

## Reading Recovery Students' Motivation To Read

Salli Forbes, Ph. D.  
University of Northern Iowa  
salli.forbes@uni.edu

Susan King Fullerton, Ph.D.  
Clemson University  
susanf@clemson.edu

Our investigation focused on first-grade learners' competency beliefs and value of reading before and after receiving the Reading Recovery intervention. Using the Children's Reading Motivation Survey (Mazzoni, Gambrell, & Korkeamaki, 1999), we administered the questionnaire developed for early literacy learners to explore motivational responses in at-risk readers before and after Reading Recovery.

### Data Sources

#### Participants

One hundred thirteen Reading Recovery learners (a convenience sample) participated in this investigation. All participants were first graders, forty-nine girls and sixty-four boys. Students were from school districts in urban, suburban, and rural locations in a Midwestern state, and were from a mixture of lower and middle socioeconomic status. All students were reading below grade level at the beginning of the study.

#### Data Collection Procedures

The Children's Reading Motivation Survey (Mazzoni, Gambrell, & Korkeamaki, 1999) was administered by a Reading Recovery teacher to each child individually at the beginning of the intervention and again, at the completion of their series of lessons (approximately 4-5 months later, depending on entry and exit date). Since these children were not able to read the questionnaire initially, conditions were kept constant, and the questions and responses were read to the child as the child followed along. Both teacher and student had a copy of the questionnaire and after hearing the question, the child chose their response by circling it. Teachers were trained to administer the questionnaire by the second researcher.

It is also important to note that the subjects of this investigation were all placed in Reading Recovery instruction in late winter or spring of first grade. While they were likely to have been identified as below-grade level at the beginning of the year, there were other children who scored lower on the *Observation Survey* (Clay, 2002) and were placed in Reading Recovery at that time. Therefore, these subjects typically waited 4-6 months before they were provided with the Reading Recovery intervention.

### Data Analysis and Results

Questionnaire data from both entry and exit periods were collected for all 113 participants. Data were entered into SPSS 16.0, a statistical analysis program. Scores for eight survey items were recoded to maintain equivalent values to other items; in other words, the highest positive responses were represented by the highest value for each item.

Paired-samples t-tests were used to determine the significance of changes between pre- and post-Reading Recovery survey responses for each item, as well as the total scale score. In addition, the data were analyzed using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) in order to determine if there was differential change based on gender. Gender served as the between-subjects factor and time of assessment (pre, post) served as the within-subjects factor. Of interest was the two-way interaction between time and gender, indicating if boys and girls experienced differential improvements on motivation scores.

*Were there changes over time in the motivation responses of Reading Recovery children?* In other words, did their responses significantly differ from the time they were given the survey before the intervention and again, after the intervention? Total questionnaire responses (pre- versus post-Reading Recovery) were compared through paired-samples (dependent) t-tests. Results indicated that children's responses did change over time in significant and positive ways; children's responses on the post-Reading Recovery questionnaire ( $M = 35.6, SD = 4.8$ ) were significantly different than their responses on the questionnaire administered before the intervention ( $M = 34.0, SD = 4.9$ ),  $t(112) = 3.06, p < .001$  (two-tailed). In addition to the analysis of total responses, each survey response item was analyzed to determine whether the responses for the item differed significantly at pre and post, again using paired-samples t-tests. Responses were significantly different at pre- and post-Reading Recovery for three items (items 1, 3, and 14), with three additional items approaching significance (items 10, 12, and 15). The responses that were significantly different were all related to the construct of valuing reading. See Table 1 for descriptive statistics.

*Were there differences in the responses of boys and girls?* We used repeated measures ANOVA to determine if girls and boys experienced differential change between the two points in time for the motivation survey. There was a significant between subjects effect indicating that reading motivation scores (combined across the two time points) were

significantly different for girls and boys,  $F(1, 111) = 20.59, p < .001$ , with girls having a reading motivation score of 33.66 ( $SD = .55$ ) and boys having a reading motivation score of 33.34 ( $SD = 0.48$ )\*. While girls' survey responses were higher than boys' responses both before and after Reading Recovery, there was an increase in positive responses for both genders, as shown by the significant within-subjects factor,  $F(1, 111) = 10.89, p < .001$ . However, there was not a significant gender by time (pre and post) interaction,  $F(1, 111) = .001, p < .979$ , indicating that both genders improved at similar rate of change.

### Selected References

- Baker, L. (2000). Building the word-level foundation for engaged reading. In L. Baker, M. J. Dreher, & J. T. Guthrie (Eds.), *Engaging young readers: Facilitating young children's motivation to read* (pp. 17-42). New York: Guilford.
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*, 452-477.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes*. York, ME: Stenhouse.
- Clay, M.M. (2005a). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals, Part one*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M.M. (2005b). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals, Part two*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cohen, S.G., McDonnell, G., & Osborn, B. (1989). Self-perceptions of at risk and high achieving readers: Beyond Reading Recovery achievement data. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell, (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction: Thirty-eighth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (117-122). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relations to reading experience and ability 10 years later. *Developmental Psychology, 33*(6), 934-945.
- Dweck, C.S. (1975). The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 674-685.
- Dweck, C. S. (1998). The development of early self-conceptions: Their relevance for motivational processes. In J. Heckhausen & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulation across the life span* (pp. 257-280). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-Theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Fullerton, S. K. (2001). Achieving motivation: Guiding Edward's journey to literacy. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing, 6*, 43-71.
- Gambrell, L. B., & Morrow, L. M. (1996). Creating motivating contexts for literacy learning. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities* (pp. 115-136). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gambrell, L. B., Palmer, B., Codling, R. & Mazzoni, S.A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 49*, 518-533.
- Greenspan, S.I. (1997). *The growth of mind and the endangered origins of intelligence*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Guthrie, J. T., McGough, K., Bennett, L., & Rice, M. E. (1996). Concept-oriented reading instruction: An integrated curriculum to develop motivations and strategies for reading. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities* (pp. 165-190). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Alvermann, D. E. (Eds.). (1999). *Engaged reading: Processes, practices, and policy implications*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, (vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harris, T.L., & Hodges R.E. (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first to fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 437-447.
- Mazzoni, S. A., Gambrell, L. B., & Korkeamaki, R. L. (1999). A cross-cultural perspective of early literacy motivation. *Journal of Reading Psychology, 20*, 237-253.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*, 360-406.
- Townsend, M. A. R., Townsend, J. E., & Seo, K. J. (2001). Children's motivation to read following Reading Recovery. In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, and B. Maloch (Eds.), *Fiftieth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 584-596). Chicago: IL.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Pre and Post-Reading Recovery (RR) Motivation Survey Items

Item	Pre-RR		Post-RR		T value	Significance (two-tailed)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
1	2.22	.86	2.42	.76	2.333	p < .02*
2	2.50	.73	2.59	.70	1.291	p < .20
3	1.41	.49	1.58	.50	3.732	p < .00*
4	2.81	1.1	2.88	1.1	.564	p < .57
5	3.12	.94	3.21	.90	.869	p < .39
6	2.15	.89	2.21	.90	.542	p < .59
7	2.77	.54	2.81	.49	.844	p < .77
8	1.82	.80	1.75	.77	1.302	p < .20
9	1.80	.80	1.77	.80	.292	p < .77
10	1.47	.50	1.57	.50	1.827	p < .07
11	1.82	.38	1.79	.41	.783	p < .43
12	2.58	.64	2.73	.56	1.864	p < .06
13	2.32	.66	2.50	.66	1.611	p < .11
14	2.23	.67	2.58	.55	4.835	p < .00*
15	2.97	1.1	3.18	1.0	1.744	p < .08

\* Indicates statistical significance at .05 level

## The Children's Motivation to Read Survey

## Me and My Reading

## PRACTICE

What grade are you in?

1  
First Grade

2  
Second Grade

I am a

1  
Girl

2  
Boy

1. How often would you like for your teacher to read stories out loud to the class?

1  
Every day

2  
Almost every day

3  
Not much

2. Do you like to read books **all by yourself**?

1  
No

2  
It's OK

3  
Not much

3. Which would you **most** like to have?

1  
A new game

2  
A new book

4. Do you tell your friends about books and stories you read?

1  
Never

2  
Almost Never

3  
Sometimes

4  
A lot

5. How do you feel when **you** read out loud to someone?

1  
Happy

2  
Embarrassed

3  
OK

4  
Sad

6. Do you like to read during your **free time**?

1  
Yes!

2  
It's OK.

3  
I would do something else.

7. How would you feel if someone gave you a book for a present?

1  
Disappointed

2  
Sort of happy

3  
Happy

8. Does someone in your family read to you before you go to bed?

1	2	3
Almost every night	Sometimes	No

9. Do you read **by yourself** before you go to bed?

1	2	3
Almost every night	Sometimes	No

10. Which would you rather do?

1	2
Clean your room	Read a book

11. How do you feel when you are in a group talking about a story?

1	2
I <b>like</b> to talk about my ideas.	I do <b>not</b> like to talk about my ideas.

12. Do you take story books home from school to read?

1	2	3
Almost never	Sometimes	Almost every day

13. Do you read books out loud to someone in your family?

1	2	3
Almost every day	Sometimes	Never

14. What kind of reader are you?

1	2	3
I am a very good reader.	I am an OK reader.	I am NOT a very good reader.

15. Learning to read is

1	2	3	4
Really hard	Sort of hard	Sort of easy	Really easy

## Motivation and Engagement

**In Reading Recovery, the teacher supports the child's development of the following attributes which promote the child's motivation to read and write:**

- **Collaboration and Interaction**
  - Emotional involvement of reader
  - Outward signs of interest and enjoyment
  
- **Control and Agency**
  - Self-efficacy
  - Believing in one's own capacity
  - Taking responsibility for learning
  
- **Challenge and Competence**
  - Willingness to complete work
  
- **Cognition—Increasing Knowledge and Understanding**
  - Seeking to understand
  - Knowledge sharing
  
- **Engagement and Strategy Use**
  - Holding a purpose
  - Total absorption or 'flow'
  - On-task behavior
  - Lack of disruptions