Literature Review

• Motivation to read is highly influenced by everyday literacy activities created by teachers, not necessarily by a school’s chosen reading instruction program (Turner & Paris, 1995).

• To facilitate children’s motivation for reading, teachers should emphasize the children’s interests to spark curiosity (Wigfield & McCann, 1996, 1997).

• Children’s purposes and perceptions of reading are often intertwined (Moller, 1999).

• The home literacy environment has also been shown to influence a child’s motivation to read (Baker & Scher, 2002).
Literature Review

• Preschoolers who are poorer readers have been shown to have fewer recurrent early literacy-related experiences (Roberts, Jurgens, & Burchinal, 2005).

• Phonological processing skills strongly correlate to reading ability in young readers, and are predictive of later word reading, reading comprehension, and spelling skills (Savage, Frederickson, Goodwin, Patni, Smith, & Tuersley, 2005).

• Significant improvement in reading rate and accuracy was revealed in children who received training in phonological processing (Nelson, Benner, & Gonzalez, 2005).
Purpose

- The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between motivation and reading abilities.
- Operationally, motivation was defined as: a) child self-rating, b) parent rating, and c) teacher rating of motivation.
- Operationally, reading ability was defined as being comprised of the following measurable skills: a) initial sound fluency, b) letter naming fluency, c) phoneme segmentation, and d) nonsense word repetition fluency.
Participants

- The participants consisted of 60 students, 29 males and 31 females, who were enrolled in two public elementary schools.
- The participants were all kindergarten students ranging in age from 5 years, 3 months to 6 years, 2 months.
- Participants could not be receiving any special services and could not have a diagnosed reading disability.
- The participant group included 51 Caucasian and 9 African American participants.
- Parents and primary teachers of the participants served as raters of the children’s motivation.
Methodology

- Participants were given the Kindergarten Benchmark Test from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy, 6th Edition (DIBELS), which includes initial sound fluency, letter naming fluency, phoneme segmentation fluency, and nonsense word fluency subtests.

- Each participant’s primary teacher completed a 14-question survey rating the child’s reading motivation, reading habits, and classroom performance.

- Each participant’s parent/caregiver completed a 15-question survey indicating his/her perception of the child’s reading motivation.
Results

• **Question 1**: Is there a relationship between children’s self-reported motivation to read and teacher perceptions of their reading ability?

• Spearman rho nonparametric correlation indicated a significant relationship, \( \rho = .305, p = .018 \).

• Teacher’s perception of a child’s reading level appears to relate to the child’s self-reported motivation to read.
Results

• **Question 2**: Is there a relationship between children’s self-reported motivation to read and children’s motivation as perceived by parents?

• Spearman rho nonparametric correlation was not statistically significant, \( \rho = 0.158, p = 0.227 \).

• Parents’ perceptions of their children’s motivation to read are not predictive of the children’s self-reported motivation to read.
Results

- **Question 3**: Is there a relationship between children’s motivation to read and children’s initial sound fluency (DIBELS)?

- No significant relationship between children’s initial sound fluency and children’s self-reported reading motivation was found, \( \rho = 0.022, p = 0.869 \).

- No significant relationship between children’s initial sound fluency and the parents’ perception of their child’s motivation to read was found, \( \rho = 0.209, p = 0.109 \).

- A significant relationship between the teacher’s perception of their students’ motivation and students’ initial sound fluency was found, \( \rho = 0.275, p = 0.033 \).
Results

- **Question 4:** Is there a relationship between children’s letter naming fluency (DIBELS) and their motivation to read?
- Children’s self-reported motivation to read was significantly correlated with letter naming fluency, $\rho = .447$, $p = .000$.
- Parents’ perception of their child’s motivation to read was not significantly correlated with letter naming fluency, $\rho = .049$, $p = .713$.
- Teachers’ perception of their students’ motivation to read was significantly correlated with the students’ letter naming fluency, $\rho = .608$, $p = .000$. 
Results

• **Question 5**: Is there significant relationship between children’s phoneme segmentation fluency and their reading motivation?

• Children’s self-reported reading motivation was significantly correlated with phoneme segmentation fluency, \( \rho = 0.260, p = 0.044 \).

• Parents perception of their children’s motivation to read was significantly correlated with the children’s phoneme segmentation fluency, \( \rho = 0.381, p = 0.003 \).

• Teachers perception of their students’ motivation to read was significantly correlated with the students’ phoneme segmentation fluency, \( \rho = 0.592, p = 0.000 \).
Results

- **Question 6**: Is there a significant relationship between children’s nonsense word fluency and their reading motivation?
- Children’s self-reported reading motivation was significantly correlated with their nonsense word fluency, \( \rho = 0.327, p = 0.011 \).
- Parents’ perceptions of their children’s motivation to read was not significantly correlated with their children’s nonsense word fluency, \( \rho = 0.073, p = 0.581 \).
- Teacher’s perception of their students’ motivation to read was significantly correlated with the students’ nonsense word fluency, \( \rho = 0.667, p = 0.000 \).
Discussion

• While it is well-know that motivation to read is impacted by reading ability, this study explored the complex relationship between perceptions of motivation to read and actual reading abilities.

• As expected, children who self-reported higher motivation also tended to perform better on early literacy skills, including nonsense word decoding fluency.

• As expected, teachers were also good at rating their students’ motivation to read which correlated to the students’ actual reading abilities.
Discussion

• A key finding of this study was the fact that parents’ perceptions of their children’s motivation to read were not good predictors of the children’s reading ability across several early literacy measures.

• In most cases, parents tended to rate children with lower reading abilities as higher in motivation to read than teachers or the children themselves.
Conclusion

• It was concluded that discrepancies between children’s reading abilities and parent’s perceptions of the children’s motivation to read needs further exploration.

• It appears that parents do not perceive the impact that weak early literacy skills have on their children’s motivation to read.
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