C. K. (1992). Enhancing reading comprehension with text-to-speech (DECTalk) computer system. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4, 205-217.
16. Lundberg, I., & Olofsson, A. (1993). Can computer speech support reading comprehension? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 9, 282-293.
17. MacArthur, C. A., Ferretti, R. P., Okolo, C. M. and Cavalier, A. R. (2001): Technology applications for students with literacy problems: A critical review. *Elementary School Journal*, 101(3), 273-301.
18. Mastroberardino, S., Santangelo, V., Botta, F., Marucci, F. & Belardinelli, M. O. (2008) How the bimodal format of presentation affects working memory: an overview. *Cognitive Processing*, 9(1), 69-76.
19. Montali, J. (2000). Facilitating memory in children with reading disabilities through computerized bimodal presentation. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*. Montali, J., & Lewandowski, L. (1996). Bimodal reading: Benefits of a talking computer for average and less skilled readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29(3), 271-279.

Report

20. Olofsson, A. (1992) Synthetic speech and computer sided reading for reading disabled children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4, 165-178.
21. Olson, R. K., & Wise, B. W. (1992). Reading on the computer with orthographic and speech feedback. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4, 107-144.
22. Pisha, B., & Coyne, P. (2001). Jumping off the page: Content area curriculum for the Internet age. *Reading Online*, 5(4). Raskind, M. H. (1998): Literacy for adults with learning disabilities through assistive technology. In *Bridging the Gap: Learning Disabilities, Literacy, and Adult Education*. Vogel, S. A. and Reder, S. (eds). Baltimore, MD, Brookes: 253-268.
23. Reinking, D. (1988). Computer-mediated text and comprehension differences: The role of reading time, reader preference, and estimation of learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 484-498.
24. Reitsma, P. (1988). Reading practice for beginners: Effects of guided reading, reading-while-listening, and independent reading with computer-based speech feedback. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 219-235.
25. Shany, M. T., & Biemiller, A. (1995). Assisted reading practice: Effects on performance for poor readers in grades 3 and 4, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), pp. 382-395.
26. Skinner, C.H., Johnson, C.W., Larkin, M.J., Lessey, D.J., & Glowacki, M.L. (1995). The influence of rate of presentation during taped word interventions on reading performance. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 3, 214-223.
27. Stahl, S. (2003). Universal design for learning. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 18, 65-67.
28. Steele, E., Lewandowski, L., & Rusling, E. (1996). The Effectiveness of Bimodal Text Presentation of Poor Readers at *Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists*, March 12-16, 1996, Atlanta. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
29. Strangman, N. & Dalton, B. (2005). Using technology to support struggling readers: A review of the research. In D. Edyburn, K. Higgins & R. Boone (Eds.), *The handbook of special education technology research and practice* (pp. 545-569). Whitefish Bay, WI: Knowledge by Design.

Report

30. Strobel, W., Arthanat, S., Bauer, S., & Flagg, J. (2007). Universal Design for Learning: Critical Need Areas for People with Learning Disabilities. *Assistive Technology Outcomes and Benefits*, 4(1), 81-98.
31. Barker, A. B., & Torgeson, J. K. (1995). An evaluation of computer-assisted instruction in phonological awareness with below average readers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 13, 89-103.
32. Trelease, J. (1989). *The new read-aloud handbook*. New York: Penguin.
33. Wise, B., Olson, R., Ansett, M., Andrews, L., Terjak, M., Schneider, V., Kostuch, J., & Kriho, L. (1989) Implementing a long-term computerized remedial reading program with synthetic speech feedback: Hardware, software, and real-world issues. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computer*, 21, 163-180.
34. Wise, B.W., & Olson, R.K. (1994). Computer speech and the remediation of reading and spelling problems. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 12, 207-220.
35. Wise, B., Ring, J., & Olson, K. (2000). Individual differences in gains from computer assisted-remedial reading. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 77, 197-235.