

What proportion of decodable words in a text is most beneficial for early reading instruction?

Cynthia Boggio, Marie-Line Bosse, Céline Pobel-Burtin, Valérie Perthué,

Maryse Bianco

► To cite this version:

Cynthia Boggio, Marie-Line Bosse, Céline Pobel-Burtin, Valérie Perthué, Maryse Bianco. What proportion of decodable words in a text is most beneficial for early reading instruction?. British Dyslexia Association's International Conference 2021, May 2021, Oxford, United Kingdom. hal-03245270

HAL Id: hal-03245270 https://hal.science/hal-03245270

Submitted on 1 Jun2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

WHAT PROPORTION OF DECODABLE WORDS IN A TEXT IS MOST **BENEFICIAL FOR EARLY READING INSTRUCTION?**

Cynthia Boggio^{1,3}, Marie-Line Bosse¹, Céline Pobel-Burtin², Valérie Perthué³ & Maryse Bianco²

Introduction



Data analysis



2 100 75 (%) 50 Decodability rate 25 0 100 75 50 25 0 100 75 50 25 0 10 12 100 75 50 25 0 14 15 13 100 75 50 25

Note. Each line represents the average decodability rate per week. The dispersion between the minimum and maximum decodability rate of the week is represented by the shaded area.

- Decodability rates increase over the weeks for each class
- In the first weeks, the rates are very diverse across the classes
- After 9 weeks, the gap reduces and the rate concentrates between 70 and 90%
- To facilitate the analyses, a grouping of similar classes is necessary

Figure 2. Grouping of classes by clustering (by Kmeans and hierarchical classification methods)



Results After controlling the variability of initial student level, classes and items.







Figure 5: Spelling measure



Figure 6: Comprehension measure



- \rightarrow Measures of reading, phonological awareness and spelling : No significant effect of the cluster variable.
- \rightarrow Measure of comprehension : Students in cluster A performed significantly better than students in cluster B.

Conclusion

- High variability of mean percentage of decodable text across classes
- Three patterns of decodability emerged:



Patterns do not significantly affect



→ Calculation of the

decodability rate with

Novembre 2019

weeks

Test 2

- - Reading
 - Phonological awareness
 - Comprehension
 - + Spelling

Mixt model:

glmer(ScoreT2[~]cluster+decodageT1+comprehensionT1+ phonologieT1+(1|Class) + (1|Item), family = binomial, df_T2) Reading

- Phonological awareness
- Spelling
- Patterns might affect the comprehension performance in line with Price-Mohr & Price (2019): less decodable texts would promote comprehension.

→ Further studies are needed to confirm these results.

References:



Acknowledgment: