

# Considering Decodable Texts: Examining Current Evidence & Exploring an Alternative Research Perspective

Elfrieda H. Hiebert  
TextProject



Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research  
Association, Philadelphia, April 14, 2024


There is no doubt that phonetic regularity is essential—both in instruction experience and also in texts used for application/practice.

Anderson et al. (1985); Snow et al. (1998);  
National Reading Panel (2000)

# Three goals

- Descriptions:
  - Current model driving textbook mandates: Lesson-to-Text-Match
  - An alternative model: Multiple-Criteria
- Research on texts in beginning reading
- Recent research paradigms for studying text effects

DESCRIPTIONS OF TWO MODELS  
OF TEXT TO SUPPORT  
AUTOMATICITY IN WORD  
RECOGNITION



Lesson-to-Text-Match (LTTM) Model for Decodable Texts  
(Texas Education Agency, 1997; California State Board of Education, 2000)

Lesson-to-Text Match (LTTM Stein et al., 1999). Unit of decodability is the letter-sound correspondence (LSC). If a lesson in teacher's guide has been provided on all LSCs within a word, it is decodable. [Words can also be taught as sight words and included in the "decodable" metric.]

Texts from: Wolf, M. (2011). RAVE-O. Cambium.

**a, t, g, p, h, m, s, j, b**  
the, his, and, in, is, a, sees,  
cap, happy  
**Tag the ham**  
**Pam has 3**  
**hams. Pam has**  
**3 tags.**  
**Pam tags the hams.**  
**Sam sees his tag**  
**and his ham.**  
**Sam jams his ham**  
**in a bag.**  
**Sam taps his**  
**cap. Sam is**  
**happy.**

**+i, f, c**  
**+this, in, on, do, not**  
**The bat**  
**This is a bat. This**  
**is a fat bat.**  
**See the fat bat in**  
**the cap?**  
**See the tag on the**  
**cap?**  
**This is Sam.**  
**Do not pat a bat,**  
**Sam!**

**+z**  
**+she, Matt**  
**At bat**  
**Bat it,**  
**Pam! Pam**  
**bats it.**  
**She tags the**  
**bag. Tap it, Sam!**  
**Sam taps it.**  
**Matt tags**  
**Sam. Zap it,**  
**Pat!**  
**Pat taps his**

WORD FEATURE	DESCRIPTION
Decodability (Letter-Sound Correspondences for vowels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•short vowels</li><li>•long vowels</li><li>•complex vowels</li><li>•variant vowels</li><li>•short vowels in 1<sup>st</sup> syllable</li></ul>
Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•100 most-frequent words</li><li>•300 most-frequent words</li><li>•1000 most-frequent words</li></ul>
Concreteness/ imageability <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•3.75-4.24</li><li>•4.25-4.74</li><li>•4.75-5</li></ul>
Morphology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Inflected endings</li><li>•Compound words</li><li>•Simple derivatives (e.g., "a," "ful")</li></ul>
Familiarity <sup>2</sup> (Age of Acquisition)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•&lt;4</li><li>•4.01-6</li><li>•6.01-8</li><li>•8.01+</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup>Brysbart et al., 2013

<sup>2</sup>Kuperman et al., 2012)

# Multiple-Criteria texts

## Pig Nests



LEVEL A-6: Pigs | Book 3  
written by Elfrida H. Hubert & Wendy Swar



This pig digs into a nest.

## A Cat or a Fish?



LEVEL A-2: Pets | Book 2  
written by Elfrida H. Hubert & Wendy Swar



The cat is looking at the fish

I want a cat. I want a fish.  
But I do not want my cat  
to want my fish!

## Bug Parts



LEVEL A-10: Bugs | Book 2  
written by Elfrida H. Hubert & Wendy Swar



This bug digs to make a nest for eggs.





WORD FEATURE	DESCRIPTION	DISTRIBUTION IN LEVEL A Texts
Decodability (Letter-Sound Correspondences for vowels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•short vowels</li> <li>•long vowels</li> <li>•complex vowels</li> <li>•variant vowels</li> <li>•short vowels in 1<sup>st</sup> syllable</li> </ul>	59%
Frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•100 most-frequent words</li> <li>•300 most-frequent words</li> <li>•1000 most-frequent words</li> </ul>	51%
Concreteness/ imageability <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•3.75-4.24</li> <li>•4.25-4.74</li> <li>•4.75-5</li> </ul>	8%
Familiarity <sup>2</sup> (Age of Acquisition)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•&lt;4</li> <li>•4.01-6</li> <li>•6.01-8</li> <li>•8.01+</li> </ul>	42%
Morphology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Inflected endings</li> <li>•Compound words</li> <li>•Simple derivatives (e.g., "a," "ful")</li> </ul>	5%

<sup>1</sup>Brysbaert et al., 2013

<sup>2</sup>Kuperman et al., 2012)




WORD FEATURE	DESCRIPTION	DISTRIBUTION IN LEVEL A TEXTS	DISTRIBUTION IN RAVE-O TEXTS
Decodability (Letter-Sound Correspondences for vowels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•short vowels</li> <li>•long vowels</li> <li>•complex vowels</li> <li>•variant vowels</li> </ul>	59%	71%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•short vowels in 1<sup>st</sup> syllable</li> </ul>	2%	8%
Frequency	•100 most-frequent words	51%	50%
	•300 most-frequent words	9%	4%
	•1000 most-frequent words	12%	11%
Concreteness/ imageability <sup>1</sup>	•3.75-4.24	8%	11%
	•4.25-4.74	12%	17%
	•4.75-5	24%	11%
Familiarity <sup>2</sup> (Age of Acquisition)	•<4	53%	48%
	•4.01-6	42%	38%
	•6.01-8	5%	8%
	•8.01+	.3%	6%
Morphology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Inflected endings</li> <li>•Compound words</li> <li>•Simple derivatives (e.g., "a," "ful")</li> </ul>		

<sup>1</sup>Brysbaert et al., 2013)38%


<sup>2</sup>Kuperman et al., 2012)8%

# EVIDENCE FOR EFFICACY OF LTTM & MC TEXTS



Study	Text Types and instruction	Study Findings
<b>Decodable vs. Leveled texts</b>		
Juel & Roper/ Schneider (1985)	Core reading program or core phonics program with same decoding instruction	At end of year, groups did not differ on Iowa Reading Total Score.
Boylin (1998)	Predictable text, decodable text, decodable text plus explicit graphophonemic decoding instruction	Predictable and decodable groups did not differ on any literacy measures at end of year; Strategy + decodable outperformed Decodable Group on word recognition at Time 2 but not Time 3.
Denton et al. (2014)	Leveled texts with guided reading, explicit phonics with decodable texts, typical school instruction	Both intervention groups performed significantly better than typical instruction on word id. Outcomes for intervention groups did not differ significantly from each other.
<b>Leveled texts re-sorted by decoding curriculum</b>		
Ehri et al. (2007)	Leveled texts re-organized to follow phonics curriculum, decodable texts with same curriculum, & typical classroom texts	Students in reorganized text group made significantly greater gains reading words and comprehending text than decodable text group ( $d = 0.70$ ) or typical classroom ( $d = 0.74$ ).
Hiebert et al. (1992)	Leveled texts reorganized for phonics curriculum and same texts used in typical Chapter I instruction	Reorganized text group performed significantly higher than controls; students in reorganized text group with lowest entry scores performed comparably to average students at end of year.
Menon & Hiebert (2005)	Reorganized leveled texts according to phonics curriculum vs. literature-based anthology texts	Intervention students outperformed students in comparison group on word and passage tasks.
<b>Multicriteria text</b>		
Cheatham et al. (2014)*	Multicriteria text or authentic text during independent reading time	No statistically significant group differences overall, although $d = .67$ for word reading of developing decoders in multicriteria group
Price-Mohr & Price (2017, 2020)**	Synthetic phonics instruction with decodable or nondecodable texts vs control	2020, 2017: statistically significant difference for reading comprehension favoring low phonically-decodable texts.
<b>Texts varying in decodability</b>		
Jenkins et al. (2004)#	Explicit phonics instruction with more or less decodable texts vs classroom control group	Both groups performed significantly better than controls on decoding and comprehension, but no significant effects between intervention groups.
Hiebert & Fisher (2016)	Explicit phonics instruction with decodable texts based on either LSC or rime vs typical instruction	On measures of word identification, fluency, & comprehension, both intervention groups performed significantly better than controls; rime-based text group performed better than LSC-based text group on all measures.

# RESEARCH APPROACHES TO DESCRIBE TEXT EFFICACY



# Efficacy of decodable texts and non-decodable texts: Pugh, Kearns, & Hiebert (2023)

Study used effect size data from three recently published meta-analyses of the effects of reading interventions on reading achievement of students with reading difficulty in kindergarten through third grade.

Effect sizes for interventions with:

Decodable texts: .50

Non-decodable texts: .49

No text: .41

Decodable & non-decodable texts: .66

---

## •Computational Modeling

- The training set consisted of items from three text sets (two decodable; non-decodable).
- Testing sets comprised items on the Woodcock-Johnson III Letter-Word Identification subtest and The English Lexicon Project (ELP) naming data.
- The dependent variable was item accuracy after 20 training epochs.
- Model performance correlated strongly with difficulty of WJ3-LWID items ( $\rho = .69$ ). The correlation with mean ELP accuracy was lower ( $r = .36$ ). Average performance on nondecodable-text words was better than on decodable-text words, but the nondecodable texts also included more high-frequency words. Performance on words unique to each text type was better for decodable texts.
- Comparisons suggest that, although decodable texts allow application of sound-spelling knowledge to many words, reading nondecodable texts may lead to better performance on words students will see more often.

# The Research We Need: Decodable Texts

1. What evidence is there for the “if taught, then learned”? Specifically, how does the pace of introducing LSCs correspond to the learning trajectories of the children who learn to read in school?

2. LTTM model is based on LSCs within words and connection to lessons as the basis for decodability. Neither the number of different words in which LSCs appear nor repetition of words is a consideration in calculation of decodability. What evidence validates low levels of repetition of words?

Text Feature	Economy's Keys to Reading (1972)	Open Court (2000)
Unique Words per 100	14	23
Single-appearing words (%)	1	10

3. In initial texts, students see little variation in LSC patterns. Number of letters in words in RAVE-O example:  $X = 3.1$ ;  $SD = .88$ . Does a steady treatment of little variation in word length and in LSCs (e.g., only words with short a) serve as a support or hindrance to word recognition?




More information:  
[TextProject.org](http://TextProject.org)

Queries: [Hiebert@textproject.org](mailto:Hiebert@textproject.org)







**Short vowels:  
60%:**

**72% Highly  
Frequency**

# Cheatham & Allor summary

**Table 1** Summary of descriptive studies

Authors (Year)	Participants (Grade; ability level)	Text description	Results
Compton et al. (2004)	248 second graders; mixed ability	Passages of equivalent levels, without regard to decodability	High frequency words related to accuracy and fluency; decodability related to fluency
Hiebert and Fisher (2007)	36 first graders; mixed ability	Low versus high critical word factor (measure of decodability and taught irregular words)	Critical word factor related to speed, accuracy, and comprehension
Hoffman et al. (2001)	105 first graders; mixed ability	Leveled readers (7 levels)	Text decodability related to accuracy, rate, and prosody
Mesmer (2010)	74 first graders; middle to high performing	Decodable versus qualitatively leveled text	Analysis of accuracy was not conclusive; students read more fluently with qualitatively leveled text

**Table 2** Summary of intervention studies

Authors (Year)	Participants (Grade; ability level)	Text description	Results
Jenkins et al. (2004)	99 first graders; low performing	More versus less decodable text	Treatment groups together outperformed control on battery of measures; Type of text made no difference in performance between treatment groups
Juel and Roper/Schneider (1985)	93 first graders; average ability	More versus less decodable text; text became more similar as year progressed	Treatment group used phonological decoding strategy, applying letter-sound correspondences more and read more new words on proximal word list; initial differences on standardized measures, but no differences by the end of the year
Mesmer (2005)	23 first graders; average ability	More versus less decodable text	Treatment group made more graphically similar errors, read more accurately, were told words less, and repeated themselves more than the control group