JEES

Volume 2 Issue 1 Year 2025 Pages 14-28
e–ISSN 3089-1329 | DOI: 10.70152
https://journal.akademimerdeka.com/ojs/index.php/jees

Analysis of Reading Ability Towards Reading Interest and Difficulty Factors in Elementary School Reading Teaching

Sarif Maulana
Institut Prima Bangsa, Cirebon, Indonesia
syrifmaulanaa@gmail.com

Muhammad Topikin
Institut Prima Bangsa, Cirebon, Indonesia

Muhamad Aditya Saputra
Institut Prima Bangsa, Cirebon, Indonesia

Abstract: Reading is a basic language skill that is essential for effective written communication and cognitive development, especially in upper elementary school students. The reading process involves converting language sounds into written symbols, recognizing letters, and ultimately understanding the content of texts. Reading facilitates critical thinking and enhances language skills, especially in grades four through six, when students transition from learning to read to reading to learn. Reading interest significantly influences comprehension ability; however, many literacy programs focus too much on technical skills, neglecting student engagement. Population in study This is all over the leader educate especially in class four, five and six with totaling 720 participants This study investigated the reading ability of upper elementary school students, the impact of reading interest and cognitive strategies, and the adequacy of teaching methods while highlighting the need for comprehensive assessment to identify barriers to reading. The study This use method through samples and procedures with technique data analysis method dependence multivariate. School basis observed at SDN Kertawaninangun Cirebon Regency, using questionnaire for evaluate progress reading, interest, comprehension, and difficulties reading. Variable in study This use interest read, ability reading, and difficulties related reading with development reading and some aspect as well as indicator from every variables. Research results This show correlation ability student Woman more tend tall in interests and difficulties read compared to student male. This study makes a significant contribution to the field of education, especially in basic literacy, by comprehensively identifying the relationship between reading interest, reading ability, and reading difficulties. These findings enrich scientific understanding of internal and external factors that influence children's literacy development and provide an empirical basis for developing more effective, contextual, and sustainable reading intervention models at the elementary school level.

Keywords: Reading, Interest, Understanding, Difficulty.

INTRODUCTION

Read is one of the from four skills core language, and is part or component from communication written. In communication written, sound Language changed become symbol or letter written (Purnama Sari & Dwi, 2022). Can understood that at this stage read beginning, transformation process This especially developed and mastered, especially during childhood, especially in the early years beginning school. Concept transformation here also includes introduction letter as symbol for sound Language (Pridasari & Anafiah, 2020). After the transformation sound Language understood with good, emphasis Then given to understanding contents material reading. Skills This in a way gradually built and developed over the years school next (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Starting from difference the beginning

between individual, appears question whether difference This still consistent or If individual meet or deviate in level performance they with Instructions read more carry on (Katzir et al., 2018). Even before children enter school, there is difference big among they as consequence from competence default and quality as well as intensity instilled parental care to they (Walberg & Tsai, 1983).

Stability difference individual, namely, consistency relatively difference individual along increase age, often found in longitudinal study of reading (Lonigan et al., 2000). However, stability This only related with order ranking participants in population certain. Differences performance absolute among reader can increase or decrease during the development process Because variation individual in intra- individual changes. Differences individual in ability read it seems No is lost with development more carry on or reduce during for years. Even among students, differences great individual in ability read they still found. Perfetti. (2007) in summary, it appears that the development of individual differences in reading ability can be characterized by a combination of rank order stability and increasing dispersion.

Read involving pronunciation of words and acquisition vocabulary from material print. Activity This covers analysis and organization various complex skills, including learning, thinking, reasoning, integration, and problem solving problem, which is collective contribute to the interpretation information for reader (Grills et al., 2023). According to Harianto. (2020) Read is a process carried out and used by the reader for to obtain the message to be conveyed submitted by the author through words/ materials written or picking as well as understand the meaning contained in material written the (Pečjak & Peklaj, 2006). Put forward that read is "a complex activities with direct a number of big separate actions, including, people must use understanding, imagination, and observe and remember." Then can concluded that read is a activity cognitive which includes understand, tell, as well to mean meaning from symbols written through visual interaction, movement eyes, internal dialogue, and memory (Alexander & Jetton, 2000).

Reading skills are an important foundation for elementary school students academic achievement. Reading serves not only as a method for gathering information, but also as a mechanism for fostering critical thinking and improving language skills (Krapp, 2016). This is especially true for students in grades 4 through 6, a critical period that marks the transition from learning to read to reading to learn, which requires the ability to comprehend more complex texts that aid their understanding of a variety of subjects (Conradi et al., 2014). Inadequate development of reading skills during this critical phase can lead to greater academic difficulties for students (PARIS, 2005). In this context, reading interest is an important determinant of literacy success. Students with high reading interest are more likely to actively explore reading materials, develop emotional attachments to books, and demonstrate greater involvement in the learning process (Kendeou et al., 2014).

Research by Mohd Daud. (2020) confirmed a significant positive relationship between reading interest and reading comprehension ability in elementary school students. They showed that students who showed reading interest tended to have higher reading comprehension scores than those who did not have reading interest (Protopapas et al., 2011). Unfortunately, many literacy programs in elementary schools emphasize the technical aspects of reading (such as fluency and pronunciation) rather than fostering students interest in reading. On the other hand according to Kuşdemir & Bulut. (2018), students reading ability is not only influenced by reading frequency but is also determined by cognitive processes such as decoding, fluency and reading comprehension. According to Cain & Oakhill. (2007), reading is an interactive process that requires the integration of phonological, syntactic, and semantic information.

Children with skills processing poor phonology will experience difficulty develop skills word recognition, so that produce ability read more low compared to with those who have skills processing strong phonological (Guay et al., 2003). Because of the relationship reciprocal causality, bad readers who read more A little more carry on damage development skills processing phonological (Burgess & Lonigan, 1998). Students who have limitations in one of the component This will fight For understand text, even If they own strong interest in reading. Troyer et al. (2018) more carry on emphasize importance interaction between motivation intrinsic and cognitive strategies in develop deep understanding about reading, where both must developed in a way simultaneously For optimal results. However, the reality on the ground show that a number of student school base class on face challenge in skills reading, which leads to difficulties in reading. Challenges This can nature general (such as delay reading) or special (such as dyslexia), and often do not identified in a way adequate by teachers.

Research by Schmitterer & Brod. (2021) revealed that the school teacher base still heavily dependent on intuition and informal observation to recognize difficulty read students, rather than use tool formal assessment or data based performance quantitative. Dependence This result in Lots student with difficulty read No accept appropriate intervention time and right. Besides that, method teaching reading used in various school bases throughout Indonesia tend to generic and standard, so that ignore profile diverse literacy from each student (Aswat & G, 2020). This is emphasize that competence read students are greatly influenced by various factor contextual, including environment home, access to literature, and conditions psychological (El-Tonsy, 2016). Without teachers who have information detailed literacy - incl interests, abilities and challenges read students- teaching strategies applied Possible No only No effective but also can own adverse outcome (Rohimah, 2021).

Objective from study this is for identify and analyze skills read student school base above and the factors that influence skills this, like interest reading, cognitive strategies, and methods teaching used by educators. Study this also aims for evaluate effectiveness approach teaching reading materials used in school base in fulfil need individual student with profile diverse literacy. Research this also aims for give a comprehensive overview about importance teacher and participant understanding educate about interests, abilities and challenges read students, as well as the need tool more assessment objective and systematic for identify obstacle read students (Snowling, 2015).

METHODS

Study This use quantitative with use design multivariate observational research and using data analysis techniques statistics through application SPSS. Method analysis used discriminant analysis. Indicators used covers aspects of each variable, each variable consists of five aspects. Research This use measurement scale dichotomy and some stages like samples, procedures and observations through instruments such as questionnaire questionnaire.

Sampling

Retrieval scheme sample with do observation direct to a number of school basis in Cirebon Regency area, sample in form questionnaire questionnaire own question with different amounts. Questionnaire sheets interest read totaling 12 questions, on the sheet questionnaire ability totaling 10 questions and sheets questionnaire difficulty totaling 12 questions. Each variable own aspects certain with different amount, amount aspect variable interest as many as 4 aspects, then on the variables ability as many as 5 aspects and on the

variables difficulty as many as 6 aspects. Then this research was conducted at SDN Kertawinangun. This research was conducted on students based on grades 4, 5, and 6. for reading learning in selected classes began. At the time this research was conducted, the reading learning method was evaluated against the progress of each student in reading and the interests, abilities, and difficulties that arose related to multivariate dependence on reading. Instrument sheets with the results of validity and reliability tests are seen in table 1 and 2. The predicate in the study used gender with an average age of students in grades 4, 5, 6 (130 boys and 110 girls) being 10 to 12 years.

Table 1. Result of Correlation

Correlations				
		Interest	Comprehension	Difficult
Interest	Pearson Correlation	1	,388**	,293**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<,001	<,001
	N	240	240	240
Comprehension	Pearson Correlation	,388**	1	,015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001		,812
	N	240	240	240
Difficult	Pearson Correlation	.293**	,015	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001	,812	
	N	240	240	240
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)				

Pearson correlation analysis shows that reading interest has a significant correlation with reading comprehension ($r = 0.388$ $p < 0.001$) and reading difficulty ($r = 0.293$ $p < 0.001$), thus supporting construct validity. However, reading ability and reading difficulty did not show a significant correlation ($r = 0.015$ $p = 0.812$). These results indicate that construct validity has been largely met.

Table 2. Result of Realibility Statistic

Reliability Statistics		Item-Total Statistics				
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items		Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach 's Alpha if Item Deleted
,464	3	Interest	12,92	8,609	,470	,030
		Comprehension	14,69	11,277	,235	,450
		Difficult	14,17	10,100	,188	,559

Reliability test using Corrected Item-Total Correlation analysis showed that of the three items evaluated, only one item, which is specifically related to the reading interest variable ($r = 0.470$), meets the minimum correlation criteria of 0.3 and is considered reliable. The other two items, namely reading ability ($r = 0.235$) and reading difficulty ($r = 0.188$), do not have

sufficient significant value, thus failing to show adequate internal consistency. As a result, the instrument as a whole is not yet fully reliable and requires item revision to produce stable and reliable data.

Procedure

Study do distribution questionnaire, each sheet questionnaire contains points so that a number of evaluation can made from development every student in reading. In matter This needed for determine every hypothesized variables related with reading. Filling sheet questionnaire done through method checklist and scale dichotomy used namely " yes " and "no" (Pennington et al., 2013). Data were collected through filling questionnaire by students during class hours, we choose for measure a number of variable interest reading, ability reading and difficulties reading. First, measurement variable interest read for know understanding reading, word recognition, vocabulary, and attitude to reading. Variable second covering ability read with connect hypothesized behavior related with reading. Variable second concerning ability read vocabulary, skills phonological, activities read relaxed, and attitude to reading. Variable third from difficulty read This covering memory work, awareness phonological, speed student in reading, accuracy and speed read and read draft self (Guthrie et al., 2007). Series variable This covering measurement for level cognitive general child, in matter this, vocabulary and nonverbal IQ, and skills reading what appears like introduction letters and words and skills related phonology with read (Gelderblom et al., 2016). Besides information biography like age and type sex.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Summary of case processing analysis for unweighted cases, presented in the form of a word table N indicates the number then the number is presented in Table 1 data totaling 240 and showing a percentage of 100%, but the excluded cases show results of 0 including missing or out-of-range group code sections as well as at least one missing distinguishing variable and bot group code outside the missing range and at least one missing distinguishing variable. All of these cases reflect no data loss or data cleaning during the analysis process.

Table 3. Result of Case Analysis Processing Summary

Case Analysis Processing Summary			
Unweighted Cases		N	Percent
Legitimate		240	100.0
Excluded	Group code lost or out of range	0	.0
	At least one discriminatory variable is missing	0	.0
	Group code is missing or out of range and at least one discriminatory variable is missing	0	.0
	Total	0	.0
Total		240	100.0

Group Statistics

Table 4 presents group statistics showing the means, standard deviations, unweighted and weighted measures by gender, used to assess reading interest, reading comprehension, and reading difficulty across all ages and levels. The data revealed that the mean age of male students was 11.19 years (SD=0.916), while the mean age of female students was 10.95 years (SD=0.913), indicating a relatively small age difference of approximately 0.24 years between

the two groups. However, this difference may reflect the level of cognitive development inherent in each gender, which could potentially influence perceptions of reading difficulty, reading ability, and reading interest. The findings indicated that female students showed higher reading interest (mean=3.23, standard deviation=0.864) compared to male students (mean=2.98, standard deviation=1.096).

Similarly, in terms of reading comprehension, females scored higher (mean = 5.32, standard deviation = 1.447) than males (mean = 4.63, standard deviation = 1.852). The lower standard deviation for females indicates that their reading ability is not only superior but also more consistent regarding reading interest and reading comprehension. Meanwhile, female students reported slightly higher reading difficulties (mean = 4.61, standard deviation = 1.687) than male students (mean = 4.01, standard deviation = 1.774), indicating that females experience greater reading challenges. Despite having higher reading comprehension and interest, the different standard deviations in this variable indicate that the distribution of reading difficulty levels tends to be more varied among males, implying that male students have a broader perception or experience related to reading difficulties. Group statistics provide an initial idea of the differences in mean scores between groups based on gender.

Table 4. Result of Group Statistics

Group Statistics					
	Gender	**Means**	**Standard Deviation**	**Valid N (based on list)**	
				Weightless	**Weighed**
Man	AGE	Date 11.19	.916	130	130,000
	CLASS	Date 5.09	.849	130	130,000
	Variable Interest	2.98	1,096	130	130,000
	Variable Comprehension	4.63	1,852	130	130,000
	Variable difficulty	3.92	1,774	130	130,000
Woman	AGE	10.95	.913	110	110,000
	CLASS	5.00	.790	110	110,000
	Variable Interest	3.23	.864	110	110,000
	Variable Comprehension	5.32	1.219	110	110,000
	Variable difficulty	4.61	1,687	110	110,000
Total	AGE	Date 11.08	.920	240	240,000
	CLASS	5.05	.822	240	240,000
	Variable Interest	3.09	1.002	240	240,000
	Variable Comprehension	4.95	1,627	240	240,000
	Variable difficulty	4.23	1,765	240	240,000

Test of Equality of Group Means

The group mean equality test showed significant differences between gender groups (male and female) related to age, class, and each of the variables studied. Based on Table 3, the group mean equality test produced several Wilks' Lambda, F, df1, df2, and significance results. The results for age showed a Wilks' Lambda value of 0.983 and an F value of 4.029 with (df1 = 1, df2 = 238) and a significance level of 0.046, which indicated a real (significant) difference in age points between male and female students, although the difference was relatively small because 0.046 <0.05. For the class variable, the Wilks' Lambda value was 0.997 with a low F value of 0.751 and a significance level of 0.387, so it can be concluded that 0.387 <0.05. This shows that class does not contribute significantly to group differentiation

based on gender, indicating a relatively even distribution of classes between the two gender groups. The reading interest variable shows a Wilks' Lambda value of 0.984 and an F value of 3.762 with a significance level of 0.054. The significance exceeds 0.05, indicating a difference between male and female students, indicating that female students show higher reading interest compared to male students.

The analysis of the reading comprehension variable produces a Wilks' Lambda value of 0.955, the highest F value among all the points and variables tested, along with an F value of 11.092, and a significance value (sig) of 0.001. These findings indicate that reading ability is the most discriminatory variable in differentiating between female and male students. In general, female students tend to show higher and more stable reading comprehension compared to their male counterparts. Furthermore, the results for the reading difficulty variable showed a Wilks' Lambda value of 0.962, an F value of 9.528, and a significance value (sig) of 0.002. These results indicate that reading difficulty is also a significant variable in differentiating groups based on gender. However, although female students showed superior reading skills, they also reported higher levels of reading difficulty than male students, indicating differences in subjective perception or experience in the reading process. The Test of Equality of Group Means is used to assess the extent to which each independent variable can differentiate groups based on Wilks' Lambda and the significance of the F test.

Table 5. Result of Test of Equality of Group Means

Test of Equality of Group Means					
	Lambda Wilks	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**Signature**
AGE	.983	4.029	1	238	.046
CLASS	.997	.751	1	238	.387
Variable Interest	.984	3,762	1	238	.054
Variable Comprehension	.955	11,092	1	238	.001
Variable difficulty	.962	9,528	1	238	.002

Merged In-Group Matrix

In Table 6, Pooled within-groups plots depict the correlation values between variables calculated simultaneously in groups (male and female). This correlation shows the direction and strength of the relationship between variables. The correlation test between age and grade yielded a result of 0.853, indicating a very strong and positive relationship. This is logical, because students in higher grades tend to be older. In the correlation test between age and other variables, the results are as follows: the correlation between age and reading interest showed a weak negative correlation of -0.080, indicating almost no relationship between age and reading interest. The correlation between age and reading comprehension yielded a very weak positive correlation of 0.051, indicating no significant relationship between age and reading comprehension.

The correlation between age and difficulty yielded a weak negative correlation of -0.127, indicating that as students get older, their reading difficulty tends to decrease, although this relationship is very weak, meaning that there may still be older students who have difficulty reading. In the correlation test between grade level and other variables, the results are as follows: the correlation between grade level and reading interest shows a weak negative correlation of -0.096, indicating that there is no significant relationship between students grade level and their interest in reading. The correlation between grade level and reading comprehension produces a very weak positive correlation of 0.053, indicating that grade level does not guarantee reading comprehension among students. The correlation

between grade level and reading difficulty produces a weak negative correlation of -0.165, indicating that as students move up to higher grades, their reading difficulty tends to decrease, although not very significant.

The correlation analysis between variables produces the following results: the correlation test between reading interest and reading comprehension shows a weak positive correlation of 0.235, indicating that as students reading interest increases, their reading comprehension tends to increase slightly. The correlation test between reading interest and reading difficulty reveals a weak positive correlation of 0.157, which is unusual because it indicates that students with high reading interest report less difficulty in reading. The correlation test between reading comprehension and reading difficulty produces a very weak negative correlation of -0.026, indicating almost no relationship between the two. From the correlation test conducted, it was found that there were no extreme correlations (all below 0.9 except for age and grade), with the highest correlation between age and grade at 0.853, and the weakest correlation was between the variables of reading interest, comprehension, and reading difficulty, indicating that each variable provides unique information in predicting differences between groups. The Pooled Within-Groups matrix displays the correlation coefficients between variables within each group by gender simultaneously.

Table 6. Result of pooled within-Groups Matrics

Pooled Within Groups Matrics					
Correlation	**AGE**	**GRADE**	**Interest Variable**	**Comprehension Variable**	**Difficulty Variable**
AGE	1.000	0.853	-0.080	0.051	-0.127
GRADE	0.853	1.000	-0.096	0.053	-0.165
Interest Variable	-0.080	-0.096	1.000	0.235	0.157
Comprehension Variable	0.051	0.053	0.235	1.000	-0.026
Difficulty Variable	-0.127	-0.165	0.157	-0.026	1.000

Box's Covariance Matrix Equality Test

In Table 7 Based on the results obtained, the log determinant value for the male group is 2.372, while for the female group it is 1.436. In addition, the log determinant value in the combined group is 2.033. The difference in these values indicates an initial indication that the covariance structure between groups is likely not identical. This is further strengthened by the Box's M results of 21.238 with a significance value <0.001. The significance value far below the threshold of 0.05 indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected which indicates a significant difference in the covariance matrix between the male and female groups. In other words, the assumption of homoscedasticity (equality of variance-covariance) in discriminant analysis is statistically violated.

The implications of these results indicate that the discriminant model built may have limitations related to predictive accuracy or generalization, especially if the sample size is unbalanced or if there is a strong relationship between variables (multicollinearity). However, if the sample size is relatively large and the data distribution remains adequate, the discriminant model can still be used, although the results should be interpreted with caution, taking into account violations of these assumptions. Box's test for equality of covariances tests for equality by sex (male and female). This test is important in Multiple Discriminant Analysis (MDA) because it tests one of the fundamental assumptions that groups should

have a homogeneous covariance matrix, which can be either uniform or show significant differences.

Table 7. Result of Log Determinant

Log Determinant				Trial Result			
Gender	Rank	Log Determinant	Box M	F			
				Around	df1	df2	Signature
Man Man	2	2,372	21, 238	7,014	3	976438 00.655	<.001
Woman	2	1,436					
Combined in groups	2	2.033					
The powers and natural logarithms of the printed determinant are the powers and logarithms of the group covariance matrix.			Testing the null hypothesis of the same population covariance matrix.				

Summary of Canonical Discriminant Function

In table 8, the application of the Canonical Discriminant Function eigenvalue analysis study aims to examine the extent to which independent variables are able to differentiate between groups. From the analysis table, only one discriminant function was detected that explained the eigenvalue value of 0.089, indicating the low discriminant power of the function, as well as the proportion that can be expressed by the function. This value illustrates how much the function contributes to separating groups. In addition, there is a canonical correlation value of 0.286 which indicates a weak level of association between the function score and the group, this indicates that the association between the discrimination score and the categorical variable is relatively weak, although the function successfully explains the entire available variation of 100% (variance and cumulative), but it is still relatively low.

Table 8. Result of Eigenvalues

Eigenvalues				
Function	Eigenvalues	% Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.089 [a]	100.0	100.0	.286
The first canonical discriminant function 1 is used in the analysis.				

In table 9, the Wilks lambda test results show a value of 0.918, which means that 91.8% of the total variability cannot be explained by the discriminant function. In other words, only about 8.2% of the information can be used to distinguish between the existing groups. With a chi-square value of 20.202, although the high lambda value indicates that the function is weak, the chi-square test shows strong statistical significance with p <0.001. This shows that the differences between the groups are still statistically relevant, so the discriminant function is still worth considering. Although the lambda value is close to 1, indicating that most of the variance in the data is not explained by the discriminant function, this result is still statistically significant. This shows that there are real differences between the groups analyzed, and although the contribution is not very strong, the discriminant function still makes a contribution. Standardized coefficients are used to determine how much each variable contributes to forming the discriminant function. Larger values indicate a stronger effect in distinguishing between groups.

Table 9. Result of Lamda Wilks

Lambda Wilks				
Function Test	Lambda Wilks	Chi-square	df	Signature.
1	.918	20.202	2	<.001

Standard canonical discriminant function coefficients

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Coefficient is a coefficient associated with each determining variable in the canonical discriminant function. This coefficient reflects how much each variable contributes to the formation of the discriminant function itself. Based on the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficient, the ability variable shows the most significant contribution in distinguishing groups, with a coefficient value of 0.742. This means that this variable has the greatest influence on group differences in the first discriminant function. The higher the number, the stronger its influence in classifying between groups. Furthermore, the difficulty variable has a coefficient value of 0.690. This variable also plays an important role, although slightly lower than the ability variable. This shows that both variables have an effect, but the ability variable makes a greater contribution to the formation of the discriminant function. In table 8 Standardized coefficients are used to identify the relative contribution of each variable in building the discriminant function. The higher the value, the greater the influence in distinguishing groups.

Table 10. Result Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficient

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficient	
	Function
	1
Variable Comprehension	.742
Variable difficulty	number .690

Structure Matrix

In table 9 Matrix Structure in Canonical Discriminant Analysis. This matrix shows the relationship between each variable with the discriminant function, and functions to determine which variables are most significant in distinguishing between groups based on how strong the correlation is. From the results of the matrix structure, it can be seen that the ability variable has the highest correlation with the discriminant function (0.724). Having the highest correlation with the discriminant function indicates that this is the most influential variable in distinguishing between groups. Followed by the difficulty variable (0.671) which has a significant influence and is very close to ability, indicating that difficulty is also important in distinguishing between groups. This shows that both variables play a major role in distinguishing between groups of respondents. Meanwhile, interest shows a lower contribution (0.283). In addition, the class and age variables are not considered in the analysis because they have very low and insignificant correlations. CLASS (-0.075) and AGE (-0.049): These two variables variables have low negative correlation and are marked with the symbol a, indicating that they are not used in the discriminant analysis because their relevance is not significant.

Table 11. Result of Structure Matrix

Structure Matrix	
	Function
	1
Variable Comprehension	.724
Variable difficulty	.671
Interest Variable [a]	.283
CLASS [a]	-.075
AGE [of a]	-.049

Pooled within-group correlations between discriminant variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions. Variables are ranked by the absolute size of the correlation in the function.
This variable is not used in the analysis.

Functions On Centroid Group

In table 11 of Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA), specifically in the "Functions at Group Centroids" section, the centroid values for two different groups based on gender are shown: Male and Female. The discriminant analysis shows a clear separation between male and female groups based on the variables that have been analyzed. The centroid value for males is recorded at -0.273, while for females it is 0.323. In discriminant analysis, this centroid value reflects the average position of each group on the discriminant function axis; if the discriminant function value of a new individual tends to approach 0.323, then it is likely that the individual is included in the Female group; conversely, if the value approaches -0.273, then the individual is included in the Male group. This shows that the discriminant function can identify individuals in gender groups quite accurately. The difference in these values also shows the discriminatory distance between groups, which can be used as a basis for building a predictive model. Centroids also play a role in classifying new data. When new data is entered into the discriminant model, the individual's discriminant function scores are compared to the existing centroid values. The goal of the classification process in discriminant analysis is to place individuals into specific groups based on the values of the independent variables. However, because the model is not always accurate, it is possible for individuals to be placed into the wrong group or misclassified.

Table 12. Result of Functions on Group Centroid

Functions on Group Centroid	
Gender	**Function**
	1
Man	-.273
Woman	.323
Unstandardized canonical discriminant function evaluated at the group mean	

Discussion

Studies This designed for answer question about How difference individual in ability read appear. For answer question this, we are empirical describe development difference between reader during three class end school basic. Initially, almost No There is difference in ability reading in between students involved in studies this. Observation This cause a number of Question: How? difference individual in ability read develop along time? Growth model what is the basis development This? Factors what is related with development difference individual in ability reading, and what importance factors this? Framework theoretical used for describe and explain development difference individual in ability read is the Matthew effect model (Stanovich, 1986). In studies this, development difference individual in skills word recognition and skills understanding reading explained in a way separate. For second skills mentioned, the equation model structural expected show improvement variability inter- individual combined with high stability. The model is also expected show that improvement difference This can explained by the pattern reciprocal relationship certain between a series factor comprehensive relevant.

Development Difference Individual in Reading Interest

Development individual differences in word recognition has shown with clear by research latest, which has been show improvement in difference This from time to time. In terms of special, two points important appear from findings This. First, it is important For highlight that latent variance in skills word recognition decreased among child man (Poskiparta et al., 2003). However, because operationalization word recognition no only covers accuracy but also ability, improvement not limited in difference performance no realistic. Limitations development in skills read of course expected. However, after level specific word recognition achieved, expansion more carry on from individual differences can switch to other components of the reading process, such as skills understanding. Second, stability individual differences seem to exist relatively low on stage beginning development reading.

This show that temporary difference performance absolute increase with fast, sequence ranking Students also shift. (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007) Trajectories growth For every participant it seems No deviate from point same start. Possible explanation For stability low This is type instructions given at the beginning development reading, plus with time assessment. During testing, inventory progress curriculum created, which reflects amount relatively content curriculum covered in order read after observation. The data disclose significant difference between school about progress curriculum and quantity the instructions given. Therefore that, can hypothesized that effect autoregressive from factor initial word recognition limited by differences between school during period testing and quantity instructions given.

If the assumption This true, interaction between membership school and growth beginning in skills word recognition must significant, and effects This must reduced on occasion testing next. Development difference individual in word recognition can explained in a way comprehensive by growth models autoregressive or simplex model. Characteristic properties from structure simplex is that size correlation between measurements taken at close proximity in time is big and in systematic decrease as function from amount time that separates two measurement of the results data.

Development Difference Individual in Understanding Read

Expected improvements in difference understanding reading No found. Although difference performance absolute in understanding reading increase from end of Grades 4, 5, and 6, no There is improvement more carry on in difference this is what was detected after measurement. More far, stability difference individual low during period time This (Schmitterer & Brod, 2021). In other words, no found Matthew effect for understanding reading, namely, not There is improvement systematic in difference performance and performance best made by different students at different times. The growth model simplex it seems give good description about development difference in understanding reading. Study This show that student experience difficulty with skills read early, so that required analysis about challenges that affect ability read they. According to research by (Pridasari & Anafiah, 2020) several student No understand letter or method to form words, because they Still in the process of recognizing and memorizing letters, often relying on spelling letter one by one. Difficulties faced by children This in read.

Based on results obtained in the study these are 240 samples with amount student 130 men and students 110 women, average age student 11.19 year old male and student female 10.95 years old. The results obtained are of interest read that student Woman show interest read more tall with an average = 3.23, compared with student man with an average = 2.98 things This show that interest read student Woman more tall than student man although the comparison No significant. On the variable ability reading, students women also

get more results tall with an average = 5.32 compared to with student man with an average = 4.63 which means that student Woman show ability read more tall than student men . However, in the variable difficulty reading, students Woman report surprising results which is an average of 4.61 compared to with student a man who only has an average of 4.01. This is show that student Woman own level difficulty read more tall although ability reading and interest read it more tall compared to student men, while student man to obtain little result more small compared to student Woman which is 4.61 which means student man experience level difficulty read a little more Lots if compared to with student woman.

CONCLUSION

This study comprehensively analyzes the relationship between reading interest, reading ability, and reading difficulty in elementary school students at SDN Kertawinangun, Cirebon Regency. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between reading interest and reading ability as well as reading difficulty, indicating that students with high reading interest tend to have better abilities but are also more sensitive to obstacles in the reading process. Female students were recorded as having higher levels of reading interest and ability than male students, but paradoxically also showed higher levels of reading difficulty. This finding indicates that in addition to technical factors, psychological factors and personal perceptions also play a role in determining students' reading experiences. However, the reliability of the research instrument showed that only the reading interest variable was relatively consistent, while the instruments for reading ability and difficulty still needed improvement because they did not meet the total item correlation standard. On the other hand, the discriminant model used in the analysis showed concrete differences between groups based on gender, although its discrimination power was relatively weak. The implications of this finding indicate that reading learning in elementary schools has not been fully able to answer students' literacy needs individually. General and less data-driven teaching methods tend to ignore the diversity of students' backgrounds and abilities, increasing the risk of students facing reading barriers being left behind. Therefore, it is necessary to reformulate pedagogical approaches through contextual, adaptive, and data-based interventions, as well as increasing the capacity and understanding of teachers in conducting objective literacy assessments to create inclusive, effective, and sustainable reading experiences.

REFERENCES

Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). *Alexander , P . A ., & Jetton , T . L . (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. Handbook of reading research, 3, 285-310. Learning from Text: A Multidimensional and Developmental Perspective . 3* , 285–310.

Aswat, H., & G, ALN (2020). Analysis of the Class Reading Corner Literacy Movement on the Existence of Reading Power. *Basicedu Journal* , *4* (1), 70–78.

Burgess, S. R., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Bidirectional Relations of Phonological Sensitivity and Prereading Abilities: Evidence from a Preschool Sample. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* , *70* (2), 117–141. https://doi.org/10.1006/jecp.1998.2450

Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. (2007). Reading Comprehension Difficulties: Correlates, Causes, and Consequences. In *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective.* (pp. 41–75). The Guilford Press.

Conradi, K., Jang, B. G., & McKenna, M. C. (2014). Motivation Terminology in Reading

Research: A Conceptual Review. *Educational Psychology Review* , 26 (1), 127–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9245-z

El-Tonsy, M. M. (2016). M Sc Pl OE –. *MEDICAL SCIENCES-Introduction to Medical Parasitology* , *July 2016* , 53.

Gelderblom, G., Schildkamp, K., Pieters, J., & Ehren, M. (2016). Data-based decision making for instructional improvement in primary education. *International Journal of Educational Research* , *80* , 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.07.004

Grills, A.E., Fletcher, J.M., Vaughn, S.R., & Bowman, C. (2023). Internalizing Symptoms and Reading Difficulties Among Early Elementary School Students. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development* , *54* (4), 1064–1074. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-022-01315-w

Guay, F., Marsh, H. W., & Boivin, M. (2003). Academic self-concept and academic achievement: Developmental perspectives on their causal ordering. *Journal of Educational Psychology* , *95* (1), 124–136. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.124

Guthrie, J.T., Hoa, A.L.W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S.M., Humenick, N.M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* , *32* (3), 282–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.05.004

Katzir, T., Kim, YSG, & Dotan, S. (2018). Reading self-concept and reading anxiety in second grade children: The roles of word reading, emergent literacy skills, working memory and gender. *Frontiers in Psychology* , *9* (JUN), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01180

Kendeou, P., Van Den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive view of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice* , *29* (1), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12025

Krapp, A. (2016). *Interest, learning, and development* . *January 1992* .

Kuşdemir, Y., & Bulut, P. (2018). The Relationship between Elementary School Students' Reading Comprehension and Reading Motivation. *Journal of Education and Training Studies* , *6* (12), 97. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i12.3595

Lonigan, C. J., Burgess, S. R., & Anthony, J. L. (2000). Development of emergent literacy and early reading skills in preschool children: evidence from a latent-variable longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology* , *36* (5), 596–613. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.5.596

PARIS, S. G. (2005). Reinterpreting the development of reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly* , *40* (2), 184–202. https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.40.2.3

Pečjak, S., & Peklaj, C. (2006). Dimensions of reading motivation and reading achievement in 3RD and 7th grade students. *Studia Psychologica* , *48* (1), 11–30.

Pennington, B.F., Santerre-lemmon, L., Rosenberg, J., Macdonald, B., Boada, R., Friend, A., Leopold, D., Samuelsson, S., & Byrne, B. (2013). *NIH Public Access* . *121* (1), 212–224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025823

Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading Ability (SSR) scanned.pdf. In *Scientific Studies of Reading* (Vol. 11, Issue 4, pp. 375–383).

Poskiparta, E., Niemi, P., Lepola, J., Ahtola, A., & Laine, P. (2003). Motivational-emotional vulnerability and difficulties in learning to read and spell. *British Journal of Educational*

Psychology , *73* (2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709903606269330

Pridasari, F., & Anafiah, S. (2020). Analysis of Early Reading Difficulties in Grade I Students at Sdn Demangan Yogyakarta. *TRIHAYU: Journal of Elementary School Education* , *6* (2), 432–439. https://doi.org/10.30738/trihayu.v6i2.8054

Protopapas, A., Sideridis, G.D., Mouzaki, A., & Simos, P.G. (2011). Matthew effects in reading comprehension: Myth or reality? In *Journal of Learning Disabilities* (Vol. 44, Issue 5). https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219411417568

Purnama Sari, B., & Dwi, DF (2022). Analysis of Early Reading Difficulties in Grade I Students of Elementary School 101884 Limau Manis. *Continuous Education: Journal of Science and Research* , *3* (2), 10–21. https://doi.org/10.51178/ce.v3i2.783

Rohimah, S. (2021). Reading difficulties and factors affecting reading difficulties of students of grade 1 elementary school. *LADU: Journal of Languages and Education* , *1* (5), 189–195. https://doi.org/10.56724/ladu.v1i5.85

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist* , *55* (1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Schmitterer, A.M., & Brod, G. (2021). Which Data Do Elementary School Teachers Use to Determine Reading Difficulties in Their Students? *Journal of Learning Disabilities* , *54* (5), 349–364. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420981990

Schunk, D.H., & Zimmerman, B.J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading and Writing Quarterly* , *23* (1), 7–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560600837578

Snowling, M. J. (2015). *Europe PMC Funders Group Early identification and interventions for dyslexia : a contemporary view* . *13* (1), 7–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2012.01262.x.Early

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly* , *21* (4), 360–407. https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.21.4.1

Troyer, M., Kim, J.S., Hale, E., Wantchekon, K.A., & Armstrong, C. (2018). *replication* . *0123456789* .

Walberg, H.J., & Tsai, S.-L. (1983). "Matthew" Effects in Education. *American Educational Research Journal* , *20* (3), 359. https://doi.org/10.2307/1162605