Binghamton University

The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

Graduate Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations, Theses and Capstones

2018

Aliterate Pre-Service Teachers' Reading Histories: An Exploratory Multiple Case Study

Krislynn A. Dengler

Binghamton University--SUNY, educatorusa@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/dissertation_and_theses

Part of the Education Commons

ALITERATE PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' READING HISTORIES:

AN EXPLORATORY MULTIPLE CASE STUDY

BY

KRISLYNN DENGLER

BS, State University of New York at Oneonta, 1993

MS, State University of New York at Oneonta, 1996

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

The degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Theory, Research, and Practice

in the Graduate School of

Binghamton University

State University of New York

2018

Dr. SG Grant, Chair

Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership, Binghamton University

Dr. Erin Washburn, Member

Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership, Binghamton University

Dr. Matthew McConn, Member

Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership, Binghamton University

Dr. Suk-Young Kang, Outside Examiner

Department of Social Work, Binghamton University

Abstract

As a literacy instructor at a university, I regularly administered a questionnaire on reading habits and attitudes as part of the teacher education program. The findings from the surveys aligned with the results of extant literature on the prevalence of aliteracy among pre-service teachers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Nathanson, Pruslow, & Levitt, 2008; Warmack, 2007). This dissertation uses an exploratory multiple case study approach to examine the experiences of two aliterate pre-service teacher candidates including their identity as a reader, their experiences with reading at home and their reading experiences at all educational levels. Using in-depth, semi-structured interviews, candidates recalled their experiences with reading and how they described themselves as readers. Findings indicate that both individuals had low self-efficacy with reading, likely as the result of struggles with comprehension. Both individuals also developed a preference for watching movies and looking up condensed summaries of assigned reading to gain information. An interpretation of the findings concluded there was a chronic use of some form of round robin reading throughout both participants' educational levels. Teachers must work to provide rich opportunities to engage students in reading and be mindful of how they help students develop a regular reading habit.

Dedication

I dedicate this to developing readers. May we inspire them to persevere and develop a life-long

habit of reading, especially Nick without whose help this would have been impossible.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful for the support of so many to achieve this goal. My family, especially my husband, Michael, has provided me with the time I needed to do this work. I am forever grateful to my very good friends Jane Miller, Alison Black, and Anna Stave for reading countless drafts and giving me feedback throughout this process, and to Jennifer Flores for being there.

Thank you to the faculty directly involved in this project, Dr. S. G. Grant, Dr. Erin Washburn, and Dr. Matthew McConn. Thank you to Dr. Larry Stedman for lots of inspiring conversations, and Dr. Don Gauss and Dr. Jean Schmitteau for pushing me to think.

A special thank you to Lori Wolverton who has inspired me with her tireless work with the Migrant Education Program, who created opportunities for kids and endeavored for them to believe in themselves as readers.

Table of Contents

"The man who does not read good books has no advantage over the man who can't read them."

~1914 (Original source credit unknown.)

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Analysis of literacy rates is a well-established method for evaluating the development status of a nation. This approach is appropriate, given that gross domestic product (GDP), a primary indicator of a country's economy, is closely correlated with adult literacy rates (United Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2015). While illiteracy is a significant problem in developing countries, aliteracy is prevalent in industrialized nations (Olufowbi & Makinde, 2011). The term aliterate applies to an individual that can read, but chooses not to (Mikulecky, 1978). Aliteracy is not specific to any demographic and is widespread in the American population (National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], 2007). According to the NEA 2009 survey, 50.2% of American adults reported reading literary works in the past 12 months, which was the highest rate in the 26 years that data has been collected. However, this figure also implies that about half of the American population does not read any literary works for pleasure. Aliterates rarely, if ever, "look between the covers of a book, [and] seldom glance beyond the headlines of a newspaper" (Maeroff, 1982). In a comprehensive overview of American reading, the NEA (2007) reported:

> As Americans read less, they read less well. Because they read less well, they have lower levels of academic achievement. With lower levels of reading and writing ability, people do less well in the job market. Poor reading skills correlate heavily with lack of employment, lower wages, and fewer opportunities for advancement. (p. 5)

Reading, defined as, a cognitive process that involves decoding symbols to arrive at meaning for particular reader purposes. Reading regularly is important on many levels. Still, reading for

pleasure could be considered particularly important for some professions. Teaching is arguably one of those.

Problem Statement

As an instructor of literacy education at a university with a teacher education program, I always believed that teachers should model positive habits and attitudes toward reading. Thus, I regularly administered a reading habits and attitudes questionnaire to each new cohort of seniors in my methods of literacy instruction classes, in order to assess if these candidates were regular readers. The findings of these surveys usually aligned with the results reported by many researchers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Nathanson, Pruslow, & Levitt, 2008; Warmack, 2007). In short, they confirmed the prevalence of aliteracy.

As an instructor, this finding worried me, as I wondered if my teacher candidates would be able to help their future students become engaged readers. I was concerned, as I understood the connection among engaged reading, motivation, achievement, and enjoyment (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Guthrie & Cox, 2001; Guthrie, et al., 2013; Guthrie Schafer, & Huang, 2001; Morrow & Gambrell, 2011; Ruddell, 1995; Ruddell, Ruddell, & Singer, 1994). The professional teaching standard for childhood educators established by the International Literacy Association (ILA) (2010) indicates that childhood educators need to "Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing" (Professional learning and leadership section, para. 6:2). I concurred with this view, wondering how those who reported little or no interest in personal reading could be enthusiastic when discussing reading with their students. Applegate and Applegate (2004) used the term "Peter Effect" to describe the inability to share what one does not possess. They suggested that, without a change in attitude, it would be difficult or

impossible for these unenthusiastic readers to model enthusiasm for reading and share it with their future students.

Aliteracy, defined as a "lack of reading habit; especially, such a lack in capable readers who choose not to read" (Harris & Hodges, 1981, p. 11), is a prevalent issue in all populations, ranging from school-aged children through adults, thus including pre-service and practicing teachers (Decker, 1986; Draper, Braksdale-Ladd, & Radencich, 2000; Frager, 1987; Gallik, 1999; Goodwin, 1996; Mikulecky, 1978; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2010). The phenomenon of aliteracy was noted in 1978 by Mikulecky in a paper presentation at the International Reading Association (IRA) Conference. Mikulecky (1978) defined aliteracy as "capable readers regularly choosing not to read" (p. 3). For the purpose of this proposed study, the term aliteracy will apply to capable readers, who read when necessary, but not for pleasure.

Background of the Study

Findings yielded by numerous extant studies confirm that the extent of engaged reading is a predictor of student achievement (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Guthrie et al., 2001; Guthrie et al., 2013; Morrow & Gambrell, 2011; Ruddell, 1995; Ruddell et al., 1994). Engaged readers are individuals who read a wide range of materials and do so frequently. They are strategic in their reading, use self-monitoring and inferencing to understand text, and are intrinsically motivated to read for knowledge and enjoyment (Guthrie & Cox, 2001). By reading for pleasure, an engaged reader develops the skills directly correlated with higher reading achievement (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Cunningham, Zibulsky, Stanovich, & Stanovich, 2009). The role of teachers is instrumental in developing the reading habits of

children. The extensive research on the time spent reading for pleasure and reading achievement confirms a positive relationship between the two.

Reading for pleasure is regularly assessed within reading achievement tests at the international and national levels. The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) (2012) findings pertaining to fourth graders from 53 education systems indicate strong, positive relationships between students' attitudes toward reading and their reading achievement. For example, students who reported that they enjoyed reading (28%) had higher overall achievement (with an average score of 544) compared with the students who stated that they did not like to read (15%), who scored at an average of 488. Likewise, the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) (2010) report noted that 37% of students surveyed in 65 countries do not read for enjoyment. In addition, students who reported enjoying reading performed significantly better than the group that reported enjoying reading the least. These findings suggest that "students who read for enjoyment are more proficient readers than students who do not read for enjoyment in all (65) PISA participating countries" (PISA, 2010, p. 34).

The participants in the 2015 NAEP assessments also completed a survey concerning reading for fun. Data analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between the amount of reading for fun and achievement. A significant difference was found between the 18% of fourth graders who reported that they read for fun "never or hardly ever," with an average score of 212, and the 38% of fourth graders who said they read for fun "almost every day," with an average score of 229. Similar results were documented for eighth graders, thus confirming that reading for fun frequently clearly correlates with higher achievement on the NAEP exams.

Teachers are instrumental in developing students' reading interests and helping them to establish a regular habit of reading. Additionally, elementary school teachers are expected to be active readers outside of school in order to serve as role models to students who are developing a positive reading habit. The ILA Professional Teaching Standards (2010) for elementary educators state that teachers should "display positive dispositions related to their own reading," exhibit "positive reading and writing behaviors and serve as a model," and "promote student appreciation of the value of reading in and out of school" (Professional learning and leadership section, para. 6:2). Improving literacy levels is primarily the responsibility of schools and teachers, who must ensure that each child develops a positive attitude toward reading in order to become a life-long reader (Duncan, 2010; Graves, Juel, & Graves, 1998).

In order for teachers to help students build a positive reading habit, they need to have one themselves (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Commeyras, Bishlinghoff, & Olson, 2003). Dottin (2009) argues that, although aliterate teachers possess reading competence, their teaching performance is compromised by their own negative attitudes toward reading. Teacher modeling in the classroom and interactions with students are extremely important to the development of positive reading habits (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Barbe, 1963; Cramer & Blachowicz, 1980; Commeyras et al., 2003; Jensen, Papp, & Richmond, 1998).

Dobler (2009) assessed 18 elementary and middle school teachers, concluding that teachers who read are engaged readers who "have a strong desire to share their reading with others" (p. 11). Moreover, these positive experiences with reading help "guide instructional decisions" and "create a learning environment where students are also engaged, motivated, and strategic" (p. 11). Similarly, McKool and Gespass (2009) reported that "the teachers who valued

5

reading in their own lives the most were more likely to use literacy practices associated with best practice" (p. 269). In an earlier study, Kolloff (2002) found that teachers who do not enjoy reading and have not read extensively are limited in their abilities to select appropriate books for students with various reading proficiency and interest levels and struggle to model the value of reading as a lifelong learning tool. Additionally, Morrison, Jacobs, and Swinyard's (1999) findings pertaining to 1,874 kindergarten through sixth-grade teachers indicated a positive "significant linear relationship between teachers who read personally and their use of recommended literacy practices in their classrooms" (p. 81).

Focus of the Study

Ample evidence suggests that approximately 50% of the American population across all demographic groups of capable readers can be classified as aliterate (NEA, 2009). This statistic is particularly alarming as it applies to the pre-service teacher population as well (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008). The available scholarship in this area has mainly focused on confirming the existence of this phenomenon in various populations; however, researchers have neglected to explore the reading histories of aliterates. I am particularly interested in the pre-service teacher population due to my experiences as an educator. Given the ever-increasing demands on teachers, the time is right for expanding and enriching understanding on this important topic. Although connections may exist between teaching and aliteracy, the aim of this research is to examine the factors that influenced these pre-service teachers' lack of interest in reading for pleasure. Hence, it is necessary to conduct in-depth research on the reading histories of those pre-service teachers who have a habit of aliteracy.

The purpose of this multiple case study is to explore the relational aspects in the pre-service teachers' reading histories (e.g., self, home, and school) that may contribute to their aliteracy. This qualitative exploratory multiple case study is important for several reasons. First, a gap exists in the current research, which has been mainly survey-based and has primarily focused on establishing the presence of an aliterate pre-service teacher population. However, there is a paucity of qualitative research on the possible relational factors stemming from their reading histories, especially those pertaining to the development of self as a reader. Therefore, the goal of this proposed study is to employ qualitative methods in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the reading-related experiences of these pre-service teachers. Finally, this study will not only expand the current understanding of aliteracy and aliterates, it will provide information to aid in planning appropriate changes in teacher education programs and professional development initiatives. It is beneficial to policy makers as well, as it will assist them in better understanding the needs of institutions of higher education and schools providing instructional opportunities to pre-service and practicing teacher populations.

I do not claim that aliterate teachers cannot teach reading. They can certainly teach the relevant skills and mechanics; still, it is at least questionable as to whether a teacher who does not have a habit of reading for pleasure can truly teach reading in a way that helps students derive pleasure from reading. Therefore, the proposed research is an essential step in exploring how and why pre-service teacher education students have developed a habit of aliteracy.

Research Questions

This proposed study will be guided by two research questions:

- How do aliterate childhood pre-service teacher candidates describe their reading experiences (e.g., school at the elementary, middle, high, and college levels)?

- How do aliterate childhood pre-service teacher candidates describe themselves as readers and their experiences at home and family experiences with reading?

Outline of the Dissertation

This dissertation will be divided into six chapters and an appendix. The first chapter provides a brief introduction to the phenomenon of aliteracy, followed by the problem statement, the study background, focus of the study, and the research questions. Chapter two will offer a comprehensive literature review of the existing themes in the research literature on aliterates and agency in reading. Chapter three will be designated for the research methodology, including the description of participants and case selection, what types of data will be collected, and how data will be analyzed. In Chapter four, I will present and highlight the results of the case-by-case analysis. Each case will be described in detail along with the themes that emerged from each. In Chapter five, I will describe the results of the cross-case analysis, highlighting findings across the two cases. In Chapter six, I will discuss interpretations of the results of the study; implications for theory development, practice, policy, and future research; and strengths and limitations of the study; before providing the conclusion. The appendix will include the initial survey, interview protocols, and informed consent forms.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The construct of aliteracy was used as a focus for the literature review. This review will begin with an explanation of the types of research obtained, databases and sources utilized in the search, the parameters used to search and select research on the phenomenon of aliteracy, related data on aliteracy, and the themes discovered through the review of the literature, which will be represented thematically.

The search for relevant literature sources for this review was conducted using EBSCOhost Research Databases, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Google Scholar, and ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. It yielded 14 studies that were included in this review due to their focus on aliterates or identification of aliterates as unenthusiastic readers. In all 14 studies included in the review, participants were pre-service teachers; however, participant populations in three of those studies included a combination of undergraduate and graduate students of education (Kolloff, 2002; Manna & Misheff, 1987; Nathanson et al., 2008). Eight of these studies are quantitative, three are qualitative and include in-depth interviews, and in the remaining three, the researchers followed a mixed methods design. In addition, authors of qualitative studies used a case study approach, along with personal narratives and interviews, similar to the methodology that will be applied in the proposed research. The selection of studies included in this review includes both international and national research, as the data cited in the first section represents both international and national results on levels of reading engagement and achievement (OECD, 2010).

When utilizing the search engines and databases mentioned above to identify appropriate sources, aliteracy as well as synonyms for the term aliterate were used as keywords. Other

search terms included descriptions of readers and reading, such as apathetic, reluctant, unengaged, unenthusiastic, and uncommitted, reading attitudes, habits, behaviors, and motivation, leisure, personal, and recreational reading, and reading histories.

This literature review is organized thematically, whereby the relevant research is presented chronologically within each theme. The themes used in the literature review are (a) the prevalence of aliteracy in pre-service teachers; (b) school experience; (c) identity as a reader; and (d) home experiences surrounding reading.

Prevalence of Aliteracy

Mikulecky first identified aliteracy in 1978 as "capable readers [who are] regularly choosing not to read" (p. 3). More recently, Nathanson et al. (2008) described aliteracy as having the ability to read but being disinterested in personal reading. Authors of several studies conducted over nearly two decades have reported that an alarming proportion of pre-service teachers lack a habit of reading (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Benevides & Peterson, 2010; Daisey, 2009; Draper et al., 2000; Frager, 1987; Kennedy, 2014; Kolloff, 2002; Miller, Fine, & Walker, 1994; Munita, 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008; Sulentic-Dowell, Beal, & Capararo, 2006; Warmack, 2007).

Frager (1987) surveyed 80 pre-service teachers, reporting that 40% of respondents could not name a book read over the summer, and 54% were unable to name more than one. Frager also examined their professional reading habits and reported that 82% of respondents were unable to name at least one book they read about teaching or related matter. In a quantitative survey-based study of 112 pre-service teachers evaluating dispositions of reading and writing, Miller et al. (1994) found that, when asked if reading a chapter book other than the assigned text

was characteristic of them, 52.7% of respondents indicated it was *slightly or not at all* characteristic of them, with 29.5% indicating it was *not at all* characteristic of them. One participant indicated, "In my adult life, I have not read an entire book" (p. 44). Another simply stated, "I really don't like to read" (p. 44). Thus, it was surprising that, when asked to respond to the prompt "I enjoy reading," more than half of the study participants indicated that this description was characteristic of them. This dichotomy is addressed later in this review when describing how researchers define unenthusiastic and enthusiastic readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Kennedy, 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008; Walker-Dalhouse, Sibley, Dalhouse, Nagwabi, & Selzler, 2011).

In a qualitative study using in-depth interviews, Draper et al. (2000) selected 24 participants using purposive sampling to examine their beliefs and habits related to reading and writing. Interview participants were chosen using a reading survey that was given to 79 pre-service teachers, as well as a writing survey given to another group of 27 pre-service teachers. Interview participants included six individuals with positive reading habits and positive attitudes toward reading, six with negative habits and negative attitudes toward reading, and the same number of participants that had positive and negative writing habits and attitudes. Draper et al. found that participants who reported not enjoying reading also stated that they only read newspapers and magazines. This characteristic is similar to the findings reported by Applegate and Applegate (2004) on unenthusiastic readers, which will be described later in this section. Although all of the participants revealed that they wanted their future students to love reading even if they did not, none of the 24 study participants could convey specific plans to help instill a love of reading in their future students.

In a 1996 study by Sardo-Brown (cited in Kolloff, 2002), an astounding 62% of the pre-service teacher respondents answered "no" when asked if there was a book so important to them that they could not imagine not having read it. In a survey of 409 students (246 undergraduates and 163 graduates), Kolloff (2002) found that 42% of undergraduates and 28% of graduate students majoring in education neither read for pleasure "nor do they particularly value reading as an enjoyable, enriching experience– one to be modeled for and shared with students" (p. 51). Study participants cited "lack of time" as the main reason for not participating in reading for pleasure. Kolloff noted that the surveys were administered on the first day of class after returning from a school break, which "raises the question of why in-service and pre-service teachers did not choose to read during their time away from school and work" (p. 52). Clearly, the author was challenging the socially acceptable "If only I had the time" excuse.

Applegate and Applegate (2004) coined the term "Peter Effect" in reference to the Biblical Apostle Peter (Acts, 3:5), who was asked to give what he did not have. The Peter Effect describes the "condition of teachers charged with conveying to their students an enthusiasm for reading that they do not have" (Applegate & Applegate, 2004, p. 556). The authors surveyed 379 undergraduate education majors using the Literacy Habits Questionnaire (LHQ) they developed. Their findings revealed that over half of the respondents were characterized as "unenthusiastic readers," as they reported little to no enjoyment with reading and did little to no leisure reading over the previous summer break. The classification of study participants as enthusiastic or unenthusiastic readers is an important one, as it is based on the self-report of enjoyment from reading and the reported amount and type of reading done over the summer. Thus, according to this information, readers were considered enthusiastic if they reported liking

"some reading," "enjoy reading," or indicated being an "avid reader" and having read at least one book over the previous summer. Using this classification, Applegate and Applegate determined that 51.5% of respondents were "unenthusiastic readers," meaning that they had no or very little enjoyment with reading and did little to no leisure reading over the previous summer.

Similarly, Nathanson et al. (2008) surveyed 747 graduate students of education, 283 of whom were practicing teachers, using Applegate and Applegate's (2004) LHQ. However, unlike Applegate and Applegate, Nathanson et al. did not juxtapose the self-report of enjoyment of reading with the amount and type of reading reported over the previous summer. In their study, enthusiasm was classified using the self-report only, which included "no enjoyment," and "little enjoyment" for unenthusiastic readers and "moderate or some," "great," and "tremendous enjoyment" for enthusiastic readers. The difference between this categorization and that used by Applegate and Applegate stems from the definition of enthusiastic readers. In Nathanson et al.'s study, it included the self-report of "moderate or some enjoyment" as the sole characteristic, without contrasting it with the amount of reading reported over the previous summer. Had Nathanson et al.'s definition been better aligned with Applegate and Applegate's, 31.6% of their participants would be categorized as unenthusiastic readers. Instead, Nathanson et al. reported that 81.4% of participants could be classified as enthusiastic readers, with the remaining 18.6% labeled as unenthusiastic readers, as they reported deriving little or no pleasure from reading. Still, when reviewing summer reading, Nathanson et al. reported a meaningful and statistically significant difference between enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers ($p = .000$). The authors claimed that "all enthusiastic readers did some summer reading" (p. 317). However, according

to the data presented in Table 2 (p. 317), which displays summer reading by category of

readership, 47 enthusiastic readers reported that they "did no summer reading." In addition, 67

unenthusiastic readers also reported "no summer reading," which is equivalent to 15.3% of

respondents (p. 317). As a result, the researchers stated, "These data suggest that summer

reading was not an important leisure-time priority for our sample" (p. 317). Applying Applegate

and Applegate's criteria for unenthusiastic readers to Nathanson et al.'s data, 27.2% of

participants would be categorized as unenthusiastic readers that exhibit aliterate habits and

attitudes toward reading. All in all, even though Nathanson et al.'s categorization for

enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers was more generous than Applegate and Applegate's

(2004), there were still statistically significant differences between the two groups.

In a more recent study, Walker-Dalhouse et al. (2011) used an adapted version of

Applegate and Applegate's (2004) LHQ to survey 69 pre-service teacher participants, while

employing Nathanson et al.'s (2008) classifications for enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers.

Using only the self-reported reading enjoyment, the authors identified 60 individuals (87%) as

enthusiastic readers and nine (13%) as unenthusiastic readers. Once again, after adjusting the

figures to incorporate reading at least one book over the summer, 20.3% of the respondents

would be considered unenthusiastic.

While Walker-Dalhouse et al. (2011) purported that their "data contrast with that of

Nathanson et al. (2008), who found that summer reading was not a priority for college students"

(p. 36), their sample (69 participants) is extremely small for survey research, compared to

Nathanson et al.'s 747 participants. Additionally, Walker-Dalhouse et al. stated, "findings

suggest that the majority of the pre-service teachers consider themselves to be moderate to good

readers and enjoy reading greatly or tremendously" (p. 33). This conclusion is not supported by any of the reported data.

Using a phenomenological approach, Sulentic-Dowell et al. (2006) surveyed 129 pre-service elementary education teacher candidates. Based on their survey responses, they chose eight to interview in an attempt to discover the kinds of early literacy experiences that affect reading attitudes and behaviors. The interviewees were purposefully chosen using the questionnaires and included three males and five females with diverse reading attitudes. Observations during field participation and a reflective paper assignment from the class served as additional data sources. Perhaps due to the nature of the setting, most participants indicated that they believed reading was important, but their personal habits did not support this claim. One shared, "I don't like to read, but I know as a teacher I have to be sure that my children read!" (Sulentic-Dowell et al., 2006, p. 244). Participants indicated that the older they became, the less time they devoted to reading, primarily due to wanting to spend more time socializing with peers.

Daisey (2009) used pre- and post-intervention surveys, adopting a mixed methods and quasi-experimental design, to study 124 pre-service teachers' changes in attitudes after completing a content literacy course. According to the initial survey findings, 87 participants were classified as having high reading enjoyment and 36 were classified as having low reading enjoyment (as the study only included 123 participants, percentages have been adjusted to represent the revised total number of participants). The results of the initial survey indicated that approximately 29% of respondents derived low enjoyment from reading. On the open-ended portion of the survey, nearly one-third of those indicating low reading enjoyment indicated "I

don't like to read" (p. 174) as the reason for their previous rating. Only 8% of this low reading enjoyment group indicated that reading can be fun or interesting, and only 17% of the high reading enjoyment group agreed that reading can be fun or interesting.

Benevides and Peterson (2010) conducted a study focusing on Canadian pre-service teachers, whereby they used a questionnaire along with tests of reading and writing ability to determine the correlation between literacy attitude and reading proficiency. The results of the questionnaire responses indicated that 61% of the 227 pre-service teachers derived enjoyment from reading, the researchers added a note of caution, stating, "percentages may reflect participants' awareness of the expectations regarding reading in schools of education, leading to an overestimation" (p. 295) indicating they believed the real percentage of students who enjoyed reading to be lower. That said, 23 students indicated they read seldom or not at all, and 25 participants agreed with the statement that they "rarely or never saw reading as an enjoyable activity" (p. 295).

In a mixed methods case study dissertation, Kennedy (2014) examined 41 pre-service teachers' reading habits and attitudes before and after taking a children's literature course. The study's initial findings indicated that most pre-service teachers do not read for pleasure. Kennedy also found that 19 of the 41 pre-service teachers were rated as unenthusiastic readers in both the pre- and post-course surveys (even though one individual did not take the post survey). When asked to identify with a reader description, in the initial survey, a majority of respondents (56.1%) indicated that they were mostly functional readers, followed by aliterate readers (41.5%) and prolific readers (4.9%). The final survey reflected the same order of responses with the number of functional readers increasing slightly. It is worth noting that the definitions for

functional readers and aliterate readers were very similar. For example, while both participate in compulsory reading, functional readers "occasionally read a book for pleasure," whereas aliterate readers "rarely/almost never read for pleasure" (p. 68). This distinction seems to be one of small degrees, prompting other researchers to use aliterate readers as the only category. When asked what reading the respondents did over the past year, 31 said that they read no books, and only read newspapers, magazines, or required reading, and the remaining nine (one response was missing) read at least one book. In the initial survey, the researcher specifically identified 17 respondents as aliterate, and 19 respondents reported no enjoyment with reading or feeling "lukewarm" toward reading. These findings suggest that a larger number of participants should have been classified as aliterates according to the accepted definition. Indeed, the researcher stated that an aliterate person "reluctantly reads for class, rarely/almost never reads for pleasure" (p. 67). When reporting the average number of hours that respondents spent reading for pleasure, very little change was noted from initial to the final survey (from 2.2 hours to 2 hours). However, there were initially 10 respondents that indicated no time (zero hours) spent reading for pleasure, and that number increased to 11 of the 40 respondents on the final survey, equivalent to more than 25% of the sample.

Using focus groups as an additional data source, Kennedy (2014) asked each participant to voluntarily commit to at least two meetings; only seven of the forty completed the minimum of two meetings. Kennedy found, "the majority of the focus group members disclosed that they were currently not reading any books for pleasure and usually did little to no pleasure reading" (p. 70). When comparing this count with the final survey results, a discrepancy emerges, as only 11 individuals reported no reading on the survey, whereas 14 disclosed no reading in the focus

group meetings. This finding suggests a larger amount of aliterates in this study. In sum, nearly one quarter of respondents clearly stated that they did not like to read and approximately 47.5% of participants were identified as unenthusiastic readers, similar to the findings reported by Applegate and Applegate (2004).

In a qualitative exploratory hermeneutic interpretative study examining reading habits of pre-service teachers in Spain, Munita (2014) analyzed life stories of 317 students, which were gathered over seven years. Students self-reported their reading habits, which made them appear to be more avid readers than their actual reports of reading indicated in the narratives. Using a combination of reader profile items, such as frequency of reading for pleasure and the titles of works read, the researcher established three types of readers—average readers (58.5%), weak readers (25.7%), and strong readers (15.8%). Average readers are those who read, but usually only during holidays or other breaks, whereas weak readers do not typically do any reading for pleasure. The strong readers read in their daily lives regardless of time of year and workload. Participants rated as average and weak readers indicated lack of time as the main reason for not reading. Munita suggested that students often use lack of time as an excuse, while failure to read is their conscious choice. This assertion was justified by student responses, such as, "I always convince myself that I haven't got time and keep leaving it to one side" and "I haven't got time to read at the moment, or we could say that it's not one of my priorities either" (Munita, 2014, p. 453). One respondent indicated, "I don't see myself as a fan of books or reading, even though I think they enrich us in many ways" (p. 452).

The aforementioned research conducted over two decades establishes a prevalence of aliteracy in the pre-service teacher population. While none of the studies focused solely on an

18

aliterate population, they all indicated a portion of the population of pre-service teachers reporting aliterate behaviors or characteristics. Most notably, Applegate and Applegate (2004) reported 51.5% of respondents were unenthusiastic readers, meaning that they indicated that they did not like to read and did no reading for pleasure. This concept of juxtaposing reported enthusiasm for personal reading with the actual amount of reading done is an important one and is further supported by an observation made by Benevides and Peterson (2010). The researchers indicated that they felt their pre-service teacher participants indicated a higher enthusiasm than they actually possessed (based on actual reported reading) due to the participants' "awareness of the expectations regarding reading in schools of education" (Benevides & Peterson, 2010, p. 295).

School Experiences

Extant research on the school experiences of pre-service teachers explored student interest in, as well as teacher practices and attitudes toward, reading at all levels of schooling. Recollections associated with school reading experiences included teacher modeling and attitudes, instructional practices, and a student's identity as a reader (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Daisey, 2009; Draper et al., 2000; Kennedy, 2014; Manna & Misheff, 1987; Munita, 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008; Sulentic-Dowell et al., 2006; Thomas, 2010; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2011).

Enthusiastic readers were more likely to report positive early reading experiences (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Benevides & Peterson, 2010; Nathanson et al., 2008; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2011). In the study conducted by Nathanson et al. (2008), the positive early school reading experiences reported by the enthusiastic readers (comprising 46.3% of the

sample) were statistically significantly different ($p = .02$) from those noted by the unenthusiastic readers (8.5%). In addition, 54.6% of unenthusiastic readers and 43% of enthusiastic readers reported negative or neutral early school reading experiences. Kennedy (2014) reported that 34% of respondents had negative or neutral early school reading experiences as assessed in the initial survey. However, this percentage increased to 47.5% (19 of 40) in the final survey. No rationale for including this item in the pre/post questionnaire was given. The researcher merely observed that, if participants responded negatively, they specifically mentioned some difficulty when learning to read.

Applegate and Applegate (2004) found a statistically significant correlation between college reading experience and reported level of enjoyment of reading. While Nathanson et al. (2008) reported no significant differences in college reading experiences between enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers, 62% of all respondents (463 of the 747 participants) reported negative college reading experience. Similarly, Kennedy (2014) reported that most of the participants in the survey indicated negative feelings about college reading experiences, and the number of individuals reporting such negative feelings doubled from pre- to post-intervention (this discrepancy could be due to the second survey being administered near final exams).

Manna and Misheff (1987) used reading autobiographies of 25 undergraduate and 25 graduate-level students (the students were asked to recount, in writing, what they remembered about their reading experiences) to assess their perceptions of teacher influence on their attitudes toward reading. Their findings revealed that 76% of graduate and undergraduate students perceived teachers as negative influences on them as readers (this percentage increased to 96%, 24 of 25, when undergraduates' reading autobiographies were analyzed separately). Only 38%

of respondents had positive memories of teachers as reading influences (if some shared multiple memories, all were counted).

According to Kolloff (2002), "Teachers who enjoy reading can generate a contagious excitement in their students by talking about books they love, books they are currently reading, and books they read as a child" (p. 53). Draper et al. (2000) interviewed 12 students aiming to determine teacher influence on their reading habits and attitudes. Seven interviewees recalled at least one influential teacher; however, five shared positive memories and two shared negative memories. Those that had a positive view of their teacher's influence recalled a teacher reading aloud, a teacher reading with a child, and a teacher creating a caring classroom environment. One participant who shared a negative memory, but was characterized as exhibiting a high reading for pleasure (HRP) level, described a specific event when the teacher would "jump out at her when she [the student] read aloud, making her feel about an inch tall" (Draper et al., 2000, p. 189). In addition, six of the twelve participants were categorized as deriving little pleasure from reading, and none of them reported any positive reading influences from their former teachers. In the survey conducted by Applegate and Applegate (2004), 36 students (of 184 in the follow-up study) recalled teachers sharing good books. More specifically, 18 respondents indicated that their teachers' attitudes toward reading were evident in their instruction; however, 17 of the 18 rated these attitudes as *negative*. Nathanson et al. (2008) reported a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teacher influences by enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers. While enthusiastic readers recalled having elementary teachers that shared a love of reading, unenthusiastic readers tended to report no teacher sharing their love of reading.

Nathanson et al. concluded, "These findings suggest that the teacher meaningfully affects student enthusiasm for reading" (p. 318).

Daisey (2009) surveyed 124 secondary pre-service teachers and characterized respondents as exhibiting either high reading enjoyment (HRE) or low reading enjoyment (LRE). According to the survey results, 52.27% of the HRE participants thought that their former teachers enjoyed reading, while 22.22% of the LRE group had "no idea" if their former teachers enjoyed reading. When asked whether teachers had a positive influence on their attitude toward reading, 20.46% of the HRE and 8.34% of the LRE group, responded affirmatively. When asked if participants recalled teachers as a negative influence 53.41% of the HRE group and 41.66% of the LRE group, declared teachers as a negative influence, citing middle school, high school, and college instructors as having the most negative effect. However, when asked to what extent they agreed with the statement, "It is my goal to be a positive role model for reading instruction," approximately 59% of the HRE group agreed or strongly agreed, along with around 25% of those in the LRE group. Kennedy (2014) reported that 46.3% of respondents indicated that a teacher had not been effective in sharing their love of reading. According to one student, "None of my teachers made me love reading because none of them were that enthusiastic about reading themselves" (p. 56).

In an international study, Munita (2014) examined life experiences of 317 pre-service teachers. Of the 21 students who mentioned teachers, 57.1% said that they had positive influence and perceived those teachers as motivators because they "transmit their own enjoyment of reading," "incorporate their own affective relation with literature into their teaching practices," and "she knew how to infect us with her enthusiasm and love of books" (p. 456).

Positive views of former teachers were shared by 12 of these 21 students, 11 of whom were identified as average and strong readers and one was rated as a weak reader. In addition, one strong reader and one average reader also identified their experiences as negative. Only one weak reader mentioned teachers in his/her narrative.

The negative instructional practices mentioned most often included compulsory reading, assignments including book reports and worksheets, having to read aloud in front of the class (round robin and "popcorn" reading), and being ranked in reading groups by ability (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Kennedy, 2014; Manna & Misheff, 1987; Miller et al., 1994; Munita, 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008; Sulentic-Dowell et al., 2006; Thomas, 2010; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2011). One of the respondents in the survey conducted by Manna and Misheff (1987) stated that reading was reduced to "an uninspiring formula" (p. 165). In their reading autobiographies, 84% of the respondents indicated a negative connotation toward book reports, and 78% criticized the competitive environment in the classroom using programs like SRA (Science Research Associates, Inc) reading kits to see who could read the most. Classrooms were described as restrictive by 78% of the respondents due to time spent on "prescribed reading selections" without consideration for student interests (Manna & Misheff, 1987, p. 166).

Miller et al. (1994) also noted a statement made by one student, who shared, "I only read textbooks required for my classes, when I have to" (p. 45). Compulsory or assigned reading was frequently viewed as a killer of enthusiasm and interest. In a study by Applegate and Applegate (2004), nearly one quarter of the 45 students that took part recalled reading instruction as "reading dull books" and doing "book reports" (p. 560). Sulentic-Dowell et al. (2006) reported that, beginning in middle school, their participants "reflected a gradual decline in motivation to

read" (p. 248) due to lack of choice, emphasis on text assignments, and being "forced" to read Shakespeare and other classics. One respondent shared the sense that, once the skill of reading was mastered in elementary school, it was only "useful for academic success" (p. 248); thus, the majority of students only read for teacher assignments. The researchers concluded that middle school experiences with reading may be the most important for determining pre-service teacher reading engagement.

In the survey conducted by Nathanson et al. (2008), 91.3% of respondents, including both enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers, reported "some" to "a great deal" of instructional emphasis on reactions and interpretations of literature. Analysis revealed statistically significant difference between unenthusiastic and enthusiastic readers' high school experiences related to the interpretation and discussion of literature. Enthusiastic readers were more likely to state that their teacher placed a great deal of emphasis on discussing interpretations of and reactions to the literature.

Similar to Sulentic-Dowell et al. (2006), upon analyzing the 42 pre-service teachers' personal reading experience narratives, Thomas (2010) reported that a large number of participants shared "negative literacy confrontations" concerning assigned literary pieces including Beowulf, and works by Shakespeare and Hemingway. Participants' narratives also "expressed stress of the ineffective use of read aloud strategies, specifically 'popcorn' reading" (p. 7).

Walker-Dalhouse et al. (2011) surveyed 69 pre-service teachers and found similar results to Nathanson et al. (2008) for both enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers. According to their findings, a majority of respondents recalled "some" to "a great deal" of emphasis placed on

completing assignments/reports. The authors also reported a statistically significant difference between unenthusiastic and enthusiastic readers' experiences with discussions and interpretations of literature. Specifically, 67% of enthusiastic readers reported that "some" to "a great deal" of emphasis was placed on interpretation and discussion of literature in their classes, while only 33% of unenthusiastic readers reported similar emphasis on interpretation and discussion. This positive correlation suggests that students who were able to partake in discussions aimed at interpretation of literature will likely be enthusiastic readers.

Kennedy (2014) reported that 41 pre-service teachers stated that they disliked assigned textbook reading and preferred choice. One respondent added, "but when I am assigned a book or a time frame in which I have to read that book I tend to shut down and see reading as a negative thing" (p. 41). In addition, 11 of the 14 focus group participants explicitly said that they did not like being required to complete assignments such as summaries, worksheets, or questions about the reading. Still, they acknowledged that, if they were not held accountable in some way, they would most likely not have completed the assigned reading. Munita (2014) also reported that two-thirds of strong readers connected compulsory reading with a positive experience, while 89% of weak readers perceived it as a negative reading influence. Nearly half of the group reporting on the negative influence of compulsory reading was defined as aliterate. In addition, 81.8% of this group linked compulsory reading with their current lack of motivation to read.

Overall, research on school experiences indicates that the majority of students viewed their school experiences as negative or neutral. This negative or neutral experience was identified at all levels of schooling. Classroom practices such as compulsory reading and associated assignments, being made to read aloud in a round robin style, and being grouped by

ability were the most frequently mentioned negative experiences (Daisey, 2009; Nathanson et al., 2008; Sulentic-Dowell et al., 2006).

Identity as a Reader

Pre-service teacher's identity as a reader is affected by a multitude of factors, including ease of comprehension of reading material (Draper et al., 2000), ease of learning to read (Applegate & Applegate, 2004), and individual perceptions of one's reading aptitude (Daisey, 2009; Thomas, 2010; Kennedy, 2014).

Five studies included in this review contained information on reader identities. Researchers found that reader identities were closely linked to their perceived ability as a reader (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Daisey, 2009; Draper et al., 2000; Kennedy, 2014; Thomas, 2010). Draper et al. (2000) found that "book readers" rated themselves as better readers than non-book readers did. Citing a history of reading difficulties, one participant said, "I can read something, but I just don't comprehend it" (p. 189). Similarly, Applegate and Applegate (2004) found that just over 33% of respondents in their follow-up study recalled struggles when learning to read. Respondents recalled being in the lowest reading group, being labeled as learning disabled, and needing more help than their peers. In addition, over one-third of these respondents noted specific difficulties with reading comprehension. Using pre and post survey data, Daisey (2009) reported a significant difference in responses between students who were characterized as having high reading enjoyment (HRE) and those exhibiting low reading enjoyment (LRE) when asked to rate the extent to which they see themselves as a reader on a 1−10 scale. The mean score of the HRE group was 8 on both surveys, while the LRE group scored 4.65 on the initial survey and 5.60 on the final survey. Thus, even after attending a

content literacy course, unenthusiastic readers who identified themselves as deriving little to no enjoyment from reading still rated themselves as "less" of a reader than those in the HRE group. Participants in the study conducted by Thomas (2010) indicated that teacher selection of difficult text and unyielding expectations for interpretation of them made them feel incompetent to find "the meaning," as well as to "navigate the language" (p. 7). Kennedy (2014) also reported that a significant portion of the focus group identified themselves as slow readers, with many requiring some sort of extra help with reading, which they saw as a negative experience.

How students, aliterates in particular, come to think of themselves as readers is very important. Several factors, including self-efficacy, practice with the skill, and interest, contribute to one's identity as a reader.

Home Experiences

Many children are first introduced to reading at home. Ideally, parents should read to their children every day from a variety of texts. Most importantly, children should identify adults in their lives as readers.

Using frequency counts performed on 50 randomly selected reading autobiographies of 25 undergraduate and 25 graduate students attending one university, Manna and Misheff (1987) reported that 72% (36) of participants recalled positive experiences with family reading and 28% (14) indicated that reading was not a priority in their homes. Furthermore, 11 of these 14 participants attributed their life-long discomfort with reading to that lack of priority. Draper et al. (2000) used in-depth interviews with pre-service teachers consisting of six with positive attitudes toward reading and six with negative attitudes toward reading. The researchers reported

that 11 of the 12 participants had positive home reading experiences, including modeling and encouragement.

Applegate and Applegate (2004) found a weak correlation between positive home experiences and level of enjoyment in reading. Nathanson et al. (2008) reported that respondents indicated a preference for home reading experiences over school experiences, but found no significant differences in the types of home reading experiences reported by enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers. The analysis of students' narratives conducted by Thomas (2010) revealed that about 10% referred to negative home experiences. Walker-Dalhouse et al. (2011) reported that both enthusiastic and unenthusiastic readers found their home reading experiences as either the same as or more positive than their school experiences, and two-thirds of unenthusiastic readers felt that their home experiences were more positive than their school experiences. Similarly, the participants in Kennedy's (2014) study rated home reading experiences as being more positive than school reading experiences.

Following a study of reading attitudes of 317 pre-service teachers, Munita (2014) indicated that all good readers (defined as readers who self-reported strong ability and habit and read for pleasure regardless of the time of year and workload) without exception came from homes that promoted positive reading experiences. On the other hand, among the weak readers (defined as those who do not read for pleasure and only read the compulsory material for their coursework) some reported positive home reading experiences, while others reported that "no motivation to read was provided and in which the child had no reading models" (p. 455). Further, the researcher concluded that, for average and weak readers, positive home experiences did not guarantee strong reading or positive school experiences.

While research on the home reading experiences of pre-service teachers is scarce, the findings yielded by the available studies do indicate that majority of pre-service teachers who are enthusiastic readers had positive experiences. Unenthusiastic readers, or aliterates, had both positive and negative home reading experiences, and having a positive home reading experience may not guarantee a positive school reading experience or the development of a regular habit of reading.

Conclusion

Applegate and Applegate (2004) conducted credible research on unenthusiastic readers, based on which they coined the term "Peter Effect" as "the condition characterizing those teachers who are charged with conveying to their students an enthusiasm for reading that they do not have" (p. 556). In a statement concerning interaction with text for aesthetic purposes, Nathanson et al. (2008) noted, "If teachers themselves do not experience this transaction, it is unlikely that they can effectively instruct their pupils to do it" (p. 561).

While the literature review presented here provides evidence of aliteracy in the pre-service teacher population, along with a few reports on the reading histories of pre-service teachers of all reading types, none of the authors employed an exploratory multiple case study approach to reveal the essence of the reading experience of the aliterate pre-service childhood education teacher. The proposed research will focus solely on an aliterate participant pool, delving into their reading histories over the course of their lived experiences, including home and all levels of school.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The aim of this exploratory multiple case study was to explore the reading experiences of aliterate pre-service teachers and identify any possible relational factors across school experiences, their identities as readers, and the home reading experiences.

Research Questions

This proposed study will be guided by the following questions:

- How do aliterate childhood pre-service teacher candidates describe their reading experiences (e.g., school at the elementary, middle, high, and college levels)?

- How do aliterate childhood pre-service teacher candidates describe themselves as readers and their experiences at home and family experiences with reading?

In the study, I used the emic perspective to explore both research questions and captured the experiences as recalled by each participant. Both questions were answered using the analysis of interviews and researcher memos performed through multiple iterative cycles of coding and evaluation. Questions were answered using the emic perspective pertaining to the collection of the reading histories as recalled by each participant throughout three individual interviews.

It was anticipated that the information gained from this research will help to guide and improve practices in teacher education programs, while attempting to bring resources into closer alignment with the needs of would-be readers and teachers of reading. This research highlighted the importance of encouraging prospective teachers to maintain or establish a habit of reading for pleasure.

Selecting a Qualitative Approach

Previous investigations involving aliteracy have been largely quantitative in nature, primarily using survey methodology to collect and analyze data. Much of this data, as discussed in the previous sections, indicate increasing percentages of various populations exhibiting aliterate traits or behaviors, including pre-service teachers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Benevides & Peterson, 2010; Daisey, 2009; Decker, 1986; Draper et al., 2000; Frager, 1987; Gallik, 1999; Goodwin, 1996; Kennedy, 2014; Kolloff, 2002; Manna & Misheff, 1987; Miller et al., 1994; Munita, 2014; Nathanson et al., 2008; OECD, 2010; Sulentic-Dowell et al., 2006; Thomas, 2010; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2011). There are fewer mixed methods and qualitative research projects concerning the phenomenon of aliteracy. Those studies concerning aliteracy have failed to provide insight into the phenomenon itself from the perspective of the aliterate pre-service teachers. In this study, I sought to understand the "what-ness" of the phenomenon of aliteracy, "thus making it an attempt to uncover and describe the structures, the internal meanings of the lived experience" (Owusu-Ansah, 2006, p. 52). Therefore, a qualitative exploratory approach using multiple case studies to capture the reading histories of two aliterate pre-service teachers was adopted.

My methodological paradigm and perspective draw heavily from the interpretivist framework where "multiple realities are constructed through lived experiences and interactions with others" (Creswell, 2013, p. 36). Further, that reality is co-constructed between researcher and researched and is shaped by individual experiences. My career as an instructor in higher education has afforded me the first-hand experience of the prevalence of the habit of aliteracy in pre-service teachers. Each semester, I administered a reading habits and attitudes questionnaire

to the candidates enrolled in my literacy education classes in an attempt to get to know them as readers. Sadly, each semester, nearly half of the candidates would report having little to no interest in reading for pleasure or not having done any reading for pleasure over the previous semester break from college. I find the topic of and attention to the phenomenon of aliteracy an important, worthwhile, and timely subject matter to study. I chose to pursue a case study approach because the phenomenon of aliteracy is intrinsically interesting. I am committed to achieving as full an understanding of the phenomenon as possible through the experiences of its participants by delving into the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience with the primary goal of describing the experience (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009).

The Present Study

In preparation for this research project, I conducted a pilot study to fine tune the survey and interview questions and sequencing of questions, as well as practice the interview protocol and analysis techniques when reviewing the interview transcripts. I gathered the data for the pilot study through three semi-structured interviews with Nick (pseudonym), a self-identified aliterate senior enrolled in a Childhood Education program at Central University. The purpose of this pilot research was to examine the history of Nick's aliteracy.

The analysis indicated that Nick's aliteracy stems primarily from his lack of self-efficacy (Schunk, 1990; Wigfield, 1997; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997) and an overall negative attitude/value (Gambrell, 1996) towards reading. Throughout the analysis, I looked for contradictions and indicated them with positive and negative characteristics for each of the constructs. For example, Nick indicated that learning to read was easy for him. He explained "[I felt] like I read

well." Later, when asked whether his early reading experiences were primarily positive, negative, or neutral, he said, "Probably neutral. I didn't hate it, but I didn't enjoy it." These statements illustrate a contradiction, as Nick previously identified himself as a good reader (coded as positive self-efficacy) and then said that he didn't enjoy it (coded as negative self-efficacy/attitude).

Nick read largely to comply with assignments from teachers and for levels of performance on tasks and assignments (i.e., book reports and tests). He frequently stated that he would "read to get the information [he] needed . . . . So it was just to get by." He also stated that he would do the required reading, but it was just to "get it done." That said, he explicitly explained that what he dislikes most about reading is "being forced to read" for assignments and finds textbooks particularly distasteful as a medium for reading.

Nick recalled four separate negative experiences with reading aloud (in a round robin or *popcorn* manner). He contemplated how he might deal with reading aloud to his students, as well as creating a culture of acceptance in the classroom.

Nick mentioned his parents as reading models several times. He began and ended the first interview by saying that his mother was a great role model as a reader and was "always reading." During the first and second interviews, Nick focused on his father, referring to him as "a manly man" and that he (Nick) "always [wanted] to be just like him . . . everything he did, [I] wanted to do just like him." Gee, Allen and Clinton (2001) explained that students sometimes struggle with various aspects of a second Discourse (identity), which includes thoughts, actions, and language. Additionally, this area of male identity may relate to Cunningham and Allington's (2015) notion regarding boys not having male readers as role models. Brozo (2006) suggests

creating mentoring situations that provide reading role models that are "gender-matched" (p. 73) to help boys "find connections between their lives and school-based literacy" (p. 71).

Nick may or may not be a typical aliterate pre-service teacher. Still, Nick did indicate that his role model, his father, did not place importance on reading and that he had no other male role models as readers. In addition, Nick was motivated to read if the information was interesting to him and to get good grades, and would do "what was needed to get by." Lastly, Nick indicated an understanding that he would need to become "more" of a reader to be a better teacher for his future students.

The pilot study helped me fine tune interview protocols, as well as refine the research questions. The goal of this research was to explore the reading histories of two pre-service teacher candidates to unveil and describe the relational aspects of the phenomenon of aliteracy. This exploratory research sought to capture each participant's reading experiences from his/her earliest recollections, to include elementary school, middle school, high school, and university, as well as elements of home. Participants' experiences related to their family backgrounds, learning to read, reading for academic purposes, and any interest in reading for pleasure or enjoyment contributed to the understanding of how these aspects relate to a habit of aliteracy.

I was intrinsically motivated to study aliteracy given the high prevalence of aliteracy among the pre-service childhood education candidates at a state university in New York, where I worked as an instructor. I considered aliterates to be capable readers who read when necessary, but do not read for pleasure in their free time. I utilized the designation of multiple case study, which involves collecting and analyzing data from several cases (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). Interviews were chosen as the primary data collection instrument, as supported by

the key principles set forth by Moustakas (1994) for accounts of experiences as a necessary part of any social phenomenon and for gathering the emic perspective.

Data Collection

Surveys were used to purposefully select two participants for a series of three in-depth semi-structured interviews.

Participants. Two childhood education pre-service teacher candidates were selected using purposive sampling, based on their scores on the survey indicating the most probable aliterate behavior. Even the most valuable studies discussed in the literature review identified aliterate populations in their findings, but did not use them as their sole participant population for their studies (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Nathanson et al., 2008). The participants were from a pool of approximately 110 seniors enrolled in a pre-service childhood education teacher program at one university in central New York. Using college demographic data, the undergraduate population of about 5,800 students is 87% culturally similar; 25% of the students are from Long Island and 23% are from the Hudson Valley. The socioeconomic backgrounds of the undergraduate population are diverse.

I had no connection with the participants (i.e., I am neither their professor nor advisor), unlike the study conducted by Thomas (2010) where he was the professor of the participants and the data was a weighted class assignment.

Survey. Approximately 110 pre-service teachers were invited to complete a confidential reading habits and attitudes survey (Appendix A). Students were assigned a number that was matched to a separate student roster and held in confidence.

The setting for the surveys included various university classrooms during the fall semester. The instructor introduced me to the students and left during the administration. I provided an explanation for my request, along with an informed consent form and the directions for survey completion. I administered and collected all materials.

Daisey (2009) conducted a mixed methods quasi-experimental study with 124 pre-service teachers, using surveys that were administered before, during, and after a content literacy course as the intervention. The Likert scale used to respond to the survey items ranged from one to ten and lacked proper descriptors as only "Strongly disagree" = 1 and "Strongly agree" = 10 were given as descriptors. All survey items for this study required a response on a four-point Likert scale (with descriptors for each), whereby some items were negatively worded in an attempt to avoid acquiescence bias. The construction of the survey was influenced by Applegate and Applegate's LHQ (2004) and a tripartite model of reading, which recognizes the complex interplay of the cognitive (conceptions and opinions about reading), affective (generally, a liking or disliking of reading), and behavioral (reading intentions and actual behaviors) aspects of reading. The survey contained 21 statements that the respondents were asked to rate in terms of how descriptive it was of them on a 4-point scale anchored at "none" and "always."

All surveys were hand scored. I examined and evaluated the individual questionnaires to select the two interview participants. Applegate and Applegate (2004) classified unenthusiastic readers as both those who reported little to no enjoyment of reading and those who did little to no leisure reading over the previous summer break from college. I used Applegate and Applegate's definition for unenthusiastic readers when determining possible interview participants. Respondents scoring the highest in terms of being unenthusiastic or unengaged readers,

possessing a negative attitude toward reading, or having little to no interest in personal reading were purposefully chosen as interview participants (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010). Yin (2015) highlighted the importance of selecting participants based on the anticipated richness of the information they will share and relevance of their responses to the study's research questions. As the instrument had 21 items, each of which is rated on the 1−4 scale, the highest possible score was 84. The interview candidates were those that scored between 50 and 84 and the final selection depended largely on the questions that provided more information about beliefs and habits, as well as responses to statements such as, "I seldom read except when I have to."

Interviews. The two interview participants were invited to take part in three semi-structured in-depth interviews (Appendix B) over the course of several weeks, each lasting approximately one hour. Draper et al. (2000) used interviews as the sole source of data, but only completed one interview with each participant. The format, number, and duration of interviews for my study were derived using Seidman's (2013) three-interview approach in order to increase internal validity. Again, informed consent was reviewed and signatures confirming voluntary agreement for participation were gathered (Appendix C).

As part of the semi-structured interview, information was gathered concerning participants' recollection of their parents or others reading to them when they were young, the manner in which parents promoted reading at home, early school experiences with learning to read, experiences throughout the participants' education, what participants do during their leisure time, as well as assessment of themselves as readers.

I personally conducted all interviews, further helping to protect the confidentiality of the research participants and fidelity of the data. Participants were assigned pseudonyms to further

protect their identities. As with the pilot study, interviews took place in a mutually agreeable

space. All interviews were audio-recorded to allow for good interview techniques, such as

maintaining eye contact, active listening, asking probing questions, recording observations of

non-verbal cues, as well as capturing other nuances of an interview situation. The second and

third interviews were of an inductive nature and were guided by some sequenced questions,

while allowing others to develop out of the process as well as be guided by the information the

interviewee divulged. Great care was taken when deciding how to structure and sequence the

questions to avoid response effect bias. The pilot study informed this process. Additionally,

using similar questions throughout the three meetings provided repetition across sessions to

ensure reliability of the data as much as possible (Moustakas, 1994).

Portions of interview sessions one and two were transcribed and submitted to the

participant for member checking at the end of the third meeting in an effort to verify accuracy.

At the beginning of subsequent interviews, I asked the participants if there was anything they

wanted to add concerning their previous interview. I audio-recorded interviews and transcribed

them, providing another opportunity for revisiting the data (Reissman, 1993).

Both participants were females from middle class backgrounds from a suburban and

urban area of New York City. Both participants were in their methods semester in a program for

childhood education. This is the semester prior to student teaching and their being eligible for

New York State teaching certification.

Data Analysis

The purpose of completing the content analysis of each individual case before proceeding

with the cross-case analysis was to "ferret out the essence or basic structure of a phenomenon"

(Merriam, 1998, p. 16). Analysis began as interviews took place through the use of memos (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Once each interview was transcribed, a more formal analysis was performed through open coding and use of provisional codes (school, self, and home) derived from the literature and the pilot study.

Each interview transcript was read to ensure its accuracy, and I engaged in a constant comparative analysis, continuing to read and reread the data, allowing for themes to emerge while reducing it each time. According to Moustakas (1994, as cited in Merriam, 1998), "The aim is to arrive at structural descriptions of an experience, the underlying and precipitating factors that account for what is being experienced . . . How did the experience of the phenomenon come to be what it is?" (p. 159).

I provided sample transcripts, along with my write-up of common themes, to two colleagues, who agreed to provide feedback and look for exceptions or alternative perspectives of the data generated as a part of my research. The two colleagues worked independently of one another prior to meeting with me individually for peer debriefing. I provided initial constructs, based on the literature, to be used by the reviewers which included reading identities, home experiences with reading, and school experiences with reading. Colleagues were encouraged to note any other constructs that became visible during their review. The purpose of peer debriefing with my colleagues was to allow them to provide feedback on both the interviews and my interpretation, and perhaps offer richer insights, contradictory evidence, new patterns, or differing perspectives (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998). I used their reflections to deepen my understanding about the experiences, attitudes, and beliefs held by participants in this study. Since confidentiality issues pertain to all interviews, both peers entered into confidentiality

agreements that precluded them from discussing their role as peer debriefers for this study. Participants received disclosures prior to their interviews regarding the role of peer debriefers. I submitted this documentation with the human subjects applications to Binghamton University.

Both researcher memos and interviews were analyzed on a case-by-case basis. All themes that emerged during the case-by-case analysis were used in the subsequent cross-case analysis (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). Once coding was completed, I created various matrices as part of the cross-case analysis to help sort and display data by theme (Yin, 2009). Analysis was guided by the following principles according to Yin (2009, p. 160):

- Attention to all evidence

- Address all major rival interpretations

- Address the most significant aspect of the case(s)

- Include (my) own prior expert knowledge

The cross-case analysis may result in creating a "unified description across cases" and to build a "substantive theory offering an integrated framework" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 234).

Analytic memos. I used memos throughout the data gathering and analyzing stages. Memos allowed me to practice reflexivity in the data analysis (Gall et al., 2010; Yin, 2015). Additionally, participants' current understandings and beliefs were analyzed during and after interviews. Memos were used to record my observations during interviews, along with my interpretations and my personal feelings (intuition) as interview data was analyzed (Roulston, 2011). The process was iterative and progressive in nature and continued while data was collected, analyzed, and reflected upon.

Validity/Credibility

Qualitative researchers can use multiple strategies to enhance the credibility and rigor of their studies (Creswell, 2013). The internal validation strategies employed in this study include narratives with thick-rich descriptions that were complemented by the use of actual quotes from the various interviews that pertained to participants' reading experiences. Participant/member checking was performed during the final interview to check for accuracy. Peer debriefing was used to provide feedback on both the interviews and researcher interpretation, and perhaps offer richer insights, contradictory evidence, new patterns, or differing perspectives (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998).

The use of a multiple case study design serves as an external validation strategy. While research based on a case study design typically lacks generalizability, the use of multiple cases increases this possibility, as well as enhances credibility through replication (Yin, 2009).

Ethical Considerations

All participants were treated in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Binghamton University Internal Review Board. There were no identifiable risks arising from participating in this study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the reading histories of two pre-service childhood education teacher candidates with a habit of aliteracy. The research used an exploratory multiple case study approach, as this is an appropriate methodology for gaining a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of aliteracy in pre-service candidates, achieved by collecting and analyzing their experiences as readers. By understanding the relational aspects of

a habit of aliteracy, including, but not limited to the constructs of school, self, and home experiences with reading, attention can be paid to necessary changes to promote a reading habit in pre-service teachers. There are high expectations for practicing teachers, including developing a lifelong reading habit in their students. It is widely accepted that childhood education teachers are teachers of reading regardless of grade level or subject (ILA, 2010). Therefore, teachers that read regularly for pleasure are better able to implement appropriate classroom instructional practices (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Burgess, Sargent, Smith, Hill, & Morrison, 2011; Kolloff, 2002; McKool & Gespass, 2009; Morrison et al., 1999; Powell-Brown, 2004).

Chapter 4: Findings

In my professional experience as an instructor of literacy education for pre-service education teachers, in order to get to know my students, I would survey them at the beginning of each semester, seeking information on their habits and attitudes toward reading. I consistently found that nearly 50% of students who were in their senior year of a four-year program reported having little interest in reading for pleasure. As an instructor of literacy education, I found this result disconcerting; it motivated me to identify factors that contributed to their habit of aliteracy.

The purpose of this exploratory multiple case study was to examine the reading histories of two pre-service teachers to gain insight into the possible reasons for their aliteracy. I found that both participants had some negative memories related to school reading experiences, that neither identified as a reader, and that both had books available in the home while growing up, but had different experiences with family reading. In addition, both participants struggled with comprehension when reading and had negative experiences with being identified for remedial help in reading comprehension. Both also preferred viewing movies based on books as a way to better comprehend the content. One surprising difference between the two pre-service teachers that took part in this study was that, unlike Jessie, Dani had no reading models or support at home. Jessie had a mother and father who were both avid readers, an older sister who enjoyed reading, and lots of books in the home.

Dani

Dani is a cheerful young woman with strong family ties. She is from a lower-middle income family who lives in Queens, New York. Dani enjoys spending most of her free time being social with family and friends usually around food. She recalled one of her favorite things

to do with family is to play games with her "little" cousins, "Just being with them is fun." Dani describes herself as a good time manager and a responsible person. When she is home, Dani enjoys walking and jogging especially along a path near the Cross Islands. It is a place, she says, she can get lost in her thoughts and come away feeling relaxed.

When asked why she wanted to become a teacher, she said that ever since she was young she would "play school," teaching her stuffed animals, and with children at her mother's in-home day care. "I just love working with kids."

Dani loves spending time with friends, being captain of the cheerleading squad on campus, using online social networking, and watching television. Dani does not *like* to read for any reason, but will to get good grades. When asked if she ever reads in her free time, the response was "never." Instead, Dani prefers to use her free time to hang out with her friends and when she is not with them, she is on social media with them, like Facebook and Snapchat.

Dani revealed what she remembered about reading at all levels of school, her identity as a reader, and her memories of reading at home as she grew. In this section I will provide information gathered through the interviews using the constructs of identity as a reader, home experiences with reading and school experiences as a reader as an introduction to Dani. Next, I will present the case study aptly titled from a quote captured in an interview, "I can read really well, just don't ask me about it." Dani's case revealed a sense of low self-efficacy in reading developed as a result with a struggle with reading comprehension, a preference to gain information from movies about the books read or Sparknotes, a use of leisure that primarily focused on being social with friends, and a lack of parental modeling and support for reading.

Identity as a reader. Dani does not see herself as a reader. She admits that she does not like to read in her free time and is not interested in reading even current popular titles or best sellers. She does not find reading relaxing and would rather watch television or a movie or hang out with friends. Although she admits that she should read more, it really does not interest her. In her interview, she stated, "I've gone through different stages like trying to read. I've really tried to do it." She also talked about trying to find that one book that would hook her interest, "but it never worked."

Dani shared that her strength as a reader was her ability to "read out loud with fluency," which she defined as accuracy and speed. She self-identified comprehension as her main weakness. She shared that she would only read, "To get good grades," adding, "Um, I just don't like it. I don't know." She conceded that she appreciated that one could gain knowledge from reading, but this was still not sufficient motivation for her. When asked if her dislike for reading was related to the effort required, she replied, "Yeah, and the time."

When Dani did read, it was for efferent purposes; she did not transact with the text for aesthetic purposes (Rosenblatt, 1993). Additionally, Dani did not persevere long when reading books before resorting to the Internet for a condensed summary. Dani's lack of motivation to persevere through difficult tasks is related to her low self-efficacy with reading (Bandura, 1989; Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996; Schunk & Pajares, 2009). She also surrounded herself with peers who did not read for pleasure. Research suggests that peers may play a more influential role than parents do in the formation of reading habits (Klauda, 2009; Klauda & Guthrie, 2015; Moje, Overby, Tysvaer, & Morris, 2008).

Home reading experiences. Dani remembered having many books at home, but could not recall ever being read to or seeing parents read for their own pleasure. Similarly, she claimed that, as her parents never encouraged her to read during her free time, she never read for fun at home. Dani did not think that her brother was much of a reader "Honestly, I don't think he is either. Yeah, so maybe it is just a family thing."

Research on family reading demonstrates that parents who read to and with their children, have books available in the home, and who model reading for pleasure help nurture love and appreciation for reading in their children (Baker & Scher, 2002; Baker, Scher, & Mackler, 1997; Strommen & Mates, 2004). Although Dani had access to books at home, she did not interact with them and she did not have any models that did.

School reading experiences. Dani's school reading experience begins with her recollection of being "one of the first to get reading" and ends with the declaration that she just does not comprehend anything when she reads. Dani recalled performing well when reading aloud, as was often required, in a round robin style where the teacher divided the text into segments, and everyone was called on to read for one to two minutes to the rest of the class. However, she dreaded being asked by the teacher to demonstrate any aspect of comprehension of what was read. In her words, "I could read really well out loud, but I just couldn't comprehend anything I read…Then it's embarrassing."

In her interviews, Dani also discussed silent reading time in the classroom, but did not recall talking about books, or seeing a teacher show excitement about reading. She remembered being "labeled" in the fourth grade as below level, especially in the area of comprehension. She

said that, based on her fourth grade English Language Arts (ELA) state test results, she was identified as needing extra help in comprehension. "I did really poorly [on the ELA test], so they put me into a, like, I guess, a reading remedial class in fifth grade. I really struggled with comprehending." She recalled feeling upset about this, and wishing that something had been done earlier to help her.

Until Dani was "labeled" as needing help with comprehension, she thought that she was a good reader. This mistaken impression was likely based on teacher praise for reading aloud fluently. Schunk and Pajares (2009) referred to this erroneous self-assessment as an issue with poor calibration, which occurs when students do "not fully understand the demand of the task" (p. 42) and therefore feel efficacious about what they are doing without reading the scope of the reading act. Once Dani was identified as needing help, she wilted. According to Schunk and Pajares, "Students in low-ability groups from which they cannot move may feel demoralized and perform poorly, even though they feel efficacious about learning" (p. 42). Dani was assigned to a low reading group for remediation, prompting her to develop negative self-efficacy about reading.

In middle school, Dani remembered being less anxious about ELA because her teachers showed movies based on the books on the reading list, which helped her feel more confident about the book content, as she could "connect to it." She recalled watching the movie *Holes* based on the novel they were all required to read as part of the class. She also recalled doing more projects on the books instead of quizzes, tests, and book reports. Dani found this project-oriented approach much more suited to her abilities "rather than just reading a book and testing

on it." This conclusion is to be expected given her struggle with comprehension, which is the main aspect being measured in tests, whereas projects frequently focus on some small aspect about the central theme that can be gleaned from discussions and movies, which Dani used as a substitute for reading.

In high school, Dani found eleventh grade as the most difficult year for her in ELA. She recalled having to read traditional texts and write or test on them. She explained that reading and then having to demonstrate comprehension, was her least favorite thing to do and often caused her to feel "embarrassed." Dani's college reading experience was similar to that in high school. When she could gain information from class discussions, hands-on labs, and videos, she recalled feeling more successful. Nonetheless, she explained, "but I have to like read through the textbook like a million times to comprehend what's going on." When she comes across reading that is too difficult she would, "go online and *SparkNotes* it, to be honest." Dani is clearly showing typical signs of low self-efficacy in reading, as well as lack of perseverance with an adverse situation (Bandura, 1989; Bandura et al., 1996; Schunk & Pajares, 2009).

When asked to reflect on her school reading experiences and identify a teacher that was effective at promoting love of reading among students, she responded with, "I never felt like that going through it."

In sum, Dani does not identify as a reader and has low self-efficacy about her comprehension skills when reading. She admits reading for grades if necessary, but prefers and relies on an audio or visual aids, a condensed summary, or a class discussion as a means of obtaining pertinent information. While Dani classified her memories of elementary and high

school reading experiences as neutral, she only shared negative memories. Even though she had access to reading materials as a child, she does not recall reading habits being promoted at home.

I can read really well, just don't ask me about it.

Analysis of Dani's case revealed four main factors that have contributed to her habit of aliteracy. First, Dani has always struggled with comprehension, which contributed to her low self-efficacy in reading. Consequently, she would resort to movies based on books or online aids to obtain the required information. Second, she developed a preference for hands-on approaches to demonstrate understanding of the book content, such as projects versus more comprehension-based approaches like tests and book reports. The third aspect contributing to her aliteracy is her need to be social, which takes many forms and leaves very little free time for reading. She reports "hanging out" with friends "all the time," spending hours using social media, participating in her sorority, and being captain of the cheerleading squad. The final aspect is a lack of parental modeling and support. Dani does not recall anyone at home modeling reading or nurturing love of reading.

Dani shared that, from an early age, she was the "one of the first to get reading." She thought that she was one of the best oral readers in her class, but struggled to comprehend the text she read. Dani continued to struggle throughout school even after being placed in a remedial class after fourth grade. Throughout high school and college, Dani frequently used SparkNotes to help her comprehend the information she was supposed to gain from the reading materials. It is clear that, once Dani realized she did not "get" reading, owing to her noticeable lack of comprehension, she avoided it as much as possible. Her avoidance (Juel, 1988) and failure to

persevere through difficult reading are congruent with behaviors other researchers found to emerge when students lack efficacy, and thus feel as if they cannot accomplish the assigned tasks (Bandura, 1989; Schunk & Pajares, 2009).

It is likely that Dani's struggles with comprehension led to her preference for viewing movies and listening to classroom discussions about the books she was assigned to read. This strategy helped her comprehend content (Isidor, n.d.) but did not address the core issue. Dani frequently noted that she liked the assigned books more if there was a movie, "I guess like the reading is more, like you can connect to it more, because they would show like movies that maybe would help me, or we would do like more projects rather than just reading a book and testing on it." Dani's purpose for reading was continually within the efferent stance, reading as little as possible to get the required information. Like many unenthusiastic readers, she would read to obtain the required information failing to transact with the text to derive personal meaning from the content (Rosenblatt, 1993). Another characteristic of unenthusiastic readers like Dani is a strong aversion to completing book reports and other assignments related to the compulsory texts (Nagwabi & Selzler, 2011), as well as finding books boring compared to other forms of entertainment like television (Gentile & McMillan, 1987), movies (Strommen & Mates, 2004), and the Internet (Margalit, 2015).

Dani's need to be social is a huge part of her life, and socializing with friends takes up the majority of her free time. Her choice of friends and activities never included reading. She said that they would "never" talk about books. Surrounding herself by peers who did not value reading in their own lives may have contributed to her habit of aliteracy (Klauda & Guthrie,

2015; Strommen & Mates, 2004). When asked to describe where she spent most of her time, Dani said, "hanging out with friends all the time and cheerleading, all the time." Even when alone, she would be on social media, such as Facebook, for approximately "10 hours" per weekend. For Dani, being social was the priority at this point in her life, leaving no room for reading. She surrounded herself with people who shared her interests and were thus also aliterate (Beers, 1998; Moje et al., 2008).

Dani's family members never read for pleasure, nor did they read her bedtime stories. Although they had books in the home, they never perused them. Family support is highly important for developing a reading habit, as it increases the likelihood that children will develop a personal interest in reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; McKenna, 2001; McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012).

Dani's struggles with comprehension certainly contributed to her low self-efficacy with reading and her decreased motivation to engage in reading. She identified being asked to demonstrate comprehension about something she had read as one of her worst fears. The ability to read and comprehend has been linked to wanting to read (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). As Dani never acquired the ability to easily comprehend what she read, this contributed to her aversion toward reading.

It is clear that Dani failed to connect the purpose of reading with aesthetic interactions with the text. Perhaps Dani's ability to break the code early on in order to read aloud resulted in her inability to comprehend not being discovered until the early intermediate grades (Hulme & Snowling, 2011; Liberman & Liberman, 1990). Dani's lack of reading comprehension likely led

to her preference for alternative means, especially watching movies, for gaining the information that she should have gleaned from the written materials. Moreover, Dani's need to be social, whether in-person or online, took precedence over all other activities (Beers, 1998; Klauda 2009).

Jessie

Jessie is an energetic, boisterous, young woman with interests in cooking, running, and binge-watching certain Netflix series. She likes to be active, as in moving, and is very talkative. She misses cooking with her grandmother, but has loved being at college, especially her time spent studying abroad. Throughout our meetings, Jessie jumped from one train of thought to the next in her responses to other, seemingly unrelated, topics and connections. She talked very fast and would frequently, abruptly end her responses without completing the thought. She frequently talked about her inability to attend to reading beyond a few quick minutes of celebrity news on Facebook. Additionally, Jessie indicated her need to always be doing (moving), even when watching television. Jessie repeatedly showed signs of issues with ability to attend.

Jessie loves being social and spending time with friends, running to clear her head, and binge-watching Netflix. Jessie does not find pleasure in reading but can be motivated to read in order to get good grades. When asked if she ever reads in her free time, her response was, "never." Jessie revealed what she remembered about reading at all levels of school, her identity as a reader, and her memories of reading at home.

In Jessie's early school career, her parents had her try multiple sports to find her niche. Soccer was the winner and she played soccer from a very young age with her father eventually

becoming the coach of her travel soccer team (non-school related). Jessie referred to herself as the son her father always wanted. She recalled, with a smile, being able to mow the lawn since she was age eight. She bonded with her father over soccer, but with the dedication to soccer also came many long nights with practices after school for two hours and weekends filled with traveling tournaments. This situation, Jessie confided, did not help with her time spent reading. She admitted that with her exhaustion, she frequently did not put the time in needed to become a reader, "There were times when we're reading things in class, I could tell people can read twice the speed than I could read, and that'll always be something that I regret, but at the same time, I can't dwell on it." She also recalled using Sparknotes with books she "wasn't into" or texts she found difficult to understand, "I'm not going to waste another hour re-reading it" so she used Sparknotes "a lot of the time, especially when we got into Shakespeare."

In her tenth grade year of high school, Jessie quit both the travel soccer and school soccer teams as she was burnt out. She took up school sports and activities that required less of her time like track and dance. Later in her tenth grade year her parents separated and ultimately divorced. Jessie has one older sibling, a sister who loves to read and was "more school oriented" than her.

Jessie wanted to become a teacher because many people told her she would be a good teacher and she wanted to work with children. She has experience working with children as a camp counselor. She indicated her first grade teacher was an inspiration to become a teacher. Jessie recalled a specific day of first grade, 9-11-2001. First grade teacher, Miss Cirillo conducted the day in a calm, loving manner, "like a normal day." Jessie did not realize the school was in a lock down and did not understand, until much later, why they stayed at school playing games until 5pm. Jessie's elementary school is located on Long Island, approximately

35 miles from downtown Manhattan. Miss Cirillo is one of Jessie's main inspirations because she cared so deeply for her students, especially that day, not knowing if any of the particular students in her class would be immediately impacted by the day's events. Jessie completed observation hours in her former teacher's class, now a fifth grade teacher in the same elementary school.

Jessie revealed what she remembers about reading at all levels of school, her identity as a reader, and her memories of reading at home as she grew. In this section I will provide information gathered through the interviews using the constructs of identity as a reader, home experiences with reading and school experiences as a reader as an introduction to Jessie. Next, I will present the case study titled, "Miss Orangestocking's culture of busy-ness and the road not taken." A bluestocking is a description of a woman who avidly reads, and orange is the opposite color of blue on the color wheel. Jessie does not read and does not have interest in reading. Further, as introduced above, Jessie was constantly busy with soccer, and when she no longer played soccer, she became involved in other endeavors including a sorority in college. Lastly, Jessie was consistently pointed in the right direction by her parents in their encouragement for her to become a reader, but she did not.

Jessie's case revealed a sense of low self-efficacy in reading developed as a result with struggles with reading comprehension, which may have resulted from her many missed opportunities to develop a habit of reading even though she had constant encouragement, support, models, and books available to her. She also had a peer group that identified themselves as readers. Jessie was also caught up in the busy-ness epidemic initially attributed to her involvement in soccer. Jessie seemed to focus on her identity as an athlete, one that her father

fully and enthusiastically supported. Due to her struggles with reading comprehension, Jessie

preferred to gain information from movies about the books she was assigned to read or by using

Sparknotes. Lastly, Jessie's case appeared to have a strong theme of procrastination.

Identity as a reader. Jessie does not identify as a reader. Yet, she jokes about books

she has not read and is reluctant to acknowledge that not having a reading habit has some

drawbacks. Asked about her experience with reading, she replied, "it like almost scared me how

much time I lost reading." She considered this a negative and unsettling experience. She

described reading as stressful, adding that she would always rather be doing something else, like

running, cooking, or hanging out with friends. While growing up, she was much more interested

in sports, especially soccer, than in reading. In her own words, "I was never one that could just

sit and read a book for fun. That was just never me." Jessie described herself as a procrastinator

when it came to reading. She talked about summer reading lists, which she would put off until

the end of summer, so that she had to spend the last week before school in her room trying to do

the "stupid summer reading." She reflected that, "I kinda made myself hate reading 'cause I

pushed it to be the last thing I did at night where I was so at the most tired point of the day."

When asked about her least favorite reason to read, she promptly replied, "Being forced

to read. But um, I just really don't like reading …Reading is not really something I love." She

said that she did not have a favorite book and that, when she tried to read, it made her feel more

stressed. She added that she was frustrated when, upon reading through a page, she would

realize that she had no idea what she had just read, "My mind goes somewhere else so easily."

Jessie constantly talked about her lack of focus.

Jessie does wish that she read more, as she realizes that others can read "twice as fast" as she can. Still, when asked about how that observation made her feel, she dismissed this shortcoming with, "I can't dwell on it." She compared herself to her friends who "voraciously read the Harry Potter series… never something appealing to me. I feel like it's a waste of time almost." She recalled that "all my friends read *The Hunger Games*…Yeah, like I still didn't read those (with a laugh). Like, normal readers who won't go out of their way still read those, and that's how I compare myself to them." Even though she had friends who were avid readers, Jessie still chose to avoid reading.

When asked what her strengths as a reader are, Jessie replied, "I, I don't really know. I, I [do] not necessarily [have] strengths, but I never considered, like thought of having strengths in reading because it was never thought of it as something that was a strength of mine to begin with…I have struggles that I had with comprehension, still something I struggle with. When I read a book that I, my mind goes somewhere else so easily." When asked what she likes most about reading, she paused before responding, "Um, (more pause) Ah, that's a hard one. I just really don't like reading. I feel like if I'm gonna spend my time focusing on something that much, it's gotta be something I love, and reading is not really something I love." Jessie shared that, to get by, she would read the beginning and ends of books, adding that she could not remember reading for pleasure at all.

Home reading experiences. Jessie recalled that her mother always tried to get her to read. She said that her older sister loved to read as a child and still reads as an adult. She, on the other hand, started playing soccer at a very young age, often traveling to tournaments with her

team and her father as their coach. She shared that playing on the travel soccer team made her develop a very strong bond with her father, recalling being his "little boy" and even learning how to mow the lawn at age eight. She remembered both parents reading to her at bedtime, and even shared that her favorite childhood book was about going to a supermarket to buy food, but she could not remember the title. Jessie shared that she liked the book because it was about something real, adding that she loves food. She also recalled having a princess book, which she did not enjoy. On the other hand, she liked the Berenstain Bears books because, even though the characters were fictional, they were like real families. She noted that her mother has kept all her old books.

Jessie remembers her parents reading for pleasure. However, her mom did more reading when she was a stay at home mother, while her father still loves Tom Clancy novels, which makes buying birthday presents quite easy. She recalled that when he flew to Italy to bring her home from a semester abroad, he read an entire novel on the plane ride home while she slept, adding "I just can't fathom doing that."

School reading experiences. Jessie remembered that students were often asked to read aloud in elementary school. She shared that she always had trouble with comprehension and enjoyed projects more than book reports, which they had to do from second grade onward. She recalled her mother helping her with a book report on a famous person by creating "a very intricate" shoebox diorama. She specifically recalled an experience from fourth grade she called "popcorn" reading. She described this practice as round robin reading with a twist. A student would begin reading aloud to the class, and would stop and randomly call on the next person to

read and so on. "It was like fun, but it got very competitive. I think my teacher should have stopped doing it… someone would stop mid-sentence to like trick someone else not paying attention, to read, and it got really bad." She added that she remembered it "being like the most pointless thing, definitely a negative experience." Jessie shared that her fifth grade teacher was really supportive, and remembered being invited along with a few classmates to join the teacher for lunch and recreation time to eat and read something that no one else was reading. She said that it made it more fun, and "not everyone got to experience that."

Jessie did not recall reading many books during middle school, but shared that it seemed more focused on writing, "We probably read a book or two throughout the year. I can't remember. But that should be an answer in itself; that's how irrelevant it was." She thought all reading was assigned to be done independently. She did recall being taught the elements of a story using a witch's hat diagram.

In high school, Jessie used SparkNotes often, especially for Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* "makes no sense," and noting that she got through *Taming of the Shrew* because her teacher showed the movie *Ten Things I Hate About You* first, which was supposed to be loosely based on the book. She also used SparkNotes for books like *Great Expectations* and *Of Mice and Men*, which she "HATED." She also mentioned, "*Animal Farm* to this day still confuses me." Early (1960) introduced the concept of literary appreciation and posited that, to attain it, one has to go through sequential stages. The author added that, when well-meaning teachers force students to try to "appreciate literature" above their stage, this would have a negative effect on the student's overall enjoyment and progression in developing a positive

relationship with reading and may result in the student "mimicking the teacher because they do not know what else to do" (p. 164).

Jessie explained that she always seemed to struggle with comprehension. However, as she wanted to be able to contribute to conversations, she used SparkNotes. This is an example of positive social motivation to read (even if it resulted in over-reliance on SparkNotes) (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Bandura, 1986; Wigfield, 1997). In high school, Jessie quit soccer because she could not keep up with her school work even with tutors' help and reliance on SparkNotes.

She declared that, when she did not hate the assigned titles, doing homework was less "painful." She recalled somewhat enjoying *The Great Gatsby* because it took place on Long Island where she lives and was in the cinema. She also liked *Lord of the Flies*, but she could not give a reason for this preference. Throughout high school, while she mostly disliked assigned reading, she found some "less painful." The "less painful" novels were not attributed to one teacher. Jessie's main objective when turning to SparkNotes was to find "something to contribute to the discussion." She wanted to be able to participate even if she did not complete the reading. In college, Jessie complained about the "boring textbook reading," which was particularly "painful for like geology and government." Jessie has many friends who read and she understands the importance of taking part in class discussions. While her reliance on SparkNotes is not commendable, she demonstrated her awareness and willingness to be a contributing member in this community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 2001; Wenger, 2004).

Jessie remembered "everyone always telling me to read and me never wanting to read." When asked if there was a teacher who was particularly beneficial to her reading experiences,

she could not recall any specific teacher promoting reading for pleasure, "I can't really think of one that necessarily, that was really stand out."

Jessie's aliteracy appears to stem from her sense of low self-efficacy, especially in the area of comprehension. Nonetheless, she will read for grades and is driven to contribute socially by discussing books. Jessie's leisure time is split between various sports activities watching television. In her interview, she consistently referred to reading as a waste of time. While reading was constantly promoted at home, and she did feel pressure to become a reader, she did not. Although Jessie has some regrets about this shortcoming, she is quick to dismiss them, saying, "it is what it is, and I'm not going to change it now." which sounds like a very deterministic way of thinking (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). Jessie knows that she is not a reader, despite having the support at home, and accepts that as something that simply cannot be changed.

Miss Orangestocking's culture of busy-ness and the road not taken.

Jessie's low motivation to read and aliteracy can be ascribed to four main factors, which emerged as major themes in the analysis of her interview transcripts. The first one was denoted as "missed opportunity." It would appear that Jessie had support and encouragement to develop a reading habit, yet consistently made choices, some deliberate, that prevented her from becoming a reader. The second major theme is that Jessie is a product of the busy-ness epidemic and youth sports culture that has prevailed in the last decade or so. Increasingly, children are made to start taking part in sports and other extra-curricular activities at an early age, joining traveling teams and spend most of their free time away from home. Many parents commit hours

64

of their time each week to have their children engage in activities they believe would increase their chances of success in the future. In Jessie's case, it was soccer that made her so busy that she had no time for anything else. The third theme is Jessie's preference for accessing information by means other than reading. The final theme is that of procrastination. Jessie's procrastination fits almost precisely within the temporal motivation theory (Steel & Klingsieck, 2016). Growing up, she consistently avoided reading, favoring other self-rewarding behaviors.

Jessie was supported to become a reader at home by her parents, who read to her regularly, made a variety of books available to her, and were readers themselves. Jessie's mother never failed to emphasize the importance of reading. She consistently tried to get her to read for pleasure to no avail. In fact, Jessie's mother would lament that, as Jessie's older sister loved to read, she was not sure why Jessie failed to develop the same habit. Jessie often referred to this sentiment as her mother's "regret in life." Recalling a time when her mother offered to buy her a Nook e-reader. Jessie shared, "It was never really an option for me. Like they know that I wouldn't use it." Jessie acknowledged that her mother was always promoting reading when she got home from school, "which I know I was fortunate to have 'cause not everyone has that."

Research concerning family experience with reading supports the notion that "children whose early encounters with literacy are enjoyable are likely to develop a predisposition to read frequently and broadly in subsequent years" (Baker et al., 1997, p.69). The only thing that Jessie shared that could be considered a negative experience was her understanding from a very young age that she was expected to like reading and did not, and that she presented some frustration for her parents at bed-time reading. She indicated that her parents would try to pick a book that

would keep her interest long enough that they could finish reading to her before she fell asleep. Perhaps Jessie felt too much pressure to become a reader and, being aware of her difficulties with comprehension, made a decision not to expend energy on something she thought she was not good at (Bandura, 1997; Bandura et al., 1996; Schunk & Pajares, 2009).

Jessie "literally do[es] not remember life before soccer." She shared a memory of her standing in her "little tiny uniform," playing striker (but not really knowing what to do). Jessie started playing soccer when she was only three years old. She said that her parents "tried her at a few different sports" before settling on soccer. Jessie enrolled in a travel soccer league in the fourth grade. Joining the league increased the level of participation and amount of time she needed to commit to soccer. The pressure was made even greater by the fact that her father was her coach. Jessie remembered having two-hour practices three nights per week along with regular weekend games and tournaments. The tournaments often took place at another location, so families had to stay in a hotel for the weekend, affording their children the opportunity to participate in multiple games throughout each day.

When asked about how she spent her summers, Jessie shared that she attended sports camps, adding, "I was always an active child. I was always the one that was just not around, or out of the house, or out with my dad doing soccer er [or] doing other things. It was never something appealing to me to be a reader. It was more appealing to me to be a runner or a soccer player, like be a cook or just like something that was active."

Jessie's story is typical given that the youth sports culture has developed into a seven billion dollar industry (Rosenwald, 2015). Many parents think that the travel leagues are an

66

investment into their child's future and rationalize their choices with thoughts of college scholarships. Some parents involved in the youth sports culture even invest in private lessons, summer camps, and expensive equipment (Coakley, 2011; Rosenwald, 2015).

Effects of the youth sports culture extend well beyond excessive time commitment, to include injuries and burnout (Rosenwald, 2015). According to a survey conducted by a George Washington University professor, Amanda Visek (reported in Rosenwald, 2015) the "number one reason kids quit sports is that it's no longer fun" (p.4). Once Jessie was eligible to join school-sponsored athletics, she started playing soccer as well as participating in outdoor track. She played soccer in high school through tenth grade, in addition to the travel soccer league. She recalled her sophomore year and shared, "it was getting to a point where I was just… it was getting to a point in high school where I had to make decisions about my academics and soccer. Like there just wasn't time for it. At that point, I wasn't loving the sport as much as I did as a child." She shared that she was "burnt out, my body was just like always exhausted every day."

Jessie's busy-ness continued in college, where she joined a sorority. She quickly became actively involved in it, and even served as Vice President. She also, completed a semester abroad in Italy. Jessie recalled that, during college breaks, her family had her scheduled the entire time, saying in a strangely pitched voice, "Oh, like Jessie's home for four days, (changed to her regular voice) like we need to spend a whole day like at my Nana's house, a whole day at my Grandma's house, and like, oh my dad wants to, oh my dad's girlfriend wants to see me, my mom's boyfriend wants to see me, I mean like four days are done just like that!" The summer breaks during high school and college were spent working, mostly at camps as a camp counselor.

One might argue that Jessie's busy-ness directly contributed to her struggles with comprehension due to the limited time she could devote to reading. Jessie admitted that she should have spent more time reading, as this would have aided in the development of her reading competence and comprehension skills (Cipielewski & Stanovich, 1992; Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999; Paris & Newman, 2009; Schiefele, Schaffner, Moller, & Wigfield, 2012; Stutz, Schaffner, & Schiefele, 2015; Wigfield, Gladstone, & Turci, 2016).

Jessie clearly prefers watching movies and accessing information online, and avoids reading whenever possible. She expressed that she liked books more when there was a movie about the book. It is likely that Jessie's struggles with comprehension led to this preference, which developed into a strategy, allowing her to comprehend the book content (Isidor, n.d.). In fact, Jessie uses Amazon and Netflix extensively, which fits with the research finding that the human brain will pursue less cognitively demanding tasks (Margalit, 2015). Our brains can process watching a video 60,000 times faster than reading an article (Margalit, 2015). These two activities also use two different brain processes. Watching a video is passive, whereas reading requires an active stance, and habits are easily created for viewing. As Jessie struggled with comprehension from a very young age, she resorted to watching videos (Hall & Stahl, 2012), as this was less cognitively demanding than reading (Margalit, 2015).

Jessie procrastinates frequently, finding other things to do to avoid reading, even for assignments. Jessie revealed that, during her elementary school years, she would constantly leave her summer reading to the very end of summer and then "HATE" it when her mother made

her stay inside the last week before school to try to do all the reading she was supposed to have done over the entire summer. Jessie resented having to be inside "trying" to read when she wanted to be outside playing. In her high school years, Jessie recalled putting reading off, and would often attempt to read late at night, when she was at her "most tired part of the day." At this point in high school, Jessie would frequently resort to SparkNotes, as this greatly reduced the time spent reading by providing the summary, or she would attempt to do it begrudgingly, creating very negative feelings toward reading. She would resent reading, as she had a hard time comprehending, especially when it came to Shakespeare. Jessie shared that she may have made herself "hate reading" because she was always putting it off. Thus, it inevitably became the last thing she did, when she was exhausted or would rather be doing other things. She explained multiple times how tired she was after doing all of the other scheduled things in her life so when it came to reading, it was always something done last when she was too tired. She shared, "If I had the time to put into my academics, it could have been different."

In college, Jessie recalled watching a lot of television to give herself a "mental break. I want a break. I want to go watch TV, something relaxing." She shared that binge-watching certain Netflix series was a way to reward herself after a week of academic work. However, as she had no classes on Fridays and Mondays, her intense television watching would usually begin on Thursday nights. "I would usually spend Friday afternoons, like give myself the day off, just to like recuperate. Uh, I probably spend like three or four hours watching TV, but I watch it more on Sunday morning and Saturday morning when I'm waking up. Like, I'll just wake up late and just hangout for a couple of hours and not like start work until 2:00 just to ease myself into it."

Jessie has developed a habit of avoiding reading as much as possible and regularly "zoning out" by passively watching television. Of course, one might argue that Jessie's lack of motivation to engage in personal reading may be directly related to her self-confessed struggles with comprehension. This is likely where Jessie developed her habit of procrastination, which was exacerbated by seeking self-rewarding behaviors.

According to the temporal motivation theory (Steel & Klingsieck, 2016) postulates, those who procrastinate, do so due to the perceived unpleasantness of the task at hand because no immediate reward is associated with completing it, motivating one to delay doing it. Jessie perceived reading as difficult and something she was not good at, and was thus more likely to put reading off when there were more immediate pleasurable activities to engage in (Steel & Klingsieck, 2016).

When examining Jessie's case through temporal motivation theory lens, it is apparent that her low self-efficacy in reading decreases her probability of success. According to Steel and Klingsieck (2016), the probability of success increases proportionally to the reward associated with the outcome, while it decreases with the subject's sensitivity to delay, compounded by the time to realization. Jessie readily admits to consistently avoiding the negative emotional and stressful task of reading, preferring to do things she finds more pleasurable, like playing soccer, watching television, and hanging out with friends. Jessie stated many times how difficult reading was for her, "I always struggled with that [comprehension]. It wasn't a pleasure to do that [read]" which further supports the first two aspects of this theory.

Another aspect of the temporal motivation theory (Steel & Klingsieck, 2016) involves distractibility and propensity for procrastination. Jessie described this issue as follows, "My mind goes somewhere else so easily that I read a whole page and I don't know what I am reading." This theory, however, suggests that the closer an individual is to realizing a goal, the harder s/he will work for it. Jessie demonstrated this aspect of the theory by sharing that "I will throw my phone across the room when I'm doing homework for long periods. I know I need to focus." The final aspect of the temporal motivation theory is the intention-to-action gap, referring to a failure to accomplish the set goal. Again, evidence of this behavior can be found in Jessie's account, as she noted, "I never didn't want to. It was just a matter of if I had time to do it or not. Like if I don't like the book, if I'm being forced to read it, it doesn't, it's not gonna help."

Procrastination can manifest in many forms, all of which were exhibited by Jessie such as denial, trivialization, blaming, and using humor to validate the inaction (Steel & Klingsieck, 2016). Jessie acknowledged her lack of reading habit, but quickly trivialized it by sharing, "That'll always be something I regret, but at the same time, I can't dwell on it." While Jessie could not explain why she never developed a reading habit, she did state that her childhood was not the same as her sister's due to their parents' divorce. She also blamed this event for her inadequate academic attainment, stating, "Everyone acknowledges the fact that she, she was always the studious one…we had such different childhoods." Additionally, Jessie frequently laughed when discussing her lack of reading habit, "We always laugh about it now, 'at least Jessie's reading *something* (referring to subtitles her mother required her to put on the television), like at least she's keeping along.' It's just so funny (laughing)."

71

Jessie's procrastination and dislike for reading may have developed as a result of her extensive involvement with soccer and the travel league, and later scholastic sports and other activities related to her culture of busy-ness. This busy-ness would also have cyclically contributed to her low self-efficacy in reading due to insufficient time spent becoming proficient, which led to her negative attitudes toward reading (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; McKenna et al., 2012; Schiefele et al., 2012; Wigfield et al., 2016). Her busy-ness and struggles with comprehension surely contributed to her aversion to reading.

It might be concluded that Jessie's comprehension issues stem from her lack of intrinsic motivation to engage in reading and tendency for procrastination. In addition, when she did read, it was almost always a negative experience (Ronberg & Petersen, 2016). Empirical evidence indicates that ease of ability to read and comprehend are positively related to wanting to read (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Schiefele et al., 2012). Jessie's awareness of her reading comprehension issues started in the fourth grade. She shared, "I always struggle with comprehension from like age three to taking the ALST. Like it's still something that I struggle with, that I always had tutoring on as a kid and it showed in my scores from elementary school from state testing, but that was always my issues."

Chapter 5: Cross-case Analysis

Cross-case analysis was conducted to compare and contrast the way two aliterate pre-service teachers included in this research described their reading experiences. It revealed two marked differences and three notable similarities. The most glaring difference was found in each participant's recall of their family reading experiences, specifically the level of family support to become a reader. Moreover, while social motivation prompted Jessie to at least appear as a reader (identity as a reader), Dani did not feel any pressure to fit in. On the other hand, both aliterate participants lacked identity and agency as a reader, which stemmed from low self-efficacy (school experience). Both participants recalled early school experiences that led them to believe that they were good oral readers, even though they struggled with comprehension. Once this issue became apparent, they started receiving remedial services (in elementary school), which contributed to low self-efficacy in reading as well as other factors that adversely affected their motivation to become readers. Both Dani and Jessie developed a preference for watching movies based on books to supplant their lack of reading comprehension.

Dani and Jessie both had books at home, but their childhood experiences with reading were very different. Dani did not have anyone encouraging her to read or modeling reading at home. She was never told by her parents that reading for pleasure had value and had never seen them enjoying books. By contrast, Jessie's family members were strong reading models, and both her parents supported her in becoming a reader. She not only had parents who read for pleasure and gave her regular bedtime stories, her sister was an avid reader. She always had many books available in the home, and her mother was prepared to buy her an e-reader in an

effort to motivate her to take up this valuable habit. Research supports the importance of a family valuing reading to help children develop interest in reading for their own pleasure (Baker et al., 1997; Klauda, 2009). Yet, despite extensive support and encouragement Jessie did not develop interest in personal reading. According to Klauda (2009), "parent support was the strongest predictor (of interest in reading), except for self-efficacy/challenge" (p. 342). This can explain why Jessie's family support to become a reader did not yield results, as her low self-efficacy outweighed all their efforts, contributing to her avoidance of reading and habit of aliteracy.

Unlike Dani, Jessie had friends who were readers. This peer group may have contributed to Jessie's attempt to appear as a reader in high school, working along the margins of this community of practice, striving to "display knowledge for evaluation" (Lave & Wenger, 2001, p. 111). Jessie shared that she always wanted to be able to contribute to classroom conversations about books. Using the social theory of learning as a lens (Wenger, 2004), it is apparent that Jessie attempted to become a member of the reading community, seeking to be seen as someone who belonged. However, she did not actively practice (as an apprentice) and therefore did not develop an identity as a reader. Rather, Jessie demonstrated "legitimate peripheral participation in such linguistic practice," but did so at a level that did not allow her to "learn the actual practice the language was supposed to be about" (Lave & Wenger, 2001, p. 108). To compensate her inadequacy, Jessie would peruse SparkNotes to gain information about the reading assignment, but avoided reading and transacting with the book itself.

Another similarity between the two cases pertains to early aptitude for decoding. Both Dani and Jessie shared multiple memories of being able read aloud very well during round robin reading which spanned many school years and was a consistent strategy used by teachers at all educational levels. Yet, they both shared negative memories of round robin reading. Both participants recalled being surprised by identification as a student in need of remedial services, which resulted from poor scores on the state ELA exam. Their surprise may have been due to a mis-calibration of their capabilities (Schunk & Pajares, 2009) in reading due to a failure to understand the complete task of reading. In particular, neither participant seemed to grasp one of the key goals of reading, deriving meaning by interacting with the text. It is also possible that, due to their effective word calling, their primary level teachers failed to identify lack of comprehension, mistakenly believing that they were proficient readers (Hulme & Snowling, 2011; Liberman & Liberman, 1990).

Once Dani and Jessie were identified as needing remedial services in comprehension, both developed a low self-efficacy in reading, believing they could not perform the task well (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2000; Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, & Blumenfeld, 1993; Schunk & Pajares, 2009). Both recalled multiple instances when they had avoided reading they thought to be difficult. They would eventually turn to SparkNotes for a condensed summary either because they had not understood what they attempted to read, or did not tackle the reading at all.

This attitude is aptly summarized by Bandura (1986), who noted that "it is mainly perceived inefficacy in coping with potential aversive events that gives rise to both fearful expectations and avoidance behavior" (p. 365). Bandura used social cognitive theory to support

the conception of triadic reciprocal determinism. Bandura further explained that the model of triadic reciprocal determinism includes three factors- behavioral, environmental, and personal- that influence and influenced by each other. In Dani's and Jessie's cases, all three elements of the model of triadic reciprocal determinism are evident. Behavioral factors include avoiding reading, not transacting with text, and looking for the answers elsewhere. On the other hand, environmental factors include remedial services, low reading group assignment, and being called upon to demonstrate comprehension in a group. Finally, personal factors include struggling with comprehension of written material and possessing a negative attitude about reading. A closer analysis of these factors reveals that, in Dani's and Jessie's cases, low comprehension contributed to avoidance of reading which led to the placement in a remedial group, thus contributing to their negative attitude toward reading. This link can also be illustrated in the reverse, as having low comprehension and negative attitude toward reading, results in being placed in a remedial class (the environmental factor). This aspect, in turn, influences the behavioral factor of avoiding reading and instead looking for the answers elsewhere, developing a preference for watching movies (to gain information) and failing to transact with text, which ultimately results in having low reading comprehension (Ronberg & Petersen, 2016). The reciprocity of all of these factors contributed to and reinforced low self-efficacy concerning reading in both participants.

Using Guthrie and Wigfield's (2000) motivational-cognitive model of reading, allows for the examination of each participant's personal and behavioral factors contributing to low text comprehension in more detail. For each case, the five aspects of the motivational processes clearly demonstrate that both participants had negative values in many aspects of motivation.

The aspect of task mastery goals pertains to the reader setting intentions for the text, whereby, higher (lower) intentions result in the reader being more (less) likely to fully understand the text. As Dani and Jessie shared in their interviews, each had some intentions to read assigned texts, but their actions produced avoidance. Ultimately, they both struggled through text, with little to no comprehension, often resorting to looking up a condensed summary online to gain the required information. The aspect of intrinsic motivation does not seem to have ever been a part of either participant's reading life. Neither recalled enjoying reading, never seeing it as a pleasurable experience. As with intrinsic motivation, both participants lacked personal interest in reading, and as they never felt positively about it, they tended to undervalue this highly beneficial habit. Although Dani did recall trying to "find that one book" that would hook her as a reader, she was "never successful." Self-efficacy also emerged as something that both participants lacked. Both Dani and Jessie acknowledged negative thoughts about their reading aptitude, especially when they were identified as needing remedial services due to their struggles with comprehension. Lastly, both participants lacked the motivational aspect of transactional beliefs, whereby readers use their own experiences to create understanding. Both viewed the purpose of reading efferently, to get the required information. They failed to aesthetically interact with text. Jessie explicitly referred to most novels as something she could not relate to, describing them as "not relevant in my life." According to Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) all of these aspects are important for text comprehension, and both participants were found lacking in each area.

As a result of feeling incompetent as readers, Dani and Jessie did not value reading and avoided it as much as possible (Bandura, 1989; Juel, 1988; Wigfield et al., 1997). Additionally,

their inferiority as readers was confirmed when they were assigned to remedial services. Schunk and Pajares (2009) explain that "students in low-ability groups from which they cannot move may feel demoralized and perform poorly even though they feel efficacious about learning" (p. 42). This negative self-efficacy related to their "perceived capabilities for learning or performing activities at designated levels" (Bandura, 1997, p. 35) may have kept Dani and Jessie from successful apprenticeship in the community of practice (Wenger, 2004) formed by those that enjoyed reading. Failure undermines personal efficacy, "especially if failures occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established" (Bandura, 1997, p. 58). Owing to their inability to comprehend text or unwillingness to practice, Dani and Jessie read only for efferent purposes maintaining a position at the periphery "preventing full participation" in the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 2001, p. 166) whereby they read to comply with the rules and to obtain good grades.

This disempowering position contributed to and reinforced an already negative identity as a reader, prompting both participants to identify as "individuals without agency" (Alvermann, 2001, p. 678). This lack of identity, or agency, concerning reading was further exacerbated as they progressed through high school (Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, 1998; Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002). There are many cultural constructs concerning reading abilities and disabilities. According to Alvermann (2001) "Readers locked into 'special' identifications know all too well which side of the enabling or disabling binary they occupy and the consequences such identities carry" (p. 677). Part of the problem with this is that the term "struggling" includes those who may have "clinically diagnosed reading disabilities as well as to those who are unmotivated, in remediation, disenchanted, or generally unsuccessful in school

literacy tasks" (Hinchman (2000), as cited in Alvermann, 2001, p. 670). Both participants clearly recalled being upset upon learning that they required remedial services for comprehension. This message made them feel like they were not (good) readers, and they did not view this position as a something they could change. In fact, they still identify themselves as poor readers.

According to Nell (1988), the antecedents for developing motivation for reading pleasure include reading ability, positive expectations, and correct book selection. Both Dani and Jessie admitted struggling with comprehension and having low reading ability. Furthermore, they did not have positive expectations concerning reading, and Dani explicitly talked about not finding that "one right book." It is believed that readers' low self-efficacy greatly contributes to their failure to become a member of the reader community of practice as well as their failure to develop any sense of agency pertaining to their own reading.

Bandura's (1986, 1989, 1997, 2000) work in the area of self-efficacy in students reveals that both Dani and Jessie accepted the designation of not being a good reader. This prompted them to opt out of full participation in the readers' community of practice (Wenger, 2004), which contributed to their growing apathy toward reading in general. Their experiences with negative self-efficacy inhibited their development of identity and agency as a reader. In their initial efforts to be a part of the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 2001; Wenger, 2004), to obtain proficiency in reading at school, each failed to move beyond an apprenticeship, maintaining a place at the margins, not moving toward mastery to engage in aesthetic experiences with reading (Rosenblatt, 1994). This unchanged status between negative self-

efficacy, inability to transcend apprenticeship, and gaining agency as a reader greatly influenced

Dani and Jessie in becoming non-participants in the reading culture, thus remaining aliterate.

Chapter 6: Interpretations & Implications

The findings pertaining to each exploratory case and the cross-case analysis, discussed in the previous chapter, support the achievement of the study goals, which were to describe the aliterate pre-service teachers' reading experiences at home and all levels of schooling as well as to elucidate how they identify themselves as readers. The findings reported in this work support those evident in the extant research on aliteracy in the pre-service teacher population (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Nathanson et al. 2008). In addition, they contribute to the body of knowledge on aliteracy in this population by revealing the jaggedness and complexity of the phenomenon of aliteracy. When examining the strategies for addressing the jaggedness of aliteracy in pre-service teachers, it is evident that we "cannot apply one-dimensional thinking to understand something that is complex" (Rose, 2016, p. 82). Thus, the discussion in this chapter will "take a leap beyond the data and present the results in a broader context" (Lecompte & Schensul, 2013, p. 301) and explain "to the reader what [it] means" (p. 2). The discussion commences with a review of what teachers can do in their classrooms for their students, before delineating what instructors can do for pre-service teacher candidates, and what school leaders can do for practicing teachers.

Analysis of all participant interviews, including those conducted as part of the pilot study, revealed that many teachers are still using some version of Round Robin Reading (RRR) at all grade levels, whereby they divide the reading material in segments, so that students can count to the paragraph they must read. Available evidence suggests that over half of practicing teachers in grades K-8 use some form of RRR (Ash, Kuhn, & Walpole, 2009). RRR has morphed to

include other forms known as Popcorn Reading where the teacher randomly selects the next reader (pops), Popsicle Reading where the teacher randomly draws student names (pre-written on popsicle sticks), and Combat Reading (Ash & Kuhn, 2006; Ash, Kuhn, & Walpole, 2009) where children randomly call on their peers with the objective of catching those not paying attention. Jessie specifically talked about this practice in her elementary experience.

RRR is a poor practice (Allington, 1977, 1980, 2013; Ash & Kuhn, 2006; Cunningham et al., 2009; Opitz & Rasinski, 2008). Research clearly demonstrates that it not only causes stress even for good readers, inhibiting comprehension, but that it is also a misuse of instructional time (Allington, 1977, 1980, 2013; Ash & Kuhn, 2006; Cunningham et al., 2009; Opitz & Rasinski, 2008). For example, instead of having the 30 minutes of instructional time to read on their own or with a partner (dividing the time), students read for approximately one to two minutes each. My previous research indicates that some children do not get a chance to read at all, while some of the best oral readers are called on more than once (Dengler, 2003). Other clear disadvantages of using RRR include slower reading rates (Opitz & Rasinski, 1998), models of dysfluent reading, and problems with self-efficacy and motivation. Further, this practice can be linked to the Matthew Effect, whereby good readers get more time and practice with reading and thus continue to get better, while poor readers read progressively less, widening the gap between the two groups (Stanovich, 1986). Educators must create opportunities for students to become engaged readers and RRR clearly does not serve this purpose.

Good alternatives to RRR include partner reading (Meisinger, Schwanenflugal, Bradley, & Stahl, 2004; Shanahan, 2012), Directed Reading and Thinking Activity (Smyers, 1993;

Stauffer & Harrell, 1975), Reciprocal Teaching (Oczkus, 2003; Palicsar, & Brown, 1986),

Reciprocal Teaching Plus (Ash, 2002), Reader's Theater, and Echo and Choral Reading (Kuhn,

2009).

Research on engaged readers, readers who are motivated and are effective with their use

of strategies to cognitively comprehend text (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000), clearly demonstrates

that the more engaged reading a student does, the better their comprehension and overall

achievement in reading becomes (Guthrie & Cox, 2001; Guthrie et al., 2013). Teachers can use

Guthrie and Wigfield's (2000) four aspects of the cognitive process involved in text

comprehension, namely activating prior knowledge, forming text representations, constructing

causal inferences, and integrating prior knowledge with text. These aspects can be modeled by

good readers and can be explicitly taught. Activating prior knowledge is important for text

comprehension and can enhance additional information for later recall. Forming text

representations (mental images), as one reads is important for text comprehension. If readers

cannot comprehend the reading material, they will not be able to create an image or

representation for what is happening. The reader must also be able to construct causal

inferences, which demonstrates an even higher level of comprehension. Lastly, the reader should

integrate prior knowledge with the text, which can only be achieved if the reader is capable of

activating any prior knowledge on the topic (alternatively, a teacher can provide pertinent

information before introducing something new). Dani and Jessie both struggled with

understanding what they were reading, since they could recall. Perhaps they lacked models to

explicitly help them develop these cognitive aspects. Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory of

learning establishes that, "Learning occurs in a social context as the child gradually acquired

competence through the interaction with more expert others" (p. 80). This experience may also directly contribute to increasing intrinsic motivation to read and a positive self-efficacy for reading. The amount of engaged reading has a very positive cyclic effect (Guthrie & Cox, 2001; Guthrie et al., 2013; Klauda & Guthrie, 2015). Unfortunately, the opposite is also true, as those who do not participate in engaged reading will show a marked decrease in reading ability (Juel, 1988; Mikulecky, 1994).

By providing rich opportunities for students to become engaged readers, teachers can help each one develop an identity as a reader (Alvermann, 2001; Botzakis & Hall, 2010). While this practice should start at home, in school it begins at the elementary level. There are many layers to helping students develop an identity as a reader. Research supports the idea that students must witness demonstrations of good reading habits and be engaged in reading (Allington, 2013; Braithwaite, 1999; Cambourne, 2002; Cunningham, & Allington, 2015; Draper et al., 2000; Ruddell, 1995; Smith, 2006) as well as have "effective educators model strategic reading" (Allen, 2001, p. 63). Strategic reading teaches students what good readers do, which includes many strategies to gain comprehension from text. According to Juel (1988), comprehension is a cognitive competency, which must be mastered to avoid disengagement and disenfranchised readers who find reading unpleasant. Ample body of research also demonstrates that teachers who have had the experience of reading aesthetically are better at selecting appropriate books for their individual students and are more likely to use best practices during reading instruction (Burgess et al., 2011; Cremin, 2011; Kolloff, 2002; Manna & Misheff, 1987; McKool & Gespass, 2009; Morrison et al., 1999; Powell-Brown, 2004; Routman, 1996; Ruddell, 1995).

Empirical evidence also indicates that students' interest in reading for pleasure diminishes as they progress through school (Oldfather, 1995). The two aliterate pre-service teachers that took part in this study, as well as the pilot study participants, expressed a dislike for many titles considered classic works that are frequently part of the high school English experience, especially Shakespeare. Educators must meet students where they are, in terms of both their reading level and reading interest. While I am not suggesting that we abandon all literature, we must be mindful about providing choice to students (Gambrell, 2011; Sanacore, 1999, 2002), especially if the goal is for them to develop a reading habit. Allen (2001) suggested being mindful of the timing of teaching literature, stating that thoughtful planning and teacher scaffolding would make even complex literature accessible to the students. Early (1960) described phases of literary appreciation, emphasizing that students must go through each phase of literary appreciation sequentially. Carlsen (1974) expanded on Early's work and identified the first of five phase as "unconscious delight," indicating that students must first learn to enjoy reading for its own sake. To do so, they should read many types of books in order to experience what they like, as once they find something they like, they will typically seek out multiple titles by that author. By essentially forcing students to attempt to appreciate works by Shakespeare, for example, without proper scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978), we are turning would-be readers away from literary works and reinforcing aliterates' attitudes toward reading, which they justify by claiming that reading is not for them, but rather "something to be endured" (Cope, 1997, p.20). This very important first phase is where students learn to enjoy reading and begin to identify themselves as readers. This is an important step to eventually read for aesthetic purposes, transacting with text (Rosenblatt, 1993). We must acknowledge that students,

irrespective of the teacher grade-level assignment, may still be struggling within the first phase of literary appreciation (unconscious appreciation). Without this consideration we may inadvertently create an environment where students "find the school's institutionalized practices of reading irrelevant and at odds with their motivation to learn" (Alvermann, 2001, p. 684) which causes them to avoid these practices and ultimately become aliterate.

Drawing upon well-regarded research concerning influential teachers (Gambrell, 2011; Gebhard, 2006; McCombs, 1997; Ruddell, 1995), teachers must "feel passionately about their subjects and are able to generate contagious energy about them" (Gebhard, 2006, p.455). In particular, we must be more proactive in helping our aliterate pre-service teacher candidates, like Dani and Jessie, to redefine themselves in relation to reading and obtain an identity as a reader. We must assist them in developing a positive disposition (habit of mind) as a reader, as this will allow them to become influential teachers who can have a positive impact "upon the motivation and engagement levels" of their future students' reading (p. 555).

Since taking part in this research, both Dani and Jessie have become NYS certified elementary level teachers. Reading their accounts, one might ask, so where does this leave us? It is encouraging that recent research demonstrates the transformability of reading identities (Lewis & DelValle, 2009). Dottin (2009) has continued to research professional dispositions in pre-service teachers and has reported that they can be developed through the use of self-reflective practice by the candidate. It is also vital that positive dispositions be modeled by the instructor using explicit instruction along with quality feedback, while allowing candidates to practice within the classroom culture. Ritchhart (2002) recommended developing dispositions of

pre-service teachers through nurturing, by getting candidates to realize what is happening to them and within them as this would enable them to understand the difference between ability and action. According to Dottin (2009), "They are taught about the disposition," such as reading for pleasure, and then they "practice demonstrating the dispositions" like reading for enjoyment within the class confines (p. 86).

Extant literature on professional judgement and dispositions (habits of mind) inform our understanding of the complexity of aliteracy, which stems from the "gap between competence and performance," i.e., what one can do and actually does (Dottin, 2009, p.86). Dottin further explained that this gap stems from "personal factors such as dispositions or attitudes, as well as environmental factors" (p. 85). According to the author, "the desire to act with professional judgement is therefore, the link between pedagogical ability (knowledge and skills), and the deployment of that ability (as a state of performance)" (p. 85).

Consequently, the first implication of the current study findings pertains to pre-service teacher education, which should include courses that assess their disposition toward reading for pleasure. We should also mandate coursework where "professional educators participate in communities of practice in ways that make it clear the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind (dispositions)" (Dottin, 2009, p. 87) necessary for becoming an influential teacher (Gambrell, 2011; Gebhard, 2006; McCombs, 1997; Ruddell, 1995). It is strongly suggested that children's literature become part of the course requirements to help students gain an appreciation and depth of reading experience (Krashen1993, 2004; Warmack, 2007). Moreover, college-level instructors for pre-service teacher candidates should create a process for reflection on attitudes

toward reading, as well as provide explicit instructional opportunities for positive interactions with text. This exercise may also include a recounting of an instance when the instructor may have "fallen out of love with reading" (Ramsay, 2002, p. 56) and discussions on how or why s/he went through an aliterate period. Most importantly, students should be prompted to identify specific experiences or factors that brought their peers and instructor back to the habit of reading for pleasure.

Professional development opportunities and professional learning communities could also successfully be utilized to engage practicing teachers who are currently aliterate. Whether this is only a passing stage (Ramsay, 2002) or they have yet to develop an appreciation and habit of reading for pleasure, becoming involved in professional development opportunities and professional learning communities could be extremely beneficial. Using a reflective practice (Schon, 1984), participants would be afforded the opportunity to evaluate their current status as readers, and if willing, create a plan for growth with the support of the group. Administrators and teacher leaders would be of great help in this endeavor. This idea of teachers as readers must become a priority and an integral part of the professional culture. As Goldberg and Pesko (2000) noted, "Interweaving pleasure and practicality makes a teachers' book club a powerful option for school districts looking for a fresh approach to professional development" (p. 39). This approach to professional development would "encourage teachers to experience (it) as engaged learners inquiring into and reflecting on literacy goals" (p. 41). Goldberg and Pesko's research indicates that teachers' inclusion in book clubs as professional development informed the literacy planning. There are many benefits to using book clubs for professional development as it creates a shared culture and builds a common practice of reading to learn (Boccuzzi-

Reichart, 2005; Burbank, Kauchak, & Bates, 2010; Florio-Ruane & Raphael, 2001; Goldberg & Pesko, 2000; Roberts & Pruitt, 2003).

In order for teachers to help students build a positive reading habit, they need to have one themselves (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Commeyras et al., 2003). Dottin (2009) argued that, although aliterate teachers possess reading competence, their teaching performance is compromised by their own negative attitudes toward reading. Teacher modeling in the classroom and interactions with students are extremely important to the development of positive reading habits (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Barbe, 1963; Commeyras et al., 2003; Cramer & Blachowicz, 1980; Jensen et al., 1998). The ILA Professional Teaching Standards (2010) for elementary educators state that teachers should "display positive dispositions related to their own reading," exhibit "positive reading and writing behaviors and serve as a model," and "promote student appreciation of the value of reading in and out of school" (Professional learning and leadership section, para. 6:2).

Extant research supports a strong connection between teachers' personal reading practices and their ability to select best instructional practices for teaching reading (McKool & Gespass, 2009; Morrison et al., 1999), as well as their ability to recommend appropriate texts (Cremin, 2011; Dobler, 2009), and use motivation techniques beneficial to developing students' interest and engagement in reading (Dobler, 2009; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; McKool & Gespass, 2009).

Limitations of the Study & Suggestions for Future Research

This study was limited in scope, as experiences of only two participants were examined in depth. Thus, when conducting further research on this subject, it would be beneficial to create

a case as a class cohort at the pre-service level to track changes in attitude toward reading after

implemented the suggestions arising from the present study findings. Second, male aliterates

were intentionally excluded from this study to help limit the scope. Further research could be

done to attempt to discover any differences in the experiences of aliterates in terms of gender and

reading histories. Lastly, developing a tool for tracking how pre-service teacher candidates use

their leisure time could greatly increase the efficacy of any interview as well as potentially

capture other types of reading for enjoyment they may be doing (e.g., online, news, and social

media).

Appendix A

Initial Survey

Number _____

Consider each statement and indicate your choice. How descriptive of you are the following statements?

1. When I find a good book, reading can be enjoyable.

       No   Not Usually   Somewhat   Yes

2. I like to share a good book with a friend.

       No   Not Usually   Sometimes   Yes

3. I only read when I have to.

       False   Mostly False   Mostly True   True

4. I go to text (digital or print) when I am interested in learning something new.

       No   Not Usually   Sometimes   Yes

5. I enjoy watching television.

       No   Not Usually   Sometimes   Yes

6. I read a great deal when I was younger.

       No   Not Really   Sort Of   Yes

7. I am happy with the amount I am reading in my free time.

       No   Not Really   Somewhat   Yes

8. I would like to read more during my free time.

       No   Not Really   Somewhat   Yes

9. I am a good reader.

       No   Not Really   Sort Of   Yes

10. I often look for books, articles, or blogs about things that interest me.

       No   Not Usually   Sometimes   Yes

11. Reading is boring.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

12. I think I should read more, but it does not really interest me.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

13. I usually read for pleasure during vacation times.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

14. I did not learn to enjoy reading in my early years.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

15. I have never really thought of myself as a reader.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

16. I think I am a devoted and avid reader.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

17. I would enjoy spending a day reading for pleasure.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

18. I get satisfaction from my personal reading.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

19. I would rather watch a program on TV or a movie instead of reading during my leisure time.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

20. Frankly, I don't find reading to be very relaxing.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

21. I enjoy reading in my free time.

| False | Mostly False | Mostly True | True |

22. Do you have a favorite book? Yes/No (Circle one). If yes, please list the title _____

23. What would be your first, second, and third choice of activity during your free time?

1

2

3

24. How much reading did you do over the summer?

25. Which of the following do you read most often? (Check one) ___Magazines, ____ Newspapers, ____ online blogs, ____ online sources of information, ___ books Fiction or non-fiction, digital or paper), ___ other (explain)

Interview Protocols

Interview 1

Tell me about your decision to become a teacher.

When you consider your early reading experiences in school, would you rate them as primarily positive, negative, or neutral? Explain.

Overall in your early reading experience, would you rate them as primarily positive, negative, or neutral?

When you consider you're your middle school reading experiences, would you rate them as primarily positive, negative, or neutral? Explain.

When you consider you're your high school reading experiences, would you rate them as primarily positive, negative, or neutral? Explain.

When you consider your college reading experiences, would you rate them as primarily positive, negative, or neutral? Explain.

Review Survey…

So even if you were assigned it, are there books that you haven't finished or that you just didn't get into?

To keep yourself busy, what do you do instead of reading for fun? What do you do with that time?

So you say you sort of think you are a good reader. What does that mean?

So, you said tell me reading is boring, you said mostly false, what…?

So, what do you usually do during vacation times?

So let's say you are done with college and you get your job as a teacher. What do you envision you doing with your summer vacation?

Besides spending time with family and friends, is there anything else you would like to do if you had a whole day to pick something?

How much reading did you do over the summer?

Were any of your teachers effective in promoting the love of reading? How?

What do you think the ideal classroom reading experience would look like to help you build intrinsic motivation to read for pleasure?

Did you ever see your parent(s) reading? Tell me about that.

Do you have any memories of a parent(s) encouraging you to read?

Have you ever recommended a book to a friend?

Interview 2

How would you describe yourself? What five qualities would you use to describe yourself?

What types would you use to describe yourself? For example, if someone were to ask me that, I would say athlete or worker.

Any other qualities you would share that are part of your identity?

Friends…So, can you give me an example or two of the things you would do?

How about family? What do you like to do when you are with your family?

In the last interview, you said …

Would you say you like to get something out of a book if you're going to read it?

Do you ever remember a specific teacher who encouraged you to read for pleasure?

Can you remember any one particular lesson during reading from elementary school?

What are your strengths as a reader?

In what ways do you need to grow as a reader?

How much time do you spend on a typical weekend day for the following:

Watching TV

Exercising

School Work

Playing Video Games

Cooking

Cleaning

Reading for Pleasure

Using the computer for other than school work

Emails or texting

Any social networking like Twitter or Facebook

Other

How do you plan to spend your next college break/vacation time?

What was the last good book that you read?

Have you recommended it to anyone?

What do you like most about reading?

What do you like least about books or reading?

What is your favorite way (or reason) to read?

Least favorite reason to read?

Describe the kind of reader you'd like to be.

So how do you see yourself in the future as a reader? What do you envision your reading self to look like when you are a professional?

How would you get a sense of what students like to read?

Do you think it's important for children to love reading?

Do you have any questions for me?

Anything from the first interview that you were thinking about maybe?

Interview Three

Review notes from Interviews 1 & 2 (accuracies and possible contradictions):

What if you wanted more information on a topic? Where would you look?

In what activity or activities have you experienced flow?

Have you ever experienced this (flow) while reading?

Would you say a teacher's personal reading practices would impact the children in his/her own classroom? How? Why?

Do you think it is important for others who do not like to read to do something about that?

Is it important for students to love reading? Why, why not?

How would you get your students to enjoy reading more?

How would you get your students to do more reading?

What do you think the ideal classroom reading experience would look like to help you, the teacher, build intrinsic motivation for students to read?

Any questions for me?

Appendix C

Informed Consent Forms

Project Director of Principal Investigator Krislynn Dengler

Title of Project A Look at Aliteracy in Pre-Service Teachers

You are invited to participate in a survey on your reading habits. We hope to learn about the amount of reading you do and your level of enjoyment related to reading.

If you decide to participate, you will be given directions to complete the survey and no further information will be gathered unless you are asked to participate in three follow-up interviews. There are no risks expected by participation in this survey. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.

Your identity will remain confidential as you will be assigned a number. If you give us your permission by signing this document, we plan to disclose this to Binghamton University in compliance with Human Subjects Review protocol.

In the event of a research related emergency please contact _____ at _____.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with the College at Oneonta and Binghamton University. Your participation is voluntary, if you decide to participate; you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

Before you sign the form, please ask questions on any aspect of the study that is at all unclear to you. If you have any additional questions, concerns, or complaints later or wish to report a research related problem, Dr. S. G. Grant can be reached at (607)777-5072, and will be happy to speak with you. If at any time you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject or have questions, concerns, or complaints about the research you may call Binghamton University's Human Subjects Research Review Committee at (607)777-3818. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.

Date _____

Signature _____

References

Allen, J. (2001). Teach your students to love reading. *The Education Digest, 64*(4), 58-64.

Allington, R. L. (1977). If they don't read much, how are they ever going to get good? *Journal of Reading, 21*, 57-61.

Allington, R. L. (1980). Teacher interruption behaviors during primary grade oral reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 371-377.

Allington, R. L. (2011). *What really matters for struggling readers*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Allington, R. L. (2013). What really matters when working with struggling readers. *The Reading Teacher, 66*(7), 520-530.

Alvermann, D. (2001). Reading adolescents' reading identities: Looking back to see ahead. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(8), 676-690.

Anderson, R., Wilson, P., & Fielding, L. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(3), 285-303.

Applegate, A., & Applegate, M. (2004). The Peter effect: Reading habits and attitudes of preservice teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, *57*, 554-563.

Applegate, A. J., Applegate, M. D., Mercantini, M. A., McGeehan, C. M., Cobb, J. B., DeBoy, J. R., . . . Lewinski, K. E. (2014). The Peter effect revisited: Reading habits and attitudes of college students. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 53,* 188-204.

Ash, G. E. & Kuhn, M. R. (2006). Meaningful oral and silent reading in the elementary and middle school classroom: Breaking the Round Robin Reading addiction. In T. Rasinski, C. Blachowicz, & K. Lems (Eds.), *Fluency instruction: Research-based best practices*. (pp. 155-172). New York: The Guilford Press.

Ash, G. E., Kuhn, M. R., & Walpole, S. (2009). Analyzing "inconsistencies" in practice: Teachers' continued use of Round Robin Reading. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 25*, 87-103.

Baker, L., & Scher, D. (2002). Beginning readers' motivation for reading in relations to parental beliefs and home reading experiences. *Reading Psychology, 23*(4), 239-270.

Baker, L., Scher, D., & Mackler, K. (1997). Home and family influences on motivations for reading. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(2), 69-82.

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*(4), 452-477.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development Volume 6, Six theories of child development* (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*(3), 75-78.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development, 67*(3), 1206-1222.

Barbe, W. (1963). Interests and the teaching of reading. *Education*, *8*, 486.

Beers, K. (1998). Choosing not to read: Understanding why some middle schoolers just say no. In K. Beers & B. Samuels (Eds.), *Understanding aliteracy* (pp. 37-60). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Benevides, T., & Peterson, S. S. (2010). Literacy attitudes, habits and achievements of future teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *36*(3), 291-302.

Bishlinghoff, B. (2002). Under the wings of writers: A teacher reads to find her way. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(3), 242-252.

Botzakis, S. & Hall, L. (2010). Aliteracy, agency, and identity. Eds. A. McGill-Franzen & R. Allington, In *Handbook of reading disability research* (pp. 129-136).

Braithwaite, J. (1999, September 22-25). *Does it matter what I think?: An exploration of teachers' constructions of literacy and their classroom practices.* Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Lahti, Finland. doi: ED458603

Brozo, W. (2006). Bridges to literacy for boys. *Educational Leadership, 64*(1), 71-74.

Burgess, S. Sargent, S., Smith, M. Hill, N. & Morrison, S. (2011). Teachers' leisure reading habits and knowledge of children's books: Do they relate to the teaching practices of elementary school teachers? *Reading Improvement, 48*(2), 88-102.

Cambourne, B. (2002). Holistic, integrated approaches to reading and language arts instruction: The Constructivist framework of an instructional theory. In A. E. Farstrup & S. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 25-47). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Carlsen, G. R. (1974). Literature IS. *The English Journal, 63*(2), 23-27.

Cipielewski, J., & Stanovich, K. (1992). Predicting growth in reading ability from children's exposure to print. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 54*(1), 74-89.

Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as positive development? *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 35*(3), 306-324.

Commeyras, M., Bishlinghoff, B., & Olson, J. (2003). *Teachers as readers: Perspectives on the importance of reading in teachers' classrooms and lives.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Cope, J. (1997). Beyond voices of readers: Students on school's effects on reading. *English Journal, 86*(3), 18-23.

Cramer, E. H., & Blachowicz, C. L. (1980). Teachers as readers: An extension of the 'impact of reading' survey. *Reading Horizons*, *20*(4), 283-291.

Cremin, T. (2011). Reading teachers/teaching reading: Why teachers who read make good teachers of reading. *English Drama Media, Feb*, 11-18.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cunningham, A. E., & Allington, R. (2015). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability 10 years later. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 934-945.

Cunningham, A. E., Zibulsky, J., Stanovich, K. E., & Stanovich, P. J. (2009). How teachers would spend their time teaching language arts: The mismatch between self-reported and best practices. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42*(5), 418-430.

Daisey, P. (2009). The reading experiences and beliefs of secondary pre-service. *Reading Horizons, 49*(2), 166-190.

Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3) 182-185.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motives and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26*, 325-346.

Decker, B. E. (1986). Aliteracy: What teachers can do to keep Johnny reading. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*, 55-58.

Dengler, K. (2003). A prospective teacher's perceptions of human intelligence on shaping practice: Managing class. Unpublished manuscript.

Dobler, E. (2009). Teachers as readers: How does my use of comprehension strategies influence my teaching of reading? *Journal of Reading Education, 34*(2), 10-17.

Dottin, E. S. (2009). Professional judgment and dispositions in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 83-88.

Draper, M. C., Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Radencich, M. C. (2000). Reading and writing habits of preservice teachers. *Reading Horizons, 40*(3), 185-203.

Dreher, M. J. (2003). Motivating teachers to read. *The Reading Teacher, 56*, 338-340.

Duncan, S. P. (2010). Lifelong love of reading. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 46*(2), 90-93.

Early, M. (1960). Stages of growth in literary appreciation. *The English Journal, 49*(3), 161-167.

Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Harold, R., & Blumenfeld, P. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self- and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development, 64*, 830-847.

Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology Vol. 3 Social, emotional, & personality development* (pp. 1017-1095). New York, NY: Wiley.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Frager, A. (1987). Conquering aliteracy in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(6), 16-19.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2010). *Applying educational research: How to read, do, and use research to solve problems of practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gallik, J. D. (1999). Do they read for pleasure? Recreational reading habits of college students. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 42*, 480-500.

Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher, 50*, 14-25.

Gambrell, L. B. (2011). Seven rules of engagement: What's most important to know about motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 65*(3), 172-178.

Gebhard, S. (2006). The lost boys (and girls): Readers in Neverland. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(5), 454-463.

Gee, J. P., Allen, A., & Clinton, K. (2001). Language, class and identity: Teenagers fashioning themselves through language. *Linguistics and Education, 12*(2), 175-194.

Gentile, L., & McMillan, M. (1977). Why won't teenagers read? *Journal of Reading, 20*(8), 649 654.

Gentile, L., & McMillan, M. (1987). *Stress and reading difficulties: Research, assessment, intervention.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodwin, L. (1996, October). *Aliteracy among college students: Why don't they read?* Annual meeting of the College Reading Association, Charleston, SC.

Graves, M. F., Juel, C., & Graves, B. (1998). *Teaching reading in the 21st century*. Des Moines, IA: Allyn & Bacon.

Guthrie, J. T., & Cox, K. E. (2001). Classroom conditions for motivation and engagement in reading. *Educational Psychology Review, 13*(3), 283-302.

Guthrie, J. T., Klauda, S. L., & Ho, A. N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly, 48*, 9-26.

Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W. D., & Huang, C. (2001). Benefits of opportunity to read and balanced instruction on the NAEP. *Journal of Educational Research, 96,* 145-162.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (1999). How motivation fits into a science of reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*, 199-205.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil & P. B. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Guthrie, J., Wigfield, A., Metsala, J., & Cox, K. (1999). Motivational and cognitive predictors of text comprehension and reading amount. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*(3), 231-256.

Hall, M., & Stahl, K. (2012). Devillainizing video in support of comprehension and vocabulary instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 65*(6), 403-406.

Harris, T., & Hodges, R. (1981). *A dictionary of reading and related terms*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. (2011). Children's reading comprehension difficulties: Nature, causes, and treatments. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(3), 139-142.

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. (1994). *Teaching reading around the world.* Hamburg, Germany: Lundberg, I. & Linnakyla, P.

International Literacy Association (ILA). (2010). *Standards for Reading Professionals*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Retrieved from http://www.literacyworldwide.org

Isidor, M. (n.d.). Viewing comprehension. Retrieved August 7, 2017, from https://www.academis.edu/4612918/VIEWING_COMPREHENSION

Jacobs, J. E., Lanza, S., Osgood, D. W., Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Changes in children's self-competence and values: Gender and domain differences across grades one through twelve. *Child Development, 73*(2), 509-527.

Jensen, K., Papp, S., & Richmond, B. (1998). *Improving children's habits in recreational reading.* Master's thesis. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 437-447.

Kennedy, A. (2014). *Reading habits and attitudes of pre-service teachers: A case study.* Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global database (UMI No. 3580314)

Klauda, S. (2009). The role of parents in adolescents' reading motivation and activity. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*, 325-363.

Klauda, S., & Guthrie, J. (2015). Comparing relations of motivation, engagement, and achievement among struggling and advanced adolescent readers. *Reading & Writing, 28*(2), 239-269.

Kolloff, P. B. (2002). Why teachers need to be readers. *Gifted Child Today, 25*(2), 50-55.

Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading*. Englewood, CA: Libraries Unlimited Inc.

Krashen, S. (2004). False claims about literacy development. *Educational Leadership, 61*(6), 18 21.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (2001). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

LeCompte, M. & Schensul, J. (2013). *Analysis and initerpretation of ethnographic data: A mixed methods approach*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Lewis, C. & del Valle, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Implicaitons for research and practice. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 307-322). New York: Guilford.

Liberman, I. & Liberman, A. (1990). Whole language vs. code emphasis: Underlying assumptions and their implications for reading instruction. *Annals of Dyslexia, 40*, 51-76.

Maeroff, G. I. (1982, September 28). Education. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1982/09/28/science/education.html

Manna, A. L., & Misheff, S. (1987). What teachers say about their own reading development. *Journal of Reading, 31*(2), 160-168.

Margalit, L. (2015, May 1). Video vs text: The brain perspective. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from http://www.psychologytoday.com/behind-online-behavior/201505/video-vs-text the-brain-perspective

McCombs, B. (1997). Commentary: Reflections on motivations for reading-through the looking glass of theory, practice, and reader experiences. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(2), 125 134.

McKenna, M. (2001). Development of reading attitudes. In L. Verhoeven & C. Snow (Eds.), *Literacy and motivation* (pp. 135-158). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

McKenna, M., Conradi, K., Lawrence, C., Jang, B., & Meyer, J. (2012). Reading attitudes of middleschool students: Results of a US survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(3), 283 306.

McKool, S. S., & Gespass, S. (2009). Does Johnny's reading teacher love to read? How teachers' personal reading habits affect instructional practice. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 48*, 264-276.

Meisinger, E. B., Schwanenflugel, P. J., Bradley, B. A., & Stahl, S. A. (2004). Interaction quality during partner reading. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*, 111-140.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mikulecky, L (1978, May). *Aliteracy and a changing view of literacy goals.* International Reading Association, Houston, Texas.

Mikulecky, L. (1994). The need for affective literates. In E. H. Cramer & M. Castle (Eds.), *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education* (pp. 249-254). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Miller, L. D., Fine, J. C., & Walker, J. J. (1994). Pre-service teachers' literacy dispositions. In K. Camperell & B. L. Hayes (Eds.), *Yearbook of American reading forum* (pp. 37-51). Retrieved from http://americanreadingforum.org

Moje, E., Overby, M., Tsvaer, N., & Morris, K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 107 154.

Morrison, T. G., Jacobs, J. S., & Swinyard, W. R. (1999). Do teachers who read personally use recommended practices in their classrooms? *Reading Research and Instruction, 38*, 81-100.

Morrow, L. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (Eds.) (2011). *Best practices in literacy instruction.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Munita, F. (2014). Reading habits of pre-service teachers. *Culture and Education, 26*(3), 448-475. doi:10.1080111356405.2014.965449

NAEP. (2015). *2015 Mathematics & reading assessments.* Retrieved from http://www.nationsreportcard.gov

Nagwabi, R., & Selzler, K. (2011). Reading engagement of preservice teachers: Impact of a reading-aloud initiative. *Journal of Reading Education, 37*(1), 33-39.

Nathanson, S., Pruslow, J., & Levitt, R. (2008). The reading habits and literacy attitudes of inservice and prospective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*, 313-321.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). (2012). *Top stories in NAEP long-term trend assessments.* Retrieved from http://nationsreportcard.gov

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Highlights from PIRLS 2011: Reading achievement of US fourth-grade students in an international context.* Retrieved from https://nces.gov

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2006). *What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning.* Washington, DC: Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). (2004). *Reading at risk: A survey of literary reading in America* (Report #46). Retrieved from www.arts.gov

NEA. (2007). *To read or not to read: A question of national consequence* (Report #47). Retrieved from www.arts.gov

NEA. (2009). *Reading on the rise: A new chapter in American literacy.* Retrieved from www.arts.gov

Nell, V. (1988). The Psychology of reading for pleasure: Needs and gratifications. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(1), 6-50.

Oczkus, L. D. (2010). *Reciprocal teaching at work: Powerful strategies and lesson for improving reading comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Oldfather, P. (1995). Commentary: What's needed to maintain and extend motivation for literacy in the middle grades? *Journal of Reading, 38*(6), 420-422.

Olufowobi, O., & Makinde, S. (2011). Aliteracy: A threat to educational development. *Educational Research, 2*(2), 824-827.

Opitz, M. F., & Rasinski, T. V. (2008). *Good-bye round robin: 25 effective oral reading strategies.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2010). *PISA 2009 results: What students know and can do.* Paris, France: OECD.

Owusu-Ansah, A. (2006). Researching lived experience as a research model. In M. Firmin & P. Brewer (Eds.), E*thnographic and qualitative research in education* (pp. 49-58). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Palinscar, A. S. & Brown, A. L. (1986). Interactive teaching to promote independent learning from text. *Reading Teacher, 39*, 771-777.

Paris, S. & Newman, E. (2009). The development of children's reading comprehension. In S. Israel & G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook on reading research on reading comprehension* (pp. 32-53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Powell-Brown, A. (2004). Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 47*(4), 284-288.

Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). (2012). *International results in reading.* Retrieved from http://timssandpirls.bc.edu

Ramsay, J. (2002). Hell's bibliophiles: The fifth way of looking at an aliterate. *Change, Jan,* 50-56.

Reissman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ritchhart, R. (2002). *Intellectual character: What is it, why it matters, and how to get it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ronberg, L. & Petersen, D. (2016). How specific are specific comprehension difficulties? An investigation of poor reading comprehension in nine-year-olds. *Scandinavian Journal of Education Research, 60*(1), 72-89.

Rose, T. (2016). *The end of average: How we succeed in a world that values sameness*. New York, NY: HarperOne.

Rosenblatt, L. (1993). The transactional theory: Against dualisms. *College English, 55*(4), 377 386.

Rosenblatt, L. (1994). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenwald, M. S. (2015, October 4). Are parents ruining youth sports? Fewer kids play amid
    pressure. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from
    https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/are-parents-ruining-youth-sports-fewer-kids-play
    amid-pressure/2015/10/04/eb1460dc-686e-11e5-9ef3
    fde182507eac_story.html?utm_term=.aa487714c74b

Roswell, J., McLean, C., & Hamilton, M. (2012). Real-time teaching. *Journal of Adolescent &*
    Adult Literacy, 55(5), 444-447.

Roulston, K. (2011). Working through challenges in doing interview research. *International*
    Journal of Qualitative Methods, 10(4), 348-366.

Routman, R. (1996). *Literacy at the crossroads: Crucial talk about reading, writing, and other*
    teaching dilemmas. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ruddell, R. B. (1995). Those influential literacy teachers: Meaning negotiators and motivation
    builders. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 454-463.

Ruddell, R. B., Ruddell, M. R., & Singer, H. (Eds.) (1994). *Theoretical models and processes of*
    reading. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Sanacore, J. (1999). Ecouraging children to make choices about their literacy learning.
    Intervention in School and Clinics, 35(1), 38-42.

Sanacore, J. (2002). Questions often asked about promoting lifetime literacy efforts. *Intervention*
    in School and Clinics, 37, 163-168.

Schiefele, U., Schaffner, E., Moller, J., & Wigfield, A. (2012). Dimensions of reading motivation
    and their relation to reading behavior and competence. *Reading Research Quarterly,*
    47(4), 427-463.

Schon, D. A. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York,
    NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Schunk, D. (1990). Introduction to a special section on motivation and efficacy. *Journal of*
    Educational Psychology, 82, 3-6.

Schunk, D., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.),
    Handbook of motivation at school (pp. 35-53). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor &
    Francis Group.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education*
    and the social sciences. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shanahan, T. (2012). Developing fluency in the context of effective literacy instruction. In T. Rasinski, C. Blachowicz, & K. Lems (Eds.), *Fluency instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 17-34). New York: The Guilford Press.

Smith, F. (2006). *Reading without nonsense*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Smyers, T. (1993). Add SQ to the DRTA and write. In M. W. Olson & S. P. Homan (Eds.), *Teacher to teacher: Strategies for the elementary classroom*. Newark, DE: IRA.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*, 360-401.

Stauffer, R. G. & Harrell, M. M. (1975). Individualizing reading-thinking activities. *The Reading Teacher, 28*(8), 765-769.

Steel, P. & Klingsieck, K. (2016). Academic procrastination: Psychological antecedents revisited. *Australian Psychologist, 51*(1), 36-46.

Strommen, L., & Mates, B. (2004). Learning to love reading: Interviews with older children and teens. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 48*, 188-200.

Stutz, F., Schaffner, E., & Schiefele, U. (2015). Relations among reading motivation, reading amount, and reading comprehension in the early elementary grades. *Learning and Individual Differences, 45*(2016), 101-113.

Sulentic-Dowell, M., Beal, G. D., & Capraro, R. M. (2006). How do literacy experiences affect the teaching propensities of elementary pre-service teachers? *Reading Psychology, 27*, 235-255.

Thomas, U. (2010). Literacy lessons and preservice teachers: Belief systems, reflective responses. *Education Resources Information Center*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519838.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2016). *Education for the 21st century*. Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker-Dalhouse, D., Sibley, C. H., Dalhouse, A. D., Nagwabi, R. C., & Selzler, K. (2011). Reading engagement of pre-service teachers: Impact of a reading aloud initiative. *Journal of Reading Education, 37*(1), 33-39.

Warmack, W. (2007). *Elementary education pre-service teachers' attitudes toward reading* (Doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, AL.

Wenger, E. (2004). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wigfield, A. (1997). Reading motivation: A domain-specific approach to motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 59-68.

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). Development between the ages of 11 and 25. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 148 185). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster/Macmillan.

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., Yoon, K. S., Harold, R. D., Arbreton, A., Freedman-Doan, K., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (1997). Changes in children's competence beliefs and subjective task values across the elementary school years: A three year study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 451-469.

Wigfield, A., Gladstone, J., & Turci, L. (2016). Beyond cognition: Reading motivation and reading comprehension. *Child Development Perspectives, 10*(3), 190-195.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 420-432.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.